SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1961

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

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

Our Father, God, who dost overarch our fleeting years with Thine eternity and dost undergird our weakness with Thy strength: In the midst of the pressures of another week, as Thy servants here face its vast concerns, with bowed heads and hearts we pause at this shrine of our spirits.

Without Thee, even our wistful hopes for humanity are like withered leaves—once verdant and bright, but now brown and crumbled ruins blown upon a bitter wind.

Join us, we pray Thee, in kinship to those who, in other times that tried men's souls, went on believing in beauty and love and God, in the midst of ugliness, hatred, and horror.

As with deep craving for reality we turn now to Thee, we remember that we date this day's deliberations from the lowly cradle of One who died on the gallows of His day—mocked, reviled, insulted, outraged. Yet that torturing cross of defeat sways the future.

By its crimson sign which towers o'er the wrecks of time, may we conquer—in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Thursday, February 16, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–42, the Speaker had appointed Mr. GALLAGHER, of New Jersey, Mrs. KELLY, of New York, Mr. YATES, of Illinois, Mr. IKARD, of Texas, Mr. DULSKI, of New York, Mr. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, Mr. STRATTON, of New York, Mr. CURTIS, of Massachusetts, Mr. BROOMFIELD, of Michigan, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska, Mr. HARVEY, of Michigan, and Mr. TUPPER, of Maine, as members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, on the part of the House.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to Federal aid for education, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President on education, received by the Senate today, which, I am informed, has been read in the House, be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare without its having been read.

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

APPOINTMENTS BY VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that pursuant to the order of the Senate of February 16, 1961, the Vice President had appointed on February 17, 1961, the following as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference to be held at Ottawa, Canada, on February 22–25, 1961: Senators LONG of Louisiana, DODD, JORDAN, METCALF, HARTKE, YARBOROUGH, CAPEHART, AIKEN, ALLOTT, DWORSHAK, BOGGS, and SMITH of Maine.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Vice President has also aksed the Presiding Officer to announce the following to be members of the Special Committee on the Aging, pursuant to Senate resolution 33: Senators MCNAMARA (chairman), SMATHERS, ENGLE, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, LONG of Hawaii, NEUBERGER, DIRKSEN, GOLDWATER, and COTTON.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with.

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

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

SENATOR HAYDEN COMPLETES 49 YEARS OF CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Sunday, February 19, CARL HAYDEN celebrated the completion of his 49th year of congressional service to his State and Nation. The distinguished record of achievement so firmly established by our beloved President pro tempore, the senior Senator from Arizona, has no parallel in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

Senator HAYDEN has served in the Congress longer than anyone else in the history of the Nation. His service has been continuous. He arrived in Washington, as the first elected Representative of the State of Arizona, on February 19, 1912, four days after Arizona was declared a State. Senator HAYDEN served in the House of Representatives until March of 1927, when he came to the Senate. He has been devoted to the cause of the West and the development of his State. The life of CARL HAYDEN is synonymous with the history of the State of Arizona.

In the Senate, CARL HAYDEN has become the mentor of us all. A man of simplicity, intellect, and always available to his colleagues for advice and consultation, he has served the Senate well in his capacity as chairman of the Rules Committee, and now as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, where he guides consideration of the Nation's fiscal affairs. He has also served, and continues to serve, with vigor and distinction in various party and congressional capacities.

I have come to know CARL HAYDEN as a true friend in the years that I have been in the Congress. This association has meant a great deal. Senator HAYDEN is the best friend the West has ever had on Capitol Hill, and is a friend that I hope we shall have in this body for many more years to come.

Mrs. Mansfield and I wish to extend our very best wishes to Senator HAYDEN and Mrs. Hayden, and to express the hope that we shall continue to share their friendship in the future.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the distinguished Senator from Montana for his generous comments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say to the majority leader that one of the many qualities that have endeared our very distinguished President pro tempore to all other Members of the Senate and to the country is his grace of spirit. I have never seen him out of sorts. I have never seen him angry. I have never seen him deeply partisan. On occasions when I was still serving on the Appropriations Committee, I noticed that on a good many of the issues which presented themselves, he inclined toward our side, rather than toward his own party's side. That is the hallmark of statesmanship, after all—to see clearly and in perspective the needs of the country, regardless of partisanship, and to follow that kind of a course. That is courage, indeed.

So I salute his grace, his amiability, and his even temper; and I also salute him for the fact that at all times he is so easy to get along with. The mark of a great committee chairman is that all the members find it so easy to get along with him and find it a real labor of love to work under his chairmanship. I believe that everyone who ever served on the Appropriations Committee will say that of our very distinguished President pro tempore.

So I join the majority leader in saluting the distinguished senior Senator from

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Arizona, and in wishing him well, long life, and, above all, the thing that I think he captured a long time ago. If time will permit, I should like to recall the fact that once I heard a young rabbi offer the invocation in the House of Representatives; his name was Joshua Liebman, and it is said that on Sundays he had a television and radio audience of some 5 million or 6 million people. Strangely enough, a week after I heard that invocation from his eloquent lips, I was coursing down the street in Chicago and I aimlessly looked in a bookshop window. There I saw a book written by the same young rabbi, Joshua Liebman. He is now gone; he died when he was but 44 years of age. The title of the book was "Peace of Mind." I went into the store and purchased a copy of the book; and I look at it ever so often, because I find it a great tonic. It is the story of an old rabbi to whom a young man went for advice. The young man had, I suppose, all the inclinations of youth—to seek money, to seek fame, to seek glory, to seek reputation. He laid his problem in the lap of the old rabbi, who took the list the young man had prepared, scratched out everything that was on it, and at the bottom put, as the great objective and goal of life, peace of mind.

I think our President pro tempore has achieved peace of mind and it is reflected in his constant grace and his constant kindliness and the affable and genial way in which he deals with his colleagues and with the problems of state.

So on this occasion I warmly salute our President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair state that he has peace of mind. The Senator from Illinois may never have seen the Chair angry, but there are occasions when the Chair boils within. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished majority and minority leaders in paying honor and respect to the distinguished occupant of the chair. It is because of his personality and his consideration and fairness in so many of our activities that he has endeared himself, not only to the Members of the U.S. Senate, but to thousands of people throughout the Nation. And I wish for the distinguished occupant of the chair many, many more happy years of being with us.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the majority and minority leaders and those of other Senators who have congratulated our Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Arizona, on his many years of service. Those of us who are younger in service in the Senate have found it a great encouragement and an inspiration to know a man who has served all these years in this body and to know that after we have met with him he has helped us. We in the Midwest are indebted to the distinguished Senator from Arizona, not only for his service to the country, but for his interest in our problems in particular. The Nation and Congress have been fortunate in having his services; and I personally have very much appreciated them.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to the words of commendation on the anniversary of the service of the Senator from Arizona.

When my husband was a Member of this body, he loved to tell the tales of the early West he heard from Senator HAYDEN, and he never failed to regale our friends in Oregon with the account that we have a Senator who has been in Congress ever since his State was admitted to the Union. I think this is a remarkable achievement, and it also attests to the comparative youthfulness of our country.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, no one more deserves the high accolades of his colleagues in the Senate, which have been paid and which are being paid to him, than the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, the beloved CARL HAYDEN.

I wish to reecho the heartfelt sentiments which have prompted the majority leader and the minority leader and other Senators on both sides of the aisle this morning, as the Senator reaches another impressive milestone in his constructive, devoted, and unselfish service to the Nation and to his own State.

One of my responsibilities in the Senate, Mr. President, is to sit as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I have seen the careful and painstaking manner in which CARL HAYDEN has conducted faithfully, efficiently, and vigorously the discharge of what in truth is one of the most monumental and arduous chores confronting the Senate of the United States. The Committee on Appropriations is an important committee. It deals with the expenditure of every single penny of the public moneys, as this Congress continues to cope with problems abroad and at home.

The fairness with which he has conducted hearings and the intense desire he has constantly demonstrated to do that which ought to be done for the Nation only further prove that CARL HAYDEN deserves the tributes which are paid to him.

Mr. President, as a Senator who comes from a neighboring State of his, California, I am most grateful once again to acknowledge the sympathetic interest he has motivated in the problems of my State as they have come before his committee.

In a larger sense, it is the people of the country who owe CARL HAYDEN a debt of gratitude.

I join my colleagues most eagerly in wishing for him many, many more years of happy, constructive service in the Senate, where all of us call him our dear friend.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last fall prior to the election I was in the State of Arizona doing my duty as I saw it at the time. I was invited to a dinner at which our distinguished colleague was the guest. I shall never forget the introduction given to Senator HAYDEN by the chairman.

The chairman said that he was a comparative newcomer in Arizona, for he had resided there only about 22 years. He said he was not essentially a very studiously religious man, but he had read the Bible. He said further that after coming to Arizona and talking to all the good people there, both old and new residents, he had come to the conclusion that the Bible should be revised.

He said, "The man I am about to introduce is the reason I say this. I understand from the Bible that God created earth, and then in 8 days created man. Then, I understand from high sources, 8 days later Mr. HAYDEN created Arizona."

I think that is the way the people of Arizona feel about CARL HAYDEN.

I, of course, have been his friend for many, many years, ever since I first came to Congress some 24 years ago. He has been my neighbor in the Old Senate Office Building. I do not know how many times I have gone down the hall to chat with him and to get his good advice.

I do not say this in any joking way, because all Senators have their influence. They work on problems and try to represent their States the best they know how, and they do it well. However, if someone should ask me who is the most influential man in the U.S. Senate, I would have to say, "CARL HAYDEN." I would say that because I do not think there is a Senator in the U.S. Senate who has not had the benefit of his good advice and of his energy, activities, and wisdom in the fields not only of appropriations but also of rules and other matters.

I do not think there is a Senator in the U.S. Senate for whom CARL HAYDEN would not do those things.

CARL HAYDEN is also the most influential because of the manner in which he does his job.

Mr. President, I join with all other Senators in offering commendations and felicitations to my good old friend, the senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am most happy to join with Senators on both sides of the aisle who speak with such appreciation of the services, the character, and the warm personality of our distinguished senior colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Senator HAYDEN].

It has been my pleasure to serve with him as one of his subalterns in the Appropriations Committee, over which he presides not only with dignity but also with very great efficiency.

I do not believe I have ever seen any other one person do such a thorough job of organizing and turning out work as Senator HAYDEN does as chairman of that committee, which has such manifold responsibilities.

He is a great and efficient Senator.

I wish to say a word about his sense of humor. For years he has told us stories of his early days as a sheriff in a rather difficult county in Arizona, and later in other official positions. But I think the choice story in my recollection is one of his visit to the Panama

Canal during the first year he was a Congressman, 49 years ago, when the canal was being dug. He got to the Canal Zone and found there had existed serious trouble between the Jamaican workmen, persons of color, who did not understand how to work with our American mules, or perhaps the American mules did not know how to work with them. The mules probably did not understand the English language as it was spoken, with Oxford accent, by the Jamaicans.

A suggestion was made that the way to solve the difficulty was to import to handle the mules some colored workmen from the Mobile area, which was done by a ship which suffered from heavy weather, eventually arriving at the foot of the hill below the compound where the mules were quartered. The colored folks who were on the ship enjoyed greatly the opportunity to get their feet on terra firma again. As they started up the hill singing, laughing, and joshing each other, an enormous noise was heard at the top of the hill. The mules had their heads over the compound, braying and hee-hawing vociferously, because at once they understood the friendly language of the people who had come to work with them, and the trouble ceased at once to exist. Senator HAYDEN assured us that that is a truthful story.

I wish to point out also Senator HAYDEN's zealous devotion to the cause of unlimited debate growing out of the fact—very often reported by him—that he does not think he could ever have come to the U.S. Senate if advocates of unlimited debate had not protested vigorously and effectively against the bringing in of New Mexico and Arizona as a single State. I deeply appreciate and honor our distinguished senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have known CARL HAYDEN for a great many years. I have had wonderful opportunities to become acquainted with him. He did a great deal for Senators by giving them good advice. I asked the Senator how he accounted for the fact that he had steadily represented his State for almost a half century, and he said, "I never make any speeches. People will forgive a vote. They will say, 'Oh, he got mixed up and just happened to vote the wrong way.' But if a Senator delivers a speech, which is written down in black and white, he can never erase it and may be 'hung' for it."

I think that is excellent advice which he himself has followed to his great profit and he has helped many of us to follow it.

Those of us who have worked with Senator HAYDEN and have watched the Hayden family in Arizona, starting with the first construction of Hayden's Mill, know the contribution that the family has made. I know I have profited by my acquaintance with him. I know the Senate has profited by his skill and his wise counsel. I know that he is establishing a great record of things he has done, not only for his State, but also for all States similarly situated.

Year after year, when the House of Representatives would strike from appropriation bills all the reclamation items, people would say, "What until the bill gets over to CARL HAYDEN. He will restore those items."

Somehow or other the bills have always come back in good shape. He succeeded in restoring the appropriations, because he had established for himself and for the causes that he represented a high and pervading position. I congratulate Senator HAYDEN and the people of our country on his long service in the House of Representatives and in the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I join my colleague in commending the great Senator from the State of Arizona. It has been my privilege to serve with the senior Senator from Arizona in the years I have been in the Senate, and I have never known a more able, more understanding, more kind and gracious public servant than the senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show my great esteem for the distinguished Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN. Such a speech would occupy a great deal of space, and could not add luster to his outstanding career. I wish to pay tribute to him for his ability to serve, for his success in getting things done, for his grasp of problems, both large and small. He, indeed, is a great public servant, and while I would not ever be guilty of intimating that he was an aged man, I say that his life certainly should be and is an inspiration to many people who think they might be growing old.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it gives me pleasure to unite with my colleagues in commending the outstanding record of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator CARL HAYDEN. On a previous occasion I referred to the fact that the Senator from Virginia whom I was privileged to succeed, Carter Glass, who had been chairman of the Appropriations Committee and who had served for 30 some years with Senator HAYDEN, once said that if the Constitution were ever changed and each State were entitled to three Senators, he hoped that Virginia could get CARL HAYDEN as the third.

Mr. President, it is not only a remarkable tribute to have served in the Congress longer than anyone else in the history of our Nation—he is beginning his 50th year—but it is also a remarkable accomplishment to be known as the man who gave water and life to a large desert area of our Nation.

During the past weekend I was privileged to fly over some of the desert areas of California, Arizona, and Nevada, and to my fishing friends I wish to say I took advantage of 1 day of fishing in Lake Mead. It was a little windy and a little cold for that salubrious climate. We went up about 10 miles from the landing at Boulder Canyon. We went out from Boulder City to get a little better water. Lake Mead is a grand lake, as clear and blue as any we have in Virginia, incidentally. I was told that it was quite full of good bass and perhaps some other species. Our fishing was not done under the most favorable circumstances, but it did my heart good to know that it was CARL HAYDEN who was the principal sponsor of what was at one time called Boulder Dam, and is now known as the Hoover Dam, and that throughout the years, in power projects and in reclamation projects, he has given water and life to what now has become a great part of our Nation.

Mr. President, when I looked down on that land and compared it with the bluegrass fields of my native State, particularly of the valley, I could not help wonder how anything could survive down there. However, as I looked down from the plane I could see little towns and ranchhouses. I could not understand how anything could possibly grow down there, but evidently something must be growing. As one flies over the great area of California, one cannot help be surprised at the way the State has developed. No wonder it is the most rapidly growing State in the Nation.

There just could not be any State of Arizona or State of Nevada if it were not for water. CARL HAYDEN is the man who gave them water. So I would say that the States of Arizona and Nevada and California should erect a heroic monument to CARL HAYDEN. I hope he will live to be a hundred.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes being paid to our distinguished President pro tempore. He has not only had a long and honorable career representing his State and his Nation, but we who serve with him also know of his many kindnesses and considerate acts toward all of us.

I have had the privilege of working closely with Senator HAYDEN as a fellow member of the Senate Rules Committee. His sharp mind and ability to deal intelligently with a wide range of subjects has impressed me greatly.

As I look forward 47 years from now to the time when I shall have had as much experience in this august body as has the distinguished Senior Senator from Arizona, I doubt very much that I shall even begin to match the talents and energies of our distinguished President pro tempore.

His 49 years have stood him in good stead. I have many times seen him walking down Constitution Avenue at 8:30 in the morning. His arms full of papers he has reviewed the night before, his eyes fired with the energy he will exert on the matters that require his attention in the day ahead.

I salute our beloved colleague and express the hope that he will enjoy good health and happiness and many more years of distinguished service.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] for his kind remarks about the great State of Nevada and for elucidating on the wonders of Boulder Dam and Lake Mead. Whenever he comes back to Nevada I shall see to it that he gets his appropriate reward from fishing in the

great Lake Mead back of what we still call Boulder Dam.

I wish to join in the tributes which have been paid to the great Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN. I became acquainted with Senator HAYDEN some 20 years ago when he ran for reelection to his second term in the U.S. Senate. At the time I was taking undergraduate studies in the State of Arizona. I have followed with interest his career from that time, both as an undergraduate and as a graduate student at the University of Arizona's College of Law, and have always found him to be highly thought of by the people of his own State as well as by the people of the entire Nation.

Little did I think at that time that I would have the opportunity at some time in the future to stand on the floor of the U.S. Senate and pay my respects to him. I have served with him on the Committee on Rules and Administration for a period of approximately 2 years. I have found him to be an outstanding and great gentleman. Certainly all the laudatory remarks which have been stated in his behalf have been, in my opinion, understated.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I wish to join with other Senators in paying tribute to the great Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. Out in what was, until very recently, the Territory of Hawaii, we found through long years of experience that if we had a problem to present to this body, the senior Senator from Arizona was always willing to listen and to extend his assistance.

We hope that he will continue to serve for a long time in the Senate; but if ever he should retire, we should like to have him as a native and a friend in Hawaii.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in joining with great pleasure in the tributes which are being paid to our distinguished President pro tempore, I note with interest the comment of my good friend the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that there is probably no Member of the Senate who has not at some time or other been the beneficiary of the interst, of the advice, and of the assistance of CARL HAYDEN. I should like to add that even those who were not Members, but Members-to-be, of the Senate, have been the beneficiary of CARL HAYDEN's helpfulness.

I remember, back about 10 years ago, that when as Governor of Alaska I would come to Washington to present the case for statehood for Alaska, I always found CARL HAYDEN very understanding. He recalled the days of Arizona's territorial status, which he had considered highly disadvantageous to its people. He was clearly sympathetic to the aspirations of Alaska and Hawaii for statehood.

However, on one occasion, he said to me with a quizzical smile: "The difficulty about allowing you to come in, is that we do not have any room for you. The Senate Office Building is filled to overflowing; where would we put two or four more Senators and their staffs?"

I remember saying: "Why don't you build another Senate Office Building?"

He said, "That is precisely what we are planning to do." And as we all know that happened and there was room for both Alaska and Hawaii. Senator HAYDEN played a large part in it.

That is the kind of constructive aid which will make CARL HAYDEN's service long remembered. The people of Alaska and the people of Hawaii owe him a great debt of gratitude. We might have been admitted even if a new Senate Office Building had not been built, but it certainly helped.

Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators in paying tribute to a great statesman whose outstanding record of nearly 60 years of public service encompasses the greatest development of any Nation in history. To that development he has greatly contributed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as one who has known CARL HAYDEN longer as a Member of the Senate than any other Senator who has spoken, I wish to join in all the fine things which are being said about him.

I became acquainted with him years ago. I learned that one thing he liked was a good cigar. So this morning, when I found that he was to celebrate his 49th anniversary of service in Congress, I took to his desk a good cigar. That has been my habit for many years, although I myself have not smoked for a matter of 10 years.

The Senator from Arizona is a real gentleman. He does not spend his time talking on the Senate floor. He spends his time working in committee. I suppose there is not a Member of the Senate who talks less than he does, and probably not one who performs as much. So I return to the old saying: It is not words that count; it is work. CARL HAYDEN is one Senator who has lived up to that saying.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I should like to add my voice to those already heard in paying tribute to one of America's most distinguished statesmen and one of America's most faithful public servants, our President pro tempore, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

I have known Senator HAYDEN for some 30 years. I first met him in connection with the legislation which led to the creation of the then so-called Boulder Dam, now known as Hoover Dam; and over a period of a number of years, both in connection with my work as attorney general of the State of Nevada and, more recently, as a member of this great deliberative body, I have come to know Senator HAYDEN even better.

During the past 2 years I have been privileged to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee. One has to serve on that committee to know of his diligence and his hard work day after day, from early in the morning until late at night, in carrying out his arduous tasks, chores, and duties as chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

All of the things said about him today certainly are well deserved. His record of serving continuously, in either one House of the Congress or the other, for 49 years has never been surpassed in the history of our country, and is in itself a tribute to his greatness.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues who today have paid their tributes to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

When I first came to the Senate, Senator HAYDEN was one of the first Members I met. He gave me advice which was valuable to me at that time. I still remember it, and have often had reason to be thankful to him.

Senator HAYDEN is a wonderful U.S. Senator. He is a great credit to the great State of Arizona; and he is an inspiration to all of us, as from time to time we come in contact with him, because of his integrity and his devotion to duty.

No Member of the Senate whom I have known during my service here has been as completely devoted as Senator HAYDEN has been to the performance of his duty in the discharge of his very heavy responsibilties.

I am glad to join in the tributes paid to him this day.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

SPECIAL PROGRAM FOR FEED GRAINS FOR 1961—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 16, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith a bill to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961. I urgently recommend to the Congress the enactment of this emergency program so that it can cover the 1961 crop.

The existing program has failed. It has resulted in the accumulation of a burdensome and dangerous surplus, mainly of commodities for which there is no adequate outlet even under our expanded programs of providing food for those in need. At the same time, it has failed to protect farm income, and it is threatening to drive down the prices farmers receive for hogs, cattle, poultry and eggs, and milk to disastrous levels. If this program is allowed to continue in effect for this year's crop, the stocks in Government hands will reach even more alarming proportions, a virtually unmanageable storage problem will be created, farm income will continue to suffer, and large amounts of Government funds will be needlessly expended. Immediate action is required to prevent further deterioration of this situation. In order to be effective with respect to this year's

crops, a new program should be authorized by March 1.

I believe that any legislation enacted should fit our overall goal to use our agricultural abundance to meet the needs of our people, and at the same time provide a fair income for those who produce that abundance. We need to shift our production from commodities of which there is an unmanageable surplus to commodities for which there is a need, even as we curtail our production of those surplus commodities. The Secretary of Agriculture already has authority to take steps toward these goals with regard to some commodities, such as milk, soybeans and cottonseed, pork, poultry, and eggs. However, new legislation is needed for effective action with respect to corn and other feed grains. The legislation I am now recommending will fill this gap with the authority needed to round out an emergency program for this year in the feed grain sector of our farm economy.

Although this is an emergency program, it is consistent with our long-range objectives and would accomplish the following: (1) a moderate increase in farm income; (2) a saving of several hundred million dollars of Government funds; and (3) a holding down or reduction of surplus stocks to more manageable proportions. This will be done without any material effect upon consumer prices.

The Government now holds 2.7 billion bushels of feed grains. The investment in feed grains stands at the alltime high of nearly $4 billion. The 1961 crop will soon be planted. By this fall, the Nation will be confronted once again with a shortage of space in which to store grain. The shortage may amount to the off-farm space required for as much as 200 to 250 million bushels if we fail to take any preventive action now. The storage problem will be further accentuated in 1962.

The legislative proposals submitted herewith (1) would provide that cooperators would receive a support price of $1.20 a bushel for corn for 1961, and would receive supports for other feed grains in relation to those for corn; and (2) would authorize a special agricultural conservation program under which acreage previously planted to feed grains would be diverted from production for 1961. Unlike the present program under which a support price of $1.06 a bushel is paid to all producers without regard to any limit on production, producers will not be eligible for price supports under this new program unless they cooperate in the special agricultural conservation program.

This emergency program covers only the 1961 crop. I intend to recommend to the Congress other legislation covering both wheat and feed grain crops for subsequent years.

There is attached hereto a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture setting forth the details of the program. It is important that it be accorded the prompt consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program through increasing the minimum benefits and aged widow's benefits and making additional persons eligible for benefits under the program, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1961.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith a bill to make five needed improvements in the social security program.

They will not only help to meet pressing social needs, but if promptly enacted these improvements will give our economic recovery program needed impetus. They will result in placing increased purchasing power in the hands of almost 5 million people. These people are among the lowest income groups in the country.

In addition, the legislation will improve the flexibility and effectiveness of our social security program over the long run and make it better able to contribute to the economic strength of the Nation and the welfare and security of our people.

The enclosed letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare describes the legislation in more detail.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE I OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for "Education and welfare services," for the fiscal year 1961, had beeen reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN QUARTZ CRYSTALS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 100,000 pounds of subgrade crude quartz crystals now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Director, Office of Administrative Operations, U.S. Department of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, on foreign excess property disposed of by that Department during the calendar year 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON PERSONAL AND REAL PROPERTY RECEIVED BY OR DISPOSED OF TO PUBLIC HEALTH AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on personal and real property received by or disposed of to public health and educational institutions, for the calendar quarter, October 1 through December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Whereas Washington State is presently suffering from extensive unemployment in many areas causing distress to families of low income; and

"Whereas President Kennedy has greatly expanded the surplus food program as an aid to low-income families as well as a factor in the solution of the farm surplus problem; and

"Whereas certain Democratic legislators of this State have worked for a number of years in an effort to obtain surplus foods for the needy and the unemployed, and on February 2, 1961, the director of agriculture was directed by the Governor to select a community within the State for one of the pilot programs for distribution of surplus foods through a food stamp plan, pointing out that recent reports of the employment security department showed Washington State third highest in unemployment of covered workers, with several counties showing rates from 25 to 33 percent unemployed of all covered workers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 37th Legislature of the State of Washington, do hereby urge the extension of the stamp plan pilot projects to include the State of Washington; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state immediately to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the Honorable Orval Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representa-

tives, and to Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Senator Henry M. Jackson, and to each Member of the U.S. Congress from the State of Washington.

"S. R. HOLCOMB,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States to restore gold and silver to their time-honored position as basic monetary metals not only for international exchange but also for the proper conduct of business transactions within the United States; to restore rights of the American people to acquire, possess and dispose of gold within and without the United States and to discontinue the sale and distribution of both the precious metals at less than present-day costs of production for uses other than monetary and to encourage, by immediate congressional action, the production of both these metals within the United States

"Whereas the international situation has created problems which have placed the United States in a real dilemma as far as our international, economic, financial, and other relationships are concerned; and

"Whereas we have a dollar of two standards: One in which the American citizen cannot demand gold for his paper dollars and the other in which the foreigner can demand gold for his paper dollars and other obligations; and

"Whereas the heavy international drain on our gold supply, coupled with the recent increase in speculative buying in world markets, suggests a growing lack of confidence in the stability of the dollar both at home and abroad; and

"Whereas the price of gold has been artificially fixed at $35 per ounce since 1935, and continued at that price since that date, although costs of mining and all other items, including taxes, have greatly increased since that time; and

"Whereas the drop in gold reserves has been accompanied by a steady dissipation of treasury 'free' silver supplies through sales to industrial users of the metal at prices below those prevailing in world markets; and

"Whereas the sale to industrial users of gold and treasury free silver has been continued to the detriment of the best interests of the American people and has accentuated the problem of monetary policy and also effectively maintained an artificial ceiling on the production of both precious metals to the disadvantage of domestic producers who have in the main been forced out of business by reason of this unfortunate policy on the part of the United States Government in its treatment of domestic producers of gold and silver; and

"Whereas the worldwide responsibilities which this Nation has assumed require that we not only adhere to a sound hard-money policy and maintain a currency which is virtually impregnable to the continuing stresses of current international unrest and dissension: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 43d General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That it respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to reassert its constitutional control over our international monetary policies and restore the American dollar to its historic place among the currencies of the world by proceeding at the earliest possible date to enact legislation that will:

"1. Reaffirm the historical and traditional American dollar to its historical place by proper recognition of realistic prices for gold and silver as monetary metals and fixing a current ratio at which the dollar and gold will be made fully convertible and establishing the procedures for orderly restoration of the gold standard.

"2. Abolish all restrictions on the purchase, sale, and ownership of gold by citizens of the United States.

"3. Terminate at the earliest possible date all sales of gold and silver to industrial and commercial users and require the Treasury of the United States to retain all of its monetary stocks of both precious metals exclusively for monetary purposes for the proper protection of the American people.

"4. Amend the act of July 31, 1946, to eliminate the seigniorage charge of 30 percent on purchases of silver and help stimulate production of this precious metal, thus assuring a continued domestic supply for our Nation.

"5. Give proper recognition to the increased costs involved in the production of gold in this country by agreeing on a price which should be paid to domestic producers for newly mined gold on a realistic basis.

"6. Assist in executive action to encourage and stimulate other governments to restore gold and silver coinage and discontinue the shackles of licensing requirements for the exchange of gold and silver on the world markets and as part of our foreign policy, to encourage the utilization of these time-honored precious metals as circulating mediums and standards of value; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the U.S. Senate and to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States.

"ALBERT S. TOMSIE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"GENE MANZANARES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
"ROBERT L. KNOWS,
"President of the Senate.
"LUCILLE L. SHUSTER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 6

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the economy of the State of Idaho is based upon its agriculture, lumber, mining, sheep and cattle industries, and the use of its waters for irrigation and hydroelectric power; and

"Whereas approximately two-thirds of the land area of the State of Idaho is federally owned and contains approximately 3 million acres set aside for primitive and wilderness areas; and

"Whereas these designations are restrictive to full utilization and deny to the natural resources industries of the State of Idaho the right to wisely develop the natural resources contained in these large primitive and wilderness areas of the State and further deny ready access to these areas to millions of American citizens, all to the detriment of said industries and to the people of the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas one of the great potential industries of the State Idaho is its tourist trade and wildlife attractions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, State of Idaho (the Senate concurring), That we are most respectfully opposed to the dedication of additional lands as primitive or wilderness areas in the State of Idaho and respectfully request that all primitive and wilderness areas in the State of Idaho be reviewed and studied with the view of eliminating all lands which have a higher or greater multiple use potential than that of single use dedication as primitive or wilderness; and be it further

"Resolved, That we oppose Federal enactment of future wilderness legislation embodying the principle of locked-up areas for single purpose use which would deny to the natural resources industries the right to wisely develop such natural resources and would also be to the detriment of said industries and to the people of the State of Idaho; and be it further

"Resolved, That the present agencies administering all Federal lands do so with the view of developing the full multiple use of the lands to further the general welfare and the economy of the State of Idaho; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the speaker of the house and to the president of the senate of the following States: Washington, Oregon, California, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, North Dakota, and South Dakota, and that these States are hereby urged to take similar action in their respective legislative bodies."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 5

"Joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia

"Whereas both Houses of the 86th Congress of the United States of America by a constitutional majority of two-thirds of each House thereof, made the following proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words and figures, to wit:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia

"'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"'"ARTICLE —

"'"SECTION 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

"'"A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform

such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.

"'"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."'

"Therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring):

"SECTION 1. That said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota.

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this preamble and joint resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State to the Secretary of State at Washington, to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 6

"Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the creating of representation in the electoral college for the District of Columbia

"Whereas the 86th Congress of the United States of America, at its 2d session, in both Houses, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, has made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"'JOINT RESOLUTION

"'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"'"ARTICLE

"'"SECTION 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

"'"A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the 12th article of amendment.

"'"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."'

"Be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana (the Senate concurring), That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United State of America, be and the same is hereby ratified; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution shall be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Administrator of General Services, Washington, D.C., to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 36th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas we believe that all moneys which may in the future be paid by the Federal Government to the State of Idaho for the increase of teacher salaries should be disbursed under the State's educational or distribution formula, and

"Whereas we believe moneys paid by the Federal Government for increases in teacher salaries should be in addition to moneys provided by the State for the educational or distribution formula: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned and the request made that all moneys paid by the Federal Government to the State of Idaho for the improvement of teachers' salaries, be paid to the Idaho State treasurer and that such funds be deposited for distribution to public schools by using the educational or distribution formula in effect at the time such funds are received; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Washington, D.C., the State superintendent of public instruction, Boise, Idaho, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

The petition of Clare F. Bodman, of Washington, D.C., relating to memorials to Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Ponce, P.R., favoring the administration's proposed bill to provide medical care for the aged; to the Committee on Finance.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF NEW MEXICO LEGISLATURE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point House Joint Memorial 4 adopted by the 25th Legislature of the State of New Mexico petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact enabling legislation permitting residents of certain Federal and Indian reservations to vote in the event such legislation should become necessary.

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

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 4

A joint memorial petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact enabling legislation permitting residents of certain Federal and Indian reservations to vote in the event such legislation should become necessary

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

Whereas there is now pending before the District Court of the State of New Mexico certain litigation questioning the right to vote of residents of certain areas within the State of New Mexico, to wit: residents on certain military reservations and residents on the Navajo Indian Reservation, all within the State of New Mexico; and

Whereas our great country was founded upon the principle that all men are entitled to equal protection, benefit and rights afforded under the laws of the United States, its States and territories, and that there be no discrimination concerning such protection, benefits, rights or duties, and that each and every citizen shall be entitled to equal rights and should assume equal responsibilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That should it become finally determined that any citizen of the State of New Mexico, otherwise qualified to vote, be denied such right by reason of his residence on certain Federal reservations including the Navajo Indian Reservation lying within the State of New Mexico, then and in that event, that the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested and urged to introduce and to enact such legislation as will enable and permit such citizens to be entitled to vote; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial shall be sent to each the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to Senators and Representatives representing the State of New Mexico in the Congress of the United States.

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPRESENTATION IN ELECTORAL COLLEGE—JOINT RESOLUTION OF ALASKA LEGISLATURE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD House Joint Resolution 1 of the Alaska State Legislature now in session ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia.

I know it was with great pleasure that the legislature acted unanimously in joining those States which have already acted. The people of Alaska, who were not able to vote in the national election until last fall, have been particularly sympathetic with the voteless residents of the Nation's Capital and their representatives in the State legislature were gratified to be able to vote those feelings in passing House Joint Resolution 1.

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

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska in second legislature, first session, assembled:

That the following article proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by the Congress of the United States through the adoption of Senate Joint

Resolution 39, 86th Congress, 2d session, is ratified:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

"A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the 12th article of amendment.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Alaska shall duly certify the necessary number of copies of this resolution and transmit them pursuant to law to the Administrator, General Services Administration, and direct facsimile copies to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the State of Alaska identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

TEXAS LEGISLATURE COMMENDS FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION FOR HOLDING AREA PREHEARING CONFERENCES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of Texas has passed a house concurrent resolution commending the Federal Power Commission for setting prehearing conferences in Midland, Tex., on March 6, 1961.

Purpose of the prehearing conference is to give interested persons in the area the opportunity to conveniently present data to be considered by the FPC in reviewing prices for natural gas moving in interstate commerce.

In keeping with the request of the legislature, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13

Whereas the Federal Power Commission has published its Statement of General Policy No. 61–1, whereby it proposes to establish and periodically review area prices for natural gas moving in interstate commerce; and

Whereas under this policy statement the Federal Power Commission has called for appearances in a prehearing conference on March 6, 1961, in Midland, Tex., to review the area prices established for the Permian Basin; and

Whereas all producers of gas in this area, which includes Texas Railroad Commission Districts 7–C and 8, have been notified to appear at this hearing if they presently have natural gas contracts under suspension by the Federal Power Commission, or if they desire to present evidence bearing on the justness and reasonableness of the area prices presently established by the Federal Power Commission; and

Whereas the need for additional exploration and drilling for natural gas is critical because of the need to develop more natural gas reserves to satisfy an ever-expanding demand, and to be available in time of national emergency, and such exploration and drilling is a hazardous undertaking with uncertain and unpredictable results which therefore requires understanding and recognition of those problems by the entire public, including consumers, and a reasonable recognition of such hazards and uncertainties on the part of those who administer any laws or regulations pertaining thereto; and

Whereas the State of Texas, as well as its citizens, has a direct and immediate interest in this proceeding because the establishment of these prices on an irreplaceable natural resource affects a substantial portion of the State's economy and because the State collects a tax on all natural gas produced in this State; and

Whereas, the length of time and the expense necessary for a hearing in Washington on prices to be allowed producers has made such procedures prohibitive in the case of many independent producers; and

Whereas, the State officials of Texas have previously indicated their concern over the importance of this hearing and the necessity that the interest of the State be presented, preserved and protected; and

Whereas this resolution shall not be construed as indicating that this Legislature of the State of Texas concedes any power, jurisdiction, or the necessity for Federal regulation of wellhead prices of independent producers of natural gas which may later be transported in interstate commerce, but rather it acknowledges that the Federal Power Commission, having had that duty thrust on it by the courts, despite contrary congressional intent, is to be commended for accommodating producers by holding consolidated hearings in the areas where the natural gas is to be produced; and

Whereas, the interests of those municipalities, localities, and States who are net consumers of natural gas transported in interstate commerce have been and are fully and adequately represented by intervention at Federal Power Commission rate proceedings: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate of Texas concurring), That the Federal Power Commission be commended for its proposed plan to hold a consolidated prehearing conference in Midland, Tex., rather than in Washington, District of Columbia, for the purpose of determining the just and reasonable price of natural gas produced in the Permian Basin of Texas and New Mexico, and transported in interstate commerce; and be it further

Resolved, That the public officials of Texas be commended for their proposal to participate in this hearing; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be distributed to Members of Congress, to the officials and staff of the Federal Power Commission, and to the public officials of Texas.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF COLORADO LEGISLATURE

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, last week I was pleased to present to the Senate a memorial from the Colorado Legislature requesting the inclusion of Huerfano and Las Animas Counties within the provisions of area redevelopment legislation.

I am now happy to present the Senate with a memorial on behalf of Costilla County.

Costilla County is an area of severe and persistent economic distress. The severity of this distress is no better illustrated than by the fact that of a population of 4,217, 570 persons are receiving assistance from the Colorado State Public Welfare Department. In December, 711 of these 4,000 received surplus food rations. In the last 10 years the county has lost 30.5 percent of its population; in the 10 years previous to that it lost 19.5 percent.

Suffering and hardship, of course, cannot be measured by statistics alone. The story of the depressed areas in our rich country is one of human tragedy and misery.

I am gratified to present this joint memorial of the Colorado Legislature to the Senate as a sign of the concern felt by all of Colorado for the distress of one of its counties.

I ask that the joint resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

Whereas the President of the United States and Members of the Congress of the United States have indicated a desire to assist areas of the United States which are experiencing a decline in their business growth as compared to other areas of the United States; and

Whereas the presence of a depressed area in any section of the United States represents a source of danger to the continued growth of the United States in an historical period of competition with other great powers of the world; and

Whereas the county of Costilla in the State of Colorado has in recent years experienced a serious decline in its business growth and must be considered a depressed area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 43d General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein) That it respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to include Costilla County of the State of Colorado in any provisions to be made by Congress or the President for aid to depressed areas of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the U.S. Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado who are urgently requested to introduce and sponsor such legislation as is necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE LEGISLATURE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution dealing with location of interstate highways adopted by the New Hampshire Legislature.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas New Hampshire has spent substantial sums for the construction of Interstate Highways 93 and 89 in the vicinity of the Vermont border; and

Whereas for purposes of self-aggrandizement, certain groups in the State of Vermont wish Interstate Highway 91 within the State of Vermont located farther from the New Hampshire-Vermont border than originally proposed; and

Whereas such relocation would reduce substantially the benefits to be derived from the sums already spent by New Hampshire; and

Whereas the future economic development of the Connecticut Valley depends heavily on retention of the location originally proposed for Interstate Highway 91 within the State of Vermont; and

Whereas His Excellency, Governor Powell, and Commissioner Morton of the New Hampshire Department of Public Works and Highways have publicly denounced such proposed relocation of Interstate Highway 91: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the General Court of the State of New Hampshire is unalterably opposed to such proposed relocation of Interstate Highway 91 within the State of Vermont; be it further

Resolved, That the members of the New Hampshire delegation in the Congress of the United States be requested to oppose such proposed relocation of Interstate Highway 91; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to forward copies of this concurrent resolution to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce of the United States and to each of the members of the New Hampshire delegation in Congress.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I present a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact remedial legislation immediately setting quotas for the importation of textile products in order to save the cotton textile industry of the United States, and ask that this resolution be appropriately referred.

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

Whereas since the culmination of hostilities in World War II, the United States of America has poured millions of dollars into foreign countries which has resulted in the development of a highly competitive textile industry beyond the seas, which has grown to gigantic proportions and seriously threatens the existence of the cotton textile industry in the United States; and

Whereas with this ever-increasing competition, where fair labor standards are low and compensation is meager, and with no restriction on amounts of textile products imported, foreign industries have been able to deliver cotton textile products for sale in the United States at prices far below the reasonable selling prices of the same products manufactured in the United States; and

Whereas this state of affairs has reached a point where the very existence of the cotton textile industry in the entire United States is seriously threatened; and

Whereas it is estimated by competent statisticians that unless quotas are established which drastically reduce the importation of foreign textile products, the cotton textile industry will disappear in the United States within five years; and

Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina believes that importation quotas should be established immediately drastically reducing the importation of cotton textile products in the United States; Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact legislation immediately drastically reducing the importation quotas of cotton textile products; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator from South Carolina in the Senate of the Congress and to each Member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina in the House of Representatives of the Congress.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], I send to the desk a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly memorializing the Congress to continue the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and ask that this resolution be appropriately referred.

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

Whereas it is undisputed that the Communists and similar groups are seeking to undermine and destroy our American form of government; and

Whereas these subversive groups are often aided and abetted by persons and organizations ignorant of their true purpose; and

Whereas the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee have rendered our country a service of inestimable value in detecting and curtailing these subversive activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to continue the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator from South Carolina in the Senate of the Congress and to each Member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina in the House of Representatives of the Congress.

WOODBINE DAM ON LYON CREEK, KANS.—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have received resolutions from the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Herington, Kans., the president of the chamber of commerce and the chairman of the agriculture committee of the Herington Chamber of Commerce, urging that authorization of the Woodbine Dam on Lyon Creek be deferred until plans and construction of the Lyon Creek Watershed District No. 41 are in operation.

The city of Herington has for many years been cooperating with the Lyon Creek Watershed District No. 41, with the view of securing control of water runoff on that stream through impoundment of water and other water retarding programs.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be made a part of these remarks and referred to the appropriate committee.

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

Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved by the board of directors of the Herington Chamber of Commerce, Inc., That it is the studied opinion of this body that the authorization of the Woodbine Dam at this time would be premature and would work irrevocable harm to the city of Herington and its surrounding territory:

That authorization of said dam should be deferred until the Lyon Creek Watershed District No. 41 and the city of Herington working in cooperation shall have had time to plan and construct impoundments and other works as provided by the provisions of Public Laws 566 and 1018 (Hope-Aikens Act) to the end that the best interest of the city of Herington, the citizens of the Lyon Creek Valley and the citizens of the State of Kansas particularly those residing in the Kansas River basin be equally protected; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to: John Anderson, Jr., the Governor of the State of Kansas; Mark Gordon, senator, 20th district; William H. Ward, senator, 21st district; Howard W. Harper, senator, 19th district; Homer Hoffman, representative, Dickinson County; J. J. Moxley, representative, Morris County; Lawrence D. Slocombe, representative, Marion County; Ed. L. Kessinger, representative, Geary County; secretary, Kansas Water Resources Board, Topeka; chief engineer division of water resources State board of agriculture, Topeka; secretary, Governor's watershed review committee, Topeka; Andrew Schoeppel, U.S. Senator for Kansas; Frank Carlson, U.S. Senator for Kansas; William Avery, Representative, U.S. Congress, First District; Robert F. Ellsworth, Representative, U.S. Congress, Second District; Walter McVey, Representative, U.S. Congress, Third District; Garner E. Shriver, Representative, U.S. Congress, Fourth District; J. Floyd Breeding, Representative, U.S. Congress, Fifth District; Robert A. Dole, Representative, U.S. Congress, Sixth District; Office of U.S. Engineers, Federal Building, Kansas City, Mo., and that sufficient other copies be made available that copies of same may be made available to other interested parties.

Whereas the city of Herington is a city located on the flood plain of Lyon Creek, a tributary of the Smoky Hill River, a part of the Kansas River basin, and

Whereas Lime Creek, a tributary of said Lyon Creek, flows directly through said city; and

Whereas said city of Herington has in the past 60 or more years suffered from flood loss and damage due to the flooding of said Lime Creek and Lyon Creek; and

Whereas the city water supply reservoir of the city of Herington is located on Kohl Creek which is a tributary to said Lyon Creek, said impoundment having been constructed beginning in the year 1923; and

Whereas said water supply reservoir due to lack of land treatment practices above said water supply reservoir has filled with silt to a result that the capacity of said reservoir has been greatly reduced; and

Whereas the city of Herington has for many years and is now working with the

Lyon Creek Watershed District No. 41 to the end that there be constructed on said watershed, particularly on Lyon Creek and Lime Creek, structures for the purpose of flood control and water supply impoundment all under the provisions of the Watershed Districts Act of the State of Kansas and the provisions of Public Law 566 and Public Law 1018 (Hope-Aiken Act); and

Whereas the construction of the Woodbine Dam on Lyon Creek as proposed by the U.S. Army Engineers will give to the city of Herington no flood protection; and

Whereas the cost of bringing water from said impoundment to Herington for public use would be prohibitive on account of the location for said structure; and

Whereas the authorization of said structure by the Congress of the United States at this time would have the practical result of depriving the Lyon Creek Watershed District No. 41 of basic credits necessary for its justification, for the reason that credit for flood control once taken cannot be also taken by a similar or supporting project; and

Whereas the authorization of this structure at this time so far ahead of actual construction would result in the economic depression of the Lyon Creek watershed area in general and particularly that part thereof as located within the area of the Woodbine Dam and its highwater flood pool; and

Whereas the board of directors of the Herington Chamber of Commerce, Inc., did on the 30th day of January 1961 pass by unanimous vote a resolution requesting deferment of authorization of the Woodbine Dam on Lyon Creek in Dickinson County, until such time as the Lyon Creek Watershed District No. 41 had time in which to plan and construct works in said watershed district under the provisions of Public Laws 566 and 1018 (Hope-Aiken Act); and

Whereas the accomplishment of such work is of vital interest to the city of Herington; and

Whereas the city of Herington is vitally in need of flood protection and an additional water supply impoundment; and

Whereas the said city of Herington has been for more than 5 years working with and cooperating with the landowners in the Lyon Creek watershed and the steering committee of the Lyon Creek Watershed District No. 41, for the mutual benefit of both parties, and for the specific purpose of securing for the city of Herington necessary flood protection, additional impoundment of water supplies, and the protection of the existing water supply impoundment of the city of Herington by proper land treatment above said structure so as to prevent further siltation; and

Whereas, said watershed district is now a duly incorporated organization under the provisions of the Watershed Act of the State of Kansas; and

Whereas the deferment of authorization of the Woodbine Dam is of vital interest to the city of Herington: Now, therefore,

We the undersigned, being the City Commission of the City of Herington, Kans., a municipal corporation, do endorse and adopt by reference the provisions of the resolution of January 30, 1961 as adopted by the board of directors of the Herington Chamber of Commerce, Inc., and direct that the city clerk of this city send copies of this resolution to the persons named in such resolution.

Passed by the unanimous vote of the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Herington, this 13th day of February 1961.

MARTIN T. KLEINSCHMIDT,
Mayor.

JOHN D. KIRKLAND,
Commissioner of Finance.

F. EDWARD KOEHLER,
Commissioner of Streets and Utilities.

RESOLUTIONS ON SOCIAL SECURITY RETIREMENT AGE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two resolutions which I have received urging the lowering of the social security retirement age limit for men to 60 years of age.

The first resolution was received from Mr. John Szydlowski of Buffalo on behalf of the Board of Fire Commissioners of Doyle Fire District No. 1.

The second was received from Mr. Joseph Ranalli, president of Local 12623, United Mine Workers of America on behalf of the employees of Church & Dwight Co., Inc., of Syracuse. This petition is signed by approximately 100 employees of local 12623.

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

HONORABLE SENATOR: At the last meeting of the board of fire commissioners the following resolution has been adopted:

"*Resolved*, That we are in favor of the bill being introduced lowering the age limit of men to 60 years of age on social security."

We hope that you will vote in favor of this bill as it will give the younger men an opportunity to secure work.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

JOHN SZYDLOWSKI,
Secretary.

We, the undersigned, employees of Church & Dwight Co., Inc., and members of Local 12623, District 50, United Mine Workers of America located at Syracuse, N.Y., request that the social security age of 65 years be lowered to 60 years of age to counteract the many employment problems, etc. that this country is faced with. We will be greatly indebted to you if this is brought to the Senate floor.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S FEDERATED CLUBS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference two resolutions adopted by the Republican Women's Federated Clubs of New Hampshire, adopted at the annual meeting of the group recently.

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

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Whereas, the House Committee on Un-American Activities of the Congress of the United States has won wide acclaim for its outstanding work in bringing out into the open the activities of certain individuals and organizations which are contrary to our republican form of government and which are against the principles of freedom set forth in our Constitution; and

"Whereas, there are widespread efforts to discredit the accomplishments of this committee: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Republican Women's Federated Clubs of New Hampshire*, That we commend the work of said House Committee on Un-American Activities and urge our U.S. Senators and Representatives in Congress to support the work of said committee and to take whatever steps they may consider necessary to insure the continuance of said committee; further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators STYLES BRIDGES and NORRIS COTTON, and to Representatives CHESTER MERROW and PERKINS BASS."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Whereas in these difficult and troublesome times for our country the American ideals are often forgotten; and

"Whereas the Communist menace does not appear to be recognized for what it is, particularly among the youth of our country: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the Republican Women's Federated Clubs of New Hampshire, urge the New Hampshire Department of Education to require all schools to devote more time to instruction in our Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States of America, and also that in said course or courses greater effort be made to impress upon our youth the fact that communism is a form of government which is a menace to all freedom-loving Americans.

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the New Hampshire commissioner of education and the State board of education."

RESOLUTION OF TOWN COUNCIL, GROTON, CONN.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Town Council of the Town of Groton, Conn., relating to a reduction of personnel and equipment of the Coast Guard involved in search and rescue operations in the waters between Watch Hill, R.I., and Milford, Conn. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION REGARDING CUT IN PERSONNEL OF U.S. COAST GUARD MOORINGS AT FORT TRUMBULL

Whereas the press and other sources of public information have announced that action has been initiated to drastically reduce the personnel and equipment of the U.S. Coast Guard involved in search and rescue operations in the waters between Watch Hill, R.I., and Milford, Conn.; and

Whereas in the past this service has been most effective in providing safety for many thousands of boaters from this and several other States; and

Whereas in the last year this service answered 320 distress calls involving the lives of 850 persons and over $8 million in property; and

Whereas the suggested reduction would result in the service no longer being effective and operational and leaving many disaster calls unanswered; and

Whereas beside the potential future loss of life and property, the security which the boating public now enjoys would be eliminated: Be it

Resolved, That the Town Council of the Town of Groton hereby urges that a copy of this resolution be immediately forwarded to the proper Representatives in Congress with the hope that they will take whatever steps necessary to insure the continuance of adequate personnel and equipment to maintain the past services of the U.S. Coast Guard at the aforesaid location.

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE RAILWAY MAIL PAY ACT OF 1916

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today I was pleased to receive a resolution adopted by the Milwaukee Association of Commerce.

The resolution urges repeal of certain provisions of the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916.

The message from Lester W. Brann, Jr., executive vice president of the association, points out that the following agencies support the repeal: The Railway Express Agency, Air Transport Association, Association of American Railroads, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Transportation Association of America, Central Western Shippers Advisory Board, Midwest Shippers Advisory Board, Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association, and subcommittee of House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The topic of the resolution—reflecting the views of such broad segments of the economy—deserves the consideration of Congress. I request unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SECTION 5 OF THE RAILWAY MAIL PAY ACT OF 1916

Whereas certain provisions of section 5 of the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1961 provide that the Postmaster General shall obtain information from the Interstate Commerce Commission on revenues received by railroad companies from express companies and may, at his discretion, arrange for the transportation of mail matter other than the first class at rates not exceeding those reported to him; and

Whereas the repeal of such provisions has been a part of the legislative program of the Interstate Commerce Commission and its recommendation for repeal was drafted as proposed legislation and introduced in the 86th Congress as H.R. 7055 and S. 1810; and

Whereas a subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee held full hearings during June 1960 and unanimously recommended that H.R. 7055 be favorably reported without amendment; and

Whereas aforesaid provisions are not required to insure reasonable railroad rates for the transportation of mail, and, have never been applied in 44 years and undoubtedly never will be applied as a practical matter for the reason that the railroads can never permit express rates to provide an excuse for reducing mail rates below the compensatory levels fixed by the ICC after full public hearings; and

Whereas the retention of these certain provisions will be of no benefit to anyone, but will seriously threaten the continued existence of the Railway Express Agency; and

Whereas it is definitely in the public interest to keep a nationwide express company, handling 70 million transactions annually and employing some 33,000 persons, operating as a successful private enterprise transportation company; and

Whereas to do this it is imperative that legislation similar to that proposed by H.R. 7055 and S. 1810 in the 86th Congress be passed by the 87th Congress, and,

Whereas the Industrial Transportation Committee of the Milwaukee Association of Commerce believes that best interest of shippers and receivers of both express matter and mail in the metropolitan area of Milwaukee, as well as the entire United States, would best be served by the repeal of the aforesaid provisions of section 5 of the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Milwaukee Association of Commerce supports and urges the repeal of the aforesaid provisions of section 5 of the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916; and be it

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the chairmen of the respective Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives with a request that this resolution be incorporated in the official record for the repeal of the aforesaid provisions of section 5 of the Mail Pay Act of 1916.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of December 1960. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

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

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, DECEMBER 1960

INTRODUCTION

This is the 13th in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories under the Department of Agriculture, General Services Administration, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is for the month of December 1960.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the agencies involved.

The four agencies reported that as of December 1, 1960, the cost value of materials in their stockpile inventories totaled $16,183,501,000 and as of December 31, 1960, they totaled $16,067,197,000, a net decrease of $116,304,000 reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc., during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 but the cost value figures are summarized by agency and program as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories

[In thousands]

Agency and program	Beginning of month Dec. 1, 1960	End of month Dec. 31, 1960	Net change, reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc.
Department of Agriculture: Price support program:			
Agricultural commodities	$7,441,730	$7,313,683	−$128,047
Exchange commodities—strategic and critical materials	72,125	85,870	+13,745
Total, Department of Agriculture	7,513,855	7,399,553	−114,302
General Services Administration: Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile	6,132,492	6,130,245	−2,247
Federal Facilities Corporation: Tin inventory	9,519	9,519	
Defense Production Act program	1,464,171	1,460,667	−3,504
Supplemental stockpile	838,128	839,999	+1,871
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit	44,974	44,974	
Total, General Services Administration	8,489,285	8,485,404	−3,881
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization: Civil defense stockpile	16,413	17,225	+812
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Civil defense medical stockpile	163,948	165,015	+1,067
Grand total	16,183,501	16,067,197	−116,304

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

Detailed tables in this report show opening inventories at the beginning of the month in quantity and cost, transactions during the month, and the closing inventories at the end of the month. Each inventory is shown by commodity except the national stockpile, for which commodity detail is classified.

Pertinent information and explanation are set forth in notes accompanying the respective tables. Statutory authority and program descriptions are shown in the appendix to the report.

The inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows:

Table 1: Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, December 1960: Including agricultural commodities, and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter.

Table 2: Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, December 1960: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

Table 3: Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, December 1960.

Table 4: Civil defense medical stockpile inventory under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, December 1960.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, December 1960: Including agricultural commodities, and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Agriculture defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Lists each commodity in the form in which it exists when extended support, and in some instances in a form to which the supported commodity is processed or converted to increase marketability. The commodities are grouped under the appropriate statutory subclassifications as "Basic," "Designated nonbasic," "Other nonbasic," and "Exchange."

Unit of measure: The applicable unit used in the accounting records and reports of the Corporation.

Inventory, beginning of month: Quantity: In number of units. Cost value: All inventories are recorded in the accounts at cost. "Cost value" is comprised of the initial cost of the commodity plus storage, handling, transportation, and accessorial expenses paid or accrued up to the date of reporting. The initial cost of inventories acquired by delivery of collateral securing loans is the unpaid balance of the notes plus storage and other charges advanced, any equities due or paid to producers on warehouse-stored collateral (by Public Law 85-835, and beginning with 1959 crop production, the Corporation will not make equity payments to borrowers on unredeemed price support loan collateral, title to which it acquires on or after maturity of the loans), and the net value of any quantity or quality differences determined upon delivery of farm-stored collateral. Amounts paid to lending agencies participating in the loan program for crop years prior to 1958 were recorded as a part of inventory cost.

Adjustments: Warehouse settlements, exchanges and transfers (net): Warehouse settlements include the net differences in quantity and/or value represented by the net of overdeliveries, premiums, underdeliveries, and discounts arising from movement of commodities. Exchanges represent the net change in quantity and/or value for inventories exchanged or in process of exchange. On completed exchanges, the change in value represents differentials due to location, quality, and quantity. Unprocessed commodities removed from inventory for conversion or processing (on a contractual or fee basis and excluding conditional sales) are included as a reduction of inventory. Processed commodities acquired as a result of this conversion or processing are included as an addition to inventory.

Acquisitions: As reflected in accounting records and reports; and includes commodities acquired by delivery of collateral securing loans, commodities purchased under terms of purchase agreements, commodities purchased directly from producers or processors as a part of the support operation but not under purchase agreements; and processed commodities acquired by purchases which offset conditional sales of unprocessed commodities from inventory. The cost value of acquisitions is described under the explanation of the cost value of inventory.

Carrying charges added to investment after acquisition: Total costs of storage, handling, transportation, and other accessorial expenses incurred during the month.

Disposals: As reflected in accounting records and reports. Inventory transactions generally are recorded on the basis of transfer of title. Disposition commitments are not reflected in the accounts. Cost value: Represents acquisition value plus applicable amount of carrying charges. The amount of cost allocated to commodities removed from inventory is determined with the view of retaining in the inventory accounts the cost of commodities remaining on hand. The cost allocated to commodities removed from price support inventory is generally computed on the basis of average unit cost of the commodity reflected in the inventory accounts for the applicable crop year and general storage location. In the case of commodities generally stored commingled (e.g., bulk grains and bulk oils) the crop year is determined on the first-in, first-out basis. In the case of commodities stored in identified lots, the crop year is determined by lot identification.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of the month, Dec. 31, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Carrying charges added to investment after acquisition		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Storage and handling	Transportation and other	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Agricultural commodities:													
Basic commodities:													
Corn	Bushel	1,472,039	$2,443,539	−169	−$271	9,281	$11,028	$12,293	$933	9,874	$22,806	1,471,277	$2,444,716
Cornmeal	Pound					40,243	1,586	(1)	1	40,243	1,587		
Cotton, extra long staple	Bale	61	17,285					9	(1)	2	570	59	16,724
Cotton, upland	do	5,437	924,068			1,311	192,044	991	−1	1,779	280,257	4,969	836,845
Peanut butter	Pound			(1)	(1)					(1)	(1)		
Peanuts, farmers' stock	do	106	11			18,753	1,742	80		3,413	314	15,446	1,519
Peanuts, shelled	do	85,904	14,347	(1)	(1)	7,305	1,008	65	29	31,275	5,017	61,934	10,432
Rice, milled	Hundredweight	1,423	13,366	(1)	−1	127	1,089	53	79	88	926	1,462	13,660
Rice, rough	do	1,393	7,546	−1	−20		(1)	35	−2	704	3,791	688	3,768
Tobacco	Pound					2,188	1,398			2,188	1,398		
Wheat	Bushel	1,145,777	2,973,498	−226	−909	49	98	13,377	6,346	12,639	44,100	1,132,961	2,948,310
Wheat flour	Pound					157,962	8,163	(1)	3	157,922	8,164	40	2
Total, basic commodities			6,393,660		−1,201		218,156	26,903	7,388		368,930		6,275,976
Designated nonbasic commodities:													
Barley	Bushel	59,646	73,241	−92	−82	−14	−9	800	587	3,522	5,637	56,018	68,900
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	312,444	851,546	−13	−123	1	3	6,702	1,690	467	1,462	311,965	858,356
Milk and butterfat:													
Butter	Pound	73,129	43,513			2,696	1,629	114	164	9,530	5,816	66,295	39,604
Cheese	do	99	35					(1)	(1)	99	35		
Milk, dried	do	307,525	43,358			35,242	5,298	146	522	62,931	9,804	279,836	39,520
Milk, fluid	do					81,280	3,333			81,280	3,333		
Oats	Bushel	11,510	9,292	+3	+1	20	12	97	6	173	151	11,360	9,257
Rye	do	4,317	6,248	−2	−2	(1)	−2	43	3	47	62	4,268	6,228
Tung oil	Pound	24,326	5,183					7	15	176	39	24,150	5,166
Total, designated nonbasic commodities.			1,032,416		−206		10,264	7,909	2,987		26,339		1,027,031
Other nonbasic commodities:													
Beans, dry, edible	Hundredweight	6	34					(1)	4		4	6	34
Flaxseed	Bushel	(1)	1	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)		(1)	1	(1)	(1)
Soybeans	do	7,017	15,564	+1	+4	2	3	90	1	2,527	5,061	4,493	10,601
Turpentine	Gallon	102	55					(1)		26	14	76	41
Total, other nonbasic commodities			15,654		+4		3	90	5		5,080		10,676
Total, agricultural commodities			7,441,730		−1,403		228,423	34,902	10,380		400,349		7,313,683
Exchange commodities: [2]													
Strategic and critical materials:													
Aluminum oxide, abrasive, crude	Pound	37,490	2,108			16,307	891	(1)	49	−1	19	53,796	3,029
Antimony, metal	do	2,231	573			983	253	(1)	6		2	3,214	830
Asbestos, amosite	do	3,613	393			1,873	156	−1	(1)		(1)	5,486	548
Asbestos, crocidolite	do	3,945	606			3,050	348	13	4		2	6,995	969
Bauxite	do	2,844,713	17,748			348,948	1,906	14	30	−55	14	3,193,716	19,684
Beryl ore	do	1,895	404					(1)	(1)			1,895	404
Beryllium copper master alloy	do	569	1,163			121	242	1	1		1	690	1,406
Bismuth	do							(1)	(1)		(1)		
Boart	Carat	1,949	5,085			500	1,379					2,449	6,464
Cadmium	Pound							(1)	(1)		(1)		
Chrome ore, chemical grade	do	159,203	1,574				4	16	1		13	159,203	1,582
Chrome ore, refractory grade	do							1	(1)		1		
Chrome ore, Turkish, metallurgical	do							(1)			(1)		
Chromium metal	do	124	120									124	120
Colemanite, Turkish boron minerals	do					9,969	247	5	(1)		5	9,969	247
Columbite	do					111	88	(1)	(1)		(1)	111	88
Ferrochrome, high carbon	do	8,765	1,511			8,274	1,362	3	−4		−1	17,039	2,873
Ferrochrome, low carbon	do					1,788	374	2	(1)		2	1,788	374

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, December 1960: Including agricultural commodities, and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month								Inventory, end of the month, Dec. 31, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Carrying charges added to investment after acquisition		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Storage and handling	Transportation and other	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Exchange commodities—Continued													
Strategic and critical materials:													
Ferromanganese	do	56,812	$5,571			23,777	$2,145	$23	$51		$40	80,589	$7,750
Fluorspar, acid grade	do	18,091	340			15,268	278	1	3		3	33,359	619
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade	do							(1)	13		13		
Lead	do							(1)	(1)		(1)		
Manganese ore, chemical grade	do	32,854	1,366				−293	1	(1)		(1)	32,854	1,074
Manganese ore, metallurgical grade	do	959,187	21,145			100,720	2,020	18	97		27	1,059,907	23,253
Manganese ore, natural battery grade	do	76,390	3,889			4,406	239	(1)	12			80,796	4,140
Mica	do	178	665			22	67	1	1		(1)	200	734
Quartz crystals	do	123	1,847			7	75	(1)	(1)			130	1,922
Raw silk	do					37	179			37	179		
Rutile	do	13,349	1,342			3,993	381	7	25			17,342	1,755
Silicon carbide	do	11,697	1,155			8,879	834	4	52		36	20,576	2,009
Thorium nitrate	do	50	115					(1)				50	115
Tin	do					1	1	(1)	(1)		(1)	1	1
Titanium sponge	do	2,600	3,405			400	480	(1)	−5			3,000	3,880
Zinc	do							−26	(1)		−26		
Total, strategic and critical materials			72,125				13,656	83	336		330		85,870
Total, Department of Agriculture			7,513,855		$1,403		242,079	34,985	10,716		400,679		7,399,553

[1] Less than 500.

[2] See appendix, p. 17, for notes relating to reporting of strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, December 1960: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The General Services Administration defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Identifies the program and the minerals, metals, fibers and oils acquired under the program.

Unit of measure: The standard weight or measure of minerals, metals, fibers, and oils determined to be the stockpile unit of measure.

Inventory, beginning of month: Opening inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the beginning of the accounting period.

Adjustments: Represents increases (+) or decreases (−) of materials in inventory other than increases from acquisitions or decreases from disposals. Decreases occur from theft, loss incurred while in transit to stockpile location, repacking from one type of container to another, beneficiation of a low-grade material to a higher grade, and the removal of material for sampling and testing purposes. Increases occur from return of material previously removed for sampling and testing purposes and from quantities received at storage locations in excess of quantities billed by the contractor. A new chemical analysis of the materials may cause an increase or decrease where the weights are based on chemical and moisture content. Increases or decreases are also made from findings of audits of inventory and accounting records.

Acquisitions: For the National Stockpile and Defense Production Act acquisitions include open market purchases at contract prices; intradepartmental transfers at market or appraised value at time of transfer; transportation to first permanent storage location; and, beneficiating and processing cost in upgrading materials. For the supplemental stockpile acquisitions include the market value or CCC's acquisition cost whichever is the lower at time of transfer from CCC.

Disposals: Cost of disposals are calculated at the average unit price of inventory at time of removal from inventory. For the national stockpile inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that by their nature would deteriorate if held in storage for lengths of time; and sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government. For the Defense Production Act inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the end of the accounting period.

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory end of month Dec. 31, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
National stockpile: Total (classified detail omitted)			$6,132,492		−$122		$4,199		$6,324		$6,130,245
Federal Facilities Corporation: Total, tin	Long ton	4	9,519							4	9,519
Defense Production Act:											
Aluminum	Short ton	750	380,340			4	1,981			754	382,321
Asbestos, chrysotile	Short dry tons	2	2,103							2	2,103
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type	Long dry tons	1,370	18,168							1,370	18,168
Beryl	Short ton	2	1,081			(1)	19			2	1,100
Bismuth	Pound	23	52							23	52
Chromite, metallurgical grade	Short dry ton	882	32,013			9	328			891	32,341
Cobalt	Pound	25,187	52,063							25,187	52,063
Columbite	do	10,618	51,736							10,618	51,736
Copper	Short ton	132	73,514			2	1,031	(1)	641	133	73,904
Cryolite	do	38	10,607					(1)	32	38	10,575
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	20	1,394							20	1,394
Graphite, lubricating	Short ton	(1)	89					(1)	8	(1)	81
Lead	do	8	3,036							8	3,036
Manganese battery grade, synthetic dioxide	Short dry ton	4	2,524							4	2,524
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do	3,031	175,407							3,031	175,407
Mica, muscovite block and film	Pound	6,136	34,672			22	333			6,158	35,005
Nickel	do	133,649	115,345	[2] −3,378	[2] −1,875			4,906	4,126	125,365	109,344
Palladium	Troy ounce	8	177							8	177
Rare earth residue	Pound	6,086	658					(1)	(1)	6,086	658
Rutile	Short dry ton	9	1,725							9	1,725
Thorium	Pound	849	42							849	42
Tantalite	do	1,529	9,734							1,529	9,734
Tin	Long ton	(1)	372					(1)	372		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, December 1960: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory end of month Dec. 31, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Defense Production Act—Continued											
Titanium	Short ton	22	$167,648							22	$167,648
Tungsten	Pound	79,809	325,459							79,809	325,459
Subtotal, DPA commodities			1,459,957		−$1,875		$3,693		$5,179		1,456,595
Machine tool inventory:											
In storage	Tool	(1)	219					(1)	143	(1)	76
On lease	do	(1)	3,966							(1)	3,966
On loan	do	(1)	29							(1)	29
Subtotal, DPA machine tools			4,214						143		4,072
Total, Defense Production Act			1,464,171		−1,875		3,693		5,322		1,460,667
Supplemental stockpile:											
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude	Short ton	131	16,699		+119					131	16,818
Antimony	do	9	4,892		+4					9	4,897
Asbestos, amosite	do	3	759		−4					3	755
Asbestos, chrysotile	Short dry ton	5	3,499							5	3,499
Asbestos, crocidolite	Short ton	2	847		+42					2	889
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type	Long dry ton	2,139	32,886		−57					2,139	32,829
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type	do	683	10,505							683	10,505
Beryl	Short ton	8	17,930		+28					8	17,958
Bismuth	Pound	1,146	2,579							1,146	2,579
Cadmium	do	6,332	10,586							6,332	10,586
Chromite, chemical grade	Short dry ton	47	9,750		+60					47	9,810
Chromite, metallurgical grade	do	1,295	202,998		+1,249					1,295	204,246
Chromite, refractory grade	do	165	4,680		+2					165	4,683
Cobalt	Pound	1,077	2,169							1,077	2,169
Colemanite	Long dry ton	51	2,165		−113					51	2,052
Columbite	Pound	153	402							153	402
Copper	Short ton	10	6,598							10	6,598
Diamond, industrial, bort	Carat	111	258		+7					111	265
Diamond, industrial stones	do	10,199	131,641		+227					10,199	131,868
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	492	26,468		(1)					492	26,468
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade	do	2	67							2	67
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump	do	1	341							1	341
Iodine	Pound	242	231							242	231
Lead	Short ton	222	58,647		+34					222	58,681
Manganese, battery grade, natural	Short dry ton	35	3,334							35	3,334
Manganese, chemical grade, type B	do	18	1,436		−21					18	1,415
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do	1,071	101,705		+10					1,071	101,714
Mercury	Flask	16	3,446							16	3,446
Mica, muscovite block, strained and better	Pound	263	698							263	698
Mica, muscovite film	do	27	212							27	212
Mica, muscovite splittings	do	4,826	6,226							4,826	6,226
Mica, phlogopite splittings	Pound	231	228		+1					231	$229
Palladium	Troy ounce	548	9,872							548	9,872
Quartz crystals	Pound	82	1,099							82	1,099
Rare earths	Short dry ton	2	2,427							2	2,427
Ruthenium	Troy ounce	15	560							15	560
Selenium	Pound	157	1,071							157	1,071
Silicon carbide, crude	Short ton	77	15,011		+103					77	15,114
Tantalite	Pound	8	21							8	21
Thorium	do	4,030	9,544		+245					4,030	9,789
Tin	Long ton	7	15,265		−319					7	14,946
Titanium	Short ton	6	23,152		+250					6	23,401
Tungsten	Pound	4,485	15,627							4,485	15,627
Zinc	Short ton	324	79,600		+6					324	79,606
Total, supplemental stockpile			838,128		+1,871						839,999
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit: [2]											
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude	Short ton	12	1,565							12	1,565
Antimony, metal	do	(1)	196							(1)	196
Asbestos, amosite	do	2	415							2	415
Asbestos, crocidolite	do	(1)	115							(1)	115
Bauxite	Long ton	551	9,213							551	9,213
Beryllium copper master alloy	Pound	799	1,620							799	1,620
Bismuth	do	350	736							350	736
Cadmium	do	277	352							277	352
Chromite, chemical grade	Short ton	(1)	1,786							(1)	1,786
Chromite, metallurgical grade	do	(1)	153							(1)	153
Chromite, refractory	do	4	103							4	103
Colemanite	Long ton	12	791							12	791
Columbite	Pound	85	94							85	94
Diamond, industrial, bort	Carat	450	1,240							450	1,240
Diamond, industrial, stones	do	326	4,370							326	4,370
Ferrochrome, high carbon	Short ton	4	1,757							4	1,757
Ferrochrome, low carbon	do	1	729							1	729
Ferromanganese	do	34	6,785							34	6,785
Fluorspar, acid grade	do	11	469							11	469
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade	do	41	1,274							41	1,274
Manganese, chemical grade	do	23	1,988							23	1,988
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do	3	5,826							3	5,826
Mica	Pound	21	14							21	14
Silicon carbide, crude	Short ton	10	1,902							10	1,902
Tin	Long ton	1	1,483							1	1,483
Total, supplemental stockpile inventory in transit			44,974								44,974
Total, General Services Administration			8,489,285		−126		7,892		11,646		8,485,404

[1] Less than 500.

[2] Loss of nickel inventory at Nicaro, Cuba, through forced expropriation by the Cuban Government.

[3] See appendix p. 17, for notes relating to reporting of strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, December 1960*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization defines the content of the columns as follows:

Commodity.—Composite groups of many different items.

Unit of measure.—Shown only for engineering supply units; not feasible for other composite groups.

Inventory-quantity.—Shown only for one item, namely, engineering supply units. It is not feasible to furnish quantity figures on the other commodity groups because they are composite groups of many different items. To report quantities, it would be necessary to list numerous different items.

Inventory-cost value.—Dollar value figures on commodities in the stockpile inventory essentially reflect their actual cost. The stockpile inventory is generally augmented by acquisition of Government excess property without reimbursement to the several holding agencies. The value assigned to these materials is (1) original acquisition cost if known, (2) estimated current market value of items in similar condition, or (3) average unit cost of identical or similar items purchased in the open market for stockpiling. Government excess property acquired by reimbursement is assigned a value equal to the amount of the fair-value reimbursement required.

Adjustments.—Represent inventory pricing adjustments resulting from recalculation of fixed average unit prices, transfers of commodities from one composite group to another, etc., during the month.

Acquisitions.—Materials placed in inventory during the month, including return to inventory of items previously released from inventory for reworking, etc. Value stated in terms of actual costs of the commodities.

Disposals.—Materials removed from inventory during the month, including items released from inventory for reworking, etc. Values shown are based on average unit costs.

Inventory at end of month.—Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory end of month, Dec. 31, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Engineering stockpiles (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe and fittings)	10 mile units	[1]	$8,247		[2] −$9		$324				$8,562
Chemical and biological equipment			776		[2] −1		33		[3] $1		807
Radiological equipment			7,391		[1]		532		[4] 68		7,855
Total, civil defense stockpile, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization			16,413		−9		890		69		17,225

[1] Less than 500.
[2] Accounting adjustments.
[3] Granted to other Federal agencies and to States.
[4] Consists of $67,110 granted to other Federal agencies and to States, and $875 inventory writeoff (certificate of destruction).

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 4.—*Civil defense medical stockpile inventory under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, December 1960*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare defines content of the columns as follows:

Commodity: Composite groups of many different items.

Unit of measure: Shown only for hospital functional units; not feasible for other composite groups.

Inventory cost value: The dollar value figures in the civil defense medical stockpile inventory reflect essentially the average acquisition costs per unit of the commodities. No transportation, delivery, or storage costs are included.

Adjustments: Represents increases (+) or decreases (−) of materials in commodity groups other than increases from acquisitions or decreases from disposals. Normally these transactions result from inventory pricing adjustments due to recalculation of fixed average unit prices, transfers of commodities from one composite group to another, removal of material for sampling during testing or reworking, etc., during the month.

Acquisitions: Materials placed in inventory during month, including new procurement and acquisition of Government excess property.

Disposals: Materials removed from inventory during the month. Costs of disposals are calculated on a basis of the average unit price of items in inventory at the time of removal. Disposals consist principally of items no longer suitable for stockpiling due to deterioration and of samples consumed through testing.

Inventory at end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory end of month, Dec. 31, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Medical bulk stocks and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses			$105,726		[1] −$493		[2] $1,091		[3] $7		$106,317
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations			4,117								4,117
Civil defense emergency hospitals	Each	2	38,504							2	38,504
Replenishment units (functional assemblies other than hospitals)			15,601		+476						16,076
Total, civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare			163,948		−18		1,091		7		165,015

[1] Consists of $273 adjustment resulting from utilization of bulk stocks, and $17,341 accountability for experimental medical items in administration use to be retained by OCDM.
[2] Serum albumin returned from manufacturer resulting from reworking blood plasma.
[3] Inventory writeoff (certificate of destruction).

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

APPENDIX

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Commodity Credit Corporation

The price-support program

Price-support operations are carried out under the Corporation's charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714), in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1962. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producer's commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans.

With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgaged collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with section 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales to livestock feed in emergency areas.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Strategic and critical materials stockpiling and related programs

1. National Stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. GSA is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OCDM. In addition, GSA is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OCDM determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

2. Tin received from Federal Facilities Corporation

Public Law 608, 84th Congress (50 U.S.C. 98 note), provided, among other things, for the continuation of operation of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., from June 30, 1956, until January 31, 1957. It provided also that all tin acquired by the Federal Facilities Corporation by reason of such extension should be transferred to GSA.

3. Defense Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, GSA is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

4. Supplemental stockpile

As a result of a delegation of authority from OCDM (32A C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V–4) GSA is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Civil defense stockpile program

This stockpiling program, conducted pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended, is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Civil defense medical stockpile program

As authorized under Public Law 920, 81st Congress, and following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1958, the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has delegated responsibility to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to plan and direct operation of the medical supply portion of the OCDM stockpile. The warehousing of the medical stockpile is principally within the OCDM warehouse system; in addition, the medical stockpile includes a program designed to preposition emergency hospitals and other treatment units in communities throughout the Nation.

EXPLANATORY NOTES RELATING TO THE REPORTING OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS ACQUIRED BY EXCHANGE OR BARTER OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Surplus agricultural commodities in the Commodity Credit Corporation's price-support inventory may be exchanged or bartered for strategic and critical materials under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), and other basic legislation including the CCC Charter Act, as amended, the Agricultural Act of 1954, and the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Except for small amounts which may go to the national stockpile, the strategic and critical materials acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation under the barter program are transferred to the supplemental stockpile.

Direct appropriation reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for materials so transferred from the price-support inventory.

The General Services Administration is charged with the custody and management of strategic and critical materials, and becomes the responsible reporting agency when title to these bartered materials is placed in the supplemental stockpile.

For purposes of this report, strategic and critical materials acquired by barter may appear in three inventories, reflecting the stages of the transfer of title.

1. The Department of Agriculture reports those to which the Commodity Credit Corporation still has title, prior to transfer to the supplemental stockpile.

2. The General Services Administration reports those which have been transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation exchange inventory in two parts:

A. Materials for which title is "in transit" from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

B. Materials for which title has passed to the supplemental stockpile.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of materials in nine Federal stockpile inventories as reported by the Agriculture Department, General Services Administration, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on December 31, 1960, totaled $16,067,197,000. December activity in these stockpiles resulted in a net decrease of $116,304,000.

Net change in these stockpile inventories reflects acquisitions, disposals, and adjustments. December activity and end-of-the-month totals are summarized:

[In thousands]

Inventories by agency and program	Cost value, December 1960	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Department of Agriculture: Price support program:		
1. Agricultural commodities	−$128,047	$7,313,683
2. Exchange, strategic and critical materials	+13,745	85,870
Total, Department of Agriculture	−114,302	7,399,553
General Services Administration: Strategic and critical materials:		
3. National stockpile	−2,247	6,130,245
4. Federal Facilities Corporation, tin inventory	----------	9,519
5. Defense Production Act program	−3,504	1,460,667
6. Supplemental stockpile	+1,871	839,999
7. Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit	----------	44,974
Total, General Services Administration	−3,881	8,485,404
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:		
8. Civil defense stockpile	+812	17,225
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:		
9. Civil defense medical stockpile	+1,067	165,015
Grand total	−116,304	16,067,197

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies involved as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

STORAGE AND HANDLING

The report shows storage and handling costs for Commodity Credit's price support inventory totaled $34,985,000 for the month of December. It should be noted these storage costs are for only two of the nine stockpiles covered by the report.

INCREASES AND DECREASES

The major net decreases in cost value during December were $88 million in cotton, $25 million in wheat, and $8 million in milk and butterfat. This was partially offset by net increases including $7 million in grain sorghum and $5 million in aluminum and bauxite.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Of 20 agricultural commodities in Commodity Credit's $7.4 billion price support inventory on December 31, 1960, those leading in cost value include:

Wheat, with 1.1 billion bushels at a cost of $2.9 billion;

Corn, with 1.5 billion bushels at a cost of $2.4 billion; and

Grain sorghum with 312 million hundredweight at a cost of $858 million.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Strategic and critical materials are shown in six inventories totaling $8.6 billion, including the $6.1 billion national stockpile for which itemized detail is classified. Combined figures from the other five inventories show materials (in all grades and forms) leading in cost value as follows:

Aluminum, bauxite, etc., with 7.3 million tons at a cost of $494 million;

Tungsten, with 84 million pounds at a cost of $341 million; and

Manganese (and ores), with 4.8 million tons at a cost of $335 million.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Supplies and equipment in two civil defense stockpile inventories total $182 million. More than 90 percent is in the medical stockpile valued at $165 million.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 985. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the prepaid dues income of certain membership organizations to be included in gross income for the taxable years to which the dues relate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. PELL):

S. 986. A bill to assist in the reduction of unemployment through the acceleration of capital expenditure programs of State and local public bodies; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. HART, and Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts):

S. 987. A bill to authorize the retraining of persons displaced from their jobs by automation or other technological development, foreign competition, relocation of industry, shifts in market demands, or other change in the structure of the economy; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. HILL:

S. 988. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that benefits payable thereunder shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility of veterans for non-service-connected disability pensions; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 989. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that benefits payable under such act or the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility of veterans for non-service-connected disability pensions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 990. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide that benefits payable thereunder shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility of veterans for non-service-connected disability pensions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 991. A bill to promote education in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 992. A bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. ELLENDER) (by request):

S. 993. A bill to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 994. A bill to provide that Guam shall be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; and

S. 995. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territory of eastern Samoa shall be represented in Congress by a Deputy to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 996. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to provide additional public relief from repetitive criminal violations of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 997. A bill to extend the program for the conservation, restoration, and management of the rare Hawaiian Nene goose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. DODD:

S. 998. A bill for the relief of Francis Zerjav; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 999. A bill for the relief of Katherine Rice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1000. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances;

S. 1001. A bill to provide offstreet automobile parking for patrons of the postal service and postal employees at certain postal installations; and

S. 1002. A bill to prohibit the use of timing or measuring devices in the distribution of mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON) (by request):

S. 1003. A bill to establish a national cemetery at Spokane, Wash., on lands which formerly constituted George Wright Air Force Base; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1004. A bill for the relief of the Sorensen Fish Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 1005. A bill to amend section 10 and section 3 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 1006. A bill for the relief of Ratko (Felix) Herskovic;

S. 1007. A bill for the relief of Sara Mishan;

S. 1008. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Viva; and

S. 1009. A bill for the relief of Tai Lam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1010. A bill to provide for adjustments in certain widows' annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, and for other purposes; and

S. 1011. A bill to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 1012. A bill to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain tracts of land in Marengo County, Ala., to the Greif Bros. Cooperage Corp.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

S. 1013. A bill to establish in the General Services Administration a service to disseminate general information concerning the organization of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1014. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of 300 years of operation of hotels in America, and the 50th annual convention of the American Hotel Association; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 1015. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not exceeding $175,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway from the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina and Tennessee to the Mammoth Cave National Park in Kentucky, and the Natchez Trace Parkway in Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1016. A bill to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Air Force; and

S. 1017. A bill for the relief of Luis Gertrudes Goncalves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. MORTON, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. GORE, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 1018. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 9 acres of land for addition to Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 1019. A bill to provide for the recovery from tortiously liable third persons of the value of hospital and medical care and treatment furnished by the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1020. A bill to establish a Commission on the Cultural Resources in the Nation's Capital, and to provide a comprehensive plan for the effective utilization of such resources in carrying out a long-range program to make the Nation's Capital equal in cultural matters to the capital cities of other nations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1021. A bill to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1022. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William H. Chinn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1023. A bill to amend the act of August 20, 1954 (68 Stat. 752), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of additional features of the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1024. A bill for the relief of Katherine Cunningham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1025. A bill to provide for the increase, modernization, and stockpiling of railroad equipment in order to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense; to create and establish a public agency with powers to carry out the provisions of this act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

GENERAL EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR EACH FISCAL YEAR

Mr. BYRD of Virginia (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. BENNETT), submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) providing for one general expenditure authorization act for each fiscal year, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

RESOLUTIONS

SORENSEN FISH CO.—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. WILEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 90); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1004) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Sorensen Fish Company," now pending in the Senate together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amounts, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

CERTAIN WORKS OF ART IN SUBWAY TO NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. CURTIS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 91) to provide for works of art depicting the scenic beauties and historical sites of the several States in the subway from the Capitol Building to the New Senate Office Building; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1961

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have been requested by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] to introduce a bill for appropriate reference, entitled "Educational Opportunities Act of 1961." He has requested that the bill may lie on the table for additional cosponsors through Friday, February 24. I also ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by him with reference to the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and will lie on the desk as requested, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 991) to promote education in the United States, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. GOLDWATER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement of Mr. GOLDWATER, presented by Mr. DIRKSEN, is as follows:

A STATEMENT OF PROPOSED REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES, PROGRAMS, AND OBJECTIVES, BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

PART II—EDUCATION

Several weeks ago I released part I of this statement dealing with proposed Republican positions on inflation, labor, electoral college reform, social welfare, foreign policy, and briefly, on one aspect of education. In this second part, I shall set forth a program dealing with the proper role of the Federal Government with respect to education at all levels—elementary school, high school, and college, university, and other institutions of higher learning.

This is a role which must be directed toward helping our people to help themselves without the direct intervention of the Federal Government. It must recognize first and foremost the danger of centralized control over the vitally important area of life encompassed by the education of our children. Then, it must take account of the actual need which exists for expanding and augmenting the facilities which we now have for meeting the Nation's educational needs. Finally, it should use the power of the Federal Government to place at the disposal of the people and the States and local governments the means to handle the needs that may exist or arise.

The problem is one of letting the people decide, in their own communities where that decision can best be made, just what are their educational needs. After that, it is one of equipping them to handle their needs locally, through their own school boards and without the direction of Washington bureaucracy.

As we pointed out in part I, the major domestic problem facing the Nation is the threat of inflation with its disastrous impact on private savings, insurance, pension funds, and social security. This threat has enormous ramifications when applied to our educational problems.

This is true because an increasingly larger share of these funds is being accumulated by parents for the purpose of providing for the higher education of their children, the costs of which are outstripping the ability of many people to keep pace. And for that reason, a specific proposal was set forth in part I for dealing with that aspect of the appropriate role of the Federal Government.

I. Financing college education

As the costs of college education continue to rise, it becomes imperative to provide relief to the taxpaying parents of college students, and to do so not in the form of Federal handouts but by narrowing the far-reaching scope of the Federal taxing power.

Providing an education for their children is traditionally the responsibility of the American family and not of the Government. The vast accumulations of private savings and insurance bear witness that most of our people still believe in this principle. Hence, a Federal program to aid our children to secure a college education should be directed toward helping their parents to do the job. It should avoid the form of Federal grants with their accompanying expansion of Federal bureaucracy and Federal supervision which not only wastes funds through unproductive administrative costs, but creates a risk as well of Federal controls over public education.

The Republican Party therefore proposes a program of tax relief for most families with children at college. Such families will be given a substantial additional Federal income tax reduction for each dependent attending college. The specific details of this proposal, as spelled out in legislation, are set forth at the end of this statement.

II. The decay of American precollege education

The Republican Party believes, and its opinion is shared by many outside the party, that what is primarily wrong with American precollege education is not lack of money but lack of quality. The deterioration in the standards of the American elementary and secondary school has been recognized not only by leading scholars in and out of the academic community but, finally, by the vast majority of the long-suffering American people as well. It seems obvious that huge sums of additional money should not be spent in perpetuating and aggravating our educational shortcomings. Any program which makes additional funds available for use by our elementary and secondary school systems should be accompanied simultaneously by a program designed to induce improvements in the quality of education.

Speaking before the American Society of Civil Engineers in February 1958, Dean Martin Mason, of the George Washington University School of Engineering, stated bluntly:

"Our schools are not fulfilling what should be their main function—basic education and the stimulation of minds. Pupils spend half their time learning social graces, automobile driving, and in building their bodies."

Mortimer Smith, director of the Council for Basic Education, in his recent book "A Citizen's Manual for Public Schools," writes:

"To sum up, this should be the bare minimum expected of a normal child finishing the elementary school: he should be able to read and write with some fluency, and spell, add, subtract, multiply, and divide with accuracy; he should know the basic geographic facts of his country and the world; have a knowledge of elementary science; know something of the culture and history of other peoples and much of his own. And above all, his schooling should have taught him the difference between aimless mental activity and orderly thought.

"There is a strange quirk in modern educational thinking which produces pessimism about the school's ability to teach such tangibles as geography, spelling, and reading, but optimism about the ability of the school to teach such intangibles as good citizenship and wise use of leisure time and to produce tolerant, well-rounded personalities."

The Republican Party, therefore, as a step in its program to aid and improve precollege education in the United States, proposes a measure to help achieve these goals which will invoke the most limited participation by the Federal Government but which will be wholly voluntary in character, completely free from any compulsion, either through law or otherwise, and which will be based entirely on the principles of emulation and inspiration.

The proposed measure will establish a national merit scholarship program to make it possible for the most promising students to obtain college and undergraduate university educations, but primarily designed to establish a set of voluntary secondary school scholastic standards which can serve as a guide and a beacon both for the high schools of the Nation and for the parents of America.

These national scholarships will require only a tiny expenditure of Federal funds. They will be severely limited in number but generous in amount so as to be attractive to students and parents alike. They will be administered by a board appointed by the President, and consisting of scholars and authorities in the humanities, literature, foreign languages, science, mathematics, history, philosophy, sociology, economics, etc.

This Board will implement the basic scholastic requirements for eligibility to compete for these scholarships as set forth in the law itself. These requirements, as a minimum, will include the study in high school of English, foreign languages, science, mathematics and history (emphasizing American history). The examinations conducted by the Board will require the student to achieve an absolute passing mark. If more students pass than the number of scholarships available, only that number, in order of performance, will receive the scholarship awards. If fewer than this number manage to get the passing grade, then only they will be selected and the rest of the scholarships will remain unused. The examinations will be conducted on a nationwide basis with no geographic restrictions or limitations on the number of students from any State or community who participate or who secure the scholarships. If all of them go to the students of a single State, community or even school, unlikely as that may be, then the rest of the Nation's school systems would do well to reexamine their own educational establishments.

There are several beneficial effects which are to be hoped for from this proposal. First, it will encourage a healthy spirit of academic rivalry among the secondary schools of the Nation, similar to that which now exists in athletics and debating. Second, it will spur scholastic competition among individual students. And last, but most important, it will expose the weaknesses in some of our secondary schools while at the same time revealing the strength in others.

The American public will assess the results of these examinations. A school which consistently fails to qualify its students for participation in the examination, or whose students consistently fail to secure any of the scholarships will come under intensive critical scrutiny. The parents and the community will want to know why their children are not eligible to compete; they will ask why their school lags behind while the school in the neighboring county or adjoining State can boast of producing national scholars. Where these seriously inadequate educational standards exist, we are confident that the American people, with their customary diligence, will ferret out the evils which have brought about the deterioration and provide the necessary corrective.

III. Financing precollege education

The third step in the proposed program to aid and improve education in the United States, is a measure, which if adopted, makes all the alternative plans for Federal aid to education which are currently under serious consideration, irrelevant and unnecessary.

Since the end of World War II, we have witnessed the greatest school building program ever conducted in this country. In the past 10 years alone, over 500,000 classrooms have been built, and based on the sale of school bonds for the past several years, there is every reason to believe that this high rate of classroom construction will continue.

In spite of the tremendous job which the States and local communities have done during the past 15 years to overcome the backlog of school facilities needed in some areas, a backlog brought on by the depression, World War II, and Korea, the proponents of direct Federal aid to education are nevertheless absolutely insistent that the only way to reduce the backlog is by way of a massive infusion of Federal grants into the States. In recent years, these same proponents have added to their propaganda the claim that teachers are not paid enough by the local school districts and, therefore, that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to correct that situation as well.

It is interesting and significant that the demands for Federal aid to education have grown louder and more insistent as the need for expanding our school facilities diminishes. It is fully apparent that many of those promoting the idea of Federal aid to education are interested only in the element of centralized control and, consequently, refuse to recognize that the States and local communities have been rapidly solving the backlog problem. They have seen their "crisis" selling point melt away in the face of determined local responsibility and are attempting to cover it up by adding new items to their list of needs and more power to their propaganda efforts. The present offensive for Federal aid to and control of the Nation's education is the heaviest ever mounted and it must be met with a courageously sound proposal incorporating the principles of individual freedom and personal responsibility.

The Republican Party is fully aware that a growing student enrollment has made it difficult for some localities completely to overcome classroom shortages despite the expenditure of considerable amounts of money and effort. We are also conscious of the fact that teachers' salaries have lagged behind those of other professions and vocations, causing some qualified instructors to resign from teaching and enter more highly paid occupations and making it difficult to attract qualified replacements.

However, recently published school statistics dealing with pupil, population, enrollment, teachers, and public school expenditures are most revealing. Between 1950 and 1960, public school enrollment increased by 44.4 percent; during this same period, the number of teachers in elementary and secondary schools increased by 51.9 percent, thus reducing the pupil-teacher ratio to 26.4 to 1 as compared to 27.8 to 1 in 1950. But while pupil enrollment and number of teachers are increasing in these ratios, total expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools rose by more than 150 percent.

It is quite obvious from these figures that the States and local communities have been making enormous and effective efforts to meet their school needs. Wherever the problem of the need for additional classrooms has not been solved, it has not been due to any reluctance on the part of the local community or the State to find and expend the necessary funds.

In view of the willingness of the State and local communities to keep pace with growing educational needs, the Republican Party rejects the wasteful and undemocratic measures to appropriate for school aid, billions of Federal dollars extracted from the States only to be partially funneled back to them again with strict limitations on the use to which these funds may be put.

We believe that the alleged evil plight of our schools has been grossly exaggerated and that the magnificent efforts of our State and local governments to find the money to meet school needs has been largely and purposely ignored.

These efforts represented the quiet response of millions of "Forgotten Americans" to the educational problems arising in their communities. The job was done without fanfare by the people who meet their responsibilities on a day-to-day basis without the benefit of prodding by nationwide pressure group organizations. We say that it represents a monument to the efforts of a free people, working with initiative and enterprise in their own communities to meet the problems of those communities as they arose. This is where the big job of meeting the Nation's educational problems has been accomplished up until now and this is where the job, rightfully, should be finished.

Our proposal will provide the means for solving additional school problems, if they really exist, but it will leave the determination of this highly debatable question where it properly belongs—with the State and local communities and not with the Federal Government. The basic problem, if there is one, is financial. If State and local governments in some parts of the country are unable to keep pace with their school needs it is because the Federal taxing power has preempted State and local sources of revenue. Hence, the proper approach is to compel the Federal Government to restore to the States and localities at least a portion of the tax resources which it has taken away. This is precisely what our measure will do.

The proposal is a simple one. Every homeowner, every owner of real estate in the United States pays a real property tax to his local community government. In most cases, a substantial part of this tax is used to meet the primary and secondary school needs of the community whether for new construction or for maintenance, teachers' salaries or other past or current school costs. We would merely provide that every taxpayer who pays a school tax on his real property or as part of his real estate tax shall after having calculated the amount of Federal income tax which he must pay Uncle Sam be permitted to subtract from the Federal income tax which he owes the full amount of such school property tax or such proportion of it as will result in a total additional tax benefit to these taxpayers of between $3 and $4 billion.

Under existing Federal income tax law, State and local school taxes are deductible from gross income but the amount actually saved by the taxpayer depends on his Federal income tax bracket. Thus, for example, a taxpayer who has paid $200 in school taxes as part of the local real property tax on his home, and is in the 20-percent Federal income tax bracket, realizes a saving of $40. Our proposal would retain this present practice, but in addition would permit him to take a $100 credit against what he owes Uncle Sam, i.e., against his net Federal income tax. Hence, instead of a saving of $40, the homeowner under our proposal would save $140 of the $200 he paid in school taxes on his home. Of course, if the taxpayer's school tax were less than $100, he would be permitted to save in toto no more than the actual amount of his school tax.

This tax credit would be available to real property-school taxpayers whether they itemize their Federal income tax returns or take the standard deduction.

The concrete advantages of this approach are overwhelming, as will be shown in the following:

1. The tax benefits provided would go directly to approximately 40 million taxpayers,

including about 34 million homeowners, who with their families constitute almost 90 percent of our population, and who, in large part, are the "Forgotten Americans" for whom only the Republican Party speaks today.

2. With the Federal Government completely excluded from the program, there would be no danger of Federal control over education. Depending on State law, each community itself, or the State, would be the final judge of how much more it would like to spend on its educational needs than it is currently spending.

3. The funds made available to the taxpayers are greater than the sums contemplated under any of the other Federal aid to education measures which are seriously being considered; greater even than the sums recently recommended by President Kennedy's task force headed by President Hovde of Purdue University.

4. Because of the complete exclusion of the Federal Government, there would be no expanded bureaucracy, no Federal administrative costs, and every dollar of tax money thus made available would purchase a full dollar's worth of school aid if the community decided to expand its expenditures for education.

5. Inasmuch as the tax resources of every State and locality would be substantially increased under this proposal, each would have ample funds to provide for its own school needs as it chooses, for none know better what these needs are than the citizens of the States and localities themselves.

6. The so-called richer States would not be required to help finance the school needs of the allegedly poorer States, for under our proposal every State would have sufficient funds to meet its school needs out of its own resources. Rich State A would not be required to pay to the Federal Government in taxes twice or three times as much as it gets back in Federal school aid while poor State B was receiving back in Federal aid two or three times the amount of tax money it paid to the Federal Government as its share of financing the Federal school aid program.

7. Under any of the other proposed Federal school aid measures, those States which have fully met their school needs and would not, if given a free choice, expand their school facilities during the next few years, would nevertheless be compelled to pay their share in Federal taxes to finance the program. The only way these States could recover any of the money thus extracted from them under these various proposals would be to accept the Federal grants and use them to expand their school facilities. The result would be the highly uneconomic and wasteful extension of school facilities in many areas where such extension is unnecessary and where other more urgent needs exist and must perforce remain unsatisfied. Under our proposal, the use made of their tax money is not dictated to the taxpayer by the bureaucrats in Washington—it is determined by the taxpayers themselves; i.e., by the parent, the citizen, the local school board, and the community.

8. Any objection to our proposal based on the assertion that it would bite into the Federal Treasury is equally applicable to any of the other measures presently under consideration. We believe that ours would lead to a good look at the Federal budget and the discovery of many items of less importance, or even of no importance, which could be readily eliminated with no ill effects for the public welfare.

9. If unemployment does not decrease and business continues to falter because of the lack of confidence engendered by the spendthrift promises of the Democratic platform, our proposal will provide the necessary tax relief which some of the proponents of expanded Federal aid programs assert to be necessary to stimulate the economy.

10. The preemption of State and local tax resources by the Federal Government would be diminished, and thus an important step would be taken in contracting big central government and strengthening State and local government.

To implement this program to aid and improve education in our country, a bill is being introduced which contains the necessary legislative provisions for achieving our goal. The bill consists of two titles, the first dealing with the establishment of the program for national merit scholarships, and the second providing for Federal income tax credits for homeowners and other owners of real estate in order to provide funds for aid to primary and secondary schools where such aid is needed and for Federal income tax deductions for parents with dependents at college. The bill is called the Educational Opportunities Act of 1961 and in specific detail it provides as follows:

1. A PROGRAM PROVIDING FOR THE AWARD OF NATIONAL MERIT SCHOLARSHIPS

A. Establishes a National Scholarship Board, appointed by the President, consisting of 13 members who are recognized scholars in the fields of engineering, science, mathematics, languages (including classical), the humanities, and the arts. The duties and responsibilities of the Board shall be to set forth the policies and principles for selection of individuals for scholarships which shall be known as national scholarships. As part of the examination, designed to measure achievement, the Board shall require each competing individual to submit an original theme or composition written in English as well as a written translation of such theme or composition from English into a foreign language.

B. In order to compete for these scholarships, an individual must meet the following requirements:

1. Must be in his last academic year or must hold a certificate of graduation from a secondary school;

2. Must have completed at least 4 years of English, 4 years of history, 3 years of mathematics, 3 years of a foreign language, 3 years of science or, in lieu thereof, 3 years of Latin or Greek.

3. Must be or have been in the upper 15 percent of his class.

C. Each scholarship awarded by the Board shall be for 4 years or such longer period of time necessary to complete the course which the student is pursuing. The amount of the scholarship shall be based on the estimated expenses of the recipient but in no event shall the amount exceed $3,000 for any academic year. The recipients of these scholarships shall be designated "National Scholar."

D. The Board would be authorized to award every year a maximum of 1,000 scholarships. The Board shall establish a minimum attainment grade for such examinations and, notwithstanding the number of scholarships authorized, a scholarship shall not be awarded to any individual unless he equals or exceeds such minimum grade. Thus, if only 700 of the applicants receive such a grade, only that number will be awarded and the remaining 300 will not be used. If more than a thousand applicants receive a passing grade, the scholarships will be awarded in accordance with the principles and policies established by the Board.

E. The examinations conducted by the Board will be on a nationwide basis with no geographic restrictions or limitations on the number of participants from any State or community. This same condition will also apply with respect to the award of these scholarships.

2. TAX RELIEF FOR FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN ATTENDING COLLEGE

A. The taxpayer is granted an additional deduction from his taxable income for the expenses incurred by him, his spouse, or his dependent or dependents, while attending college.

B. Expenses shall include tuition and fees charged by the college for a course of instruction and attendance at such college; books, supplies, and equipment; room and board, whether the student is living on or off the campus. The amount the taxpayer may deduct shall be the actual amount of expenses paid but not to exceed $2,000 for each child attending college. Of this amount, the cost of room and board may not exceed $90 a month while the student is in attendance at college ($45 in the case of a student living at home).

C. In addition to his child or children, the taxpayer may also deduct such expenses which he incurs as a student as well as those of his wife and anyone else whom the taxpayer can lawfully claim as a dependent.

D. The deduction is available to a taxpayer whose dependent is attending a college, university, or other institution of higher learning, such as medical school, dental school, law school, or other graduate school. This deduction is not available to a taxpayer whose dependent is attending a trade or vocational school or any other school which does not award a baccalaureate or higher degree.

E. The amount of expenses which the taxpayer may deduct from his taxable income shall be reduced by the amount by which the taxable income of the taxpayer exceeds $10,000 if the taxpayer is unmarried or if married, files a separate return or, $20,000 if the taxpayer is married and files a joint return or is a head of a household or a surviving spouse. Thus, if a taxpayer has $2,000 in educational expenses and a taxable income of $20,800, he would be entitled to a deduction of $1,200 ($2,000 less $800, the amount in excess of $20,000). The taxpayer thereby reduces his taxable income from $20,800 to $19,600. If the taxpayer is in the 50 percent bracket, he would thereby reduce his tax by $600 (50 percent of $1,200).

3. TAX CREDIT TO HOMEOWNERS FOR THAT PORTION OF THEIR REAL PROPERTY TAX WHICH IS USED FOR THE MAINTENANCE, OPERATION, AND CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

A. The taxpayer would continue to deduct the amount of his real property tax from his gross taxable income; after he determines what his tax will be, he then credits against his final tax that amount of his real property tax which is used for the maintenance, operation, and construction of public elementary and secondary schools.

B. Tax credit would be the amount actually paid by the taxpayer or $100 whichever is less. To illustrate, a taxpayer pays a real property tax of $600, of which $350 is used for public school purposes. As he does at present, the taxpayer would be able to deduct from his taxable income $600, and assuming that he is in the 20 percent bracket, this would result in a tax saving to him of $120 (20 percent of $600). After determining his final tax, for example, $500, the taxpayer would be able to take a credit of $100 against his net tax, thus, instead of paying a tax of $500, he would pay only $400.

C. The taxpayer who takes a standard deduction would also benefit since the credit granted is taken against the final tax after all exemptions and deductions have been made.

D. The deduction together with the tax credit cannot result in a saving to the taxpayer of more than the actual amount of that portion of the real property tax devoted to public school needs. For example, the taxpayer pays a real property tax of $100, of which $60 is used for public school purposes. Assuming the taxpayer is in the 20 percent bracket, he would be able to reduce his tax by $20 (20 percent of $100), $12 of which is attributable to the tax for school purposes.

Giving such a taxpayer a $60 credit—the actual amount paid for school purposes—would return a saving to the taxpayer of $72 or $12 more than the tax he paid for support of the public schools. Thus, the tax credit in this case would be limited to $48.

THE OREGON DUNES NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATION AREA

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, we cannot legislate an awe-inspiring natural wonder into existence, but we can give protection to unique and majestic works of nature. This is the purpose of the bill which I am introducing today to authorize establishment of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Recreation Area.

By the year 2000 the population of the United States is expected to reach 300 million. We must look and plan ahead if future generations are to enjoy the natural resource heritage now in our custody. There are, however, other reasons of greater immediacy for establishing the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Area as part of the national park system. After lengthy study, four areas along the entire coastline of the United States were selected as having special national significance as seashore parks. One of these was the area of about 35,000 acres on Oregon's seacoast.

OREGON DUNES UNIQUE

The Oregon coastal dunes are unique among America's scenic areas. Geographic changes and influences of time and the elements have shaped an unusual combination of coastline, rolling and precipitous dunes, and forested fresh-water lakes. These values were recognized by the former Secretary of the Interior in a report sent last year to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He described the Oregon Dunes as "an area of the most spectacular sand dunes in North America."

I concur in this judgment.

Aside from its scientific and scenic significance nationally, the Oregon Dunes are of vast importance to the economy of my State. This area has great recreation potential. Present and future generations need expanded outdoor facilities for relaxation and enjoyment of nature. Through Federal park development, Oregon would have another magnet for bringing tourist dollars to our economy, thereby creating new payrolls and income. An economic study by Dr. Granville Jensen, chairman of the department of natural resources at Oregon State College, shows that tourist business in the Oregon coast area alone would increase $18 million annually in the years after an Oregon Dunes National Seashore Park is developed.

Similar views have been expressed by others interested in Oregon's development. An editoiral by Mr. William M. Tugman, until recently the editor of the Port Umpqua Courier at Reedsport, stated:

> There is every reason to believe that the Oregon sand dunes, with its infinite variety of all-year-round attractions, would soon become one of the most heavily attended parks in the entire national system.

PROTECTION OF HERITAGE

Some individuals have the view that the Oregon Dunes area does not need national park status because of existing public land ownerships in the vicinity. But recent events tend to refute this belief. Proposals have been made for utilization of this section of Oregon's unique coastline for other purposes, including oil and gas exploration. Establishment of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Recreation Area would assure that this part of the coastline would not meet the fate of Atlantic seaboard areas which have been exploited or liquidated so that their scenic and recreational value is permanently impaired.

The new Oregon Dunes Seashore authorization bill which I am introducing today was before the 86th Congress in a substantially different form, and was the subject of both House and Senate hearings. As a result of these hearings there have been further consultations with the Governor of my State, Mark Hatfield; with the Park Service; and with other persons interested in conservation and wise land use.

In addition, I have given this subject long consideration and in that process have made further modifications which, I am hopeful, will assure proper local control and adequate Federal supervision.

LOCAL CONTROL STRENGTHENED

The bill I am introducing has one major technical change. The lengthy descriptions of the land involved have been placed at the end of the bill. I have done this so that those concerned with the substance of the bill will find it easier to study the policies involved.

There are a number of other revisions, but I should like to call attention to two major revisions:

First. Creation of a five-member Oregon Dunes Advisory Board to consult with the Secretary of the Interior on management policies and zoning standards.

Second. Mechanism for local zoning of private property within boundaries of the seashore.

The purpose of these two changes is to provide maximum local influence on matters relating to development of the seashore, and to minimize the need for the Secretary to acquire privately owned property in the area.

The new section which creates the Oregon Dunes Advisory Board is patterned after provisions in legislation introduced by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore. The board which I have proposed is a smaller board, but I think that it will just as capably represent the local interests, the State interest, and the National interest as would a much larger group. We in Oregon have had long experience with advisory boards, such as that on the Oregon and California lands which are within the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. I am confident that an advisory board such as this will prove most beneficial and will aid measurably in proper development of the scenic and recreational facilities of the Oregon Dunes.

Two new sections deal with land use and occupancy and provide the mechanism for local zoning. The purpose of these sections is to assure that the Secretary will make the minimum use of his powers to acquire private property and that, to the extent that private ownership of land and water areas within the park are consistent with park purposes. Such ownership will be permitted. In any such provision it is essential to provide a decisionmaking mechanism; and, since the Secretary of the Interior is charged with the responsibility of carrying out the purpose of the act, he must, in the final analysis, concur in the sufficiency of the zoning bylaws adopted by the counties.

It was interesting to me in preparing this bill to discover that in some 33 cases—including the beautiful seashore at Cape Hatteras and Oregon's historic Fort Clatsop National Memorial, which was established through legislation sponsored by my late husband and my senior colleague from Oregon, Mr. MORSE—the Park Service has unencumbered rights to acquire property through condemnation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table listing park areas where authority to acquire private property through condemnation is permitted by statute.

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

National parks, monuments, and military parks where power of condemnation to acquire land is authorized

Unit	Year	Authority
1. Colonial National Historical Park, Va	1930	16 U.S.C. 81e.
2. Chalmette National Historical Park, La	1930	16 U.S.C. 231b.
3. Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, N. Dak	1947	16 U.S.C. 242.
4. Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, Ky., Va., Tenn	1940	16 U.S.C. 263.
5. Hawaii National Park, Hawaii	1920	16 U.S.C. 392.
6. Great Smoky National Park, N.C., Tenn	1938	16 U.S.C. 403i.
7. Mammoth Cave National Park, Ky	1942	16 U.S.C. 404c-11.
8. Richmond National Military Park, Va	1936	16 U.S.C. 423k.
9. Eutaw Spring National Military Park, S.C	1936	16 U.S.C. 423n.
10. Fredericksburg National Military Park, Va	1927	16 U.S.C. 425a.
11. Spotsylvania National Military Park, Va	1927	16 U.S.C. 425a.
12. Stones River National Military Park, Tenn	1927	16 U.S.C. 426a.
13. Sioux Indian National Military Park, Mont	1926	16 U.S.C. 427.
14. Fort Donelson National Military Park, Tenn	1928	16 U.S.C. 428d.
15. Kings Mountain National Military Park, S.C	1931	16 U.S.C. 430a.
16. Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa	1895	16 U.S.C. 430g.
17. Vicksburg National Military Park, Miss	1899	16 U.S.C. 430h.
18. Monocacy National Military Park, Md	1934	16 U.S.C. 430k.
19. Kennesaw National Military Park, Ga	1935	16 U.S.C. 430u.

National parks, monuments, and military parks where power of condemnation to acquire land is authorized—Continued

Unit	Year	Authority
20. Perry's Victory International Peace Monument, Ohio	1936	16 U.S.C. 433c.
21. Fort Frederica National Monument, Ga	1936	16 U.S.C. 433h.
22. Ocmulgee National Monument, Ga	1934	16 U.S.C. 447b.
23. Pioneer National Monument, Ky	1934	16 U.S.C. 449.
24. Fort Stanwix National Monument, N.Y	1935	16 U.S.C. 450m.
25. Andrew Johnson Homestead National Monument, Tenn	1935	16 U.S.C. 450p.
26. Ackie Battleground National Monument, Miss	1935	16 U.S.C. 450r.
27. Homestead National Monument, Nebr	1936	16 U.S.C. 450u.
28. George Washington Carver National Monument, Mo	1943	16 U.S.C. 450 aa.
29. De Soto National Monument, Fla	1948	16 U.S.C. 450dd.
30. Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area, N.C	1940	16 U.S.C. 459a.
31. Booker T. Washington National Monument, Va	1956	16 U.S.C. 450ll.
32. Yosemite National Park, Calif	1937	16 U.S.C. 47c.
33. Fort Clatsop National Memorial, Oreg	1958	16 U.S.C. 450mm–2.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I wish to emphasize, Mr. President, that in the case of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore, the Secretary's ability to utilize condemnation will be circumscribed by the degree to which the counties wish to use their own authorities for land use zoning.

The view that there should be a national seashore recreation area on the Oregon coast is one which, in my opinion, is widely held. Our shoreline is a vanishing natural resource, not because our boundaries are shrinking, but rather because we have not made adequate provision to preserve this beautiful scenery in a way which permits the best public use and enjoyment.

In redrafting this legislation, I have endeavored to meet all of the various points of view that have been expressed and, in the process, to make certain that we will protect an important scenic and recreational resource, while at the same time promoting both economic growth and stability in this important area along the Pacific coast.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Recreation Area, and ask unanimous consent that it be allowed to lie on the desk for 3 days to allow other Senators who may wish to cosponsor it to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk for 3 days, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 992) to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Recreation Area, and for other purposes, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I shall be happy and proud to be a cosponsor of this most worthwhile bill.

I followed the efforts of my friend, and a great Senator, the late Richard Neuberger, to set aside areas of immense natural beauty and value for the future benefit of our people. Of these none not yet so reserved is probably more important than this, as we seek to safeguard our rapidly dwindling seacoast areas. The Oregon Dunes are unique and superb beyond comparison. Dick wanted coming generations to share his enjoyment of them.

I am very hopeful that this seashore recreation area may be named after Richard Neuberger, and I shall make that proposal at the proper time. No one deserves such appropriate recognition better than he. Future generations of American citizens should learn thereby to appreciate the great service Richard Neuberger rendered with respect to the preservation of our natural heritage and his increasing dedication to that end.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

PROPOSED REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS OF EASTERN SAMOA AND GUAM

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the basic strength of Congress is the extent to which it represents the people of the United States—all the people. With the growth of our Nation, each successive expansion of Congress has permitted a greater representation of the infinite variety of men and women who comprise our adult population.

During the interim between the closing of the 86th Congress and the opening of the 87th Congress, the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I investigated conditions in Guam and eastern Samoa. I now introduce on behalf of both of us, for appropriate reference, two measures which would enlarge the idea of congressional representation to encompass those two offshore areas. The bills would enable each of these areas to elect a deputy who would serve in the House of Representatives, without vote but with the right to engage in debate.

This arrangement proved most beneficial to Congress for obtaining the participation in national legislation of the several organized territories, most recently Alaska and Hawaii. Essentially the same arrangement is made for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, through the office of the Resident Commissioner. I suggest that we would also benefit from the counsel which could be contributed by deputies from Samoa and Guam. Both territories are experienced in self-government. They have a great deal to contribute to our National Assembly. We should avail ourselves of their knowledge and experience.

During the course of our visit, we were impressed by the growing degree of political maturity which the people of eastern Samoa and Guam now display. We were fortunate to be in Samoa following the first election of the Samoan Legislature under the new constitution, adopted in April of last year.

I believe that Congress would benefit by adding to the House of Representatives the voice and the wisdom of nonvoting delegates from eastern Samoa and Guam. Through these delegates, we could learn much of the needs and the potential of the South and Central Pacific. Through their counsel, our legislative decisions affecting that large part of the world could be more securely based on knowledge and understanding.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, for myself and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], bills to provide that eastern Samoa and Guam be represented in Congress by nonvoting delegates.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. LONG of Hawaii (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. 994. A bill to provide that Guam shall be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; and

S. 995. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territory of eastern Samoa shall be represented in Congress by a Deputy to the House of Representatives.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I desire to commend the Senator from Hawaii for the great interest which he has taken in our remaining Pacific territories, Guam and Samoa, and in the trust territories which come under the jurisdiction of the United Nations and are being administered, and administered very ably, by the United States.

I feel that the bills which he has introduced, and which I have been happy to cosponsor, to provide for a deputy from Guam and a deputy from Samoa in the House of Representatives constitute a step forward toward achieving the basic principle of extending the maximum self-government to all the American people.

Mr. President, I feel that these bills propose an important step in what should be the enlightened policy of the United States in moving as rapidly as consistent with wisdom to give the maximum of self-government to our outlying areas.

The United States is not a colonial power. Its brief excursion into colonialism, dating from the Spanish-American War, or perhaps a little earlier than that, has been effectively liquidated.

Alaska and Hawaii have been granted statehood.

Puerto Rico has become in accord with its people's wishes a self-governing commonwealth associated with the United States.

We now have left as outlying possessions only Guam, Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

The proposed elections of a deputy to serve in the House of Representatives to represent the Island of Guam, and also a deputy to represent eastern Samoa—steps similar to those taken for Hawaii and Alaska in the days of their territorial status—are clearly desirable. It is my understanding that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate will soon visit the Virgin Islands and will study the problems which exist there. In the meanwhile I am very happy to be a cosponsor of the two bills which seek to extend representation—which they have not had thus far—to our Pacific possessions, Guam and Samoa.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I wish to express appreciation to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Alaska, for his statement about the importance of these two bills.

ADDITIONAL PENALTIES FOR PERSONS CONVICTED OF VIOLATING THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Sherman Antitrust Act, to provide additional penalties for persons convicted of violating the antitrust laws.

The conviction of 29 manufacturers of heavy electrical equipment and 45 company officials in one of the most gigantic antitrust conspiracies in our history is only one of a series of incidents indicating widespread violation of antitrust laws. The literally thousands of identical "competitive" bids on file in the office of the Attorney General speak even more eloquently. Violation is widespread. This is common knowledge.

Antitrust laws have been on the books in the United States since 1890; and many distinguished names are connected with the attempts to enforce these laws, so as to prevent the growth of monopoly and economic concentration. From the days of Theodore Roosevelt to the efforts of Assistant Attorney General Robert Bicks, who prepared the case against the electrical machinery producers, some dramatic chapters have been written in the fight to keep our business competitive.

I believe in vigorous antitrust law enforcement, because I think it necessary to preserve our free enterprise system. Nothing could so quickly bring about demands for Government control or ownership of business in the United States as could an unchecked development of giant cartels and monopolies, such as have grown up in some countries to the point where they rival the power of the state itself and destroy the competition which is vital to a healthy economy and the protection of the consuming public.

In this day and age the American people rightly fear—not only as consumers, but also as taxpayers—collusion and conspiracy among giant corporations. The Federal Government and many State and local governments were cheated out of millions of dollars by the price-fixing agreements of the electrical equipment manufacturers. This is another way of saying that both Federal and State and local taxpayers were defrauded by the collusion of these manufacturers.

Small business is hit even harder than the taxpayer. As chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking Committee, I have become convinced that small business in this country can survive and prosper only if the antitrust laws are vigorously enforced.

The overwhelming dominance of many fields of business by one, two, three, six, or a dozen giant firms poses a daily threat to the existence of smaller firms. What is more, actions of the very kind for which the electrical equipment companies were convicted deprive small businesses of a chance to sell to the Government.

This is one of the reasons why I am so anxious that the Department of Defense award more contracts on a competitive basis. Thus, small business has a better chance to make bids, and savings to the Government are always greater. This is also why I have introduced Senate bill 836, which will give small business a more equal opportunity to compete for subcontracts in connection with defense procurements.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the antitrust activities of the Federal Government have had two major weaknesses. The first has been a lack of vigorous enforcement; the second is the ineffectiveness of the penalties.

During too many of the 70 years since the first antitrust law was passed, its halfhearted enforcement has been no deterrent to continued practices which stifle competition. In the 1920's there was a lack of interest in enforcement on the part of the administration in power. In the 1930's, the great depression so overshadowed all other economic problems that the Government actually encouraged questionable cooperation among businesses, in an effort to stimulate economic recovery. During the Second World War, as during the first, the emergency necessity of obtaining sufficient production of war materiel led to a neglect of antitrust law enforcement.

Fortunately, the record has improved in recent years. The work of Assistant Attorney General Robert Bicks deserves special praise. We hope the new administration and Mr. Lee Loevinger will carry on that record.

The prosecution and convictions in the electrical equipment manufacturers' case constitute a good precedent. Fines were imposed. Seven executives were given jail sentences. Two of these were suspended. But five will go to jail for 30-day periods. Jail sentences have so rarely been imposed that a corporation official who contemplates violation knows that the odds are 100 to 1 that in the unlikely event that he ever is caught, the worst that could happen would be a fine which would be only "a drop in the bucket" compared to the extra profits his company would make by violating the law—profits that would insure his lush salary.

Labor union officials convicted of almost any offense worse than speeding are absolutely prohibited from holding union office for 5 years, but corporation executives convicted under the antitrust laws cannot be suspended from their positions, except by action of the firm itself.

The Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 goes much farther in imposing disabilities on convicted union officials than the bill I am introducing today would go in imposing disabilities on corporation executives. Under that law, any union official convicted of violating the act or convicted of any one of a number of other crimes or misdemeanors is mandatorily barred from serving, "(1) as an officer, director, trustee, member of any executive board or similar governing body, business agent, manager, organizer, or other employee (other than as an employee performing exclusively clerical or custodial duties) of any labor organization, or (2) as a labor consultant to a person engaged in an industry or activity affecting commerce, or as an officer, director, agent, or employee of any group or association of employers dealing with any labor organization," during, or for 5 years after, his conviction.

The bill I am introducing provides that—

> The United States district courts—upon application made by the Attorney General and a showing of probable cause for belief that such individual may engage in additional criminal antitrust violations if retained in the service of any such corporation, may enter an order—
>
> (1) restraining any such individual from (A) rendering service for any corporation convicted of any such violation in that action, or for any related corporation for a period not exceeding 1 year beginning on the date of execution of judgment upon his conviction, or (B) at any time receiving directly or indirectly from any corporation so convicted in that action, or any related corporation, any compensation or gratuity for service rendered by him during that period, or any indemnity of any kind in lieu of compensation with respect to that period and
>
> (2) restraining any corporation convicted of any such violation in that action, or any related corporation, from (A) retaining in service at any time during the period specified (1) any individual convicted of any criminal antitrust violation in that action, or (B) at any time promising, offering, or giving directly or indirectly to any individual convicted of any criminal antitrust violation in that action any compensation or gratuity for service rendered by him during that period, or any indemnity of any kind in lieu of compensation for service with respect to that period."

It will be noted that this is an optional penalty. It is a civil, rather than a criminal, penalty. It can be used in conjunction with, or as an alternative to, fines or a jail sentence.

A jail sentence is a very serious social penalty, but may not impose any financial hardship if the convicted person continues to hold his office and draw his salary. A 1-year suspension from office without pay is a much more serious financial penalty.

As Judge J. Cullen Ganey, who tried the recent case in Philadelphia, has said:

> Here we have the nonfictional case of the organization man and the question of conformity to the corporate line. As an executive he goes along with a way of doing business. Consider his stake in this—large salary, high position, seniority. He may realize it's risky; but he must either violate the law or give up his seniority and excellent remuneration.

This bill would arm the judge with an additional weapon to use where it is the best way to provide an effective punishment of violators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held open for cosponsorship for a period of 2 weeks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 996) to amend the Sherman Act, to provide additional public relief from repetitive criminal violations of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROTECTION OF HAWAIIAN NENE GEESE

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator FONG and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase and extend the authorization for protection of the rare Hawaiian Nene goose. The Hawaii Wildlife Federation has reported that progress on this program has been very satisfactory and that the first release of pen-reared birds was made last spring above Hawaii National Park near Kilauea. Wildlife experts inform me that the program should be expanded. The project of restoring Hawaii's official bird to self-sustaining numbers in wild habitat is considered of international significance and a challenge equal to that of restoring the trumpeter swan in North America.

The present program which authorizes an appropriation of $15,000 a year will expire in fiscal year 1963. My bill would extend the program another 5 years to fiscal 1968 and authorize an increase in appropriation to $25,000 a year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 997) to extend the program for the conservation, restoration, and management of the rare Hawaiian Nene goose, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LONG of Hawaii, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

KNOW YOUR GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Know Your Government Service to disseminate information about our Federal Government to students and interested citizens throughout the Nation.

This bill is similar, but not identical, to a measure which I introduced last year. It is cosponsored by Senators CASE of New Jersey, FONG, JAVITS, and SCOTT, all of whom were cosponsors last year.

Briefly, the function of the Know Your Government Service would be:

First. The dissemination of general information about the functions of the major departments and agencies of the Federal Government to those who request such information;

Second. A special promotional program to provide students and teachers with similar information;

Third. Answering specific inquiries as to the agencies or departments which should be contacted on particular matters affecting the Federal Government.

The Service would be established in the General Services Administration under the National Archives and Records Service. As I envision it, the Service would be a limited staff and mailing operation located entirely in Washington.

Mr. President, an office such as I propose would play a very real and important function in making it easier for citizens to understand and keep in touch with the Federal Government. Too many Americans are frightened off by visions of redtape and hopelessly unfathomable rows of offices and office buildings. It is unfortunate that there exists this lack of knowledge as to how our Federal Government operates and as to the types of assistance and information which all citizens can and certainly should obtain.

Under my bill, a person who did not know where to write about a particular matter could find out very easily by contacting an office in Washington with an easily remembered title and function. Persons desiring information about the overall structure of the Federal Government could also obtain this information from the Know Your Government Service. In the case of students, the Know Your Government Service would have an additional promotional function of making available to schools and teachers general information which they could use in conjunction with their studies.

I want to make it clear that the Know Your Government Service would not and should not involve any great cost to the taxpayer. It would serve to coordinate existing functions in some cases; and, where it provides for new functions, these functions are well worth the effort and certainly could be carried out on a limited budget.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate Government Operations Committee will devote some time during the 87th Congress to the consideration of my proposal. I shall be happy to cooperate with the committee in any way I can.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill appear at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1013) to establish in the General Services Administration a service to disseminate general information concerning the organization of the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in order to achieve a better public understanding of the organization of the Federal Government, and the operation of its various agencies, the Administrator of General Services shall establish in the National Archives and Records Service a service to be located in Washington, District of Columbia, and to be known as Know Your Government Service (hereinafter referred to as the Service).

(b) The functions of the Service shall include—

(1) the dissemination of general information concerning the functions of the various departments and agencies of the Government;

(2) providing students and teachers with information concerning the organization of the Government; and

(3) the furnishing of information upon request concerning the officer or agency to be contacted for specific inquiries bearing upon the activities of a particular agency of the Government.

SEC. 2. Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

RECOVERY FROM TORTIOUSLY LIABLE THIRD PERSONS OF VALUE OF CERTAIN HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the recovery from tortiously liable third persons of the value of hospital and medical care and treatment furnished by the United States.

In connection with this bill, I ask unanimous consent that the following explanatory statement be published in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1019) to provide for the recovery from tortiously liable third persons of the value of hospital and medical care and treatment furnished by the United States, introduced by Mr. BYRD of Virginia, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. BYRD of Virginia is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The Comptroller General of the United States, Hon. Joseph Campbell, has found at least several million dollars a year slipping through legal loopholes which prevent the Government from recovering costs in accident cases involving thousands of persons receiving Federal hospitalization, medical treatment, etc.

I concur in the Comptroller General's conclusions that Government medical care in these cases is not intended to relieve any one of any accident liability, and that the

right of recovery should be uniform throughout the Government. I am introducing a bill to this effect.

The Comptroller General's findings were made in a "Review of the Government's Rights and Practice Concerning Recovery of Cost of Hospital and Medical Services in Negligent Third-Party Cases," which was forwarded to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The review developed that while provision is made for recovery of these costs in other areas, the law without apparent reason is silent or insufficient with respect to accident cases involving injury to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, the Coast Guard, merchant seamen, veterans, and others for whom Government medical care is furnished.

The magnitude of these errors of omission is shown by the Comptroller General's examination of Department of Defense records which reveal that in the 3-year period ending December 31, 1959, there were 39,700 accidents involving privately owned automobiles in which military personnel were injured.

The Comptroller General estimated that costs of Federal medical and related services in these cases averaged $10.3 million a year, or more than $30 million for the 3-year period; but lacking specific authority, and under a 1947 Supreme Court decision, the Defense Department made no effort to recover any of these costs.

The Comptroller General found so-called third-party negligence reasonable to assume in 15,900 of the 39,000 accident cases because the injured military personnel were passengers or pedestrians. The unrecovered costs of medical and hospital services in these cases were estimated at an average of $4.1 million a year.

The military peronnel injured in the other 23,800 accident cases were drivers of vehicles involved, and the Comptroller General said while incidence of "third-party liability in these cases is not known, it is reasonable to assume that it was present in a significant number of instances."

In the same review the Comptroller General found that the U.S. Public Health Service does not recover from negligent third parties the costs incurred by the Government in the treatment of injured Coast Guard personnel, merchant seamen, and others who are entitled to care in PHS hospitals at Government expense.

He found further that the Veterans' Administration, while successful in some degree in proceedings under general provisions of the Veterans Benefits Act, also lacks specific authority to recover medical costs from negligent third parties for accident cases treated through VA facilities.

The review found in some cases injured personnel may recover from negligent parties, but the Government cannot recover from either party in the absence of specific legal authority. In other cases injured parties, having received medical care at Government expense, do not include such costs in their claims.

The right of recovery in accident cases is already provided under the Federal Employees Compensation Act, and under Federal law relating to railroad employees, longshoremen and harbor workers. The Department of Defense and other agencies involved have concurred in the Comptroller's recommendations and they have assisted in drafting the bill I am introducing.

GENERAL EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution to provide for the general expenditure authorization bill.

In connection with this resolution, I ask unanimous consent that the following explanatory statement be published in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13), submitted by Mr. BYRD of Virginia (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. BENNETT), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, effective on the first day of the ———— regular session of the Eighty ———— Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c)(1) All new expenditure authorizations for each fiscal year shall be contained in one general expenditure authorization bill to be known as the General Expenditure Authorization Act of (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The general expenditure authorization bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted. As used in this paragraph, the term 'expenditure authorizations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental expenditure authorizations, expenditure authorizations under private Acts of Congress, or rescissions of expenditure authorizations.

"(2) The general expenditure authorization bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general expenditure authorization bill containing expenditure authorizations available for such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the total net expenditures during such fiscal year against each expenditure authorization made therein; and the general expenditure authorization bill for each fiscal year shall contain provisions limiting the total net expenditures during such fiscal year against each expenditure authorization available from prior years. In each case in which an expenditure authorization for any fiscal year for any purpose is provided in any such bill and any other expenditure authorization or authorizations for the same general purpose are available during such fiscal year, the limitation shall be against total expenditures from all expenditure authorizations available for the same general purpose during such fiscal year. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to expenditure authorizations made solely for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States or of judgments, to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to expenditures from intragovernmental revolving and management funds. Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the inclusion in any general expenditure authorization bill or in any deficiency or supplemental expenditure authorization bill of such provisions as may be deemed appropriate with respect to transfer of expenditure authorizations or expenditure limitations.

"(3) The committee reports accompanying each general expenditure authorization bill, and the statement of managers accompanying any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form for information purposes, by items and totals—

"(A) the amount of each new expenditure authorization available for expenditure in the fiscal year;

"(B) estimates of the balances of expenditure authorizations as of the beginning of the fiscal year;

"(C) estimates of the net expenditures in the fiscal year from each expenditure authorization referred to in clause (A), except expenditures from intragovernmental revolving and management funds;

"(D) estimates of the net expenditures in the fiscal year from the balances of expenditure authorizations, referred to in clause (B), except expenditures from intragovernmental revolving and management funds;

"(E) estimates of the net expenditures in the fiscal year from intragovernmental revolving and management funds;

"(F) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (C), (D), and (E); and

"(G) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of the fiscal year from the expenditure authorizations referred to in clauses (A) and (B).

The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental expenditure authorization bill containing expenditure authorizations available for obligation or expenditure during the fiscal year, and each expenditure authorization rescission bill, and the statement of managers accompanying any conference report on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

"(4) The information reported under paragraph (3) shall be accompanied by (i) data on intragovernmental revolving and management funds and public enterprise funds (including the funds of wholly owned Government corporations) which shall show the gross amounts from which the net amounts estimated to be expended are derived, and information on estimated investments, repayment of capital, payment of dividends, and other cash transactions which do not affect net expenditures; and (ii) such supplemental data as may be considered desirable by the committee making the report.

"(5) No general expenditure authorization bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conform with this rule.

"(6) For the purposes of this subsection, the amount of expenditures shall be determined upon a checks-issued basis.

"(7) As used in this subsection (c), the term 'expenditure authorization' shall apply to all current appropriations, permanent appropriations, contract authorizations, authorizations to expend from public or corporate debt receipts, cancellation of obligations of Government agencies to the Treasury, reappropriations, reauthorizations, and any other authorizations to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States. The term 'expenditure authorization' shall not apply to appropriations of trust funds, deposit funds, transactions involving public debt retirement, or appropriations made solely for payment of refunds and drawbacks.

"(8) The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general expenditure authorization bill or may hold joint hearings thereon.

"(d) The general expenditure authorization bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general expenditure authorization bill containing expenditure authorizations available for expenditure during such fiscal year shall at the time the bill is reported to the House of Representatives and to the Senate contain in the body of the bill or in the preamble thereto, as the respective committees may deem

appropriate, a current estimate by the Secretary of the Treasury of the overall Federal receipts for such fiscal year."

SEC. 2. (a) The Senate, recognizing the necessity for an amendment to its Standing Rules in order to make effective the amendment to the joint rule made by the first section of this resolution, hereby adopts the provisions of subsection (b) of this section as an exercise of its rulemaking power.

(b) Effective on the first day of the —— regular session of the Eighty —— Congress, but only if prior thereto this resolution is adopted by both Houses of Congress, subsection (b) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Committee on Appropriations, to consist of twenty-seven Senators, to which Committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Expenditure authorizations. As used in this paragraph, the term 'expenditure authorizations' means current appropriations, permanent appropriations, contract authorizations, authorizations to expend from public or corporate debt receipts, cancellation of obligations of Government agencies to the Treasury, reappropriations, reauthorizations, and any other authorizations to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States except authorizations to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States for the payment of private claims."

The statement presented by Mr. BYRD of Virginia is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Congress has lost control over Federal expenditures, and it acts on spending legislation without providing itself with means of knowing whether it is creating deficit or surplus.

Under present legislative procedures vast backdoor spending is authorized outside of the appropriation process; consideration of spending authorizations which do go through the appropriation process is splintered in a dozen separate bills; and Congress does not effectively control the annual rate of expenditures.

In order to recapture congressional control over Federal expenditures I am introducing a concurrent resolution to provide for a general expenditure authorization bill. The resolution would require: (1) Action on the Federal expenditure budget as a whole, as well as in segments; (2) control of expenditures as well as appropriations; and (3) enactment of the spending side of the budget in full view of latest revenue estimates revised at each stage of the legislative process.

Under terms of the resolution this would be accomplished by (a) bringing all spending authorizations under jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committees; (b) acting on all new and additional spending authority in one bill (with provision, of course, for necessary supplemental and deficiency bills); (c) requiring annual expenditures limitation on each item in the bill; (d) providing that committee reports carry tabular presentation of both expenditures, and expenditure authorizations allowed under the bill; and (e) requiring the latest revenue estimate by the Secretary of the Treasury at each stage of the legislative procedure on the bill.

These are simple fundamental requirements for orderly and intelligent action on fiscal legislation. They are not met by current procedures which were established before the days of multibillion dollar budgets and multiyear appropriations and other expenditure authorizations.

The Federal debt is now $290 billion. We have been on a deficit financing basis for 24 of the past 30 years. We are certain to be on a deficit financing basis in the current year and next fiscal year. Need for major reform in congressional procedures for enactment of spending legislation is obvious.

CERTAIN WORKS OF ART IN SUBWAY TO NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the imbalance in trade is the result of many factors. Some of them are within the jurisdiction of this body. Others relate to a rising economy and an advancing technology in many nations of the free world. Several things need to be done in this area within the control of the Congress. No one simple solution can, like the wave of a magic wand, solve the total problem. But, diligence does require that we overlook no facet of the problem which can contribute to its ultimate solution.

I applaud the bipartisan effort which has brought to the floor this bill to strengthen our foreign and domestic commerce by encouraging foreign tourists to visit the United States. Any increase in these visitations will narrow the dollar gap. First hand knowledge of our attainments, our bountiful life, and our tremendous enterprise will serve to strengthen bonds of friendship and to elevate the prestige of this Nation. You will recall that, a few months ago, our prestige was alleged to be slipping among people of Western Europe who have never seen our great land. We take note of the fact that prestige flourishes in a moral climate—we have learned, in the past 15 years, that apparently prestige is not bought by shipping billions abroad.

The State of Nebraska has inaugurated a program to stimulate travel into Nebraska by foreign tourists. We have much, in Nebraska, to demonstrate that which makes America great. Our office of tourism, if I may call it that, will be guided by John Kelley, a native Nebraskan and public relations expert who worked in the House of Representatives as administrative assistant to former Congressman Don McGinley. The facilities of our State will be available to entertain and comfort travelers from foreign lands.

On this occasion I will take the opportunity to submit a resolution which will authorize the several States to fashion works of art for the millions of visitors who explore Capitol Hill each year. My proposal affords to the 50 States an opportunity to create works of art depicting scenic beauty or historical sites in the several States along the well-illuminated and spacious walls of the 1,400-foot subway between the New Senate Office Building and the Capitol Building. These objects of art will be done at the expense of each contributing State, and space will be allocated by the Architect of the Capitol, with the approval of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

The most recent estimate indicates that 5 million persons visit the Capitol Building each year. We can conjecture the numbers visiting the Senate buildings—certainly we would be amazed at an accurate tabulation of the persons traveling each year through this 1,400-foot tunnel. The completion of this project would be an invitation to these 5 million to visit the States of our Union. With the cooperation of each State, this rather drab corridor can become a "subway of the States." Its beauty could enhance the utilitarian purpose of this corridor, and make it another delight for those who come to see our National Capitol. Many of us who depart this Chamber frayed after a trying day might rekindle a zest for comradeship, and be helped in leaving behind our lesser natures in this Chamber of contention.

I am in hopes that the Committee on Rules and Administration, on which it is my privilege to serve, can present to this body under this resolution a splendid opportunity to give even more charm and graciousness to our beloved and beautiful National Capitol.

Mr. President, my resolution is very short. It provides as follows:

Resolved, That the Architect of the Capitol, with the approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration, is authorized (1) to allocate among the several States the available wall space in the subway between the New Senate Office Building and the Capitol, (2) to invite each State to furnish without cost to the United States one or more paintings depicting its scenic beauties or historical sites to be placed in the space so allocated to it, and (3) to accept and cause to be placed in such space any painting or paintings so furnished which he determines to be suitable for such purpose.

I send this resolution to the desk for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 91) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] may be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 836) to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes, which I introduced—for myself, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. CAPEHART—on February 9, 1961.

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

HEALTH INSURANCE BENEFITS ACT OF 1961—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 13, 1961, the names of Senators NEUBERGER, MORSE, LONG of Missouri, MOSS, and PASTORE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 909) to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health services furnished to aged beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators) on February 13, 1961.

PRINTING OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON FEED GRAINS AS A SENATE DOCUMENT (S. DOC. NO. 12)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's message on feed grains be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the filing of reports pursuant to Senate Resolution 226, and Senate Resolutions 231 through 241, of the 86th Congress, be extended to March 31, 1961. This request concerns annual reports of certain subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I merely wish to state that approximately 12 reports are involved. Some of them are very substantial and rather lengthy; and it does take time for both the majority reports and the minority views to be presented adequately. That is the real reason for the requested extension of time. So I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], I ask unanimous consent that the filing of the report by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare called for in Senate Resolution 267, 86th Congress, 2d session, be extended from February 21, 1961, to March 15, 1961.

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

NOTICE OF HEARING ON ASSISTANT-ATTORNEYS-GENERAL-DESIGNATE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Monday, February 27, 1961, at 2:30 p.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, before the Committee on the Judiciary, on the following:

Ramsey Clark, of Texas, an Assistant-Attorney-General-designate.

Herbert J. Miller, Jr., of Maryland, an Assistant-Attorney-General-designate.

Lee Loevinger, of Minnesota, an Assistant-Attorney-General-designate.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF BURKE MARSHALL, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 1, 1961, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Burke Marshall, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Harold R. Tyler, Jr., resigned.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

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

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

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

Speech entitled "Political Lag—Enemy of Freedom," delivered by Senator CLARK at Therese M. Loeb Memorial lecture, February 15, 1961.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

Civil War Centennial address by Senator BYRD of Virginia, together with excerpts from the booklet entitled "Virginia's Opportunity," expressing reasons for and the purpose of the Civil War Centennial.

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from address by him delivered over Wisconsin radio stations concerning economic problems.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

Statement by him at public hearing on residual fuel oil conducted by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, Department of the Interior auditorium, on February 20, 1961.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Article entitled "Higher Education Is a National Problem," written by Senator CLARK and published in current issue of the Saturday Review.

THE FIRST 30 DAYS OF THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to be recognized for 3 minutes; and when those 3 minutes have elapsed I wish to be called to account, so that later I can complete, in my regular turn, what I have to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is now 1 month since Mr. Kennedy took office as President of the United States. As the affairs of this Government go, a month is neither a long time nor a short time. It is a period of 30 days, which we hope, and I know the people of the United States hope, has been used with good sense by the leadership of the Government in trying to ameliorate the state of the Nation at home and abroad.

I believe that any objective judgment would indicate that the Kennedy administration has used these 30 days in precisely that fashion. It has wielded existing authority—moral and legal—of the executive branch of the Government to get more surplus food to those in need; to help to settle the serious threat of a strike in the railroads; to pump more life into the economy, in an effort to prevent the sag from spreading into a depression; and in many other significant ways.

In the field of foreign policy, the new administration has taken steps to keep the highest civilian and military officials of this Government from speaking at cross-purposes and, hence, exacerbating all our difficulties. In so doing and by speeding up the accumulation of certain key defense tools, such as the Polaris submarines, it has made a significant beginning on the formidable task of reestablishing the classic dictum of President Theodore Roosevelt to speak softly, but carry a big stick.

In Laos, there has appeared the outlines of a new policy designed to win sound progress for peace rather than the empty and costly triumphs of propaganda. And toward Latin America this administration has taken the first steps toward a tangible reaffirmation of an intimate inter-Americanism by offering bread where it is needed to feed the hungry and by bringing into the direction of these affairs new men with deep understanding of Latin America.

In the critical situation in the Congo, this Government, from the President on down, has demonstrated a coordinated and quiet determination to do what must be done—no more, no less—to keep open the prospect for a decent peace in that region and the hope for the peaceful progress in independence of the entire new Africa. Peace cannot be guaranteed in that region, but its prospects are increased by the course we are now following—the course of close attention to the voices of Africa and firm support for the United Nations in the Congo situation.

Finally, by obtaining the release of the RB–47 fliers, one more obstacle has been cleared away for a significant reduction in the tensions between Russia and the United States and the opening of better cooperation on the common problems of humanity if the Russians so desire.

At home, the program of the Kennedy administration, beyond immediate emergency measures, has begun to move through the mill of the legislative process. Today's splendid Presidential message calling for action in education constitutes one more block in the edifice of a revitalized America, an America of hope and purpose which this administration is determined to lead in building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on this subject may be printed consecutively.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President. Congress has its part to play in this great effort. As far as the leadership on this side of the aisle is concerned, it is determined to do whatever it is able to do with respect to the Kennedy program to see to it that its legislation needs receive adequate and prompt consideration in the Senate of the United States.

In that effort, this is where the Senate stands at this moment:

We have passed a bill to reinstate and extend the President's authority to reorganize the executive branch, a key power which the President must have if he is to bring order out of the bureaucratic chaos into which we have drifted.

We have scheduled for action on the floor today a bill to establish an Office of International Travel with a view to bringing about some reverse action in the outflow of tourist dollars.

I am confident that the Finance Committee will act promptly on the President's recommendation for a temporary program to extend unemployment benefits and to aid the children of the unemployed once the House has completed its consideration of this measure, since the House must act first under the Constitution.

Hearings on the question of raising minimum wages and extending coverage have begun in the Senate, and it is anticipated that a decisive step toward floor action will be taken when the Subcommittee on Labor meets tomorrow.

The Foreign Relations Committee has completed hearings on the President's request for early approval of U.S. membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Within the next 2 weeks this measure should be before the Senate.

Proposed legislation has been introduced for a program of health insurance for the aged, clothed with the dignity and decency of the social security system. As noted, the message on a program for education has just been received. On these and on other major measures, I would hope that we can move promptly and expeditiously to Senate consideration.

It is my intention to meet tomorrow with the chairman of all the committees which have or will have under consideration proposed legislation pertaining to the President's program. Together with the majority whip and the secretary of the conference, I shall seek the counsel of these outstanding Senate leaders with a view to bringing these bills and whatever subsequent major proposed legislation is sought by the administration to trial on the floor of the Senate as promptly as prudence permits.

While the major legislative acts of the administration are only now entering into the legislative channels, I wish, nevertheless, to express my deep appreciation to the distinguished minority leader, to the majority whips, to the secretaries of the conferences, to the chairmen of committees, and to every Member of this body for the outstanding cooperation which has enabled us to set a pattern of moving such business as we have had quickly and smoothly and with a minimum of fanfare. Appointments have constituted our principal preoccupation to date, and we have disposed of 13,731. In addition, we have passed 63 measures. When the administration last changed party hands in 1953, the comparable figures as of this date were 354 appointments cleared and 45 measures passed. These figures in themselves, of course, are not of any great significance, for obviously the quality of effort is far more significant than the quantity. I merely state the figures for the record.

And I may say that while we have kept the calendars clear, we have still been able to get home for supper at a reasonable hour most of the time. As we move now into the heart of the legislative program for this session, I am confident that the distinguished minority leader joins with me in soliciting a continuance of the effective cooperation which we have had to date, to the end that we may not only discharge our responsibilities in the Senate, but also continue to maintain a measure of good will in the Senate Wives' Club.

PAUL WOOTON

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last week, in the death of Paul Wooton, I lost one of my choice and close friends of many years.

He was a perfect gentleman. Those who had the privilege of knowing him will never forget his interest in and his unselfish service to his fellow man. He truly practiced and lived by the Golden Rule as near as any mortal man could.

Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, pastor of the National Presbyterian Church, of which he was an outstanding and devoted member, stated as follows regarding Paul Wooton:

> The memory of what he was to each of us will speak with an eloquence neither written nor spoken words can convey.
>
> Few men have worked so hard, few men have seen their labors produce more good in this world. * * *
>
> He was what you would like to become if you were a journalist.

Mr. President, to know Paul Wooton was to love him. He set for us an example of honor, integrity, and fair dealing which we might well emulate.

To his family and relatives, I extend my sincerest and deepest sympathy.

ENRICHMENT OF CEREAL PRODUCTS—COMMEMORATIVE RESOLUTION BY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate the observance during 1961 of what is appropriately called the quiet miracle. I refer to the commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the enrichment of bread and flour and other cereal products.

Unfortunately, too few of us are aware of the accomplishments of enrichment—beriberi, pellagra, and other dietary deficiency diseases have almost disappeared and iron-deficiency anemia has been lessened without adding calories or cost to some of our most important food products. This quict miracle—the addition of thiamine, niacin, riboflavin, and food iron—has made our bread and other cereal products nutritionally the best in history.

Those of us from the great wheat-producing areas of our country are joining other millers and bakers and all others associated with enriched food products, to remind the American public of the tremendous benefits we have reaped from the quiet miracle.

The National Association of Wheat Growers at its annual meeting in Enid, Okla., in December, adopted a commemorative resolution which I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD following my remarks. Also, I ask to have inserted a brief statement on the history, philosophy, and public health benefits of the enrichment program.

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

At their meeting December 6, 1960, in Enid, Okla., the members of the National Association of Wheat Growers adopted a resolution observing 1961 as the 20th anniversary of enrichment, as follows:

"Whereas, since 1941 the bread, flour and other products of wheat, as well as certain other cereals in the United States diet, have been enriched with specified amounts of the B-vitamins—thiamine, niacin, and riboflavin—and the mineral, iron; and

"Whereas, since 1941 even clinical signs of deficiency diseases caused mainly by inadequate supplies of thiamine, niacine, riboflavin, and iron in the national dietary have all but disappeared, while at the same time general standards of public health have been raised; and

"Whereas, the contribution of the enrichment program to personal and public health goes largely unrecognized and unappreciated in the public mind and professional consciousness: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Association of Wheat Growers join together and strongly urge others to join with all wheat producer groups, flour millers, bakers, and the producers, processors and manufacturers associated with enriched food products to campaign vigorously during the year 1961 to commemorate the 20th anniversary of enrichment as the 'quiet miracle' to the end that physicians, nurses, health workers, teachers, and community leaders as well as the public at large become aware and appreciative of the immense contribution of enrichment to the health and welfare of the United States and its people."

THE 2-MINUTE STORY OF THE QUIET MIRACLE AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO YOUR HEALTH

A QUIET MIRACLE?

Since 1941, practically all cereal foods in U.S. diet have been enriched. B-vitamins—thiamine, niacin, and riboflavin—as well as food iron have been added to bread, flour, processed cereals, white rice, corn meal and macaroni foods without changing taste or color, without adding calories or cost.

Since 1941, deficiency diseases caused by diet inadequate in thiamine, niacin, and riboflavin have all but disappeared. The occurrence of iron deficiency anemia has been materially reduced. Enrichment accomplished a quiet kind of miracle—to bring better health to all through better nutrition for all. In the American tradition, enrichment was voluntary—the combined work of science, medicine, government, and industry.

PHILOSOPHY OF ENRICHMENT

In 1939, the American Medical Association recommended adding synthetic nutrients to general purpose foods to make up deficiencies in popular diet. By that time, scientific and industrial research made enrichment not only possible but commercially practical. Nutritionists were alarmed by surveys showing great public need for certain nutrients.

The fortification of margarine with vitamin A; milk with vitamin D; table salt with

iodine; the restoration of breakfast cereals; and enrichment of bread, flour and similar food have since resulted. The addition of these needed vitamins, minerals and other dietary essentials to general purpose foods was urged in the interest of public health.

HISTORY OF ENRICHMENT

Even in 1939, some bakers and millers were adding B-vitamins, nonfat dry milk and sometimes vitamin D to improve their products nutritionally. But definition and agreement were needed.

After many hearings, the term "enriched" was adopted by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration to describe the addition of specified amounts of thiamine, niacin, riboflavin and iron to popular cereal-based products. Enrichment standards were issued May 27, 1941, and later amended as enrichment was made mandatory for the duration of the war. Since 1946, enrichment laws have been adopted by more than half the States. Today it is estimated that 80 to 90 percent of all breadstuffs, family flour and macaroni foods are enriched.

PUBLIC HEALTH BENEFITS

Beriberi, pellagra and ariboflavinosis are related diseases caused by diet deficient in thiamine, niacin, and riboflavin. Once common ailments, they affect heart, mind, skin, and nervous system. Since enrichment, they have almost disappeared. Physicians now rarely find evidence of beriberi, pellagra or riboflavin deficiency, even in chronic alcoholics among whom these diseases were formerly prevalent. The occurrence of iron deficiency anemia has also been lessened.

Credit for this revolutionary achievement—this quiet miracle in public health, in nutrition—has been given the enrichment program and those who made it possible.

BENEFITS TO YOU AND YOUR FAMILY

Improved public health means better family and personal health. Through enrichment—bread and other products of flour and wheat have been made so nutritious that they can improve any normal diet—even those designed for weight reduction. Low in fat and not excessive in calories, enriched products contribute generous supplies of thiamine, niacin, riboflavin, and iron to our national food supply. Enrichment makes U.S. bread nutritionally the best in history—one of the best breads in the world today. Always look for the word "enriched" on the label of the bread, flour, cornmeal, rice, macaroni or other cereal products you buy.

(The nutritional statements made above have been reviewed by the Council on Foods and Nutrition of the American Medical Association and found consistent with current, authoritative medical opinion.)

INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER CO. CALLS BACK WORKERS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, many years ago a New York newspaper carried this rather unexpected headline in huge black letters: "No Bad News Today."

That is a great headline, and I trust there will be occasions when it can appear again.

In the welter of stuff setting forth how bad everything is supposed to be, it is rather refreshing to take note of an article in the February 14, 1961, issue of the Chicago Daily News. In brief, it recites that for the second month the International Harvester Co. has called back workers, and now has a payroll which is the highest since July 1960. There is a little sunshine, after all; and I ask unanimous consent that the news article be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

HARVESTER SPURT BRINGS BACK MEN

A business pickup, the manufacture of farm and construction equipment, and trucks for the spring trade resulted in a recall of 3,442 laid off workers at International Harvester Co. last month.

Harvester said Tuesday that its employment of production and maintenance workers February 1 totaled 39,112 workers, highest since last July.

The company added that January was the second consecutive month its payrolls have increased. Some 2,338 workers were added in December, making the total 5,780 recalled since December 1.

Harvester said that the 4,000 workers laid off in November for 5 weeks at its Springfield (Ohio) truck plant now are back at work.

THE MISSILE CONTROVERSY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the Sunday, February 12, 1961, edition of the London Observer appeared a comment on the missile—I repeat "missile"—controversy. Since "Comment" is a regular feature in the Observer, the point of view expressed might be of interest, and so I submit it for the RECORD and ask unanimous consent to have it printed therein.

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

COMMENT

President Kennedy has said that until he has completed his study of the American defense program he cannot be sure that the so-called missile gap between the United States and Russia has been closed. But even discounting various leaks from the Pentagon, it is already fairly clear that this gap, which was always exaggerated by the more warlike Democrats, has been closed by the brilliant work done by American scientists in developing, first, the Polaris submarine, and now the long-range Minuteman missile, which uses solid fuel and can therefore be fired from mobile bases such as railway trucks and surface ships.

It is no doubt politically embarrassing for Mr. Kennedy to have to admit so early that some of his severest criticisms of the Eisenhower administration were unfounded; but so far as defense and foreign policy are concerned it is pure gain. Confident that the United States really has at last an invulnerable deterrent within her own control, the President should be less dependent on America's allies for overseas bases. He should, therefore, be able to tackle more boldly questions of disarmament and disengagement.

He may even find that this improves Russia's attitude. Having lost some of the advantages of her own closed society secrecy—hitherto American missile bases have been public knowledge whereas Soviet ones are a genuine secret (except to the now defunct U–2 flights)—Russia may begin to appreciate the need for some form of inspection and control.

COSPONSORSHIP

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the sands of time have not run out for me, I wish to reaffirm my interest in the resolution I introduced for a modification of the Senate rules, to put an end to dual or multiple sponsorship. I hope I may have the cooperation of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration to bring that about.

I have become more alarmed than ever, because I noticed in the Sunday press a statement to the effect that the House of Representatives is now considering multiple sponsorship. We can imagine what will happen when there are bills with 200 or 300 names on them in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall belabor the matter later, Mr. President.

DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS FOOD TO AMERICANS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the first act of the new administration on taking office last month was to increase the distribution of surplus food to Americans who have been hit by the current recession. There is a serious need for such food in many parts of our country, and the President is to be commended and supported in his efforts to assist those in need.

St. Louis, Mo., has been badly hit by the recession. The plight of many citizens was recently well described by Arthur K. Atkinson, chairman of the St. Louis Advisory Board of the Salvation Army and former able president of the Wabash Railroad. As Mr. Atkinson states:

It is almost incredible that in one of the largest cities in the richest country in the world, hundreds of people are literally starving.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, "Urgent Plea for Food Made Here," dated February 11, 1961, which describes conditions in the city of St. Louis, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

URGENT PLEA FOR FOOD MADE HERE—ATKINSON SAYS NEEDY LITERALLY ARE STARVING

"It's almost incredible that in one of the largest cities in the richest country in the world, hundreds of people are literally starving."

That was the statement Friday of Arthur K. Atkinson, chairman of the St. Louis Advisory Board of the Salvation Army.

He said that, since January 26, the Salvation Army—the last resort for those who need help immediately—has had to turn down 315 of 631 families who need food.

Meanwhile new figures from the Missouri Division of Employment Security showed that unemployment in St. Louis and St. Louis County is increasing.

And—as Mr. Atkinson was issuing a public plea for a State emergency appropriation to finance distribution of Federal surplus food—the city Aldermanic Surplus Food Committee was meeting to discuss the problem.

City Comptroller John H. Poelker told the committee details of a city distribution program can be worked out in a week.

Mr. Atkinson made his plea in a press conference in the Boatmen's Bank Building.

At the conference Mrs. Joyce Smith, director of the Salvation Army's family service department, said, "I cry myself to sleep every night."

The reason: because she has to say "No" to so many whom she knows need help and have nowhere else to go.

The 1961 breadline at the Salvation Army headquarters in the Fullerton Building at Seventh and Pine Streets has upward of 100 people waiting most of the time, Mr. Atkinson said.

In the recent bad weather, many of them were soaked to the skin, wet and cold and literally famished, Mr. Atkinson said.

One woman in the last few days fainted as she waited in line, he added. She was taken to City Hospital, where she was diagnosed as suffering from malnutrition.

The Salvation Army sent workers to her home, found five small children there—and they too were suffering from malnutrition. All six wound up in City Hospital.

He said that Salvation Army funds have allowed "taking care" of only 316 of the 631 families which had applied for help since January 26. All of those had been checked and found to be in real need, he added.

By "taking care" he said he meant giving them a week's food orders, which they can present at a grocery store. The Salvation Army has not been giving them cash.

The United Fund is considering the army's request for more funds, he said.

And on January 26 Mr. Atkinson wrote Governor Dalton, asking the Governor to request an emergency appropriation from the State legislature to pay the costs of distributing Federal surplus foods.

He pointed out that only State, municipal or Federal agencies can distribute Federal surplus food in this country—though church organizations and others may do so abroad—and do do so.

Mr. Atkinson's letter to Governor Dalton also asked legislative change in the State welfare law, which would allow the State to give direct relief to families in which there are employable persons.

PREPARING BILL

In the aldermanic meeting at city hall, State Senator Sorkis J. Webbe, fourth district Democrat, said he is preparing a bill calling for the State and the city of St. Louis to split the surplus food distribution program's cost on a 50-50 basis.

He said he hopes to introduce it into the house Tuesday.

Comptroller Poelker has estimated that the cost in the city would be $25,000 to $30,000 a month.

He said that if persons already getting monthly checks from the State division of welfare are certified by that office as eligible for surplus food too, it would save about $10,000 of that estimated cost.

PROPOSAL APPROVED

His proposal for such certification was approved Friday by Proctor N. Carter, director of the State division of welfare, and Dennis M. Doyle of Chicago, area field supervisor of the Food Distribution Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Jack Doussard, administrative assistant to Mr. Poelker, said two-thirds of the 30,000 families expected to apply for the food could be certified through the State welfare division. He directed the city's surplus food program in 1958 and 1959.

Biggest obstacles in the path of the program now, the Aldermanic Committee was told, is finding warehouse space for storage and distribution of the food.

The ideal warehouse, the committee was told, would have 60,000 to 70,000 square feet of storage space, would be on a railroad siding, have ample parking space and be centrally located.

Suggestions made to the committee included the old I.G.A. warehouse in the 2200 block of North Second Street, the old J. C. Penney warehouse, Fourteenth and Spruce Streets, and space in Union Station.

Alderman Joseph P. Roddy, Seventeenth Ward Democrat, and committee chairman, said his group will meet again when Mr. Poelker has prepared more detailed information on the program.

Representatives of the Chamber of Commerce, Downtown St. Louis, Inc., and Civic Progress, Inc., attended the meeting, as did Mayor Tucker, A. J. Cervantes, president of the board of aldermen and Frank Hewey, administrative assistant to Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN.

FILING CLAIMS

Meanwhile, figures released by Charles DeLargy, metropolitan manager of the Missouri Division of Employment Security, showed that a total of 25,541 St. Louis and St. Louis County residents were still filing claims for unemployment insurance in the week ending Friday.

That was the highest continued-claim total since the peak week of the 1958 recession.

In addition, 5,329 St. Louis and St. Louis County residents filed their first claims for unemployment insurance in the week ending Friday.

Those initial claims which reflect new layoffs, were 999 above the preceding week, 3,458 above the comparable week last year and 1,832 above the comparable week of 1958.

The continued claims, which in some measure reflect the difficulty of finding new jobs, included 1,730 by automobile plant workers who are on short-duration layoffs.

The continued-claim total of 25,541, highest since the week ending May 9, 1958, was 2,657 above the preceding week, 12,497 above the comparable week of 1960 and 7,500 above the comparable week of 1958. It was 1,413 less than the peak 1958 week, however.

PAUL WOOTON

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Nation has lost one of its finest newspapermen in the death of Paul Wooton. He was from my area of the country, and represented the Times Picayune of New Orleans; but he belonged to the entire country.

Mr. Wooton never held any political office of any kind. He never headed any corporation or business firm with vast industrial power. He never had any power to hire many people. He never had any power to bestow great favors upon friends or associates. He never accumulated a major fortune. He was never associated with any position that is ordinarily considered one of vast power.

However, on Saturday afternoon last, in the midst of a rain and also slush of what remained of the snow, 900 people in blase Washington trudged through the rain to attend Mr. Wooton's funeral at the National Presbyterian Church.

I was very much impressed by this honest, sincere show of respect and admiration by this vast throng, which included some of the topmost and ablest thinkers, both men and women, in our Nation. They attended because they respected him and because he represented the very best in his profession here since 1914.

Further, in spite of great success, Mr. Wooton never became so big that he was not deeply concerned and interested in the individual and in the welfare of his Nation and in the welfare of his church. Truly, I cannot think of anyone who rose higher in his profession, in his citizenship, in his church stewardship than the late Paul Wooton. We are all better persons, and the world is a better place, because of him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial which was published in the Washington Star of February 17.

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

PAUL WOOTON

Paul Wooton's sudden death yesterday at the age of 79 is in the nature of a closely personal loss to literally scores of newspapermen in Washington. In his long career here, dating from the Wilson administration back in the teens, he did many things for them collectively and individually. He had served as president of most of their organizations. His office had become the busy center of the detailed arrangements for many of their organizational enterprises. He was the natural choice when it came to the selection of someone to represent them in the semiofficial or purely social gatherings of "the press"—including its various components.

Yet his self-imposed and extracurricular activities for his own brethren, and in other unrelated fields, never overshadowed his own professional standing as a competent Washington correspondent of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, and the dean of business publication representatives in the Capital. He did many useful things. Yet he will be remembered more by those who knew him for what he was than for the many things he did. He was an unusual gentleman in his thoughtful kindness to others, in his unselfish interest in those who needed help, in his adoption of a code of living which came as near to being the practical application of the Golden Rule as mortal man can achieve. The sudden termination of Paul Wooton's various activities will leave a void. But it is Paul Wooton himself who will be missed.

PAWLEY TESTIMONY SHOWS NEED FOR FURTHER HEARINGS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee today released the transcript of the testimony of former Ambassador William D. Pawley. This testimony is a shocking commentary on the conduct of U.S. foreign relations in Latin America and elsewhere during the last two decades. It implicates many high ranking Government officials, some of whom are still serving in Government posts.

The testimony is significant, and as a member of the subcommittee, I approve of its release. The testimony must be read with some caution, however, until all the principals involved have had an opportunity, in public session, to state their side of the case. It should be understood, moreover, that the subcommittee already has heard other testimony on some of the issues covered by the Pawley hearings. It would be most unfortunate if final conclusions were drawn by the public before all of this testimony was released and public hearings are held.

Mr. President, the hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee

on the Communist threat to the United States through the Caribbean, have been extremely useful. The subcommittee should continue its study of this subject until the full story of the Castro rise to power has been documented. In this connection, it is very important that the persons named by Pawley, such as William Wieland, Spruille Braden, Roy R. Rubottom, and James E. Webb, be called before the subcommittee in public session to explain their side of the case. I hope this will be done in the very near future.

Mr. President, I believe that Castro's days are numbered. I intend later this week to speak at length on this subject. But we can learn a great deal about how to avoid another Castro or Batista for that matter in Cuba or any place else in this hemisphere, by preparing a full case history on Castro's rise to power.

THE RIGHT OF THE PUBLIC TO SERVICE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning I received a letter which asked, in effect, "When are you folks in Congress going to do something about the rights of us, the public? We have been thinking that perhaps we could witness a repetition of what took place when the Secretary of Labor went up to New York. Millions of us up there were inconvenienced. Now a strike is in effect in another branch of the public service"—the air lines.

Mr. President, when will this administration take hold of this problem and meet it head on in these perilous times, when war may be our lot at any moment? Is not the right of the public the most significant right there is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if my colleagues will indulge me, I should like to have the Senate act on the Executive Calendar at this time. I believe it will take only a minute or so.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to consider executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] I ask that a statement prepared by him concerning the nomination of Brooks Hays to be Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

I am very much pleased that the President has appointed Brooks Hays to be Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations.

Brooks Hays has been a personal friend of mine for many years. He has an enviable record of service both to the people of Arkansas and the Nation. He is well known to most Members of this body and of the House of Representatives. As a member of the Arkansas delegation from the 78th Congress through the 85th Congress he continuously showed a keen insight into the intricacies of foreign affairs problems. He served for 8 years on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and contributed immeasurably to the deliberations of that committee on important problems in the foreign field.

He is a man of integrity and ability, and I know that he will serve the country with distinction in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations. I think his appointment augurs well for the future relationship between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government on foreign affairs problems.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

AMBASSADOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert J. Burkhardt, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Postmaster General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

SECRETARY FREEMAN CHAMPIONS THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the new Secretary of Agriculture appeared on a network television broadcast.

I had no opportunity to see the broadcast; but I read about it this morning and became so deeply interested in it that I then called CBS for a transcript.

Mr. President, it is great to have, at long last, a Secretary of Agriculture who believes in going to bat for the American farmer. In Orville Freeman we have exactly that kind of man.

Secretary Freeman not only spoke out for the farmer, but he did so in a convincing and persuasive way that is going to mark a real turning point on the farms throughout America.

In the course of his half-hour interview, Secretary Freeman said:

We see the magnificent unbelievable success of American agriculture and the tremendous contribution of the American farmer.

Now, we tend to overlook this. In agriculture the two words we hear about are "surplus" and "subsidy." We don't stop to think, for example, that the average industrial worker works only 1 day a week in this United States of America to eat better than anyone in the history of the world. The next best countries are probably Italy and Japan, where they work 2 days. In Russia they work 3 or 3½ days to eat.

The net result is that here in this country we work less and less and less to eat better and better and better, and the most dramatic success story of the American economy and its productivity, the genius of organization and production, agriculture is No. 1, and yet somehow we have drifted off where we consider this a great problem. It is a great success.

Some figures that I have reviewed from time to time which show that if the cost of food had risen as much as the cost of other things that we all use, in the last 8 years it would have cost the American consumer $70 billion more to eat than he has had to pay.

Now if you take what you call subsidies to the farmer, and might I make a plea here also that a great many things are lumped in the budget of Agriculture that should not be charged against the farmer, but at the most, subsidy to the farmer would be during these years $35 billion, and so there has been a net gain to the consumer, a subsidy from the farmer, of $35 billion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full transcript of the CBS broadcast featuring the Secretary of Agriculture be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON CONVERSATION

(Broadcast over the CBS television network February 19, 1961; guest, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; host, Paul Niven; producer, Michael J. Marlow; director, Bill Linden.)

ANNOUNCER. The CBS television network welcomes you to a new program with a different approach to prominent man's private mind and public philosophy. During

the course of the next half hour you will be present for a live "Washington Conversation" with the man charged with trying to solve what President Kennedy has termed "the No. 1 domestic problem."

He is Orville L. Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture.

Your host for this informal, unrehearsed conversation in our studio conference room is CBS News Washington correspondent, Paul Niven.

Mr. NIVEN. Mr. Secretary, when President Kennedy was elected, a lot of people said he was going to have an awful time getting anybody to take your job. His predecessor, who was I think by general agreement a well-intentioned and sincere man, ended up without the support of Congress, with a Presidential candidate of his own party disowning him.

What persuaded you to take the job? And is it true you didn't want it?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, it isn't true that I didn't want it. I did have some hesitation in connection with it, but when I had thought the matter over thoroughly, and incidentally discussed it with my family and my wife, because it is a trying job, why, I was anxious to have the opportunity.

It is a difficult job. Agriculture throughout history has presented very grave and difficult problems. It affects everybody, because everybody wants food and fiber. Everybody needs it, and of course millions and millions of people here and around the world are involved in growing it and processing it, in selling it, in using it, and so it comes right down to the nub of human life itself.

Mr NIVEN. I read somewhere that when you went home and told your family that you had taken the job, your daughter Connie, age 15, said "Daddy, I will try to be brave about it."

Is that true?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, that is about right. Connie may be listening now, I hope she is, and Mike and my wife. Neither of the children, of course, were very anxious to leave Minneapolis, where they are going to school and enjoy their home community, school and church, but they are good sports, and have been throughout the time I have been in public life, and are going to make the best of it, and I think they will enjoy Washington.

Mr. NIVEN. Mr. Secretary, isn't this job so difficult some people have said it can't be solved? Isn't it likely to swallow up the reputation of anybody who tackles it?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I really never quite thought about it in those terms. If you can make some progress really—and I don't want to sound dramatic or like a martyr or anything; why, that is relatively unimportant—if we can make progress—now, I don't think we can talk in terms of solutions. This world is changing so fast, the technology of agriculture is more explosive than any other, so there isn't any solution where you could say at a set point we have solved the problem. I doubt if there ever will be.

But the main point is that we move in the right direction of getting food and fiber to people who need it, and also of getting a fair, equitable return to the farmer who produces it.

Mr. NIVEN. Did your predecessor make any progress or did things go in the opposite direction?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I don't want to pass any kind of harsh judgments, but in relation, for example, to the present so-called stocks of food that are called surpluses, why, they climbed about from a billion and a half to eight and a half billion dollars, our present stocks. Farm income dropped sharply, in the nature of 25 percent in terms of net income to the farmer, and I would say that that is hardly progress.

Mr. NIVEN. And the cost of subsidy to the taxpayer grew and grew, didn't it?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, the costs of the program grew commensurate to the storage on hand, but I would emphasize this is in a sense the essence of the problem, Paul, because we tend to produce the things that are difficult to use that we have enough of.

What we really need to do is to produce more of the things that we want and that we need.

Now, almost all of the so-called surplus today is in wheat or in feed grains, primarily corn. Outside of this there isn't a surplus problem in agriculture.

And one of the things that we are trying to do is to move in the direction of converting these things into vegetable oils desperately needed here and around the world, and into proteins, into poultry, into turkeys, into eggs, into beef, into hogs, into the kind of thing—into dairy—the kind of thing that people need and want.

Mr. NIVEN. Do we need more of all those things that we are producing now?

Secretary FREEEMAN. If you want to state the need in terms of what people need and what would make for better living, why, we need more of all of them.

Recent analyses, for example, made show that in our country itself 31 percent of our people have a calcium deficient diet, and of course right now in our direct feeding program we will be reaching in the neighborhood of five and a half million people, and may I say that this, I think, is progress, and I am thrilled with it, and the President, who had seen this in the campaign at first hand, the first Executive Order, everyone in the Department of Agriculture thrilled to it, and I think the American people, was "Let's put some of this food to work."

Mr. NIVEN. Is this calcium deficiency the result of poverty, unemployment, or is it a carelessness in diet?

Secretary FREEMAN. Both. It would be the result of both. There is poverty and unemployment. The first thing that a family that goes out of work will stop buying will be beef and pork and cheese and butter will come very quickly, and after a bit the milk. These are the things that are very important to the diet.

Mr. NIVEN. But even if the surplus problem is confined to feed grains and corn, it is a big problem, and the President has just sent a bill down to discourage the aim of cutting production in those fields.

Now, a couple of days later, Mr. Khrushchev came out with new incentives for the Russians to grow more. Now, if Mr. Kennedy keeps on trying to curtail production here, and Khrushchev keeps on trying to increase production there, isn't Khrushchev inevitably going to fulfill his boast and overtake and surpass us?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is a very interesting question.

The answer is "No."

Let me answer it directly, because Mr. Kennedy isn't concerned in curtailing production, as such. He is concerned in channeling it into the right things, as I said earlier.

But it dramatizes the point, Paul, but I would like to make here, and to make for all the viewers in this program all over America, that by the very definition of this fact of production, we see the magnificent unbelievable success of American agriculture and the tremendous contribution of the American farmer.

Now, we tend to overlook this. In agriculture the two words we hear about are surplus and subsidy. We don't stop to think, for example, that the average industrial worker works only 1 day a week in this United States of America to eat better than anyone in the history of the world. The next best countries are probably Italy and Japan, where they work 2 days. In Russia they work 3 or 3½ days to eat.

The net result is that here in this country we work less and less and less to eat better and better and better, and the most dramatic success story of the American economy and its productivity, the genius of organization and production, agriculture is No. 1, and yet somehow we have drifted off where we consider this a great problem. It is a great success.

Mr. NIVEN. But I don't see why our advances and our high standard of living should necessarily imply that the urban dweller, the consumer, is subsidizing the farmer. Where do you get that?

Secretary FREEMAN. You get that—you put these words, I didn't use them exactly, but I think maybe when you say subsidizing——

Mr. NIVEN. You have said it I think.

Secretary FREEMAN. On occasion. Well, I just say this: that some figures that I have reviewed from time to time which show that if the cost of food had risen as much as the cost of other things that we all use, in the last 8 years it would have cost the American consumer $70 billion more to eat than he has had to pay.

Now if you take what you call subsidies to the farmer, and might I make a plea here also that a great many things are lumped in the budget of agriculture that should not be charged against the farmer, but at the most the subsidy to the farmer would be during these years $35 billion, and so there has been a net gain to the consumer, a subsidy from the farmer, of $35 billion.

Mr. NIVEN. Put it another way. The President pointed out recently that Detroit has a million cars in inventory. There have been layoffs in the auto industry. All right, now why shouldn't the Government on the same principle start paying the industry not to produce cars, pay subsidies, establish support prices? Why isn't the same principle applied?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, in the first place it has been a matter of the decision of a handful of men that they would lay off people who, incidentally, then go on unemployment insurance or on relief, and have a lot of facilities to help them in making the adjustment, a half-dozen remedies, and all they have to do really—of course, this oversimplifies it a bit—is to close the doors. But in agriculture you have 3 to 4 million individual producers. Once you put a crop in the ground, once you have farrowed some pigs, once you have brought in some cows and you are milking them, you just don't close the door. This keeps right on going. And so it requires a kind of coordination, programing, and planning on a much longer basis than is true in the case of industry.

Mr. NIVEN. Yes. In industry in the same field somebody could invest a lot of money in a plant, and if they were producing too much or too much was being produced all over the country of that particular product, by the law of supply and demand and the invisible hand, the plant will be forced out of business. If it should happen to people in business, why shouldn't it happen to farmers?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, it has in part as agriculture adjusts itself, and there are fewer farmers. And technological changes are as a matter of fact taking place rather rapidly. But the transition is a much more difficult one.

The movement of capital in and out, the movement of people in and out, is an extremely complex one which involves millions and millions of producers, not just a few producers.

Mr. NIVEN. But you and many people in politics in both parties have been especially zealous in guarding, in preserving the small family farm. I believe in Minnesota your

policies were designed to help them rather than to be corporate farms. Again in the analogy with business, if the small firm can't compete with the big firms, it is usually forced out of business.

Secretary FREEMAN. The answer to that is that the small farm more than competes in the majority of instances with what we will call corporate farming. We have had in the United States of America a family farm structure, and the great success to which you referred a moment ago in talking about United States versus Russia, Russia's plea for more production and our efforts to adjust it attest very dramatically, if I may say so to you, taking the words out of your mouth, to the overwhelming success and efficiency of the American family farm.

Mr. NIVEN. I remember going to a collective farm in Russia, and incidentally over every cow was a document, and I asked my guide what it was, and he said "That is a plan; every cow has a plan from the government." Is this the logical extension of government intervention in agriculture?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, it is not, and the purpose here generally is to try and bring about a kind of working partnership to synthesize these forces in a sensible way.

Now the plan you have mentioned, which was the feed grain program, was designed to meet an emergency in effect. We already have in storage 2.7-plus billion bushels of feed grains. Now the best estimates we can make that this is a reasonable crop year is that at the end of this crop year that there will be added to that in excess of our 600 million bushels more of feed grains.

It will cost the Government, that means all of us, the taxpayers, $1.5-plus billion, and this is a conservative figure, to handle 600 million bushels of feed grains when we already have 2.7 billion.

So the whole purpose of this is to adjust this and try and move some of this feed grain into other areas, and to bring about the same kind of balance between consumption and demand that is brought about when the steel industry shuts down to 50 percent, as they are now, when the automobile industry shuts down with, as they have now, a million cars in inventory. Only in agriculture with its tremendous productivity and with millions of individual producers, it is much more difficult and complicated.

Mr. NIVEN. And the President wants to turn some of the land into soybean production, doesn't he?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes. The suggestion was made, the program as outlined would call for strengthening the support prices on soybeans, with the thought that several million acres of corn land and feed grain land would move into soybeans, because the price and demand for soybeans is very strong, and the need for vegetable oil from all indications will continue to grow stronger and stronger.

Mr. NIVEN. Mr. Schuman of the Farm Bureau Federation has said that farmers will now be encouraged, if this plan goes through, farmers will be encouraged to move land into soybean, and their total production will go up while they are going to be paid for reducing the total acreage devoted to grains.

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, there is a certain element of truth in Mr. Schuman's statement. The answer is that you don't push the button with millions of producers and get the result overnight.

Mr. NIVEN. Yes.

Secretary FREEMAN. The alternatives that we are faced with in this situation, none of them are ideal, and so we deal with the very practical realities of a situation where, in a couple of weeks, we will start a crop under way in feed grains which will produce substantially more than we need of that crop at this time, and which will be enormously expensive to purchase, to move, to store, to hold, and finally to distribute.

As a matter of fact, if you bought this corn at $1.06 it would cost in the neighborhood of $1.50 more, almost 25 percent more than it would cost for the Government to buy it before we could handle it and eventually use it.

Mr. NIVEN. This is going to be a voluntary program?

Secretary FREEMAN. This is a voluntary program.

Mr. NIVEN. Have you any means of seeing that the farmers who don't cooperate won't make more money than those who do?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, this is a very good question, and we do have, and there is an effort in this bill that I hope that Congress will examine and give careful and thoughtful consideration to, and that is to provide the Secretary with the discretionary authority so if a farmer should say, "Well, I am not going to take some acres out of production even though it is going to be a pretty good arrangement, I am going to go ahead and plant as much as I can, and if there is a $1.20 support price, why then I will be able to go to the market and I will do much better," if this happens, we hope to have the power to release into the market a given amount of the 2.7 billion bushels we have now so it won't be a $1.20 price, it will be a price where that farmer will not be permitted to take advantage of his neighbors.

Mr. NIVEN. I see. Mr. Secretary, during the campaign the Democrats talked a lot about Bensonism, and certainly the Republican Members of Congress from your area and even the Vice President made considerable efforts to disassociate themselves from Mr. Benson, but why if Benson was so unpopular and President Eisenhower backed him all the way, why did the Farm Belt go Republican in the election?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I don't think that the overwhelming issue in these areas was particularly agriculture in the cities. The fact remains that the farmers in the Farm Belt voted much more strongly for President Kennedy than they had in the two previous elections.

Mr. NIVEN. Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, yes, in all of these States you would find if you checked the figures that the farm vote—you are getting down now into Nebraska and Kansas. I am getting on shaky grounds. But you get up into Iowa, into Minnesota, into North Dakota, into Wisconsin—South Dakota is an exception to the rule—there is the feeling, and it has been said by the Republicans, that the farmers voted against President Kennedy. This simply is not true.

The people in the small towns in the Midwest and in the cities did not run as strongly as we had hoped that they would, and the election in the so-called Farm Belt was not won by Mr. Nixon in those particular States and lost by the President in terms of the farmer. It was in terms of the small town and the city.

Conversely might I add, Paul, that in the South, in the South the cities voted for Mr. Nixon, but the farmers, the farmers in the South, in the Carolinas, in Alabama and Georgia, they voted for the President.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, Mr. Truman was wrong then after the election when he said he thought the farmers ought to be told where to go.

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I have the greatest affection and respect for Mr. Truman. I didn't see that statement, Paul, and I certainly wouldn't comment on it.

Mr. NIVEN. I think he said they ought to be told where to go, and he named the place, which is not normally mentioned on Sunday morning on television, so we will leave that.

Governor, I wonder if we could get into your personal life a little more. I understand one of the books you are reading these days is "Machiavelli the Prince," and I have read that several members of the Kennedy administration are reading it.

Do you read Machiavelli in order to be better acquainted with the Devil, or do you think it has some useful illumination of politics?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I think that Machiavelli has been much maligned over history as a writer and as a philosopher and as a political scientist. As a matter of fact, his writings are very interesting as they analyze the relationships of power and motivations in the process of government, and I find it very stimulating and useful. It is relaxation, not going to school actually.

Mr. NIVEN. Power and motivations I think Machiavelli would have been right at home in the recent controversy over the Rules Committee in the House. He would probably have been on the side of the Speaker and the Administration, but I think he would have probably thought that Judge Smith would have been a pretty good prince for him. Did you call any Members of Congress and pressure them to support that?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, I didn't pressure anybody, Paul, and I don't think anybody was pressured.

Mr. NIVEN. Haven't some of your Cabinet colleagues admitted that they made a few phone calls?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I haven't discussed that with them.

Mr. NIVEN. Don't you think it is necessary and proper, wouldn't it be reasonable for a Government or an Administration, caught in the act of pressuring Congress in an instance like this, to say, "Look, this Administration has sent a program to Congress which we feel is essential for the Nation's survival. We will use every ounce of political strength we can mobilize to get it through"?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I speak now personally, and I am sure that the President will use—he believes in his program and hopes to have it through Congress. Speaking now as an individual and as one who has served as a Governor for 6 years, and 3 terms in the legislature, I just believe that our system of Government works the best and doesn't work properly unless there is a strong executive who works to develop the program that he thinks is best, who presents them affirmatively to the legislature or to the Congress, and then proceeds to fight for those programs.

Mr. NIVEN. Yes, and when you say fight, don't you mean calling committee chairmen, calling members, using the carrot and the stick, threatening them to cut off patronage or other favors or promising favors if they do support you? Isn't that all part of Government as it must be?

Secretary FREEMAN. You are drawing word pictures here that emphasize the stick and forget about the carrot.

Mr. NIVEN. Yes, the carrot——

Secretary FREEMAN. I believe in a—I won't comment on the stick, but I would certainly say that I spent, oh, I spent a great deal of time since I have been here talking to people in both the House and the Senate, both Republican and Democrats, about agriculture.

I have learned a good deal. And I hope that they know me a little better and know these programs a little better. And the real thing is a matter of persuasion in connection with the program.

There are then some other elements that you could say are properly within the rules of the game, but it doesn't mean shaking your finger at somebody's nose threatening him that he won't have any patronage, and the rest of it.

Mr. NIVEN. It can be done politely?

Secretary FREEMAN. You are just like all the newspapers and the TV and the radio and

the—you would like to emphasize the stick. I mean I like to emphasize the carrot.

Mr. NIVEN. I am just wondering if politicians aren't less than frank with the people if they don't pretend that this pressure and threatening doesn't go on and if they might not serve their own ends best if they would be more frank and say, "Sure we do this, we have to. We can't compete with the monolithic totalitarian adversary if we don't."

Secretary FREEMAN. This is a serious question, and let me give it a serious answer. I have been a little facetious about it to this point.

Of course this goes on, but it is a very practical day-to-day business. For one thing, you don't threaten a man of integrity and ability in the Congress and say, "You vote for that or else I am going to go out and lick you." In the first place, if you do that, he would go home and tell his people that, and the next election why you will take the big licking. I mean it is the relationship here.

It may very well be that in a marginal case on a matter of an appointment where there were two good people and he was particularly anxious that one should be appointed, that conceivably you might go the other way, and I think the reason is a hesitation to discuss this in the sharp outline frankness that you talk about is that once you do, you see, it becomes overemphasized in terms of its meaning and its application, because you tend to deal in black and white and extremes. There is a deal of gray here. If I may repeat, I would never dream of threatening and saying, "You do this or just look out."

Mr. NIVEN. But you wouldn't mind letting the man know that if he behaved in a certain way, you would be more benevolent to him in the future?

Secretary FREEMAN. I would assume that anyone who was in politics or in any branch of human life who had an intelligence quotient of 75 at least would understand that that is going to be the case.

Mr. NIVEN. So threats don't have to be spelled out.

Secretary FREEMAN. Correct. Now you have put your finger on it.

Mr. NIVEN. Mr. Secretary, a week ago you appeared on that very unusual television program which is run by two Senators from Pennsylvania. Senator CLARK is a very partisan member of your party, Senator SCOTT is a very partisan Republican, and at one point I believe you said you were in an uncomfortable position. If you were running for office you would know how to handle yourself, but you didn't know how to handle yourself as a Cabinet officer. What restraints or inhibitions do you feel you have?

Secretary FREEMAN. I have no restraints or inhibitions except a desire to work on a basis with the President of the United States who I feel a warm affection for as a person, and admiration for as a leader.

Having just begun here, exactly the form of this is going to have to develop itself.

If your question is have I been directed what to say and what to do and what not to say and do, the answer is absolutely "No." This hasn't even been suggested. In fact, I am on this program and I was on Mr. Garroway's program. No one in the White House said to me what I should or shouldn't say.

Mr. NIVEN. I can tell you you shouldn't mention Mr. Garroway, but still——

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, on this program, I beg your pardon. I ought to know better than that, hadn't I?

Mr. NIVEN. Seriously, sir, some of your friends in Minnesota used to say that you were a very able politician, but you were also a very stubborn man, and there have been some predictions that you might even end up as a sort of Democratic Ezra Benson.

What do you think about that?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, again, it is hard to say. I guess maybe I am stubborn. When I believe in something and when I have made a decision on it, and when I have listened to all sides of it, why, then I try to carry it out.

I think perhaps I have learned from the past. I think I may be a little bit more flexible in that regard. One learns as he gets on. But I would hope, and I don't intend to lose the orientation that when I have a strong conviction I am prepared to fight for it. Otherwise there is no reason for being in this business. Public life is not an easy one. It is a challenging and a wonderful life, and this isn't a complaint, but it takes a lot out of you, and it takes a lot out of your family, and the reason for being in it is because you think you can do something worth while. Then if you don't do it, you believe in and fight for it, what is the sense of being in it?

Mr. NIVEN. That is what I was going to ask you.

During the campaign especially millions of Americans wondered why do people subject themselves to this sort of thing.

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I must say to you, and this is Sunday morning, and one time a clergyman who is a good friend of mine came to me and asked me that question, and I asked him, I said, "Why are you a man of the cloth, and why do you preach the Lord's word, and why are you a clergyman?"

And he looked at me, and he said, "I never thought about it that way."

I hope this isn't sacrilegious, but in a very real sense most of the real leaders in political and public life in both parties that I know are in it because they feel a sense of mission, dedication and purpose.

Mr. NIVEN. You were a marine platoon leader during the war, I believe.

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes.

Mr. NIVEN. And you were wounded in combat.

Do you feel that that experience gave you any benefit as far as politics was concerned? I don't mean veterans' votes. I mean do you feel that you learned to understand people in a way that has helped you since.

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes. There is something about the experience of living with men under circumstances of life and death that gives you an understanding and a feeling for people that I think you could get no other way. And of course the experience in organization and finally at times in public life when it goes a little rough and the criticisms are pretty sharp and you just wonder if it is all worth it.

I can think back to the many times when life and death were hanging in the balance, and really and truly the problems day to day in public life seemed rather small compared to that.

Mr. NIVEN. I have read somewhere that you used to have a terrible temper, that you have learned to control.

Did you learn that in the Marine Corps?

Secretary FREEMAN. I learned it in part. I got dressed down awful hard sometimes and had to learn that I couldn't talk back. I did have a temper as a boy, but I think since the war and during the war that as I grew to be a man that I have learned to control my temper, and to my best knowledge at no time when I was Governor of the State of Minnesota, or since I have been in public life, have I lost my temper.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, now, I will call you up on that. I don't know that you lost your temper, but during the Los Angeles Convention I happened to be staying on the same floor of the hotel that the Minnesota delegation was staying on, and about 4 o'clock one morning I was returning to my room and I heard a couple of loud voices in high argument, and I listened for a moment, and it was Senator HUMPHREY and yourself, and I tried to eavesdrop, but unfortunately there was another man in the corridor, and I still don't know if it was another reporter or some sort of guard that you had put out there, but anyway, I was embarrassed, so I went in my room.

Can you tell me now what you and Mr. HUMPHREY were arguing about?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I don't even remember. There were a number of differences of opinion at the convention in Los Angeles, and Senator HUMPHREY and I have been very dear and warm personal friends for many, many years, and we have not hesitated to speak with abandon and frankness and sharpness to one another on occasion, and it is usually inside a room, and in the future we are going to post a guard outside the door.

Mr. NIVEN. I know I did hear enough so I can press you a little more, but I think I will stop.

How did two such strong personalities as you and Senator HUMPHREY manage to get along in a State political party? You have done it for quite a while.

Secretary FREEMAN. I think you will have to ask him that question. As far as I am concerned, why, I have a great admiration. I think he is an extraordinarily able and competent person, gifted with a brilliant mind, with an effectiveness of analyzing and presenting materials, of reaching people, that is quite extraordinary, and also I feel a real affection for him as a person. Having this kind of a guy, why, it isn't very hard to get along.

Mr. NIVEN. I don't know anybody who knows Senator HUMPHREY who doesn't like him, but when you are arguing don't you find it hard to get a word in?

Secretary FREEMAN. No. I must say that when HUBERT HUMPHREY and I have our discussions, why, he listens, and I listen.

Mr. NIVEN. One final question, Mr. Secretary:

What do you plan to do at the end of 4 or 8 years as Secretary of Agriculture?

Secretary FREEMAN. I haven't got the slightest idea. I haven't thought. You live day by day, kind of fatalistic, you know, as they say in the Marine Corps, and during the war, "If there is a bullet with your name on it, it will find you."

Mr. NIVEN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

That is all the time we have right now.

This is Paul Niven, inviting you to be with us next week at this same time, when our guest will be the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. SAM RAYBURN.

ANNOUNCER. This has been another informal, unrehearsed "Washington Conversation" with a prominent national figure, a different approach to a prominent man's private mind and public philosophy.

Our guest today was the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman.

Next week don't miss our "Washington Conversation" with a man who rarely grants a television interview, the Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, the victor in the recent controversy to change the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives. Be sure you are with us for this "Washington Conversation" that promises to be a program of insight into SAM RAYBURN, one of the great men of our time.

MENOMINEE TERMINATION ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on February 9 I introduced two bills, S. 869 and S. 870, at the request of the Menominee Indian Tribe, to amend their Termination Act, which is scheduled to take effect April 30, 1961. I was joined in sponsorship of this legislation by my senior colleague, Mr. WILEY.

In the past few weeks the Menominee tribal delegates, Mr. Jerry Grignon and

Mr. Al Dodge, have been here in Washington to discuss the many difficulties that the tribe has run up against in working out its termination program. Speaking on behalf of the tribe, the delegates have stated that some adjustments and financial aids will be necessary, to make termination successful. Their statements are supported by a resolution of the tribe, adopted unanimously by the Menominee General Council. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at the end of my remarks.

One subject that has an important bearing on the tribe's ability to become self-supporting is the possible development of the recreation potential of its land. Recently the chief of State cooperation, region V of the National Park Service, submitted a preliminary report on these possibilities, which states that a full survey by a competent recreation resource planning group is needed. The report submits other suggestions of similar importance, and I ask unanimous consent that it, too, be printed at the end of my remarks.

On February 15, I wrote to the new Secretary of the Interior, enclosing copies of the two bills, and asking that he see to it that a sympathetic review of the tribe's many difficulties be undertaken immediately. I expressed the tribe's belief that an adequate financial base must be available if termination is to work without causing serious hardship.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Secretary also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution, report, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas:

1. The Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin, within its financial, and training and experience, ability, has in good faith tried to meet the requirements of the Menominee Termination Act, as amended from time to time, and has perfected a plan of organization for the administration of its varied business and governmental affairs required by the Termination Act;

2. The Menominee Termination Act and the organizational plans, so carefully worked out by State and tribal agencies, are at best a grand experiment, and neither the economic nor the human factors necessary to success have been tried or tested;

3. The success of the Termination Act and the termination plans, in their entirety, depend upon the successful management, operation, and redevelopment of the now very limited and nonmodern industrial affairs of the tribe, which have not kept apace with the business world during the last 50 years, resulting in limited employment opportunity and a low living wage standard;

4. The health and welfare of tribal members, and their dependents, are seriously at stake because of the forced closure of the Menominee hospital, the delimiting of medical services, and the questionable ability of the municipality to care for its needy;

5. The plans for redevelopment, improvement, and expansion of the industrial plant have only recently been completed and necessitate substantial restudy and capital investment now not available from tribal funds or sources;

6. The State of Wisconson, after long and careful examination, study and negotiation, has providently seen fit only to establish a provisional form of government for the reservation area, reviewable and reversible by the legislature during the next 8 years through 1969;

7. Many of the people most drastically to be affected by termination effects will have passed on: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved by the Menominee General Council in a regularly convened session at Keshena, Wis., this 9th day of January 1961, That we do hereby and respectfully, in all good faith, request that the Congress of the United States, through the guidance and assistance of the Secretary of the Interior, amend the Menominee Termination Act to:

1. Provide not less than an 8-year period, similar to that enacted by the State of Wisconsin in 1959, for readjustment of business and governmental affairs to the end that the trials and errors of industrial expansion, improvement, and redevelopment are given a reasonable period for resolution;

2. Provide exemption from Federal and State income and State direct property taxes for a similar period;

3. Provide that the plan of organization for business and governmental services, as now incorporated in the Menominee termination plan, shall proceed as now intended, the business organization to be incorporated as a Federal chartered corporation and the governmental affairs to be conducted according to the forms of State law as required by the Menominee County law, but not as a totally integrated part of State government;

4. Provide for establishment of a separate stumpage account administered as before 1955, such funds to be used to defray administrative and other governmental expenses and to develop a reserve fund;

5. Provide authority for the Menominee Tribe to borrow Federal funds at reasonable terms and amounts necessary to expand, improve, and redevelop business operations; and be it further.

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Wisconsin delegation in Congress, namely, Members of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of the Interior.

DECEMBER 8, 1960.

To: Menominee Indian Advisory Council.

From: Peter DeGelleke, chief of State cooperation, region V, National Park Service.

Subject: Proper development of reservation's recreational resources.

In accordance with arrangements made by Assistant Secretary of the Interior George W. Abbott's letter of November 25, I am glad to submit the following observations and suggestions concerning the natural recreational resources of your reservation.

1. Based upon the information of previous reports, the location of the reservation in relation to population concentrates and transportation facilities and personal field observation of portions of the reservation, it is considered that the potential value to the tribe of the recreational resources is sufficient to warrant immediate full scale evaluation and planning.

2. As soon as possible, the services of a competent recreation resource planning organization should be engaged to prepare a report defining the recreational resources and a plan for their most beneficial long-range utilization.

3. The report should include:

(a) An orderly inventory of the existing natural recreational resources and those that it is possible to restore or create by proper management of natural factors such as forest, fish, wildlife, water, etc.

(b) An estimate of the potential visitation by recreationists and vacationists and its potential economic value to the tribe providing proper management is exercised.

(c) A recreation master plan for the reservation designating by types of use the areas to be primarily used for recreation and those to be used secondarily for recreation or scenically controlled and establishing the location of required roads, trails, etc.

(d) A development program establishing a schedule and sequence for executing the master plan by phases including estimates of cost.

(e) Development plan studies for sites to be included in an initial economically feasible phase of the development program.

4. The following items are suggested for incorporation into the master plan or other use as may be considered appropriate:

(a) Ownership of the land should remain with the tribe. Leases to individuals or corporations should be only for such period as is necessary to economically justify the construction of required recreation facilities and should incorporate all restrictions or controls necessary to carry out the principles established by the master plan.

(b) Provision for arrangements with the Wisconsin Department of Conservation for the preservation of such outstanding scenic features as the Dells and certain other falls of the Wolf River and virgin pines which are determined to be of statewide significance as State parks and their development by the State to provide interpretive and day use facilities to preserve and present the natural and historic features of the sites for the general public enjoyment.

(d) Establishment of a scenic zone to preserve and restore the natural condition along the highways providing access through the reservation which will be principally used by recreationists and the access roads to sites and areas to be preserved or developed for recreation.

(e) Establishment of a style and type of architecture that will be followed in all structures and that will utilize items produced by the Menominee mill and consider the feasibility of establishing specially fabricated construction housing units to be used throughout the reservation as individual vacation cottages and residences.

(f) Establishment of a tribal recreation authority with a professionally competent director to carry out the provisions of the master plan and to establish a uniform quality for all facilities and services offered to recreationists on the reservation. Through the use of a system of standards, licenses, and inspections to guide individual enterprise so that the public can use any and all services offered on the reservation with full confidence.

PETER DEGELLEKE.

FEBRUARY 13, 1961.

The Honorable STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On February 9 I sponsored two bills to amend the Menominee Termination Act. I am now writing to urge that you immediately undertake a sympathetic review of the many difficulties that have arisen in connection with the Menominee Indian Tribe's termination program. The matter is urgent, because termination is scheduled to take effect on April 30, about 10 weeks from now.

Self-government will impose a heavy financial burden of providing essential health, education, and other welfare services on the Menominee community. Medical services available to members of the tribe have already been sharply reduced by the closing of the Menominee tribal hospital on January 1, 1961. Due to lack of funds and physicians' services, the nuns who had run the hospital could no longer continue. One consequence of the decline in medical services has been a sharp rise in the number of tuberculosis cases among the tribe.

Termination will be successful only if the tribe is supported by an adequate return

from its enterprises and industry. The termination plan agreed upon by the tribe and your Department was based on the harvesting and marketing of 29 million board feet of timber. The amount of timber sold in the past 6 months was less than 5 million board feet, about one-sixth of the volume specified in the termination plan. The management and technology of the tribe's industry must be greatly developed and modernized if adequate revenues are to be available.

After careful study of the tribe's situation, the State of Wisconsin established a provisional form of local government for the reservation area, which is to be reviewable by the State legislature through 1969. I consider it extremely important that Wisconsin and Federal authorities work together very closely to insure that the tribe's transition is accomplished with an absolute minimum of hardship.

I hope that your Department and the Bureau of Indian Affairs will act quickly to report to the Senate on the bills I have introduced. From your own experience in the legislative branch, you know the importance of these departmental comments on legislation affecting Indians. If the specific proposals in these two bills could be improved upon, I hope that your comments will suggest useful and beneficial alternatives.

With warm regard.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL RANKED FOURTH IN UNITED STATES BY CRITERIA OF PAPERS RANKED FIRST AND SECOND

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, American publishers were recently asked to judge the quality of American newspapers by the criteria of three famous statements of what a newspaper should be. The statements are the creeds of three great newspapermen: Joseph Pulitzer, Adolph S. Ochs, and Thomas Gibson, and they provide widely recognized standards of news coverage, independence, impartiality, courage, and attractiveness. They are also the creeds of two great newspapers, the New York Times and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

In this nationwide poll the Milwaukee Journal was ranked fourth. Last year, in a similar survey, the Journal ranked sixth, and in 1958 it ranked 10th. This march up the rankings attests to the rising esteem in which the Journal is held by those crustiest of critics, the publishers of its fellow newspapers.

The top-ranked newspapers, the New York Times and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, have occupied those positions since the surveys were first conducted. These two papers live under the inspiration of the famous editors whose mottoes served as criteria for the evaluation, and their high rank reflects a long-established tradition of excellence. The third-ranked paper, the Christian Science Monitor, is a national newspaper in a class by itself. The fourth-place ranking of the Journal is, therefore, all the more remarkable, since it has no direct connection with the authors of the well-known newspaper creeds, and is not principally a national newspaper.

The reputation of the Journal has not been carved out by flamboyance. It is not a crusading newspaper in the usual sense. Dedicated to fairness and justice, it seeks to expose wrongdoings, waste, and any attempt to cover up the truth. The Journal is a family newspaper, remarkable equally for its sense of proportion, the wisdom of its comments, the thoroughness of its news coverage, and the excellence of its writing, editing, and production. The record of its contributions to its community is long and honorable. In Milwaukee, the Journal is a trusted newspaper.

I would add—and this is not intended as a comment on the Journal's wisdom—that at no time has the Milwaukee Journal supported me in its editorial columns.

The poll was conducted by Mr. Edward L. Bernays, an advertising executive in New York City, and states that such ratings "encourage the practice of high standards and provide newspapers themselves with yardsticks of performance."

The basis for judgment in the poll are these famous newspapermen's statements:

Joseph Pulitzer, in a statement of principle of the New York World, May 10, 1883:

An institution that should always fight for progress and reform, never tolerate injustice and corruption, always fight demagogs of all parties, never belong to any party, always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy with the poor, always remain devoted to the public welfare, never be satisfied with merely printing news, always be drastically independent, never be afraid to attack wrong, whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty.

Adolph S. Ochs, on assuming control of the New York Times, August 8, 1896:

It will be my earnest aim that the New York Times give the news, all the news, in concise and attractive form, in language that is permissible in good society, and give it early, if not earlier, than it can be learned through any other medium. To give the news impartially, without fear or favor, regardless of party, sect, or interest involved; to make the columns of the New York Times a forum for the consideration of all public questions of public importance, and to that end, to invite intelligent discussion from all shades of opinion.

Thomas Gibson, in a statement of principle of the Rocky Mountain Herald, Denver, Colo., May 1, 1860:

A newspaper untrammeled by sinister influence from any quarter—the advocate of the right and the denouncer of the wrong—an independent vehicle for the free expression of opinions of all candid, honest, and intelligent minds—a medium of free discussion, moral, religious, social, and scientific.

The top-ranked 10 newspapers, based on the survey of the Nation's publishers, are first, the New York Times; second, Post-Dispatch; third, Christian Science Monitor; fourth, Milwaukee-Journal; fifth, Louisville Courier-Journal; sixth, New York Herald Tribune; seventh, Washington Post and Times Herald; eighth, Los Angeles Times; ninth, Chicago Tribune; and 10th, Kansas City Star.

TADEUSZ KOSCIUSZKO (1746–1817)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in our great American Revolution our people fought bravely for freedom and independence. In that fight they were aided by a number of distinguished freedom fighters from Europe. The gallant son of Poland, Tadeusz Kosciuszko, was one of these soldiers of freedom.

Kosciuszko was born into a middle-class family on February 12, 215 years ago. In his early youth he showed an unusual liking for books and study, and his parents did everything in their power to educate him. After he had finished the Royal School in Warsaw, he earned a scholarship to study in France. There he entered the famous Mezieres School, and specialized in artillery and engineering.

While in Paris, Kosciuszko was told of the American Revolution; immediately he resolved to fight for a good cause. He borrowed money from friends, sailed for America, and arrived in Philadelphia in August of 1776. There he applied for military service; he was admitted and charged with the drawing up of plans for fortifying the Delaware. His success in this first assignment earned him a colonel's commission.

From then on, a high place in our Revolutionary War was assured for him. In October of 1783 he was made a brigadier general. Having fought for our cause, he returned to Poland, hoping to carry on the fight for Polish freedom.

Unfortunately all his efforts in behalf of his countrymen were unsuccessful and he ended his gallant career in exile in Switzerland, on October 15, 1817. On the observance of his birthday we honor his memory as a gallant soldier of freedom.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, February 16 was the 43d anniversary of Lithuania's independence, an independence that was lost to Russia in 1940. In Lithuania, this day of independence cannot be observed and it becomes the somber obligation of other freedom-loving people to let their voices be heard; to remind ourselves and the world that the job of obtaining freedom is not complete, nor is the job of retaining freedom ever ended.

On Sunday, yesterday, this 43d anniversary was commemorated in Detroit at a ceremony which served well this purpose. The leading figures in the Lithuanian community of Michigan and Ontario, Canada, organized a well-supported public program which spoke clearly the continuing concern of those Americans for their kin in Lithuania and their devotion to the America which has given opportunity to all of us from every point of the compass.

We must continue to work for, to hope for and to pray that one day the freedom-desiring people of Lithuania will once again join the free world.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, more than 700 years ago the Lithuanian people founded an independent state in northeastern Europe, and for centuries they enjoyed freedom, grandeur, and glory. However, at the end of the 18th century they came under Russian subjugation. But even under the czarist

oppression they did not lose sight of their goals: freedom and independence.

For more than 100 years the Lithuanians waited for the opportunity to regain their liberty. It came with the overthrow of the czarist autocracy in Russia in 1918. On February 16 of that year the Lithuanians proclaimed their national independence and set up their own government. Soon that government was recognized by other sovereign states, and in due time Lithuania was admitted into the League of Nations. For two decades the industrious Lithuanians worked hard to build their war-ravaged country, enjoying the precious freedom that had been denied to them for more than a century.

Unfortunately the last war was the beginning of new misery and misfortune for the Lithuanians. In 1940 their country was annexed to the Soviet Union, and their independence vanished. From then on for over 20 years the unhappy Lithuanians have been suffering under tyrannies, first under Communists, then under the Nazis, and, for the last 17 years, again under the Communists. They have been not only cut off from the free world, but all forms of freedom have been denied to them. While thus driven to work for their taskmasters the Lithuanians are, one and all, devoutly hoping and praying for their delivery from Communist totalitarian tyranny. On the 43d anniversary celebration of their Independence Day I gladly echo their genuine sentiments for freedom and hope that they will soon attain their goal.

COMMEMORATION OF BROTHERHOOD WEEK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Brotherhood Week, which has been commemorated during the past week throughout our Nation, stands as a living reminder of the eternal truth that all men are brothers, and that their true destiny is to dwell with one another in the spirit of fraternity and of harmony. Too often, throughout the history of our Nation, the differing views, attitudes, and practices of men have become walls which isolate and divide. Only by a dynamic and continuing effort to break down those walls of distrust and misunderstanding do we foster the harmony of mind and heart which is the essence of true brotherhood.

In a world where viciously divisive forces would set friend against friend and neighbor against neighbor, to create the enmity on which tyranny breeds, it becomes ever more urgent and vital that we strengthen and expand the great counterforce of the spirit of brotherhood throughout America and the world.

To be our brother's friend is the way of peace. To be our brother's keeper—when he cries to us for help—is the way of charity and of love. These are the directions men must take if they are to walk toward the true meaning of life.

The road to brotherhood is the road to international understanding, and ultimately to the peace for which all peoples yearn.

SURPLUS FOOD FOR STARVING WILDLIFE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, an editorial from the Poughkeepsie Journal calls attention to the serious hardship recent snows have caused to wildlife all over the country. Along the Hudson River this hardship has appeared the more poignant because surplus grain belonging to the Commodity Credit Corporation is stored in vessels nearby on the river. Just a little of this grain could save many starving birds and other wildlife in the Hudson Valley. I am sure the same is true in other parts of the country.

Mr. President, a resolution has been introduced to permit the Secretary of the Interior to authorize the use of some of this grain on the appeal of the Governors of the States involved. The House resolution has been offered by Representative J. ERNEST WHARTON, of New York. A Senate version was offered by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. It was be an act of justice and mercy for the Congress to consider and approve these resolutions promptly so that this grain can be made available while the need still exists this year. But in any case, these resolutions should be approved in time to do some good for the storms of next winter. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point the editorial from the Poughkeepsie Journal.

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

RURAL VIEWPOINT—TONS OF WHEAT GOING TO WASTE, SOME COULD BE USED TO FEED PHEASANTS

Good morning, Sheriff Quinlan. Happy days. Now we're going to suggest a little work for you to do. You'll recall that 3 weeks ago we had a heavy snowstorm. A few days later we had rain, leaving the snow a soggy mass. Then we had severe cold which left the snow almost a solid mass of ice. The earth is really covered with a hard shell which is almost impregnable to the hungry birds.

And they are hungry, too, especially the pheasants, which do not fly long distances in search of food but must depend on picking up small seeds from a limited range. These seeds are now locked up beneath the snow and the pheasants are starving. We've seen more in the last 3 weeks than we saw in all the fall, mostly hens, because the cocks were largely killed during the hunting season. They seem to have been made bold by hunger and are coming out into the open in search of food. A half dozen come into our garden every day to search the sweet corn stalks for the few nubbins which may have been left from the picking. If relief does not come at once we are afraid that they will die in large numbers

Downriver, only some 50 miles away, we are holding a million bushels, more or less, of surplus wheat, scores of ships loaded to the utmost limit with it. This wheat belongs to all of us. We don't want it. We can't use it. Neither have we been able to sell it. We are holding it, together with other surplus food, at an expense which is said to amount to $1 million per day. Let's go to work on it. Let's get some of this wheat released to responsible officials like yourself to be shipped all over the East wherever the need is great. Let us make it available to the hungry birds, and we wouldn't overlook the deer if their need is also great. If this wheat is not used in some way, and it is not being used, the day will surely come when we will dump it into the sea. We cannot hold it forever. It would not remain good forever. It's probably already on the way out insofar as human use is concerned. We hope it won't require a constitutional amendment to break the redtape and make this food available to the only ones which can use it in their present critical emergency, the wild things of the field and forest.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FEDERAL JUDGESHIPS FOR PENNSYLVANIA—RESOLUTION OF PENNSYLVANIA BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted at the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Bar Association held in Philadelphia on January 26–28, 1961. This resolution relates to the need for the creation of additional judgeships for the U.S. district courts of Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, as you know, I am a cosponsor of S. 403, which was introduced by Senator CLARK on January 13, 1961. This bill—S. 403—would create seven additional Federal judgeships in Pennsylvania to cope with the heavy load of additional cases now being brought before the Federal courts. In spite of heroic efforts by judges now sitting in those courts, there is a 3-to-4-year backlog of untried cases. For many a plaintiff this means justice denied because of justice delayed.

Repeatedly, in the past 6 years the Eisenhower administration urged Congress to enact legislation to increase the number of Federal judges. The nonpartisan Judicial Conference has recommended similar action, but the Democratic Party leadership which controlled Congress refused to act.

I do hope that the leadership will now recognize the necessity to create the much-needed judgeships and that the administration will adopt the "fair deal" proposed by the Eisenhower administration for equal political distribution of appointments.

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

Whereas there is a desperate and mounting need for additional judgeships in the U.S. District Courts for the Eastern and the Western Districts of Pennsylvania, respectively, created by the quantity and the complexity of litigation in those courts; and

Whereas special conditions existing in the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania create the need for an additional judgeship in that court at this time; and

Whereas the consequent delay in bringing cases to trial in these courts is causing serious hardships to litigants in cases pending therein; and

Whereas critical conditions of court congestion in these courts have placed such burdens on judges now serving, as seriously to impede the efficient performance of the judicial function: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Pennsylvania Bar Association strongly endorses legislation in the Congress of the United States sponsored by the Judicial Conference of the United

States, providing for the creation of three additional judgeships for the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania; one temporary judgeship for the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, and two additional judgeships of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, with the existing temporary judgeship in that court being converted to a permanent judgeship; and be it further

Resolved, That the judiciary committee of the association shall cooperate with the standing committee on Federal judiciary of the American Bar Association in support of such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the respective chairmen of the Judiciary Committees of the U.S. Senate and of the House of Representatives, to the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives of the United States from Pennsylvania, and to the chairman of the standing committee on Federal judiciary of the American Bar Association.

DEATH OF MEMBERS OF AMERICAN FIGURE SKATING TEAM

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, American figure skating as an organized sport originated in the Greater Boston area nearly 50 years ago. Many of the great stars of this beautiful sport have come from my home State of Massachusetts and its capital.

Last week a plane crash near Brussels, Belgium, took the lives of 73 persons including the 17 members of the American figure-skating team. Six of them were from the Greater Boston area.

In particular the crash killed three American skating stars who had entertained New Englanders for two generations. They were Maribel Vinson Owen, nine times national champion; her older daughter Maribel; and younger daughter Laurence, recent winner of the national championship title who was hoping to gain the world title at Prague.

I know of few disasters as tragic as this involving the death of an entire family, on top of the loss of a nation's entire representation in one sport. The sympathies of the country, I know, are with the relatives and survivors of those lost in this terrible accident.

I think that many of our feelings concerning this terrible crash were well expressed in the editorial "Boston's Loss at Brussels," which appeared in the Boston Globe on February 16 and the editorial "A Tragic Loss," which appeared in the New York Times the same day. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorials printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Boston Globe, Feb. 16, 1961]

BOSTON'S LOSS AT BRUSSELS

The blow to Greater Boston from the air catastrophe near Brussels, Belgium, cannot be exaggerated. Of the 73 who lost their lives, 54 of them Americans, 7 were from this metropolitan area. Since organized American figure skating originated here nearly a half century ago and was long dominated by 2 Bostonians, Mrs. Theresa Weld Blanchard and Nat Niles, it is not surprising that the team of 17 wiped out by this disaster included 6 from Greater Boston.

Appalling is the blow suffered by a distinguished family associated with figure skating for generations. Among the lost were Mrs. Maribel Vinson Owen, nine times national champion; her older daughter Maribel, a member of the team; and her younger daughter, 16-year-old Laurence, who had just won the national championship and hoped to gain at Prague the world title her mother never attained.

These, and the others who died are people the community will miss. Every sympathy is extended their relatives.

Air travel is of much assistance to sport; it enables east and west coast clubs to play in the same leagues. Statistics show it to be safer than automobile travel, but its accidents sometimes produce stupefying results. A failure on takeoff wiped out the California Polytechnic Institute football team last fall, but the plane involved had been chartered. Since the aircraft in the Brussels disaster was Belgian, the record of this country's scheduled air lines in the safe handling of sport travel remains intact.

The catastrophe near Brussels will spur already intense efforts to bring ground and traffic control abreast of the jet age, now in only its third year on commercial lines. This country has made greater progress than European nations in meeting this problem, but the need for further improvement here is widely recognized. The record indicates that such new needs are quickly filled.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 16, 1961]

A TRAGIC LOSS

The death of 73 persons in an airplane crash at Brussels has shocked the world. Every person who died left a void in hearts somewhere. There is a special feeling of loss and grief over the young athletes, and at the New York Times because of the death of Mrs. Maribel Vinson Owen, former writer of women's sports for the Times. Mrs. Owen and her two daughters and the other members of the U.S. figure-skating team who perished were all skaters in the championship class. There is no sport more graceful, and the thousands who have been thrilled by such skill can only pause in sadness to think of such beauty brought to a sudden stop.

THE YEAR OF THE PACIFIC

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the Honolulu Advertiser, in its issue of January 31, included its fifth annual progress edition, detailing the progress made by the Nation's 50th and newest State during the past year. As Hawaii enters this promising new year, the newspaper has very appropriately named 1961 the Year of the Pacific.

The Advertiser has very thoughtfully sent me extra copies of this issue which I plan to send to the office of each of my colleagues. I hope you will find it interesting and encouraging reading.

FEDERAL SUPPORT OF EDUCATION URGED BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY SHOULD BE ENACTED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as a member of the Education Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee who has had the privilege of giving detailed study to the need for strengthening our national education effort, I urge strong support of the basic aid to education program outlined by President Kennedy in his message to Congress today.

President Kennedy said:

The human mind is our fundamental resource.

We might correctly add that the brainpower of Americans that is not developed to full potential constitutes a tragic waste of our Nation's, and each individual's most valuable natural resource.

In patterning his public school assistance program after S. 8, the bill which passed the Senate last year, the President has followed a sound approach which will be fair to schoolchildren in all the 50 States. It is noteworthy that the proposal retains the stipulation that State or local school boards have an option on whether the national funds will be utilized for classroom construction or teacher pay increases, or both.

Under the proposed formula, a total of $142 million in national assistance would be extended to improving educational opportunities of Texas schoolchildren over the next 3 years. It provides $21.40 per student in average daily attendance for a total of $40.2 million the first year; $24.38 per student for a total of $47.3 million the second year, and $27.19 per student for a total of $54.4 million the third year.

A key point of the President's message, which the legislature of my own State of Texas and all other legislatures should heed was:

Each State will be expected to maintain its own effort or contribution; and every State whose effort is below the national average will be expected to increase that proportion of its income which is devoted to public elementary and secondary education.

Any areas of difference of opinion that I find with the President's program principally stem from my belief that an even greater effort of national assistance is required. Where the President called for a study of the National Vocational Education Act with a view toward its modernization, I believe it is evident that enactment of a cold-war veterans GI education bill would be a strong, sound step toward meeting the tremendous and growing needs for vocational training for millions of young Americans. All of us may have some different or additional ideas on how or where our educational effort must be strengthened.

But surely none of us can be in disagreement with the candid, powerful, 14-word opening sentence of President Kennedy's message:

Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education.

We must work together at local, State, and National levels with that knowledge foremost in our minds.

LAWFUL EXPENDITURES FOR LEGISLATIVE PURPOSES TO BE ALLOWED AS LEGITIMATE BUSINESS EXPENSE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on January 17, I introduced a bill providing that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as legitimate business expense.

The senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] has joined me in the sponsorship of this measure.

Legislation identical to this was introduced in the House of Representatives last year by Congressman HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana. The House Committee on Ways and Means, after consideration of this, reported a bill which varied somewhat from the original bill. Because of adjournment last year, no final action was taken on this measure.

This year Congressman BOGGS and I have introduced legislation in the House and Senate to again permit freedom of petition by various groups with an interest in legislation coming before Congress.

Congressman BOGGS' bill was identical to the bill reported last year by the House Committee on Ways and Means. My bill was identical to the bill I introduced last year and the bill originally considered by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Although the two bills before the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee are different, I would like to stress that this should indicate no disagreement as to the necessity for legislative action. The bill which I have introduced indicates that there is a real interest in the Senate in getting action on this matter this year.

I am hopeful that the House will act on this early. I want to assure all of those interested in this legislation that the difference in the House and Senate bills in no way affects my support of any measure which the House may approve. I know that the House and Senate will be able to resolve any differences which may arise.

TRANSPORTATION ON CANADIAN VESSELS IN ALASKA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consulting with the minority leader and other Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 47, Senate bill 707.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 707) to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that none of the three bills on the calendar are controversial, but there are a number of Members of the Senate who wish to comment on S. 610, the bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board.

That bill will be brought up at the conclusion of the morning hour and will be made the pending business.

Does the Senator from Washington, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, wish to make any statement on Senate bill 707?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will put into the RECORD extracts from the report on both bills. The bills were reported by the committee unanimously.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an explanation of the bill from the report printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would permit Canadian vessels to provide passenger service between ports in southeastern Alaska, and passenger and freight service between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska and in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of such transportation, until such time as the Secretary of Commerce determines that U.S.-flag service, presently lacking, is available to provide such transportation.

Under statutes of long standing only vessels of U.S. registry are permitted to engage in the coastal and intercoastal trades.

However, in recent years, because of increased vessel operating costs, and because of the small and seasonally fluctuating population in the area in question, U.S.-flag vessels have found such service uneconomic to the point where there is now no regular U.S.-flag service provided, and none in prospect. Without the modicum of service provided by the Canadian vessels, many of the ports thus served would be almost completely isolated.

For the past decade or more, exemption from the coastwise restrictions for service in this area of Alaska by Canadian vessels has been provided on an annual basis, to meet objections raised by shipping groups. However, inasmuch as the Secretary of Commerce would be empowered by the bill to stay the exemption at any time if he should find that U.S.-flag service is available, your committee feels that the protection historically given U.S.-flag vessels in the domestic trades is fully retained, and that there no longer is a necessity for placing a definite time limit on the authority for service to the area by Canadian vessels. Concurrence in this position has been announced by one of the major shipping groups which formerly insisted upon the annual exemption, and by the Comptroller General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

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

The bill (S. 707) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of law of the United States restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from any port in the United States to another port of the United States, passengers may be transported on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and passengers and merchandise may be transported on Canadian vessels between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation until the Secretary of Commerce determines that United States-flag service is available to provide such transportation.

SUSPENSION OF TARIFF SCHEDULES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 48, Senate bill 804.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 804) to amend the act of March 3, 1933, relating to the length of time by which the Federal Maritime Board may suspend tariff schedules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished chairman of the committee will put in the RECORD the purpose of the bill as stated in the report. I think the bill was reported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an extract from the report printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Section 3 of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1426), provides that—

"Whenever there shall be filed with the board any schedule stating a new individual or joint rate, fare, or charge, or any new individual or joint classification, or any new individual or joint regulation or practice affecting any rate, fare, or charge, the board shall have * * * authority * * * to enter upon a hearing concerning the lawfulness of such rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice * * *. Pending such hearing and the decision thereon the board * * * may * * * suspend the operation of such schedule and defer the use of such rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice, but not for a longer period than four months beyond the time when it would otherwise go into effect."

This bill would extend to 7 months the period of time during which the Board may order suspension, and may defer the use of the proposed rate, fare, etc., on the ground that such tariffs and other considerations are of such complexity as to make it impossible at times to consider fully and to render a considered decision on the matter or matters involved, within the 4-month period presently established. Enactment would put the permitted suspension period in the maritime field on the same time basis as is now established by statute for the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to proposed water, rail, and truck rates, etc., and for the Federal Aviation Agency in similar proceedings affecting regulation of air transport.

No objection to the bill has been received by the committee.

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

The bill (S. 804) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "The Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933," approved March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1426), as amended by the Act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 965) and the Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1182), is amended by striking out "four" where it appears in the third section and by inserting "seven" in lieu thereof.

TALKING THE COUNTRY INTO A RECESSION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when the President of the United States delivered his state of the Union message and his economic message, I indicated at the time that I thought the case was rather overstated and overdrawn. Since that time there has been a good deal of talk with respect to the so-called recession in the country, and I made the observation last week that there is such a thing as talking the country into a state of recession.

I noted, therefore, on February 17, in the Washington Post, an article on the financial page written by Mr. A. J. Livingston. I have followed his statements and articles for quite some time, and I must say that he writes in a reasoned way and a very objective manner. The title of the article is "Kennedy's Crying Towel Can Impair Confidence."

The first line of the article states:

I never dreamed till now that it might be possible to talk a great nation, such as the United States, into a depression.

I will let the rest of the article speak for itself, and also an article by Mr. Bernard D. Nossiter, "First Hints That Slump Has Hit Bottom Appear."

In connection therewith, I have asked the Library of Congress to assemble figures from 1939 to 1960, and partially 1961, on gross national product, civilian employment, Government purchases of goods and services, individual income-tax receipts, median family income, labor income, average gross hourly earnings in all manufacturing, business expenditures for new plant and equipment, and per capita consumer expenditures.

Mr. President, I think this table will prove very interesting, and I ask unanimous consent that both articles and the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

KENNEDY'S CRYING TOWEL CAN IMPAIR CONFIDENCE

(By J. A. Livingston)

I never dreamed till now that it might be possible to talk a great nation, such as the United States, into a depression.

Even now, I don't really think it. But I never reckoned with President Kennedy's crying towel.

I have always considered Americans too sensible, too observant, and too aware of their own well-being to be upset or panicked by public pronouncements, whether they came from: 1. Big men of big business. 2. Big men of big unions. 3. Big men of big government, including Senators, Congressmen, and members of the Cabinet.

I know you can't talk people out of bad times. President Hoover, leading Wall Street bankers, and John D. Rockefeller, Sr., tried that during the 1929 crash. To no avail.

HUMPHREY WARNING

Nor is it easy to talk prosperity down the drain. When George M. Humphrey was Secretary of the Treasury under President Eisenhower, he issued this warning during the Fulbright committee stock market inquiry in 1955:

"There is one word of caution that I want to leave with [the committee]. Confidence or lack of it has more to do with the conduct of investors, businessmen, and the great mass of people generally than any single thing * * *

"Confidence is a subtle thing. It is built slowly and can be easily and quickly shaken. A crowd leaving a theater at the close of a play will walk out in an orderly fashion, but if as the curtain goes down someone calls "Fire" terror can reign and great injury can result.

Confidence was not disturbed by the Fulbright hearings. Business was too good. People were too well off. Confidence was too deeply set in the economy.

NO ORDINARY MAN

But when confidence stops growing, when an economic uptrend turns into a downtrend, as at present, confidence can be seriously impaired—and with it, business—by a President who hammers away in headlines and over TV and radio on the sad state of the economy.

The President is not a businessman with autos or appliances to sell, not a labor leader with higher wages or unemployment benefits to get, not a tradesman with bills to pay. He's above the petty, parochial, and partisan. What he says is accepted by millions of Americans at face value. He's no ordinary man.

Surely, if President Kennedy wants to mobilize public opinion to force Congress to act, he can find some other method than by crying, "Crisis!" He has said twice that this is a time for "concern but not for panic." Why not let it go at that?

In his state of the Union message, he said conditions would get worse before they got better. In a special message on the economy, he set forth a detailed program.

RANK MORBIDITY

Since, at every press conference and in speeches, he has emphasized how bad conditions are. Disarming candor can become rank morbidity.

The President wisely accelerated road-building spending. He has speeded up defense and other orders. He has asked Congress for extended unemployment benefits. He has spurred food relief. He has encouraged low interest rates to stimulate State and local government public works projects. He promises tax incentives. All to the good.

He's caught, we're all of us caught, in the dreary months of January, February, March. The economy is in winter dormancy. We won't know till April (and President Kennedy has so said himself) how bad or unbad conditions are. We won't know till then how much recuperative power the economy has.

AGAINST ANY GAG

I've always disputed businessmen who said that publication of bad news—layoffs, lower profits, unemployment statistics—hurt business. I always argued that people are too sensible to be fooled by news that doesn't apply to them. They rely on their own judgment. They can't be talked into despair.

I'm not suggesting that we push unemployment under the bed, merely that the President stop making a career of it.

I've been optimistic on an early economic recovery. I still am. But I must confess the President's iteration is getting me down.

FIRST HINTS THAT SLUMP HAS HIT BOTTOM APPEAR

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

The first faint signs that the recession may be hitting bottom have begun to appear. New Government figures issued yesterday showed the economy was still slipping, but at a somewhat slower pace.

Such key measures as industrial production and incomes both fell again last month. But the drop was smaller than in December and November.

At the same time, the Kennedy administration announced several small steps to pump funds into the economy faster.

The President wired the 50 State Governors that he had freed $1.1 billion for highways and schools that normally would not be released until April. Mr. Kennedy urged the Governors to speed up projects using these funds as well as their own local public works programs. The funds released include $734 million for the Federal-State highway system and $350 million largely for schools that are overcrowded because they serve Government installations.

The Veterans' Administration said it would mail out $258.5 million in GI life insurance dividends by the end of March. Earlier, the VA had aimed at distributing the checks by June 30.

The Small Business Administration liberalized its standards so that more small firms in areas of high unemployment could get preference on Government contracts.

The President also set up a Cabinet committee headed by Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges to study how the chronically troubled textile industry can meet competition of imports from Japan and other countries.

HARBINGER OF UPTURN

Economists are reluctant to read much significance in 1 month's statistics, but several thought the newest measurements were a harbinger of the slump's bottom. Typically, when a complex economy changes direction, the rate of decline (or advance) is first slowed. Some experts predicted flatly that February would mark the low point of the latest recession. Even if they are right, business could bump along in this valley for months. Unemployment will certainly remain high for more months after the recovery actually begins.

Here's what the latest measurements showed:

Industrial production: Output of mills, mines and utilities fell 1.1 points in January on the Federal Reserve Board's index. The decline in November was 1.7 and in December, 1.4. After rounding, the index for January was 102 which means production was only 2 percent above the 1957 level.

Industrial production has now fallen for 6 straight months. But it has dropped only about 7 percent during this stretch, much less than in the 1958 slump.

A reduction of 20 percent in auto production was the biggest drag in January. There were small cutbacks in most soft goods industries, but a few hard goods lines, notably steel, increased production slightly. The steel advance has continued into February.

Since sales to retail customers have continued to fall, what all this may add up to is a change in business inventory policy.

The corporations may be reducing or even ending the cuts in their goods on hand.

If this is so, it would fit the estimates of some of the most important economists in the Government.

Personal income: Incomes in January were earned at a yearly rate of $406.3 billion, down only $600 million. The December drop was $2.1 billion and in November, $900 million.

The relatively small drop in January wouldn't mean much if incomes had been bolstered by a large increase in unemployment benefits. But these payments apparently had little to do with the results.

The key portion of incomes—wage and salary payments—fell only $400 million last month to a yearly rate of $271 billion. And this drop was considerably smaller than the $2.2 billion drop in December and that of $1.2 billion in November.

Other new figures on housing and freight movements also showed the recession wasn't worsening. Applications last month for Veterans' Administration mortgage guarantees on new homes—a clue of sorts to new building—fell about as much as they usually do in January. The number of freight cars loaded in the week ended February 11 were a sixth less than in the same week last year. But this lag has been about the same for the 4 earlier weeks.

All these less unpleasant results were foreshadowed in the job figures issued last week. The excitement over the big unemployment total of 5.4 million for January obscured the key data. After allowing for the usual seasonal changes, employment actually improved. The number of persons on payrolls outside of farming increased by 120,000 to 52.6 million. However, no one is throwing his hat in the air over this because it was due to an inexplicable strengthening in retail jobs.

Certain specified economic statistics, 1939–60

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951
(1) Total gross national product (billions of dollars)	$91.1	$100.6	$125.8	$159.1	$192.5	$211.4	$213.6	$210.7	$234.3	$259.4	$258.1	$284.6	$329.0
(2) Civilian employment (millions of persons)	55.2	55.6	55.9	56.4	55.5	54.6	53.9	57.5	60.2	61.4	62.1	63.1	62.9
(3) Government purchases of goods and services (billions of dollars)	$13.3	$14.1	$24.8	$59.7	$88.6	$96.5	$82.9	$30.5	$28.4	$34.5	$40.2	$39.0	$60.5
(4) Individual income tax receipts (billions of dollars)	$0.89	$1.4	$3.8	$8.8	$14.4	$16.2	$17.0	$16.2	$17.8	$19.3	$15.5	$15.7	$21.6
(5) Median family income						$2,533	$2,621		$3,033	$3,190	$3,107	$3,319	$3,714
(6) Labor income (billions of dollars)	$72.9	$78.7	$97.3	$123.5	$151.4	$165.7	$171.2	$179.3	$191.6	$210.4	$208.3	$228.5	$256.7
(7) Average gross hourly earnings in all manufacturing	$0.63	$0.66	$0.73	$0.85	$0.96	$1.02	$1.02	$1.09	$1.24	$1.35	$1.40	$1.46	$1.59
(8) Business expenditures for new plant and equipment (billions of dollars)	$5.5						$8.7	$14.8	$20.6	$22.1	$19.3	$20.6	$25.6
(9) Per capita consumer expenditures	$516	$544	$614	$665	$735	$793	$870	$1,040	$1,148	$1,216	$1,214	$1,286	$1,359

	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
(1) Total gross national product (billions of dollars)	$347.0	$365.4	$363.1	$397.5	$419.2	$442.8	$444.2	$482.1	[1] $503.1		
(2) Civilian employment (millions of persons)	63.0	63.8	64.5	65.8	67.5	67.9	68.6	69.4	70.6		
(3) Government purchases of goods and services (billions of dollars)	$76.0	$82.8	$75.3	$75.6	$79.0	$86.5	$93.5	$97.1	$99.6		
(4) Individual income tax receipts (billions of dollars)	$27.9	$30.1	$29.5	$28.7	$32.2	$35.6	$34.7	$36.7	$40.7	[2] $43.3	[2] $45.5
(5) Median family income	$3,889	$4,233	$4,167	$4,420	$4,787	$4,978	$5,095	$5,417			
(6) Labor income (billions of dollars)	$273.1	$288.3	$289.8	$310.2	$332.9	$351.4	$360.3	$383.3	$404.2		
(7) Average gross hourly earnings in all manufacturing	$1.67	$1.77	$1.81	$1.88	$1.98	$2.07	$2.13	$2.22	[1] $2.29		
(8) Business expenditures for new plant and equipment (billions of dollars)	$26.5	$28.3	$26.8	$28.7	$35.1	$37.0	$30.5	$32.5	$35.7		
(9) Per capita consumer expenditures	$1,400	$1,457	$1,381	$1,555	$1,605	$1,663	$1,683	$1,772			

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Estimated.

Sources: U.S. Departments of Commerce, Labor, and Treasury, Bureau of the Budget, Securities and Exchange Commission.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT HEARINGS ON RESIDUAL FUEL OIL

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this morning the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, opened hearings on the principal purpose of our policy with regard to residual fuel imports.

I compliment the Secretary because the timeliness of the hearing reflects the desire of this administration to thoroughly explore the pros and cons of this problem, which so vitally concerns our well-being.

I appeared at the hearing at the request of and as the spokesman for all of our New England Senators, and presented a statement in our behalf, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE BEFORE THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT HEARINGS ON RESIDUAL FUEL OIL, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1961

Mr. Secretary, we in New England deeply appreciate the opportunity which you have afforded us to present to you our arguments with respect to mandatory quotas on the imports of residual fuel oil.

I am here today to speak for the consumer. New England produces no fuel supply of its own. It is entirely dependent on fuel from other regions of the country and from abroad. As a heavy manufacturing area and as a densely populated region, we require vast quantities of fuel—to power our industries and to heat our homes.

Thus, you can understand, Mr. Secretary, our immense concern with Government policies as they affect the supply and price of this most basic element of our economy.

Fuel costs are already higher in New England than in any other region in the United States—over 50 percent in excess of the national average. These higher costs are borne by the New England consumer and by New England manufacturers who must compete in national markets.

The New England Senators have been deeply concerned with the effect of residual oil import restrictions.

Just a few weeks ago we expressed our grave concern in a joint letter to the President, a copy of which I ask be introduced into the record.

At this point, Mr. Secretary, permit me to express my deep appreciation of the heartwarming response, the salutary though temporary relief granted in your order of last Friday by expanding the quota by 100,000 barrels of oil per day. The severity of our New England winter has added urgency to what we consider to be a continuing emergency. The respite for this quarter—and indeed it is only for this quarter—merely emphasizes our permanent problem. It points up very graphically this artificial, arbitrary imposition of quotas on a necessity of life, an essential of community well-being, and an absolute must of industrial existence in our New England area.

It is not enough in urgent emergency to adjust these restrictions; it is imperative in equity and in the public interest to remove them entirely.

Let me point out, Mr. Secretary, what the effect of these residual import restrictions has been on New England. It has been estimated that price increases caused by these restrictions cost the New England States last year over $10 million.

We know of specific instances where major electric utilities have had to pay millions of dollars in increased costs, passing these along to the consumer by way of increased rates.

We know of industries which have absorbed huge increases in their annual fuel bills which have increased the cost of their end product to the consumer. We know of many public institutions—hospitals and schools—which have been burdened with substantial cost increases. It is the consumer who is thus paying for these restrictions.

Now let us examine the justification for these quota restrictions. Unlike almost any other trade restriction, say, for example, on textiles or fisheries, these quotas are not designed to help the domestic oil producing industry. These are not quotas to eliminate low cost foreign competition since, as a matter of fact, the domestic oil producers are unable to supply the domestic demand for residual fuel oil.

The yield of domestic residual fuel oil per barrel of refined domestic crude oil has been steadily declining. In 1930 it amounted to 31 percent of total refinery output; in 1950, 20 percent, and currently it stands at approximately 10 percent.

Domestic production of residual fuel oil is 26 percent less today than it was 10 years ago, but this is not because of competition from imported residual fuel oil.

Every single producer of fuel oil and every single major fuel oil company agrees that imports of residual are no threat to the domestic residual fuel oil industry.

The reason for the decline in domestic residual production is the improvement in domestic refining facilities. As the refining process becomes more efficient and domestic refineries are able to produce more gasoline, kerosene, diesel, and light, heating oils from each barrel of crude their output of residual declines, and it is in the economic interest of domestic producers to continue to produce greater quantities of higher cost products from every barrel of crude. There is every economic incentive, therefore, to reduce the output of domestic residual oil.

The demand domestically for residual fuel, therefore, has little if any effect upon domestic production. Domestic supply is determined by the market for other products rather than by the market for residual fuel.

Imports, therefore, of residual fuel only fill the gap—a growing gap—between domestic demand and available domestic supply.

So, it is perfectly clear that residual import restrictions are not calculated to help domestic oil producers. And if all imports of residual oil were eliminated tomorrow, the domestic production of residual fuel oil would increase not one whit.

It might be thought that restrictive quotas on residual oil imports would boost employment in our coal mining areas. It is a myth to look to this source for more coal mining jobs. If coal were to take over all the markets now being supplied by imported residual fuel, the increase would be absorbed mechanically by new automatic equipment. Technological advances in coal production have been tremendous. Manpowerwise, no more than a handful of miners would be put to work. We are deeply and sincerely concerned with the unemployment plight of the mining areas—just as we are deeply concerned with our own. We desire that a healthy economy be restored everywhere. But the restoration must be practical, plausible, and equitable, and cannot be accomplished by forcing the oil users of New England to convert to coal.

Therefore, Mr. Secretary, I maintain that these quotas do more harm than they do good. They are arbitrary and discriminatory, and have no economic justification. They can help neither the oil producer nor the coal miner, and are grossly discriminatory in that the entire burden is borne on the east coast and most heavily in New England.

Practically all residual oil imports consumed in the United States are consumed on the east coast. Our consumers suffer the full share of this burden.

I have said that it is the consumer who pays the bill. This is true, but it also over-simplifies the problem. For, in addition, these quotas destroy any opportunity for economic growth in the industrial areas of New England.

We have many chronically distressed communities with a severe and persistent labor surplus in New England. Here we are fighting now to enact a depressed areas bill whereby the Government will assist us in spurring new industrial growth in these communities. What justification can there be for the Government to expend vast sums of money on the one hand to create jobs in these distressed areas and, in the same breath, perpetuate a program which effectively stifles economic growth and denies new job opportunities in these same distressed areas?

These import quotas make it impossible for any new industry or any existing industry that wishes to expand to predict with any assurance a readily available supply of residual oil at competitive prices. Industry in New England requires vast quantities of residual oil for industrial heating and power. How can we expect any new industry to locate in New England or to expand in New England without the assurance that not only will this basic commodity be available, but that it will be available at a reasonable cost?

The way the quota system has worked out, certain distributors and jobbers are allocated the entire supply of residual fuel oil. They must protect and supply first their present customers. And it is difficult—well nigh impossible—for them to make any commitments to a new customer.

Lacking available residual fuel oil, an industry planning to locate or expand in New England must, therefore, look to another source of energy and heat. If it chooses coal, certainly it will not locate in New England. Such a substantial proportion of the cost of coal in New England is attributable to freight costs that any manufacturer would be foolish to adopt coal for his operations in New England. He would locate rather in a region close to the coal producing areas. We don't mind this kind of competition and we expect it, but we want it to be fair competition.

Manufacturers in other areas have advantages in being located near the source of supply in the case of coal. If residual imports were eliminated in New England the competition would be grossly unfair.

We ask only this, Mr. Secretary: That we not be discriminated against by a quota system, the entire burden of which is borne on the east coast and for which the heaviest price is paid in our New England region.

We ask only that we be given an opportunity to compete fairly and openly and that our Government, by its policies, does not prevent us from receiving an adequate supply of fuel energy which we need at reasonable cost.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
February 7, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Knowing of your deep and longstanding interest in the question of mandatory oil imports restrictions, we wish to bring to your attention certain facts about the effect of this program of grave concern to New England.

As you well know, New England is a fuel-consuming region, producing no fuel supply of its own. The availability of adequate supplies of fuel at reasonable prices from a competitive market is thus of immense importance, not only to the New England consumer, but to our substantial manufacturing industry—indeed to our entire industrial complex.

The restrictions imposed in 1959 have in effect curtailed the supply of residual oil into the New England States with severe economic consequences. The added cost to New England during this year has been conservatively estimated at $10 million. Our electric utility industry demands huge quantities of residual fuel; increased costs to them are reflected in increased electric rates. Increased costs to the manufacturer, moreover, weaken our competitive position.

We firmly believe that the mandatory quotas are not only unjustified from a regional point of view, but cannot be justified from a national point of view. Domestic refineries each year become more efficient and, as a result, yield a smaller percentage of residual. Domestic refineries simply cannot meet the demand for residual oil in New England nor would it be economical for them to do so, since residual oil is not an end product in itself. Domestic supply is governed not by the demand for residual, but rather by the market and demand for other products, notably refined fuels. Thus, the restrictions on residual oil do not aid the domestic oil-producing industries which is the sole announced objective of the import restrictions.

The only effect of the residual restrictions is to reduce the overall supply available and hence to inflate its cost to the user. These restrictions have, moreover, created an unfortunate marketing situation whereby certain importers in effect control the distribution. It is impossible under these circumstances to obtain open competition.

We are aware that proponents of the mandatory restrictions argue that this program is necessary from a national security viewpoint—that the restrictions in effect encourage the domestic oil-producing industry to continue necessary exploration. Whether or not this argument is sustainable with respect to crude oil restrictions, it is certainly not applicable to residual oil restrictions. It is difficult for us to understand how the national security interest is served by a program which in effect requires us to exhaust our own supply, thereby hastening the day when we are even more dependent on foreign sources.

We appreciate that you are familiar with this problem and with the effect of this program on the American consumer. We appreciate that you are particularly aware of the impact of this program on regions like New England, wholly dependent on an adequate supply of fuel from abroad or from other areas of the country.

We therefore urge you to reevaluate the mandatory oil import quota program—to consider its effect upon our region—to consider its effect on competition in the supply and distribution of fuel—to consider its wisdom as a national security measure. We sincerely hope that you will agree with us that restrictions should be removed—or at least liberalized—with respect to residual oil imports.

Respectfully yours,

STYLES BRIDGES, GEORGE D. AIKEN, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, JOHN O. PASTORE, PRESCOTT BUSH, NORRIS COTTON, EDMUND S. MUSKIE, WINSTON L. PROUTY, THOMAS J. DODD, BENJAMIN A. SMITH II, CLAIBORNE PELL.

COURT SYSTEM ADOPTS SOUND RECORDING

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, today marks the first anniversary of the court system of the State of Alaska.

The supreme court of the new State came into being in the autumn of 1959, but it was not until February 20, 1960, that the superior courts were set up and began to operate.

Before statehood, the Alaska judicial system was altogether unique in American history. There were four Federal judges, one for each of the judicial divisions. The district court of Alaska was not a Federal constitutional court. The judges served for 4 years under appointment of the President. By act of Congress, the Federal courts were empowered to hear and decide cases originating under Federal law. There was no subordinate court system at all, except that supplied by U.S. commissioners and magistrates in the incorporated municipalities. The Alaska constitution provided for establishment of a State supreme court and a superior court.

When Chief Justice Buell A. Nesbett, newly appointed to the Alaska Supreme Court, began to make the complex administrative arrangements necessary before a very considerable judicial establishment could be created, he was confronted by a shortage of trained court

reporters in Alaska. This shortage had been apparent even under the old system, and the problem seemed almost incapable of solution, except possibly at a cost which would have been almost astronomical. Even before territorial days had ended, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, at the direction of the Judicial Conference, had been making inquiries into the feasibility of installing electronic sound recording devices in the district courts throughout the Nation. Their studies were reasonably far advanced. When Chief Justice Nesbett came to Washington to consult with officials of the Administrative Office he consulted with Mr. Olney and others, and as a result of those consultations and by reason later of approval by a majority of the Alaska Supreme Court, it was decided to test out the electronic system for recording in the new courts.

How that has worked out, its advantages and its drawbacks, are set forth in a report issued this very day by Mr. Warren Olney III, Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. That report, in my opinion, has more than local interest. Mr. Olney traveled to Alaska last fall and during his stay there made it his business to conduct a thorough-going inquiry into the electronic operation. What he discovered, what others have found, is objectively set forth in this report, and I ask unanimous consent to include it with my remarks.

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

REPORT ON ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING IN THE TRIAL COURTS OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

GENERAL

The equipment being used in the Alaska court system was developed by the Soundscriber Co. of New Haven, Conn., based upon studies and experiments made at the request of and in conjunction with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. In this activity the Administrative Office was acting at the direction of the Judicial Conference of the United States and under the supervision of a subcommittee of the Judicial Conference Committees on Court Administration and Supporting Personnel, of which subcommittee U.S. District Judge William C. Mathes is Chairman. The subcommittee was appointed in January 1958, in response to the chronic complaints of representatives of the Federal Court Reporters Association, and was directed to study:

1. The practicality of continuing the use of shorthand, stenotype, and other conventional systems of reporting with only those changes required to improve its efficiency and adequacy, and to provide fair and equitable compensation for the reporters.

2. The practicality of continuing the use of shorthand, stenotype, and other conventional systems of reporting, but eliminating fees as a basis of compensation, and making reporters full-time, salaried Government employees with transcript fees covered into the Treasury to defray the cost of the system at least in part.

3. The practicality of electronic recording of court proceedings by salaried Government employees in the clerk's office.

The subcommittee caused extensive studies to be made and has submitted detailed reports on all three assignments.

Even prior to the appointment of the subcommittee in 1958, there had been some studies and experiments with electronic recording of court proceedings carried on at the instigation of the Judicial Conference, and these were reviewed by Judge Mathes' subcommittee. With respect to the experiments, it was ascertained that none had been successful up to that time. But it appeared that all of these earlier experiments had had the same basic weaknesses:

1. The machine used in each experiment was one or another of the makes of standard office dictating equipment used singly or in combination.

2. The microphones used were of the comparatively inefficient type used for office dictating equipment.

3. The experimental equipment was assembled and tested without modification and without the advice and assistance of professional electronics and acoustics engineers.

In view of this past experience, the administrative office of the U.S. courts, at the request of the subcommittee, made inquiry from as many manufacturers as possible to ascertain whether any of them were already manufacturing a machine which with competent advice might be modified to meet the special requirements of recording court proceedings.

The Soundscriber Co. of New Haven, Conn., responded that it was already manufacturing an electronic magnetic recorder with a 24-hour tape for use in airport control towers and in airplanes of the Strategic Air Command which, in the opinion of their engineers, was capable of modification for court use. Soundscriber was the only company willing to employ its engineers in making modifications and experiments to develop a machine for court reporting.

After many modifications in the equipment and a number of experiments, the members of the subcommittee came to the unanimous conclusion that electronic recording of court proceedings was feasible and practical and that accurate transcripts could be produced more promptly and with far less cost to the litigants than by any other system yet devised. Consequently, in August 1959, the subcommittee recommended quite independently of its conclusions with respect to the compensation of the court reporters then in Federal service, "that the Administrative Office be instructed, wherever possible and agreeable to the judges concerned, to supply electronic recording systems for use in the U.S. district courts whenever a vacancy occurs in the office of the existing court reporter."

The subcommittee's recommendation received the unanimous endorsement of the Judicial Conference Committees on Supporting Personnel and Court Administration and the recommendation was adopted by the Judicial Conference of the United States at its meeting in September 1959.

In July 1960, upon instructions from the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts distributed to all judges, clerks, and court reporters in the Federal system a report, entitled "The Court Reporting System in the U.S. District Courts—1960." This report had not been adopted by the Judicial Conference or the Administrative Office, but was a report of a survey of the court reporting system in the Federal courts made by two management analysts of the Bureau of the Budget at the request of the Director of the Administrative Office. It was distributed primarily for the information and consideration of all of those concerned with reporting in the Federal judicial system.

In part II of their report, which is headed "Conclusions and Recommendations," Mr. Charles Parker, Jr., and Mr. Norman R. Tharp, the authors of the report, included a discussion of electronic sound recording which they recommended for eventual and gradual adoption in the Federal trial courts (pp. 63–73 of the report). The report described how an electronic sound recording system might be installed and might be operated. It included a discussion of such matters as identification of speakers, conduct of the proceedings, daily copy, reading back from the record, supervision by the clerk, preparation of transcript for appeal, charges for transcript, and other practical aspects of the proposed system.

The discussion and, indeed, the conclusions and recommendations of the authors with respect to electronic sound recording were based entirely on the brief and fragmentary experiments conducted by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts under the aegis of Judge Mathes' subcommittee. At the time of preparing their report the authors were not able to point to any trial court where electronic sound recoording was in regular use. The court system of the State of Alaska was not established until after Messrs. Parker and Tharp had completed their survey and Alaska was not one of the States included in their studies.

The adoption by the Judicial Conference of the United States of the resolution instructing the Administrative Office to supply electronic recording systems for judges who desired them and the distribution of the Parker-Tharp report has brought response from court reporters, Federal judges, and others. Much of this response consists of rather heatedly expressed arguments as to why electronic sound recording of court proceedings is impractical and undesirable. While most of the judges were careful to limit themselves in their letters to discussing the problems of their own courts, the arguments which they advanced as to why sound recording would not work would clearly apply to electronic sound recording in any court. Of course the authors of these communications, like Messrs. Barker and Tharp, did not have the benefit of knowing what actual experience would show in a court system which relies exclusively on electronic sound recording.

While these discussions, which were necessarily hypothetical in nature, were going on, an important body of actual experience in electronic sound recording was accumulating in the Alaska court system.

The Alaska court system became operative following Presidential proclamation on February 20, 1960. From the beginning, it relied exclusively upon electronic sound recording for reporting trial proceedings. By October 1960 the total experience of the Alaskan courts seemed sufficiently large and long to warrant observing it in operation and evaluating the accumulated experience.

For this purpose the author of this report went to Alaska to see the system of court reporting in operation and to learn as much as possible from the judges, clerks, and members of the bar as to how the system was working out.

WHY THE ALASKA COURT SYSTEM ADOPTED ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE TRIAL COURTS

The Alaska court system did not adopt electronic sound recording because it was novel, progressive, or because its judges were gadget-minded. Electronic sound recording was adopted because there was no other satisfactory alternative.

During the territorial regime, Alaska was served with a U.S. district court with four judges and divisions. Each judge held court mostly in the principal city of his division, that is, Juneau, Nome, Anchorage, and Fairbanks. Proceedings in these courts were reported by court reporters using shorthand, stenotype, and other common and conventional systems of court reporting. The results were extraordinarily unsatisfactory. Delays on appeal due to the inability of court

reporters to get out the transcript were immense. Even in criminal cases it was not unusual for 1, 2, or even 3 years to elapse between the time of trial and the time of filing the transcript on appeal. Complaints from the bar and the public were constant.

The cause of the difficulty was neither incompetence or lack of diligence on the part of the court reporters. It was due almost wholly to the shortage of trained court reporters and transcribers in the territory. The delays in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals of Alaskan cases because of the failure to get the transcript on file became so bad that at one time the chief judge of the circuit attempted to interest the Department of Justice in a program to recruit reporters for emigration to Alaska.

Whereas there were only four trial courts under the territorial regime in Alaska, the new Alaska court system created by statehood provided eight superior court judges—one each at Juneau, Ketchikan, and Nome, two in Fairbanks, and three in Anchorage, as well as a number of district magistrate courts.

The chief justice of the new Supreme Court of Alaska, who under the State constitution is the administrative head of the judicial system, the Honorable Buell A. Nesbett, had been prior to appointment an active member of the practicing bar of Alaska and as such was fully familiar with the delays attendant upon reporting in the old U.S. district court. To Chief Justice Nesbett it seemed perfectly apparent that, if the conventional shorthand reporters available in Alaska had been unable to provide satisfactory service for only four courts, it was hopeless to expect them to be able to serve as well or even at all more than twice as many courts under the State system. These circumstances left the chief justice with little choice.

In September 1959, shortly after taking office, Chief Justice Nesbett visited the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts in Washington where he was given access to the studies, information, and experiments with electronic court reporting above mentioned, and also obtained full information about the equipment, including its cost from the manufacturers. The decision to use electronic recording exclusively in the Alaska court system was made by a majority of the justices of the supreme court. According to the chief justice, the decision was originally unanimous although, after some $27,000 worth of equipment had been ordered, one of the justices changed his mind and wrote a dissent which was filed with the clerk of the supreme court.[1]

The chief justice has stated that the court decided to use electronic equipment because: First, the sound of the recording on the tape is the closest one can come to determining the truth as to what actually was said in a given instance. In a dispute over the wording in a transcript prepared from shorthand or other notes there is no possibility of reference to the source. The court, counsel, and litigants are limited and bound by the notes, no matter how fragmentary or incorrect they may be. Second, sound recording represented a tremendous financial saving to the Alaska court system. The total cost of all of the equipment for all of the courts of the State of Alaska, including a reasonable allowance for maintenance, was only one-half of the expense of employing court reporters for a single year. The total saving over the 5 years of useful life for the equipment is estimated at close to a quarter of a million dollars. Third, the conventional methods of reporting had proven to be impractical in Alaska because of the chronic shortage of court reporters.

[1] The dissenting justice was the Honorable Walter H. Hodge, who is now U.S. district judge for the district of Alaska.

THE SYSTEM OF ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING PRESENTLY IN USE IN THE ALASKA COURT SYSTEM

The system of sound recording adopted by Alaska and presently in use in the State courts there is very like the system of sound recording recommended in the Parker-Tharp report.

Alaska uses the Soundscriber electronic recording equipment developed by the Soundscriber Co. and modified for court use by experiments made in conjunction with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. This is the equipment described in the Parker-Tharp report. Alaska also operates the equipment with personnel from the clerk's office, logs the proceedings, and prepares and charges for transcript, as recommended in the Parker-Tharp report. However, Alaska has worked out appropriate procedures for supervision by the clerk, logging of the proceedings, and fixing the charges, in far greater detail than set out in the Parker-Tharp report. These details are numerous but are by no means unimportant. In fact, most of them are absolutely vital to the successful operation of the system.

* * * * *

The chief justice and the administrative director of the Alaska court system did not have and had never seen a copy of the Parker-Tharp report when they prepared instructions to court clerks and set up rules and regulations. The reason for the resemblance is that the same tests and experiments conducted by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts were the basis of the system worked out in Alaska as well as the conclusions reached by Messrs. Parker and Tharp.

PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS OF ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING IN THE ALASKAN COURTS

On October 17, 1960, commencing at 2 p.m., the author observed the proceedings in department A of the Superior Court of the State of Alaska, at Anchorage, presided over by Judge Edward V. Davis. These observations were made without prior announcement of the author's presence or identity.

* * *

The courtroom was the conventional wood-paneled room, somewhat smaller than ordinary size. The court personnel consisted only of the judge and a deputy clerk, who was a woman. No bailiff or other officer was in attendance. The deputy clerk sat in the usual place, below and directly in front of the judge's bench, with a Soundscriber recording machine in plain view. The installation included five microphones, one on the judge's desk, one on the clerk's desk, one in front of the witness box, one on the counsel table at plaintiff's end and one at the defendant's end. The deputy clerk wore around her neck, like a necklace, small earphones which she could use from time to time without having to pick them up or put them down.

The deputy clerk preceded the judge into court, turned on the Soundscriber machine, examined its lights, made notations on a pad, which was later ascertained to be the log, put on her earphones and tested the machine by speaking into a microphone in front of her to make sure the machine was recording. When the judge appeared, the deputy clerk started the machine recording. The jury was polled and all answered present. This was followed by the opening statement of the plaintiff's counsel.

The deputy clerk had her earphones in use at the beginning and made a series of entries in the log. After about 10 minutes she took off the earphones while counsel concluded his statement. This was followed by an opening statement from defense counsel, at which time the deputy clerk again put her earphones on and made entries in the log.

When defendant's counsel came to make his opening statement it was observed that he did not stand anywhere near the microphones on the counsel table, or the one near the witness stand, but stood in front of the jury box. Considerable doubt arose in the author's mind as to whether the microphones could pick up defense counsel from this distance, and the deputy clerk was observed to keep her earphones on watching counsel and the machine but without interrupting.

Next, the plaintiff's counsel called as the first witness the plaintiff herself. When the witness took the stand Judge Davis explained to her that it was necessary to have an accurate record of all the proceedings, including the questions asked her and her answers and that a tape recording was being made on the Soundscriber machine for this purpose. He told her that she should answer questions audibly and not with nods of the head and that she should try to keep her voice up but that the deputy clerk would tell her if she was not speaking loud enough. The direct and cross-examination then followed.

In the course of the cross-examination, notwithstanding the judge's instructions, the witness responded to a question with a shake of the head. The judge observed this and asked her to answer audibly.

When court was over the author introduced himself to Judge Davis and to his deputy clerk, Mrs. Edna Stradley. Mrs. Stradley was asked if she was sure that defendant's opening statement had been recorded. She said that she had noticed how far away from the microphone counsel was and for that reason had kept the earphones on to make certain that it was all on the tape. She said she was certain it had been properly recorded.

At the author's request, the portion of the proceedings in the case, which had been observed, were transcribed from the tape and the transcript forwarded to Washington. The transcript corresponds exactly in all particulars to the author's notes and to the best of his recollection as to what he heard and saw. It differs from the usual transcript only in that the transcriber put in most, if not all, of the "ah's" and "uh's" uttered by counsel, noises that most transcribers leave out. The opening statement of defense counsel had been recorded completely and accurately notwithstanding the fact, as before mentioned, that during delivery he faced the jury box and was not near a microphone. A copy of the transcript is attached as appendix 3.

On the same day the author also observed proceedings in department B presided over by visiting Judge Hubert A. Gilbert from Nome. A jury in a criminal case was in the process of selection. Here again the court personnel consisted only of the judge and the deputy clerk, who again was a woman. The courtroom was very large, being at least double the size of Judge Davis' courtroom, and the acoustics were not good. The recording installation and the microphone equipment was the same as described in Judge Davis' court. The prospective jurors were seated in the box and were being questioned without moving from their chairs. The deputy clerk had her earphones on most of the time. There was no interruption from the deputy clerk while the prosecutor, who was closest to the jury box, was asking questions. But when defense counsel arose from his chair while speaking, the deputy clerk interrupted and told him his voice was not being recorded. One of the table microphones was then moved closer to him. He repeated what he said and went on with his questioning while continuing to move around the room. His words were recorded notwithstanding his movements.

In talking with Judge Davis about recording the examination of jurors, he told the author that he had adopted a practice of

putting the jurors in the witness box when they were to be questioned one by one, and that he did this partly to avoid any difficulty in recording their answers and partly because he felt it made the jurors more serious about their answers.

On October 20, 1960, the author observed the proceedings in the Superior Court of the State of Alaska in Fairbanks, presided over by Judge Jay A. Rabinowitz. The court personnel again was only the judge and the deputy clerk, Miss Grace Decker. The installation was like that in the other courts.

On this occasion, as on the others, the author's presence and identity was not announced. The case on trial was a suit for personal injuries, and at the time of observation a doctor was testifying as a medical expert. The proceedings were being logged and monitored by the deputy clerk as previously described.

During the examination of the doctor, plaintiff's counsel propounded a rather long hypothetical question, loaded with medical terms. Objection was made to the question, which was sustained. Plaintiff's counsel attempted to reframe the question, with another objection which was sustained. This happened two or three more times. * * * The court then instructed the doctor to answer, and the doctor understandably said "Which question?" After discussion between counsel and the court the doctor was told to answer the question as first put to him.

The judge then directed the deputy clerk to play back the question as first asked. This was done with precision and speed. The deputy clerk first made a notation on her log as to the reading on the tape when the recording was stopped. She then referred to her log to locate as near as possible the tape reading when the first question had been asked. The tape was turned back and when the replay commenced it was evident that the deputy clerk had located the question almost exactly. After the question was replayed, the witness was cautioned by the judge not to answer yet. The deputy clerk then turned the tape to the reading she had noted when she first stopped the machine, let the tape revolve without recording for a few seconds, and then indicated to the judge that it was ready to record. The judge then directed the doctor to give his answer, which he did.

The time taken by the deputy clerk in locating the question that the judge directed be played back was certainly no longer, if as long, as it would take a shorthand reporter, or stenotype operator, to find the question in his notes.

INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY DEPUTY CLERKS AND TRANSCRIBERS OF THE ALASKA COURT SYSTEM CONCERNING THEIR EXPERIENCES WITH ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE TRIAL COURTS

While in Anchorage, the author of this report had an interview of more than 2 hours with Mrs. Thelma Dome, Judge Davis' in-court deputy clerk, about her experiences with sound recording. The author also had a very much shorter conversation with the in-court deputy clerk who had recorded the selection of the jury in Judge Gilbert's court, as above described. At Fairbanks the author had similar, although briefer, discussions with Miss Olga Steger, chief transcript secretary in that court, and with Miss Judy Aaron, a transcriber. He also interviewed at greater length in Fairbanks Miss Marian Dellage, an in-court deputy clerk with extensive experience in transcribing.

The purpose of these interviews was to ascertain the degree of training necessary to produce competent operators of the recording machine, to learn what training or special qualities were essential for a competent transcriber, to probe for failures and weaknesses in the system and the machines, and to get as much additional information as possible as to whether electronic sound recording was in fact proving to be practical.

None of the in-court deputy clerks who were operating Soundscriber recorders had received any training, excepting basic instruction in the purpose of the dials, the meaning of the lights and signals, the installation and removal of the tape, the significance of the numbers on the tape, and the details of logging. Each had been allowed to run the machine making practice recordings. None of them seemed to consider that any additional training was necessary to produce a competent operator. Experience demonstrated very early, however, that at least this much instruction is necessary.

In one of the very first trials recorded in Fairbanks the machine was operated by a veteran deputy clerk of more than 70 years of age who insisted that he could operate so simple a machine without any instruction. The result was a tape which was described as virtually unintelligible. Great concern was expressed by the clerk if an appeal should be taken and a transcript required. This fiasco is well known in Alaska, and it seems to be regarded by the deputy clerks and transcribers as the horrible example of what not to do.

In Fairbanks the cause of this failure is attributed to three factors: First, the installation of the microphones was defective in that they were set on steel tables without insulation. The tables picked up an undue amount of vibration and noise. Second, there were jackhammers working on the outside of the building at the time the trial was going on. Third, the deputy clerk did not monitor the proceedings properly, and consequently failed to detect that they were not being properly recorded. No one interviewed thought that this failure was due to any weakness in the system or defect in the machine. The opinion was expressed that the failure would have been avoided if the deputy clerk had known how to operate the machine. This case is the only one reported to the author where the record made by the Soundscriber machine proved to be inadequate for the preparation of a proper transcript.

Although there appears to have been only one major failure, the in-court deputies and transcribers have experienced quite a number of less serious problems in the operation of the machines. The office of the administrative director of the Alaska court system requires monthly reports on the operation of the sound equipment from all clerks of the superior court. These reports are in the form of printed questionnaires designed to bring out difficulties with the equipment or its operation, with transcription or tapes, and general comments, including information or criticism which would merit consideration in improving recording procedures. Most of the questionnaires report no difficulties with the equipment or its operation. The most critical monthly report which the author examined contains the following complaints with respect to equipment:

Question. Have you had any difficulty with any of the equipment? If so, set forth details.

Answer. Tape doesn't back up far enough when transcribing. Has been set a couple of times but evidently slips out before long. Could use some regular servicing on the machines.

With respect to operations:

Question. How often are you operating your equipment?

Answer. Every day.

Question. Are you having any difficulty in maintaining strict discipline in court?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Set forth details.

Answer. You can't control rattling of papers at all times nor keep coughing down, which will cut out what is being said.

With respect to transcribing:

Question. List any difficulties on transcribing.

Answer. Tape doesn't back up far enough. Some attorneys drop their voices so often it is very hard to make out what they say at times.

Answering the request for general comments, it is said: "Either more microphones are needed or they need to be placed away from the noises of papers and banging against the tables. In transcribing, if the speed could be slowed, one could type more steadily and at times make out words that otherwise are impossible. It takes hours and hours longer to transcribe than the time the original recording takes."

The comments of Mr. David L. Luce, administrative director of the Alaska court system, on these complaints are of interest:

1. If the tape doesn't back up far enough it can be corrected with a comparatively simple mechanical adjustment.

2. Large part of the extraneous noise that gets on the tape and concerning which complaint is made comes from vibrations of metal standards of the microphones, which would be eliminated if the microphones were suspended without being attached to rigid stands.

3. The mumbling of an inaudible lawyer or witness should be corrected by interruption from the monitoring clerk just as a shorthand reporter would ask to have the words repeated.

4. The time it takes to make a transcription from a recorded court proceeding is undoubtedly much greater than it would take the same transcriber to transcribe stenographic notes or to transcribe the dictation of a court reporter, although if a shorthand reporter dictates his notes onto a record for the benefit of a transcriber, which he often does, and that time is added to the time it takes the transcriber to write up what the court reporter has dictated, the total is not much less than the time it takes to transcribe direct from the tape.

Nearly every one of the deputy clerks and transcribers interviewed commented on how long it took to make a transcript from a recorded tape.

The interviews with the deputy clerks and transcribers disclosed quite a difference of opinion as to whether there was any advantage in having the transcription made by the deputy clerk who was personally present at the time of the proceedings. Most of the deputy clerks and transcribers seemed to think it was an advantage. This is the conclusion reached by Mr. Luce, the administrative director of the Alaska court system. However, Miss Marian Dellage, at Fairbanks, who has probably has as much experience as anyone in both recording and transcribing, stated that she had found it just as easy to transcribe a proceeding recorded by someone else as one which she had recorded herself. Regardless of this difference of opinion, no one doubted that it is perfectly practical for a transcriber to make an accurate transcript of a record of proceedings at which he had not been personally present.

According to the statements of the in-court deputy clerks and to the author's personal observation, the logging of the reporting machine does not interfere with the performance of the clerk's regular courtroom duties. The deputy clerks were observed administering oaths and marking exhibits without any complications being added by the sound recording process. All of the in-court deputy clerks had been trained to keep the usual clerks' minutes and they still do. When they first started to use the sound recording machines they attempted to keep minutes separately and in addition to logging the recorder. However, they quickly found that the log contains all information necessary for the preparation of minutes,

that there is no necessity for keeping notes for the minutes separate from the log and they no longer do so. The minutes are made up from the log at the conclusion of each day in court.

INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY JUDGES OF THE ALASKA COURT SYSTEM CONCERNING THEIR EXPERIENCE WITH ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING OF PROCEEDINGS OF TRIAL COURTS

In Anchorage the author interviewed Judge Edward V. Davis, of the superior court, for over an hour, and in Fairbanks, Judge Jay A. Rabinowitz, of the superior court, for a lesser time, concerning their experiences with and evaluation of the recording of court proceedings by electronic sound recording equipment. The author also had somewhat longer interviews on this subject with Chief Justice Buell A. Nesbett, of the Supreme Court of the State of Alaska, and with Mr. David L. Luce, the administrative director of the Alaska court system. They were unanimous in the conclusion and opinion that the court reporting services based upon the electronic sound recording is infinitely superior to the reporting in the district court of territorial days and equally superior to what the Alaskan courts would have if they relied upon court reporters using shorthand, stenotype, and other conventional means of note taking. All of them said they had experienced no major problem with the system of sound recording, but they were of the opinion that the machine needed improvement and that the whole system would operate better when the transcribers in the clerks' office had gained more experience.

The judges pointed out that in some, not too obvious, particulars, sound recording had very distinct advantages. Judge Davis stated that when jurors wanted to have an instruction repeated, something that happens fairly frequently, instead of having the court reporter stumble through his notes on what the judge had said he was able to have the Soundscriber play back his instructions exactly as he had given them in the first place.

Mr. Luce pointed out that the sound recorder provides a check on the accuracy of interpretations which simply does not exist with the ordinary system of court reporting. When a witness speaking a foreign language is on the stand, all that a shorthand or stenotype reporter ever gets are the words of the interpreter. He cannot record the actual words of the witness. With sound recording, however, the tape records the actual words of the witness, no matter what language he may be using, just as accurately as it picks up the interpretation. The accuracy or inaccuracy of the interpretation can always be determined at a later date by having someone else with an adequate knowledge of the language listen to the recording. This is a matter of no small importance in a State like Alaska where skilled interpreters are hard to find and where the population includes peoples speaking Aleut, Athabascan, Tlingit, Eskimo, Russian, Japanese, and Chinese, as well as a number of western European languages other than English.

Judge Rabinowitz stated that he had found that recording the pretrial conference was a great timesaver in the preparation of pretrial orders.

Chief Justice Buell A. Nesbett stated that in his opinion the electronic sound recording of proceedings in the trial courts of Alaska is, in general, highly successful. The transcripts made from recordings that have been filed in the Supreme Court of Alaska have been accurate, as has been evident upon comparing them with the original tape. While there was one serious failure to obtain an intelligible record with the sound recording machine at Fairbanks, as previously related, this has been an isolated incident and the real cause of the failure in his opinion did not lie with the system or the machine.

The chief justice also stated that the system had eliminated the excessive delays in the preparation and filing of transcripts experienced by the district court during the territorial regime and that, with few exceptions, the transcripts from the tape recordings had been filed in the supreme court within the 30 days allowed by rule 48 of the rules of administration.

The chief justice pointed out that there were on file in the Supreme Court of the State of Alaska a number of cases in which the appeal had been noticed before the Supreme Court of Alaska became organized and which were transferred to the supreme court when it became operative, and which still remain unheard because of the inability of the court reporters of the former district court to complete and file the reporters' transcript. The chief justice stated that while be believed the recording equipment was capable of improvement, in general it was doing its job very well. He emphasized, however, that the key to the successful operation of the system of electronic sound recording was the attitude and cooperation of the judges and clerks. In the opinion of the chief justice, this had made the difference between success and failure. The chief justice stated that he believed the judges and clerks in the Alaska court system were almost unanimous in preferring electronic sound recording to a return to the court reporting service provided in the U.S. district court during territorial days.

COMMENTS IN THE PRESS AND FROM THE BAR OF ALASKA CONCERNING ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE TRIAL COURTS

The author obtained very little information from members of the bar as to their views of the practicality of electronic sound recording of court proceedings. This was because no member of the bar had had extensive experience with transcripts on appeal because the time since the system was inaugurated was too short for any firm to have had occasion to take more than one or two appeals. However, of the members of the bar interviewed who had actually tried cases where the proceedings were recorded, none of them voiced doubt about the ability of the recorder to accurately record the proceedings or the ability of the transcribers to produce an accurate transcript. A number of them commended the new system because it eliminated the unbearable delay of the old court reporting service. They also commended the saving in the cost of transcript and also other major reductions in the costs of appeal which have been achieved by the Alaska court system.

* * * * *

The Alaska court system has received a large amount of mail from outside the State criticizing the adoption of electronic sound recording in the trial courts, some of which is highly vituperative. Most of it comes from officers or members of various shorthand reporters' associations. There are few, if any, helpful ideas or comments in these letters. None of them are based on observation or experience with the system.

THE PERPETUATION OF RECORDS OF TRIAL PROCEEDINGS IN THE ALASKA COURT SYSTEM

The basic purpose of any court reporting system is to make an official record of the court proceedings for subsequent use on appeal or otherwise. It is especially important in criminal cases that the official record of the proceedings in the trial court be complete, and also that it be preserved, even though no appeal may be taken. Questions about the legality of the proceedings are raised with increasing frequency at dates long subsequent to the time of conviction. In habeas corpus proceedings and petitions filed under section 2255 of title 28 of the United States Code the proceedings in the trial courts must be examined on the record of what happened, oftentimes, years before.

Congress has recognized and attempted to meet this need by providing in section 753 of title 28 of the United States Code that the court reporter in a U.S. district court must "report all proceedings in criminal cases had in open court" and must also "transcribe and certify all pleas and proceedings in connection with the imposition of sentence in criminal cases," regardless of whether an appeal is taken or any request is made for the transcript. The purpose of the statute is to insure perpetuity of the record.

The system of electronic sound recording presently in use in the Alaska court system meets this need for perpetuating the record of what happened in the trial court perfectly and completely, whereas the system of conventional court reporting in current use in the U.S. district courts fails lamentably.

Rule 47 of the "Rules Governing the Administration of All Courts of the Alaska Court System" provides that it is the electronic recording, not the transcript, that constitutes the official court record. To preserve the record indefinitely all that is necessary is to store it properly. Under this system there is a complete original record to which reference can be made at any time in the future, regardless of whether a transcript has or has not been made from the tape. Transcripts when made are certified under the Alaskan court rules as true and correct copies of the official record and never of themselves constitute the official record. (See App. 2, p. 3, "Transcript Fees and Rules Relating to Monitoring, Transcription, and Storage," Bulletin 60–9, Supreme Court of Alaska, office of the administrative director). Under this system there is no need to transcribe any part of the court proceedings merely to perpetuate the record.

With the conventional methods of court reporting in current use in the Federal courts, on the other hand, experience has shown that it is necessary to transcribe the proceedings if the record is to be preserved. Recognition of this fact by the Congress is of course the reason for the enactment of 28 U.S.C. 753. The superiority in this particular of a system of electronic sound recording becomes apparent when it is contrasted with the admitted failure and inability of the Federal court reporters to meet the need for preserving and perpetuating court proceedings where no appeal is taken. Although it is a duty imposed on court reporters by Congress to transcribe and certify all pleas and proceedings in connection with the imposition of sentences in criminal cases, regardless of whether an appeal is taken, the Parker-Tharp report states (p. 34) that in only two districts visited by the survey team was this statute being complied with and that less than 25 percent of the Federal district courts are achieving anything approaching compliance.

In June 1959, the Administrative Office requested the clerks of all of the district courts to report the number of cases of criminal defendants convicted and sentenced during the fiscal year 1958 in which the typed and certified transcripts of the proceedings on plea and sentence had not been filed and to ascertain from the court reporters their best estimate of the number of man-hours that would be required to transcribe and certify the proceedings in conformity with the statute. The replies showed that in 64 percent of the criminal cases in that 1 year typed transcripts had not been made and filed, and that the efforts of the court reporters in the other 36 percent of the cases in complying with the law had resulted in the production of over 55,000 pages

of typing to be placed in storage indefinitely. The answers also showed that the court reporters estimated that it would require 41,444 hours to make the transcripts necessary to comply with the law for that 1 year.

It is abundantly clear that it is physically impossible for the present Federal court reporters to make the necessary transcriptions to meet the need for preservation and perpetuation of the proceedings on sentence in all criminal cases. Such a goal could only be achieved by a very great increase in the total number of reporters and with huge increase in cost to the United States. This is demonstrated by experience in the District of Columbia. Prior to 1957 the court reporters in that District did not transcribe proceedings on plea and sentence, excepting where an appeal was had or a request for a transcript was made, it being their practice merely to file their shorthand or stenotype notes for preservation. Because of a number of instances where a complete record of proceedings on pleas and sentences was not available when needed, an order was issued at the prodding of the court of appeals (*Poole* v. *United States*, U.S.C.A.D.C., 1957, 250 Fed. 2d 396) requiring the reporters to comply with the statute and transcribe all pleas and sentence proceedings. When the effort was made to prepare transcripts from the court reporters' notes on file, it was found in a number of the older cases, where the original reporter was no longer available, that the notes on file could not be deciphered. In order to permit the reporters for the District of Columbia to comply with the law just in future cases it was necessary for the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts to employ five additional reporters at a cost to the United States, which is continuing, of $35,000 per year. Compliance with the law in other districts would undoubtedly result in similar and proportional increases in cost. The electronic sound recording system used in Alaska provides a permanent official record without any cost of transcription whatever.

COMPARISON OF PRESENT DELAY IN FILING OF TRANSCRIPTS IN CASES ON APPEAL IN THE ALASKA COURT SYSTEM AND THE FEDERAL COURTS

The Supreme Court of Alaska became operative on October 5, 1959. The remainder of the Alaska court system, including the superior courts, became operative on February 20, 1960. On the latter date the former U.S. district court of four divisions went out of existence and was succeeded by the present U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska. This change resulted in a transfer to the State courts of about 90 percent of the cases originally filed in the old district court, including cases on appeal. One year later, there are still pending in the Alaska Supreme Court a number of cases appealed from the old district court which remain unheard because of the failure of the court reporters to complete and file the transcript.

On the other hand, while there have been a considerable number of appeals from the new superior courts during the same year, in no instance has the delay in filing the transcript exceeded 90 days and, in the majority of cases, the transcripts have been filed without any extension of the 30 days provided by court rule. The information supplied by the administrative director concerning appeals from the superior court to the Supreme Court of the State of Alaska, as of February 16, 1961, is to the effect that there has been one appeal from Juneau in which the completed transcript was filed within less than 30 days, 1 appeal from Nome in which the transcript was filed within less than 30 days, 1 appeal from Ketchikan in which the transcript was filed in less than 50 days, 12 appeals from Anchorage in which 6 transcripts were filed within less than 30 days, 3 within less than 60 but more than 30 days, and 3 within less than 90 but more than 60 days. The breakdown of the appeals from Fairbanks is not presently available, but the administrative director has stated that there has been no greater delay in the preparation of transcripts on appeal in Fairbanks than in Anchorage, and that in no instance has it been necessary to extend the time for completion and filing beyond 90 days.

The situation in the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska, where the conventional method of reporting is still in use, is in marked contrast. On December 13, 1960, the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts inquired of the Department of Justice as to whether delay was being experienced in the appeal of criminal cases from the new U.S. District Court in Alaska to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals by reason of the inability of the court reporter to prepare a transcript on time. Assistant Deputy Attorney General Howard A. Heffron responded on January 5, 1961:

"This is to reply particularly to the question in your letter about any delays experienced in criminal appeals from the district of Alaska.

"At present the Government is involved in three criminal appeals. In one of these, a bank robbery case tried in June of 1960, we are told that the reporter is just now beginning to transcribe the record, and the other two transcripts will still remain to be done. The U.S. Attorney informs us that the court reporter has been laboring under a backlog of work because it was necessary for her to transcribe certain appeals from the predecessor court to the Alaska Supreme Court."

The situation in the Federal court in Alaska gained very unpleasant notoriety with the arrest of one Frank Marrone in Los Angeles, Calif., in November 1960, on a charge of kidnaping perpetrated in San Diego, Calif. At the time of his arrest for kidnaping, Marrone was out on bail pending appeal from a conviction of second degree murder in the U.S. district court at Anchorage, Alaska, which judgment was rendered as long ago as May 1, 1959. The appeal had been taken and Marrone had been released on bail shortly after the pronouncement of judgment. The appeal was still pending when the supreme court of Alaska became operative on October 5, 1959, and the appeal, although originally noticed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, was transferred to the supreme court of Alaska since Marrone had been prosecuted for violating a section of the Alaska Compiled Laws and not with violating the laws of the United States. The files of the case show the entry of a number of orders extending the time for filing the transcript of record and docketing the cause "for the reason that the court reporter is, as of this date, unable to prepare a transcript of the evidence within the time granted by the court." The transcript was not filed with the supreme court of the State of Alaska until February 18, 1960. The delay after this date was occasioned in the most part by the need for extending the time for the preparation of briefs to enable the new State district attorney's office to familiarize itself with and brief the conviction which had been had in the Federal court.

Of course the transcript in the murder case was actually on file before Marrone was arrested for kidnaping. However, if the transcript had been filed within approximately 30 days after notice of appeal, as appears to be the present practice in the State courts in Alaska, it seems reasonably certain that Marrone's case would have been decided in the supreme court prior to the conviction of the kidnaping in San Diego for which he was arrested.

Some of the special difficulties under which the court reporter for the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska presently labors should be mentioned. Upon his appointment in February 1960 to the newly created U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska, Judge Walter H. Hodge found pending on the court docket a considerable number of cases in Juneau, a few in Ketchikan, and a much larger number in Fairbanks, most of which were quite old and needed to be brought to trial. By far the greatest number of cases, however, were pending in Anchorage. Realizing that the accumulation in Anchorage could not be attacked with much prospect of progress unless court was held in Anchorage steadily and for a rather prolonged period, Judge Hodge decided to clean up the dockets in the other towns and cities before making a start in Anchorage.

Pursuant to this plan and beginning with his appointment, Judge Hodge held court in Juneau, then in Ketchikan, and had progressed to Fairbanks by October. He did not begin to hold court in Anchorage until November 1960. He was, of course, accompanied on these peregrinations by his court reporter, who was under duty although traveling to report all the proceedings in court, to transcribe all pleas and sentences in criminal cases, to prepare transcripts in all appeal cases, and, in addition, was obliged to prepare transcripts in cases reported by her in the predecessor court of territorial days where she had formerly been employed. The delays in the preparation and filing of transcripts above described cannot with any fairness be considered as reflecting on the ability or diligence of the court reporter. The truth is that she is being required to do the impossible.

It should also be pointed out, however, that no such difficulties would have been encountered if the new Federal court upon becoming operative in February 1960 had adopted the same system of electronic sound recording used in the Alaska court system. In such case the proceedings in each place where Federal Court is held would be recorded by a different in-court deputy clerk on a Soundscriber machine. There would be no need to make any transcript except in cases which are appealed. The needed transcripts would be produced where recorded without their being any interruption caused by the Judge's departure. Indeed, simultaneous transcription in different places, with a very great saving in time, would often occur.

Such a procedure is more practical in Alaska than anywhere else because in that State the Federal and State courts are using the same courthouses, the same clerks' offices and, in certain instances, the same deputy clerks, each government making an appropriate contribution to the cost adjusted according to the appropriate proportion of the volume of work, and this arrangement will be continued for an indefinite period. Transcripts in Federal cases could be produced by the same transcribers now making transcripts for the Alaska court system, with such additions to the staff as the amount of business might require. The delays on appeals to the Court of Appeals of the Ninth Circuit would be eliminated, just as they have been on appeals to the Supreme Court of Alaska.

COMPARISON OF THE COSTS OF TRANSCRIPTS IN CASES ON APPEAL IN THE ALASKA COURT SYSTEM AND THE FEDERAL COURT

Although the costs for services are in general far higher in the State of Alaska than in any other State in the Union, the Alaska court system is providing transcripts to litigants at a cost far less than that charged in any court in the Federal system.

The schedule of charges for transcripts in the Alaska court system is as follows:

Record on appeal:

Original, 50 cents per page; first copy, 10 cents per page; each additional copy, 10 cents per page.

Trial or proceedings (not daily):

Original, 50 cents per page; each additional copy, 10 cents per page.

Daily transcript:

Original, 85 cents per page; each additional copy, 10 cents per page.

Judge's request. No charge.

The schedule of charges for transcripts in the U.S. district courts, including Alaska, authorized by the Judicial Conference of the United States, is as follows:

Regular transcript	Rate per page		Total charge
	Original	Each copy	
Original and each copy	$0.65	$0.30	--------
Daily transcript:			
Original only	1.30	0	$1.30
Original plus 1 copy	1.25	.50	1.75
Original plus 2 copies	1.20	.45	2.10
Original plus 3 copies	1.15	.40	2.35
Original plus 4 copies	1.10	.35	2.50
Original plus 5 copies	1.05	.35	2.80
Original plus 6 copies	1.00	.35	3.10

For an original and more than 6 copies: $1 for original and $0.35 for each copy.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The experience of the Alaska court system with electronic sound recording over a period of nearly a year in eight superior courts and additional district magistrate courts offers persuasive evidence in substantiation of the conclusion of the Judicial Conference of the United States and its committees, that electronic recording of court proceedings is feasible and practical.

2. The doubts and fears expressed by numerous court reporters, judges, and others as to the practicality of electronic sound recording of proceedings in trial courts have proved to be illusory and without substance.

3. A comparison of the electronic sound recording used in the State courts in Alaska with the conventional shorthand reporting system presently being used in the Federal courts including Alaska discloses: (a) electronic sound recording produces an original record of trial proceedings which is more accurate and more complete than shorthand or stenotype notes; (b) electronic sound recording preserves and perpetuates a complete original record of all court proceedings without the waste of time and money in making transcripts of proceedings which are not appealed; (c) electronic sound recording reduces enormously the delay in the preparation and filing of transcripts in cases appealed; (d) electronic sound recording is less costly to the Government (State or Federal) than court reporters; (e) the system of electronic sound recording has reduced the costs of transcripts to the litigants; (f) the system of sound recording has a number of important advantages over shorthand, stenotype, and other conventional methods of reporting, such as providing a complete record of interpretations of foreign languages, permitting the repetition of instructions to the jury in the exact language as originally given.

4. When the service provided by conventional shorthand reporters is inadequate, overly expensive or otherwise unsatisfactory, electronic sound recording is a practical alternative from every point of view.

PROGRESS REPORT ON SOCIAL SECURITY POLL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, over many months there has been intense debate on the subject of medical care for the older people in our communities.

Over the weekend, I was given by a physician from Detroit the latest report on a poll which is being conducted by the Medical Society of Wayne County, Mich. It is most interesting, because it is a report from the profession itself in respect to its idea of its role under social security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this progress report printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Progress report on social security poll (as of Feb. 9, 1961)

In favor of compulsory social security	501
Opposed	107
Undecided	16
Total	624
Age groups:	
28 to 40	104
40 to 50	143
50 to 60	121
60 to 70	103
70 to 80	32
Age not given	118
Type of practice:	
Surgery	111
Medicine	103
General practice	127
Other	176
Unspecified	107

Employment status: employed, 86; self-employed, 538. Those presently on social security, 100.

MEDICAL AID TO THE AGED

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Detroit News of Wednesday, February 15, 1961, on medical aid to the aged, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MEDICAL AID TO THE AGED: A QUESTION OF METHODS

With an administration bill and two others now before it, Congress is fairly launched on study and discussion of the problem of supplying some form of financial assistance to retirees confronted with medical expenses.

It should be beyond dispute that this class of citizens (women 62 or over, men 65 or over) receives lower income and suffers more ill health than younger age groups and that hardship results. True, the American Medical Association dissents from time to time, its literature partially basing its case on a survey of the aged which has been attacked as unprofessional by several sociologists. Physicians representing local medical groups frequently concede that a problem exists, but they say it can be solved by the doctors themselves in voluntary care of their patients regardless of ability to pay.

Those assuming—rightly, we think—that the Federal Government has a proper interest in the retired ill, disagree as to the method to be used and the means of paying for it. Their attitudes have hardened over the past several months and it will be the job of congressional committees to settle the issue.

One school firmly asserts that medical care should be put under the social security program, the present tax being increased to cover the cost of the care. Opponents criticize this proposal because it is "involuntary" and advance alternatives which are "voluntary" and which would be financed out of the general funds of the Treasury. Thus the application for assistance would be by choice, but the contributions would be involuntary, in a sense, since everybody supports the Treasury.

A more recent criticism of the social security method brings up the question as to the added cost to employers through the increased tax. Employers may be unwilling to hire additional workers when they will thereby add to the cost of the jobs to themselves. It is pointed out that the social security tax has been steadily increased and is scheduled to increase further in the years to come. The question is whether the social security system can stand additional burdens.

That problem would be avoided in a proposal that the Government pay a portion of the premiums on health care policies issued to retirees by commercial insurance companies and nonprofit organizations such as Blue Cross-Blue Shield. The form that criticism of this proposal takes is exemplified by a Princeton economist who said that under it "the Government would pay more, the beneficiaries would get less, and private carriers would trade freedom for little profit and thankless regulation."

The subject thus is complex, despite the efforts of partisans of one scheme or another to simplify it and to claim perfection for their point of view. It will be and should be well chewed over in committee and, the AMA to the contrary, it is inevitable that a solution will issue. The form that the legislation should take should be decided when all of the agreed upon evidence is in the record.

Our chief hope is that the AMA, the one group with specialized knowledge of the problem, will recognize that a solution of some sort is sure to come out of Washington and will make a positive—rather than obstructionist—contribution to arriving at the solution.

EXPERIMENTAL FOOD PROGRAMS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, since the President's announcement designating certain areas as areas for conducting experimental food programs, interest in this program in Michigan has been widespread.

Letters and resolutions I have received from Michigan express interest in this pilot program. This is a small indication of the interest I have found in getting this food program underway.

It is unfortunate that the previous administration did not see fit to follow the suggestions of some of us in the Congress who proposed that such programs be made available in areas of critical unemployment.

I have been assured that the Department of Agriculture is doing all possible to formulate its program to comply with the President's order.

We in Michigan are proud that Detroit has been selected as a test area, and I have been assured that the State, city, and local retailers will make every effort to cooperate with the Department in a way to make the test program a success.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letters and resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

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

MUSKEGON, MICH.,
February 2, 1961.

Senator PHILIP HART,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please suggest Muskegon County as an addition to pilot group of areas under the surplus food stamp program now being put in effect by administration.

JAMES KOBZA,
Muskegon County Chairman.

CITY OF FLINT, MICH.,
February 7, 1961

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

SIR: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution adopted at the Flint City Commission meeting held February 6, 1961, and directed to your attention.

Very truly yours,

LLOYD S. HENDON,
City Clerk.

Whereas unemployment in the Flint area has increased steadily since the beginning of 1961; and

Whereas prospects of additional factory layoffs already have been publicly announced which will increase materially the number of jobless and provoke more acute economic distress; and

Whereas many workers affected by layoffs and continuing unemployment, either have not earned or have exhausted unemployment compensation and supplemental unemployment benefits, and are becoming an increasingly heavier burden upon the direct relief roles of the county; and

Whereas local physical facilities available for the direct distribution program of surplus foods administered by the Department of Agriculture do not lend themselves to the efficient administration of relief to current growing numbers of needy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Flint city commission does hereby petition the President of the United States, and the administrators of the departments affected, to consider the county of Genesee and the city of Flint as an economically depressed area, according to the percentages of the unemployed work force available through the Michigan Unemployment Security Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That said Federal officials be petitioned to consider the city of Flint and Genesee County for inclusion in the pilot food stamp plan for distribution of surplus foodstuffs to the needy.

BAY CITY MILLING & GROCER CO.,
February 7, 1961.

Senator PHILIP HART,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: I see by the news that Detroit has been chosen as the pilot area for testing the new stamp plan. Bay City is in the same condition as Detroit. We have the Chevrolet plant here and several other plants here that are down. We have industry like the Industrial Brownhoist and the Bay City Shovels that have gone out of business and there is an awful lot of unemployment here. How about trying to get this part of the country on this plan as well as Detroit.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN KOFFMAN.

NEW INDUSTRY SOUGHT FOR HUERFANO COUNTY, COLO.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, there are two areas of my State which are chronically in an economically depressed condition. They are the cities of Walsenburg and Trinidad, Colo.

These two cities have lost employment and lost population steadily for 20 years.

Their history has been largely tied to the coal-mining industry and as it declined so did the economic health of the two cities.

A dramatic story of the plight of the city of Walsenburg has been published in the Pueblo Star-Journal of February 5, 1961.

It was written by Mrs. Betty Kalmes, who is the energetic secretary of the Walsenburg Industrial Development Corp., a nonprofit citizens organization which is diligently pledged to the objective of bringing new industry and new economic life to Walsenburg.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the Pueblo Star-Journal and Sunday Chieftain on February 5, 1961, entitled "New Industry Sought To Ease Huerfano County Job Scarcity," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

NEW INDUSTRY SOUGHT TO EASE HUERFANO COUNTY JOB SECURITY

(By Betty Kalmes)

WALSENBURG.—Bulging welfare rolls and vast unemployment among miners in Huerfano County is typical of what is happening to coal mining communities all over the Nation.

Walsenburg, the county seat of Huerfano County, was the center of 20 coal mines back in the 1920's. The peak of the mining industry was reached between 1923 and 1925.

There were 3,000 coal miners employed here at that time.

The first decline in the coal industry started in 1929 during the depression. It continued to decline for 10 years. In 1939, the mines started to pick up and the peak was reached in 1942. At the end of 1946 a second decline started.

By 1952 there were only 75 miners employed in the mines. That number has held steady. Work in the few privately owned mines is not steady—these mines produce domestic coal and the miners are out of work 3 to 4 months each year.

Welfare rolls in Huerfano County have swollen. The monthly average payroll is $95,000. The number of persons receiving commodities has risen from 913 in December of 1957 to 1,502 persons in December of 1960. Mrs. Harry Haines, welfare director, says, "We have a good rehabilitation program but there is no particular employment for them here and they don't like to leave home."

OVERALL PICTURE

The overall employment picture in Huerfano County looks like this: 1,575 persons employed in nonagricultural work; 500 persons employed in agricultural work; 325 persons unemployed.

John George, local manager of Colorado Employment Office, puts it this way.

"A lot of people don't bother to register at the employment office because they know that there aren't any jobs available. In the event that an industry moved to Walsenburg and jobs were available, we could muster a nonagricultural labor force that would probably reach 2,500 people. If an industry that would employ women came, our female labor force would be triple what it is at present," he said.

More than 200 of Huerfano County's employed commute as far as 170 miles round trip.

Unemployment claims have increased from 4,896 in 1959 to 5,150 in 1960.

POPULATION DECLINE

With the decline in the coal industry, the population in Huerfano County has declined.

In 1940 the population was 16,088 but by 1960 the population had dropped to 7,771.

With few jobs in Huerfano County, many miners have left to seek other employment. The mining camps have all closed. The gaping foundations of the houses stand as a reminder of a once vigorous coal industry. Most of the remaining miners moved to Walsenburg. Most of them bought homes or built them; they are not lazy people, but men who want to work to earn a living.

Fifty of Huerfano County's coal miners are working out of the county. Unless Walsenburg is able to attract industry that will employ these men, they face the same fate as the miners before them—they will have to look for employment elsewhere or go on the welfare rolls. The average age of today's miners is against them.

They are not old enough for a pension and not young enough to be desirable in most industries.

PUBLIC OPINION

Pete Pavlick, 44, has a wife and two children. He worked in the mines for 22 years, but has been unemployed since the middle of December.

"I think that we should forget about coal around here and get something else to employ people. As far as this coal research is concerned, it's too slow. The coal around here is mostly owned by the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. Unless C.F. & I. opens up something, we may as well forget coal in Huerfano County.

"I think that all of the miners voted for Kennedy hoping that he would do something for these depressed areas. I hope that they will help us to attract an industry, a broom factory, a shoe factory—most anything where we could have a steady payroll."

Mike Morrelli, 62, worked in the mines 46 years but has been unemployed since May 1960.

"I would like to go back to work. If I don't go back by March, then I don't think that I will get to go back to work. I was in a worse spot in 1927 to 1932. The only hope for coal is that they stop importing the cheap oil. There are some 2,000 items that can be produced from coal. I am going to stick it out in Walsenburg. If we had a good commercial mine in Huerfano County with 300 miners employed, we would be in good condition.

"I just hope someone will help us bring some work. It is my judgment that with all the money that is being spent by the State and Federal Government that we have been forgotten. Huerfano County doesn't belong on the U.S. map or on the Colorado map. I don't think that anyone will help us, except for relief. We want decent jobs so that we can work for what we earn. We don't want something for nothing."

John Conder, 56, worked in the mines 40 years, but has been unemployed since December.

"We are supposed to go back to work, but I don't know when. At my age, I'm too old to learn something else. When you pass 45 they don't hire you. I'll stay in Walsenburg, because there is no place else to go, but we need industry for the young people. When they get out of high school, there is nothing for them."

John Hayden, 52, worked in the mines 35 years, has been unemployed since December.

"I think they should open some mines or put people over 50 on a pension. I think that the new administration may help us. Colorado Springs is pretty well to do, and they keep putting Government installations there. They ought to put a few here."

Adolph Sanich, 49, worked in mines 25 years, unemployed since May 1960.

"When I was laid off it was supposed to be temporary. I'm going to sweat it out in Walsenburg; if I hear it is definite that we aren't going back to work, then I will have to look for something else. The administration should help us get industry. More relief isn't the answer; I don't think that the people like to go on relief. Also, unemployment payments should be extended. When that check runs out, a lot of guys are going to be out of luck."

WHAT IS BEING DONE?

Walsenburg is trying to pull itself up by its bootstraps.

The Walsenburg Industrial Development Corp. was formed to induce industry. The city council has appointed a city planning commission. The Walsenburg Housing Authority was formed, and a survey is being made to establish the number of houses that will be built.

They are trying to make Walsenburg a better place in which to live and to bring jobs.

Will the construction of the houses or the coming of an industry be soon enough to help these pople? Will the administration help? Can it?

These questions are being asked in coal mining communities all over the Nation.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if there is no further morning business——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have further morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the inaugural message of the President of the United States he used the rather captivating sentence, which was rather roundly applauded:

> And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what the country can do for you: ask what you can do for your country. [Applause.]

That is the way it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Today the President sent us a special message on education. First, I think it would be appropriate to read one or two paragraphs from the Republican platform on the question of aid to education:

> Toward the goal of fullest possible educational opportunity for every American, we pledge these actions:
>
> Federal support to the primary and secondary schools by a program of Federal aid for school construction—pacing it to the real needs of individual school districts in States and territories, and requiring State approval and participation.
>
> We are aware of the fact that there is a temporary shortage of classrooms for our elementary and secondary schools in a limited number of States. But this shortage, due to the vigilant action of State legislatures and local school boards, is not increasing, but is decreasing.
>
> We believe moreover that any large plan of Federal aid to education, such as direct contributions to or grants for teachers salaries can only lead ultimately to Federal domination and control of our schools to which we are unalterably opposed.

I note in the President's message this morning that the "gap" recurs. We have heard about gaps before, and I have had occasion to talk about gaps. On page 4 of the message I note this sentence:

> Even with increased contributions from State, local and private sources, a gap of $2.9 billion between aggregate needs and expenditures is anticipated by 1965, and a gap of $5.2 billion by 1970.

Mr. President, I took the sacrificial spirit on the state of the Union message as uttered even before it was uttered, in presenting a school bill as early as January 17. I go in for simplification and for the necessity of establishing a demonstrated need.

The bill was introduced on the 17th of January. It is Senate bill 433. Briefly, it would provide $250 million a year for a period of 4 years, which is a total of $1 billion of available Federal authorized funds. Secondly, the need for the money must be shown before it can be obtained and before it can be expended.

The bill provides for no "frills." I think, on the New Frontier, the emphasis ought to be on reading, writing, and arithmetic, American history, and perhaps some science, but I like to be solid about it. When I think of the New Frontier I think of solid knowledge rather than culture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Does the Senator care to ask unanimous consent to proceed further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall renew my remarks directly, and will ask unanimous consent to have them printed together.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there was objection to my proceeding the other day, for the same reason.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is all right. The rule is the rule.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in order to keep within the 3-minute rule I think it is about time that I "spell" the distinguished minority leader, so long as he is speaking about education.

I point out that in contrast to the Republican proposal, which was introduced earlier and I am sure in anticipation of today's message and the measure which will be introduced today, the President's proposal includes this statement:

> Education must remain a matter of State and local control, and higher education a matter of individual choice.

I hope that those who have a phobia against Federal aid to education because of their alleged fear of Federal intervention and control will look over the history of Federal aid to education, which goes back many, many decades. We find that under the Morrill Act land grant colleges received assistance for a good many years, and with that Federal assistance they have been conducting their own affairs quite free of Federal control.

We also have such acts as the Smith-Hughes Act, applicable to agricultural classes in high school, many of them in my State of Montana. They have been operating successfully for many years. Part of the funds are appropriated by the Federal Government to make better farmers out of youngsters from farms and ranches. There has been no indication of Federal control in that respect.

Then, of course, there is the George-Barden Act, which is likewise of benefit to our school systems, and which also has never imposed Federal control on the schools.

It appears to me on the basis of the message sent down by the President that this is a reasonable proposal, one which is necessary if our undereducated children and, in all too many instances, our undereducated teachers, are to be given the incentives and the facilities which they must have. We need better teachers. We need to get away from the crowding of classrooms. We need to make an investment in the youth of this country, because they are the ones who, in the not too distant future, will be required to take the reins and guide the Nation.

So I know that this year, as last year, the Senate will give every consideration to the proposal of the President of the United States; and, I am certain, at the same time it will give consideration to the proposals advanced by the distinguished minority leader and his colleagues in the field of education.

I make my statement on the basis of need. I do not know why a burden should be imposed upon all the taxpayers of the country for a school district or for a State unless the need is clearly shown.

Second, we should see the burden be not imposed for frills. The whole school case was built up in the first instance because of the emphasis on classroom shortage. I was willing to take that thesis at face value, and so I am willing now to see a program that addresses itself to the classroom shortage, exactly where this problem started in the first instance.

The formula is very simple. I take the 1960 census and the proportion of youngsters of school age, not between 5 and 17, as has been proposed, but between 5 and 14 because we are building for the future, not necessarily for the present school population, because it would take some time to get the proposed facilities built, and several years would have elapsed.

I take the proportion of the number of youngsters from 5 to 14 in the State to the whole number in the country, derive a very simple factor, and then take that proportion of $250 million and say, "This much is available to Connecticut. This much is available to Illinois."

There are no fancy indices in this bill, there is no index of per capita school income, no index of State effort or individual effort. We do not need an engineer's slide rule, a book of logarithms, a book of squares and fourth dimensions, to solve this very simple bill, because the proportion is there. It deals fairly and equitably with every State on the basis of the number of youngsters of school age. In addition, it calls for half the cost, or matching in an equal amount by the States.

Finally, there is a provision that a facility that is built in part with Federal funds shall admit all students and provide an equal oportunity for education. I do not know of a simpler way to draw a bill. I know of no simpler way to set up the criteria and make it easy of administration.

So the bill will be before the Subcommittee on Education. I have forgotten, but I think I am on the subcommittee, and I presume in due course I shall have an apportunity to hear the testimony not only on the administration bill but on my own bill and any

other bills on the subject of Federal aid to education that may be presented.

So there is the story. This is a simple bill, involving a reasonable request, and it does not propose to go off into the blue. As I evaluate the President's bill, the cost would run into billions before we got through. Obviously, with a $660 million authorization requested for the first year, I can see a great nuclear hole in the 1961 budget, and probably a hydronuclear hole in the 1962 budget. So for the moment we will let the case stand there. However, I felt that the remarks which I made were in order, in view of the fact that the President's school message came to Congress today.

FEED GRAINS BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had hoped to express myself on the feed grains bill which was sent to Congress. The message came up last week. I have gone through the message and the bill pretty carefully, and I note some rather interesting items in the bill. I believe the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will probably hear the Secretary of Agriculture on Thursday of this week. I will forebear on that matter as of this moment, but some time later in the day, or tomorrow, I shall undertake, if the Senate is in session, to say a few words about the new feed grains bill.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, during the morning hour I sent to the desk, for appropriate reference, two bills to deal with two aspects of our most urgent domestic problem—unemployment.

More men and women are now out of work in this country than at any time in 20 years. The latest figures, those for January, show 5,400,000 workers unemployed, and indications are that the situation may be even worse in February. Especially serious is the problem of the long-term unemployed, because these are families whose unemployment compensation benefits and private resources have become exhausted. In January, 1,300,000 workers had been unemployed for 15 weeks or longer, and half of that number had been out of work for 6 months or more.

Of course, the burden and the tragedy of unemployment do not fall evenly across the country. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, being a State of concentrated heavy industry, has been particularly hard hit. In our Commonwealth alone, 504,000 persons are unemployed—or 11.3 percent of the labor force. All but 3 of our 12 major labor market areas are listed as having substantial unemployment.

In my Commonwealth, because of the low rate of operation of the steel industry, there are thousands upon thousands of underemployed workers who are working less than half time. Also in my Commonwealth, because of the steel industry in part and because of other situations affecting the marketing of coal, there are tens of thousands of coal miners who are working hardly as much as part time.

The suggestion has been made in some quarters that it is unwise to admit we are in a recession, or to call it by that name, because that might impair confidence in the economy and thus make matters worse. My own view is just the opposite. American businessmen certainly know the state of the economy; they have access to all the figures put out by the Departments of Commerce and Labor and by private sources. What will inspire confidence is a clear indication from the Government that it does not intend to permit the recession to continue and to deepen. What destroys confidence is any suggestion that the Government is going to permit matters simply to take their course.

I believe, therefore, that President Kennedy has acted wisely in telling the people the facts of economic life, no matter how harsh those facts may be.

I believe the President has inspired confidence by taking Executive action to speed up Federal public works and by proposing for quick action on a series of major measures which will alleviate the effects of the recession and help to check any further decline. I agree that we should act promptly, and I believe that the Ways and Means Committee of the other body in particular deserves commendation for the speed and dispatch with which it is considering the extension of unemployment compensation benefits.

One of the measures which I have introduced today, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would authorize an emergency program of State and local public works.

The President has said that we should take a careful look at the economy in April and decide whether additional measures, beside those he has already taken and proposed, are needed in order to bring the recession to a rapid end.

My bill of today is designed to put the Congress into a position to act in April if the President and his economic advisers conclude, and if the Congress concludes, that further action is needed.

Those of us who served in the Congress during the 1958 recession will remember the amount of time that was lost in debating whether we really were in a recession; whether, if so, it would cure itself without the need for legislation; and, if not, what form the legislation should take. The result of all the delay was that our actions were, for the most part, too little and too late. The exception was the Emergency Housing Act, which many economists believe had an important effect in stimulating recovery, but for the rest the recession was virtually allowed to run its course—and one result was a deficit in the Federal Treasury of over $12 billion in a single fiscal year. The potential antirecession effect of State and local public works was not utilized at all on a nationwide basis.

For three decades, economists have advocated public works as a countercyclical device. We should accelerate them in recessionary periods; curtail them in inflationary periods. Yet, once a recession begins, we tend to be too slow in getting the acceleration underway.

I take it there is no longer any Member of the Senate who denies that we are in a recession. This President Kennedy has made abundantly clear since he took office. If we are in a recession, let us do something about it, and do it now, while it will help.

Accordingly, the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems of the Senate, headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], in its report a year ago recommended that standby legislation be enacted so that at the outset of a recession the President would have available the authority needed to expedite public works—State and local as well as Federal—without the need for further congressional action. With the cosponsorship of several of my colleagues, I introduced legislation to provide the President with the necessary standby authority to accelerate Federal and federally aided construction programs, to provide emergency stimulation to homebuilding, and to assist State and local governments to accelerate public works of all kinds.

Mr. President, if this legislation were on the statute books, the President would have all the authority needed to move rapidly if the decision is made in April to stimulate the economy through acceleration of public works expenditures.

However, the legislation was not passed, and we now face the prospect of lost time in getting laws drafted, considered, and enacted, if it appears clear in the spring that additional legislation is essential.

I urge that the Congress not wait until April to get started. I urge that during the next 6 weeks we proceed through the early stages of the legislative process, so that bills will be ready to be laid on the President's desk for his signature in April if it is clear then that we should go ahead.

I introduce my bill today for that purpose. I would hope that hearings could be held, that the potential antirecession impact of State and local public works could be measured, and that a consensus could be reached on the administrative arrangements and other details of a Federally-aided construction program. At best, to proceed through these steps in both Houses will take until the end of March. By that time, the administration and the Congress will be in a position to decide as to whether such a measure as this is needed to help bring us out of the recession. If the conclusion is negative, which all of us hope it will be, then I shall propose that the measure be converted into a standby act and passed to give the administration an important weapon in its arsenal for use the next time we enter the recessionary phase of the economic cycle.

Briefly, this is what the bill would do:

It would authorize the President, through any Federal agency which he may designate, to contract for $500

million in grants to States, their subdivisions, and other public bodies to increase their levels of capital expenditures.

The Federal share of the State and local projects would be 45 percent. The $500 million would thus make possible $1.1 billion in additional construction. When the first $500 million has been committed, the President after consultation with the Council of Economic Advisers may commit another $500 million if he concludes it is necessary to bring an end to the recession. The authority would end at such time as unemployment falls below 4 percent of the labor force.

I wish to emphasize that point. This is not merely an across-the-board spending project. It is to utilize public works construction to terminate unemployment or to bring it within acceptable limits. Our national rate of unemployment is presently well in excess of 7 percent of the labor force. If we get it down to under 4 percent, then we ought to eliminate further progress on these construction measures, because we will not need them purely as antiunemployment measures.

The bill specifies that aid will be given to projects which amount to a net increase in the level of capital expenditures of the public body receiving the grant. The object is to increase total construction, and Federal money could not be used merely to substitute for funds that would otherwise be provided locally.

Let me point out that this is not a depressed areas bill. The bill would provide for accomplishing a public service across the board everywhere in our country in order to eliminate unemployment everywhere in our country.

The 45 percent Federal share is adapted from the matching ratio that was in effect for the Public Works Administration program of the 1930's. I believe there is general agreement that the PWA, which was administered by Secretary Ickes, was one of the most effective and respected of all the New Deal agencies. Its projects made a permanent contribution to public wealth throughout the country.

It has been national policy for a decade to assist States and local communities to plan ahead with a "shelf" of public works, for just such a contingency. Planning funds under section 702 of the Housing Act of 1949 have been provided for the purpose. Communities which have been alert and enterprising enough to proceed under that act, and who have thus sought to further a declared national policy, will probably be in an advantageous position to make early application for aid under the bill.

I do not know which communities have projects which are on the shelf and ready for execution, and would thus be able to proceed. I understand the Community Facilities Administration has undertaken a survey to obtain this information; and I have asked for a tabulation of the results. When it is available, I will ask permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that each Senator can see how his State might be affected.

The bill specifies that the projects must be of a type that can be started and completed within a reasonable time. To such end, priority is to be given those projects on which construction contracts can be let within 90 days and which can be completed within 12 months thereafter. Projects which would be aided under existing acts, such as the Hill-Burton Hospital Program Act, or the airport program, or the aid to education program, when we enact such a program, would be ineligible.

Mr. President, I am in complete sympathy with President Kennedy's proposal to extend unemployment compensation benefits and to improve public assistance. They are urgently necessary. Yet I submit that it is far preferable, to the extent possible, to put people to work building badly needed public structures, to improve the roads, streets, water and sewer systems, police and fire buildings, schools, libraries, to catch up on our needs for public facilities of all kinds and thus to improve our public services.

If Federal money is going to be spent, I urge that we put our emphasis on buying things of lasting value, as we did through the PWA, rather than pay it out in the form of a dole which brings no tangible public benefit of any kind.

There is hardly a community in the country that does not have a backlog of needed public works. When the private economy is sagging, that is the time to move ahead on needed public expenditures—expenditures which must be made, sooner or later, in any case.

The second bill which I have introduced, on behalf of myself and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], would provide a cooperative Federal-State program for the retraining of unemployed workers whose skills have become obsolete as the result of automation or other technological development, foreign competition, shifts in market demands, or other change in the structure of the economy.

This is intended not as an emergency measure but as permanent legislation.

The retraining bill is also an outgrowth of the work of the McCarthy Committee on Unemployment Problems. We found that throughout the country, even in prosperous times, thousands of workers cannot be employed because they do not have the skills that are needed in our modern economy.

In my own State, automation in the coal industry and the loss of markets has wiped out tens of thousands of coalmining jobs. But when a worker knocks at the door of a modern factory and is asked the question, "What can you do?" and he says, "I can mine coal," he never gets through the door.

Mr. President, in my Commonwealth we have also a large-scale movement of textile industry to the South, leaving unemployed many textile workers who can do nothing else and who also will require retraining.

In my Commonwealth there has been a drastic falling off in railroad employment, particularly in the maintenance and repair shops. Those skilled men can repair locomotives and freight cars, but they are not trained for anything else. With a little retraining, they could be made available for other types of work.

These are a few of the areas where the retraining of competent, able workers will be effective in stimulating reemployment and also building up production. This is particularly true of older workers, those over 40 or even 35. Unless they acquire a new skill, one that is needed in the economy, many of them will never work again.

The bill provides for organization of training courses under the present cooperative Federal-State vocational education program initiated by the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917. It provides, however, that the employment service, acting under criteria set forth by the Secretary of Labor, shall determine what skills are needed in the economy and shall make sure that opportunities exist for the employment of persons retrained. Then it shall certify persons from those registered for employment with the employment service, giving preference to those who are over 30, those who are heads of families, and those who have at least 5 years work experience. The younger, single people are more mobile and better able to obtain their own retraining opportunities, and for them the existing vocational education program is well adapted.

Let me stress the importance of having manpower planning, so that we will know where job availabilities are. There is no sense in retraining an unemployed worker for a job opportunity which will never arise. The States, the Department of Labor, and, indeed, the Council of Economic Advisers, have an important function to perform in continually studying the economy and prognosticating where the opportunities for retrained workers will be, and then to see to it that those persons who are out of jobs are retrained in skills which will enable them to become employable as a practical matter.

I note with interest that in the education bill which has just come to the Senate, the President suggests that the whole vocational training setup should be restudied, so that we can be certain that vocational and technical retraining will be for skills which have employment opportunities attached to them.

I stress again the fact that the bill I am introducing contains a requirement that in a retraining program there shall be a certification that the skill in which the retraining is given is a skill for which employment opportunities exist.

Unemployed workers certified for retraining would be eligible for transportation and subsistence allowances in cases where the course was set up at a location requiring the worker's travel. In addition, payments equal to unemployment insurance benefits would be continued for the period of the retraining, but not in excess of 52 weeks, to enable the worker to remain in the course until the training was complete.

Experience has shown that retraining programs are of limited effect unless the worker can pay such transportation expenses as may be necessary, and has a small living allowance.

After all, the men being retrained are out of work. Their unemployment compensation, in many cases, has been exhausted. They have to support their families. They have no reserves with which to pay for their subsistence while retraining is taking place.

If the worker can be made employable and productive, of course, the ultimate cost of the training expenditures is more than repaid and the expenses are offset by the reduction in public assistance and unemployment compensation costs. This has been proved in the vocational rehabilitation program, which proceeds on a similar principle.

Almost every employed worker pays an income tax. An unemployed worker does not. It is simply a matter of hard, fiscal commonsense to get people who are not unemployed back on the payrolls, so that they, in turn, can contribute the Federal taxes which are necessary to keep our economy going.

This bill, while it may in the first instance call for the expenditure of some Federal money, will, in my judgment, in the long run, more than repay the Treasury for the moneys it is putting out, through the taxes which will come back from the men and women who will have jobs which they are not now qualified to fill, but would be qualified to fill after their retraining had been completed.

Mr. President, these are two measures to deal with only two aspects of the complex and many-sided problem of unemployment. The Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I have the honor to be chairman in this Congress, and which was created to follow up on those aspects of the work of the McCarthy committee which fall within the jurisdiction of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, will hold hearings in the coming weeks on the unemployment problem in general and on many of its specific aspects.

Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg will be our first witness when hearings open on Wednesday, February 22. On the following day, we will hold a hearing in Pittsburgh in conjunction with a special joint committee of the Pennsylvania Legislature.

Additional hearings will be held in Washington; in Chester, Pa.; in Trenton, N.J.; and elsewhere throughout the country. I should be happy to have Senators suggest where they think hearings could profitably be held in the interest of getting testimony we need in support of the proposed legislation or in favor of its modification. I hope that we may arrive promptly at recommendations for constructive legislation to be presented to the full committee and by that committee to the Senate for early consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the two bills be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, they will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. CLARK, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 986. A bill to assist in the reduction of unemployment through the acceleration of capital expenditure programs of State and local public bodies.

S. 986

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Employment Acceleration Act of 1961".

POLICY AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that unemployment in the United States has reached an intolerable level, and that emergency measures to increase employment opportunities are necessary in the interest of the public welfare. The Congress further finds that a quick and effective means of increasing employment is through the acceleration of capital expenditure programs of State and local governmental bodies, particularly through smaller projects which can be initiated promptly and completed by the time the private sector of the economy has recovered from the recession. Virtually every community in the Nation has a backlog of needed public projects, and an emergency acceleration of these projects now will not only increase employment at a time when jobs are most urgently required, but will also meet long-standing public needs, improve community services, and enhance the health and welfare of the citizens of the Nation.

The purpose of this Act is to provide an incentive, through Federal grants, for State and local governmental bodies to accelerate their capital expenditure programs through the initiation of projects which can be begun promptly and completed over a reasonably short period of time, such assistance to be automatically terminated when the rate of unemployment falls below the level of 4 per centum of the civilian labor force after adjustment for seasonal variation.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territorial possessions of the United States;

(2) the term "public works and facilities" includes the construction, repair, and improvement of public streets, sidewalks, highways, parkways, bridges, parking lots, airports, and other public transportation facilities; public parks and other public recreational facilities; public hospitals, rehabilitation and health centers; public refuse and garbage disposal facilities, water, sewage, and sanitary facilities, and other public utility facilities; civil defense facilities; public police and fire protection facilities; public schools, libraries, museums, offices, and other public buildings; and public land, water, and timber conservation facilities.

GRANTS

SEC. 4. (a) The President may, upon application and under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, make grants to States, municipalities, and local public bodies, to finance the construction of specific public works and facilities under State, municipal, or other applicable law; but no such grant shall be made for the payment of ordinary governmental or nonproject operating or maintenance expenses.

(b) The authority conferred by this section shall be subject to the following restrictions and limitations:

(1) No grant shall be made with respect to any project unless such project results in a net increase in the current annual level of capital expenditures of the applicant.

(2) The amount of any grant with respect to any project shall not exceed 45 per centum of (A) the cost (as determined by the President) of undertaking and completing the project, exclusive of any costs attributable to land acquisition, or (B) the amount of the net increase in the current annual level of capital expenditures of the applicant attributable to such project, whichever is the lesser.

(3) No grant shall be made in the case of any project, if a grant or a commitment for a grant has been made with respect to such project under any other Act of Congress.

(4) No grant shall be made with respect to any project the construction of which cannot be commenced and completed within a reasonably short period of time. In entering into contracts for grants under this section, the President shall accord priority to projects which he determines can (A) be commenced by the letting of construction contracts within ninety days after a contract under this section is entered into, and (B) be completed within twelve months after construction is commenced.

(c) The President may contract to make grants under this section aggregating not to exceed $500,000,000. Such limit may be increased at such time and in such amount, not exceeding $500,000,000, as the President determines, after consultation with the Council of Economic Advisers, is necessary to fully accomplish the objectives of this Act.

(d) The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all grants contracted for under this section, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amounts necessary to provide for such payments.

(e) The authority to enter into contracts for grants under this section shall terminate whenever the President determines, upon the basis of statistical data compiled and published by the Department of Labor, that the national unemployment rate, adjusted for seasonal variations, is not in excess of 4 per centum of the civilian labor force of the Nation; but nothing herein shall affect the validity of any contract entered into under this section prior to any such determination.

LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 5. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects assisted under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a–5), and every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be. The Secretary shall not approve any project involving the contribution of Federal funds without first obtaining adequate assurance that these labor standards will be maintained upon the construction work. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this provision the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Number 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176, 64 Stat. 1267, 5 U.S.C. 133z–15),

and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276c).

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the powers vested in him by this Act, the President shall maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office, and no other audit shall be required.

(b) In the performance of, and with respect to, the powers vested in him by this Act, the President may—

(1) sue and be sued;

(2) commence any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon him by law, contract, or other agreement;

(3) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this Act such covenants, conditions, or provisions as he may deem necessary to assure that the purposes of this Act will be achieved; and

(4) make advance or progress payments on account of any grant contracted to be made pursuant to this Act, notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to administer the provisions of this Act.

AMENDMENT

SEC. 7. Section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the provision of any public improvement or facility with respect to which assistance has been extended under the Emergency Employment Acceleration Act of 1961 shall not be considered a local grant-in-aid within the purview of this subsection."

DELEGATION OF POWERS

SEC. 8. The President may delegate any function, power, or authority conferred upon him by this Act to such departments, agencies, or offices of the Government as he deems appropriate; but nothing herein shall authorize the delegation of the power conferred upon the President by the second sentence of section 4(c).

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. HART, and Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts):

S. 987. A bill to authorize the retraining of persons displaced from their jobs by automation or other technological development, foreign competition, relocation of industry, shifts in market demands, or other change in the structure of the economy.

S. 987

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Vocational Retraining Act of 1961".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that the skills of many persons have been rendered obsolete by dislocations in the economy arising from automation or other technological development, foreign competition, relocation of industry, shifts in market demands, and other changes in the structure of the economy; that many such persons, in order to become qualified for reemployment, must be provided the opportunity for retraining in skills which are or will be in demand in the labor market; that it is in the national interest that such opportunities be provided in order to alleviate the hardships of unemployment, increase the Nation's productivity, and reduce the costs of unemployment compensation, public assistance, and other forms of relief. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide financial assistance to States for the purpose of enabling them to modify and expand existing State programs of vocational education so as to provide for the retraining of unemployed workers.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. (a) There is authorized to be included within the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for each succeeding fiscal year, the sum of $30,000,000 to be apportioned among the States to carry out retraining programs in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary for the administration of this Act.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 4. (a) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 3(a), each State shall be entitled to an allotment of an amount bearing the same ratio to such sums as the total number of long-term unemployed individuals in such State during the last full calendar year for which satisfactory data is available from the Department of Labor bears to the sum of long-term unemployed individuals in all the States during such year.

(b) The amount of any allotment to a State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the State certifies to the Commissioner of Education will not be required for carrying out vocational retraining programs under this Act shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year.

AMENDMENT OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 5. To be eligible to participate in the benefits of this Act, a State must—

(a) have in effect a State plan established pursuant to, and approved under, the Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended; and a State plan established pursuant to the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 115; 29 U.S.C. 492) relating to the United States Employment Service.

(b) submit amendments to each such State plan creating a new part of such plan to administer vocational retraining programs assisted under this Act. Such amendments shall set forth the plans, policies, and methods under which the State proposes to administer such retraining programs, which plans, policies, and methods shall—

(1) provide for a determination by the State employment service of the existing or potential shortages of persons with particular skills, and the opportunities which may exist for employment in the State of persons currently unemployed, if such persons are retrained in the skills needed within such State under the provisions of this Act;

(2) provide for the organization, by the State board of vocational education or under its direction, of retraining courses to equip unemployed persons with needed skills;

(3) provide for the selection of eligible unemployed individuals, in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary of Labor under section 7 of this Act, and certification for retraining of, payment or reimbursement of transportation costs to, and subsistence payments for, such individuals, as authorized in section 8 of this Act;

(4) provide such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of funds paid to the State under this Act;

(5) provide that the State board of vocational education will make such reports to the Commissioner of Education, and the State employment service will make such reports to the Secretary of Labor, as are reasonably necessary to enable them to perform their respective functions under this Act; and

(6) provide, to the extent possible under State law, that individuals shall not be disqualified from receiving unemployment compensation benefits while receiving retraining provided pursuant to this Act.

(c) Amendments made pursuant to this Act to a State plan shall be approved in the same manner as the State plan being amended, and any findings of noncompliance with such amendments shall have the same effect as that, and be subject to the same rights of appeal and review as those, provided with respect to the State plan being amended.

PAYMENTS TO THE STATES

SEC. 6. (a) Any amount paid to a State from its allotment under section 4 for any fiscal year shall be paid on condition that—

(1) such State pay 25 per centum of the costs of carrying out its vocational retraining program established pursuant to this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and 50 per centum of such costs in each succeeding fiscal year;

(2) funds appropriated under this Act will not be used to reduce the amount of State or local funds, or both, being spent for vocational education programs operated under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and titles I, II, and III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and reported to the Commissioner, but such State or local funds, or both, in excess of the amount necessary for dollar for dollar matching of funds allotted to a State under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and titles I, II, and III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 may be used to match funds appropriated under this Act;

(3) funds appropriated under this Act shall be used by the State for the retraining of unemployed persons certified as eligible for retraining in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 7; and

(4) no funds appropriated under the authority of this Act shall be expended in industrial-plant-training programs, unless such programs constitute bona fide vocational retraining and are not used as a device for the utilization of the services of vocational retrainees for private profit.

(b) The Commissioner shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State for vocational retraining programs under this Act for such period; and shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for such period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this subsection) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid to the State for any prior period for such purpose under this Act was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period under this Act for such purpose. Such payments shall be made in such installments as the Commissioner may determine.

ELIGIBILITY FOR RETRAINING

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Labor shall establish criteria for determining the eligibility of unemployed workers for vocational retraining under State programs established pursuant to this Act. Such criteria shall limit eligibility to individuals who, on the date of application for such retraining, are (1) unemployed or underemployed, because of change in the structure of the economy, (2) cannot reasonably be expected to secure

full-time employment without retraining, and (3) can, upon completion of retraining, reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment in work relating to such retraining. Such criteria shall provide priority for otherwise eligible individuals who are thirty or more years of age, otherwise eligible individuals who are heads of families, and otherwise eligible individuals who have had not less than five years experience in gainful employment.

USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 8. (a) Funds paid to a State under this Act may be used, in carrying out programs of vocational retraining under the vocational education plan of the State, as amended pursuant to section 5, for—

(1) conducting retraining courses; paying salaries and travel expenses of State and local school personnel (including teachers, supervisors, and administrators); purchase, rental, maintenance, and installation of instructional equipment; and purchase of instructional supplies and teaching aids;

(2) payments in lieu of unemployment compensation to individuals who are undergoing retraining under the State vocational education program assisted under this Act and who have exhausted their entitlement to unemployment compensation benefits under provisions of State and Federal law; except that (A) no such payments shall be made to any individual for a period in excess of fifty-two weeks, and (B) no such payment shall be made to any individual who fails to apply for retraining under such State vocational education program prior to the expiration of ten weeks after the date he last became entitled to such unemployment compensation benefits, or the date retraining (upon the making of timely application therefor) first became available to him in the State of his residence, whichever is the later; and

(3) transportation and necessary subsistence expenses for workers engaged in retraining under this Act when such retraining is provided in facilities which are not within commuting distance of their regular places of residence.

(b) Funds paid to a State under this Act shall not be used to defray any portion of the cost of the purchase, preservation, erection, repair, or rental, of any building, or the purchase or rental of any land.

(c) Any equipment and teaching aids purchased by a State with funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act shall become the property of the State.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

SEC. 9. Effective on and after July 1, 1963, no funds appropriated under this Act shall be paid to any State the law of which disqualifies individuals otherwise entitled to unemployment compensation benefits under State law from receiving such benefits while undergoing retraining under State programs of vocational education assisted under this Act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 10. For purposes of this Act—

(a) the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands;

(b) the term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education; and

(c) the term "long-term unemployed" means persons who have been unemployed continuously for a period of fifteen or more weeks and have, during such period, registered with the employment service of the State in which they reside as available for, and seeking, employment.

(d) the term "State board of vocational education" refers to a State board created or designated by a State pursuant to the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act; and

(e) the term "Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act" means the Act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114).

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL AND TRAVEL ADVISORY BOARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 610.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 610) to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "is authorized and directed to" and insert "shall"; on page 3, line 11, after the word "businesses", to strike out "and organizations engaged in or concerned with international travel, including" and insert "private organizations, and"; in line 14, after the word "agencies", to insert "engaged in or concerned with international travel;"; at the beginning of line 19, to insert "travel,"; on page 4, line 10, after the word "Commerce", to strike out "an Office of International Travel" and insert "a United States Travel Service"; at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "the Office" and insert "the Travel Service"; in line 13, after "(b)", to strike out "The Office shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be compensated at the rate of $17,500 per annum." and insert "The Travel Service shall be headed by an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Travel (hereinafter referred to as the "Assistant Secretary") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Assistant Secretary shall be in addition to the other Assistant Secretaries provided by law for the Department of Commerce."; in line 24, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "Director" and insert "Assistant Secretary"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "The Director shall have authority to appoint and fix the compensation of such subordinate personnel as he deems to be required in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."; on page 5, line 4, after "(c)", to strike out "The Director" and insert "In the absence of the Secretary the Assistant Secretary"; in line 10, after the word "of", to strike out "twelve" and insert "twenty"; at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "six" and insert "ten"; on page 6, line 1, after "(d)", to strike out "Seven" and insert "Twelve"; after line 2, to strike out:

(c) The Board shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems to be required in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

At the beginning of line 7, to strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)"; after line 13, to strike out:

(g) Service of any individual as a member of the Board shall not constitute service or employment of such individual within the purview of sections 281, 283, 284, and 434 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99); however, such individual shall be subject to the aforesaid provisions for the purpose of prohibiting them from acting as an agent, attorney, officer, or otherwise, contrary to the interest of the United States, and such individuals shall be subject also to the aforesaid provisions so as to preclude them from receiving certain compensation as indicated in the aforesaid provisions.

After line 24, to insert:

(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Board or as an expert or consultant under section 2(b)(3) of this Act shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18, or of section 99 of title 5 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceedings, or matter involving the United States, except insofar as such provisions of law may prohibit any such individual from receiving compensation in respect of any particular matter in which such individual was directly involved in the performance of such service.

On page 7, line 15, after the word "the"' to strike out "Director" and insert "Assistant Secretary"; in line 16, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "Office," and insert "Travel Service"; at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "Director" and insert "Assistant Secretary"; in line 23, after the word "the", to strike out "Office" and insert "Travel Service"; on page 8, line 1, after the word "the", to strike out "Director" and insert "Assistant Secretary"; after line 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 6. Section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 408, Eighty-third Congress) is amended by striking the period at the end of subsection (r) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by inserting after such subsection a new subsection as follows:

"(s) For financing the establishment and operation of travel offices and other activities authorized by the International Travel Act of 1961, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts.".

At the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "6" to "7", and after line 16, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "International Travel Act of 1961".

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce, improve the foreign payments position of the United States, and promote international understanding and appreciation of the United States of America by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally.

SEC. 2. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as "the Secretary") shall—

(1) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program, utilizing all appropriate media of public information and communication, designed to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by the residents of foreign countries for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities conducive to better international understanding of the people and institutions of the United States;

(2) encourage the strengthening of tourist facilities, programs, and other arrangements within the United States for assuring a friendly welcome and meeting the special requirements of foreign visitors;

(3) coordinate all travel facilitation activities of the United States Government, and actively encourage progressive elimination, reduction, or simplification of barriers to travel;

(4) assist in the implementation of foreign technical assistance and economic development projects in the travel industry field; and

(5) collect, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics and technical information relating to international travel and tourism.

(b) In performing the duties set forth in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) utilize the facilities of existing agencies of the Federal Government to the fullest extent possible;

(2) consult and cooperate with individuals, businesses, private organizations, and local, State, Federal, foreign government, and international agencies engaged in or concerned with international travel;

(3) obtain by contract and otherwise the advice and services of qualified and experienced professional agencies, consultants, and specialists in the field of travel, advertising, public information, and mass communication;

(4) establish such travel offices in foreign countries, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, as he deems to be necessary and desirable;

(5) refrain from conducting any activity or furnishing any service which might result in adverse economic competition to persons engaged in the business of providing transportation, accommodations, or other facilities to persons traveling between the United States and foreign countries.

(c) The Secretary shall submit to the President and to the Congress an annual report on his activities under this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Commerce a United States Travel Service (hereinafter referred to as "the Travel Service").

(b) The Travel Service shall be headed by an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Travel (hereinafter referred to as the "Assistant Secretary") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Assistant Secretary shall be in addition to the other Assistant Secretaries provided by law for the Department of Commerce. All duties and responsibilities of the Secretary set forth in section 2 of this Act shall be exercised through the Assistant Secretary.

(c) In the absence of the Secretary the Assistant Secretary shall represent the Secretary on any interagency committee, board, or other organization established within the executive branch to deal with travel matters.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Travel Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as "the Board") which shall be composed of twenty members who shall be appointed by the Secretary and who shall serve for such terms as may be designated by the Secretary. Such members shall not be officers or employees of the Federal Government and shall be individuals who, by reason of interest, training, or experience, are qualified to carry out the duties provided for in section 5 of this Act. At least ten of the members of the Board shall be representatives of the travel and related industries.

(b) The Board shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from its members.

(c) Any vacancy in the Board shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Twelve members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

(e) Each member of the Board shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of his duties; and, while away from his home or regular place of business and engaged in the actual performance of his duties, he shall also receive travel and subsistence expenses in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Board or as an expert or consultant under section 2(b)(3) of this Act shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18, or of section 99 of title 5 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceedings, or matter involving the United States, except insofar as such provisions of law may prohibit any such individual from receiving compensation in respect of any particular matter in which such individual was directly involved in the performance of such service.

SEC. 5 The Board shall—

(1) advise and consult with the Assistant Secretary with respect to the activities of the Travel Service and from time to time shall submit to the Assistant Secretary recommendations for programs and policies to be adopted; and

(2) submit to the Secretary and the Congress from time to time, but not less than once a year, reports containing appraisals of the effectiveness of the programs and activities being carried on by the Travel Service and setting forth recommendations the Board has made to the Assistant Secretary and such other matters as it may consider pertinent.

SEC. 6. Section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 408, Eighty-third Congress) is amended by striking the period at the end of subsection (r) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by inserting after such subsection a new subsection as follows:

"(s) For financing the establishment and operation of travel offices and other activities authorized by the International Travel Act of 1961, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts.".

SEC. 7. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $5,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and thereafter such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "International Travel Act of 1961".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this measure provides for a major new effort to attract foreign visitors to the United States, as called for by President Kennedy in his messages to Congress on the state of the Union and the balance-of-payments problem. The bill is identical in most respects to S. 3102, of last year, which was introduced by me, and was passed without objection by the Senate, in June, but died in the House in the closing days of last session. It has enjoyed the support of both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, the support of all segments of the travel industry, and of business, banking, farm, and labor leaders. I am unaware of any serious opposition to this measure.

As set forth on page 3 of the report on Senate bill 610, favorable testimony on it was received, at the committee hearings on February 2 and 3, from a number of outstanding persons, including the Secretary of Commerce, several Members of the Senate, and representatives of outstanding business organizations, publications, and transportation companies. The support of the bill by all those persons, including many of the Members of the Senate who have joined in the sponsorship of the bill, testifies to the widespread support this measure has received. They testified wholeheartedly in favor of it.

As a matter of fact, as will be seen from reading page 4 of the report, after the hearings—and there was much publicity in regard to the fact that the hearings would be held—we received only one statement unfavorable to the bill; it came from the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies.

On many occasions it has been pointed out that today the United States is almost the only nation in the world which has no active travel promotion and tourist hospitality program. As a result, we are losing more and more dollars to travel-conscious foreign countries—money which is not made up by tourist spending here. Our travel deficit is growing at the rate of $150 million every year. In 1960 it reached nearly $1,200 million, or the equivalent of about one-third of our entire balance-of-payments deficit, which this year will, according to a study made by my committee, amount to approximately $3,500 million. This deficit accounts for approximately 30 or 40 percent of our entire balance-of-payments deficit, and, of course, accounts, in turn, for our serious problem in respect to the withdrawal of gold from our country.

The pending bill will go a long way, we hope, toward correcting this unhappy state of affairs, by establishing a U.S. Travel Service, headed by an Assistant Secretary of Commerce. The Assistant Secretary would be directed to carry out a national travel program built around these three points:

First. A comprehensive promotional and information campaign overseas directed toward encouraging tourists to visit America's scenic attractions, cities, and national shrines, and toward dispelling the exaggerated but common notion of many foreign residents on the high costs of traveling in the United States—which, of course, is not a correct notion. Such a campaign would include the use of paid advertising and the setting up of Government travel offices in selected foreign countries.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that our country spends very large sums of money to encourage the bringing of students to this country, to study in our institutions and to see and become acquainted with our kind of life?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. That program is not as large as I should like it to be; but we have a student exchange program of modest size, and I believe it has done more good in creating the good will which exists for our country than has anything else we have done.

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator from Washington about the great value of the student exchange program, which I—along with the Senator from Washington and other Senators—have always strongly supported.

I wish to ask the Senator from Washington if it is true that it is just as desirable, and probably would be just as useful, to assist in encouraging travel in the United States by foreigners, whether adults or children, who wish to travel in our country and enjoy the various parts of the United States in which they may be interested?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, indeed. Certainly the great, intangible value of this program is to be found in what we call person-to-person contacts. Whenever we travel abroad, we find widespread interest in visiting the United States. Americans are very much interested in traveling in other countries; for instance, the Senator from Florida may wish to visit Italy; I may wish to visit Spain; others may wish to visit Japan. American tourists spend, annually, $2 billion or $2½ billion on foreign travel, and that is why the gap to which I have referred is so glaring.

As I have said, almost all the people of other countries wish to visit the United States. Therefore, this program would be a "sell America program," right at the grassroots.

I thoroughly agree with what the Senator from Florida has said; and this program should have been instituted 2 years ago, when I first supported it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I represent a State which enjoys a great amount of travel by citizens from other States; the same is true of the great State of Washington.

Last year more than 9 million Americans from other parts of the country visited Florida. In addition to the money they spend when they visit our State, we value their visits because they result in much greater knowledge of the industries and products of Florida; and we believe that as a result we benefit by means of increased sale of Florida products.

Does not the Senator from Washington think there would be a similar result from increased visits to the United States by foreigners, in addition to the money they would spend within our borders?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course. In fact, I am sure the Senator from Florida realizes—because the tourist trade is probably as important to Florida as any other activity there—that every dollar spent by tourists creates more actual employment than a dollar spent in connection with any other form of economic activity. Certainly I have discovered that is true. That results from the fact that so many personal services in restaurants and elsewhere are involved in taking care of travelers. We need to think more about that aspect of the situation. That is why our travel deficit, in 1960, of nearly $1,200 million is so important.

Our country spends less on encouraging travel by foreigners—and I have checked on these figures—than does the Belgian Congo or the Isle of Cyprus. We have had a small office for this purpose in the Department of Commerce, but it has had very little money to spend. We have not engaged in any advertising campaign at all. On the other hand, one has only to pick up a copy of almost any American magazine in order to find beautiful advertisements by other countries which welcome visits by Americans. But the United States has no similar program.

The pending bill calls for the making of a beginning, by means of a modest appropriation of $5 million. I believe that the Senator from Florida and other Senators discussed this aspect of the matter, last year. Most other countries have a rule of thumb which they use in connection with expenditures to encourage travel by foreigners; they spend for that purpose from 5 percent to 10 percent of the expenditures for travel within their borders by foreigners.

The pending bill calls for far less than that, but it would be a beginning. We also wish to advertise our country, in a sense, because of another erroneous impression that foreigners have. They know about the New York skyline and our large industries and factories, about which we like to brag; but very few of them know that we also have beautiful parks, marvelous roads, a great culture, the best theater in the world, outstanding education, and outstanding music. I venture to assert that more concerts are given at any given time during the summer in the United States than in all the countries in Europe combined. That is because of the fact that our country is so very large.

These are matters about which the people like to know. I suppose some persons would like to see cowboys and Indians, too, and some will want to try Florida fishing. We do not make any attempt to attract such tourist. Such touring would not only help reduce the large gap in the balance of payments, but think of the value of people coming to this country. We have told them about our country; now we say, "Come and see it." All of the travel agents have joined in this effort. If the tourists could use small cars, with lower prices, travel in this country would be just as cheap as travel in Europe if not cheaper. I point out that the motels would receive many benefits from that kind of travel. We cannot help but be understood better if people from foreign countries travel in our country.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot begin to say with sufficient vigor how strongly I support the Senator in this action. In my own State the counties and the progressive communities advertise in greater or less degree to attract tourists. As a result, we have, as has already been stated, about 9 million tourists a year. The State chamber of commerce, in evaluating the worth of that great group of visitors to our State, has placed a dollar-and-cents value on it of between $1½ and $2 billion.

The Senator has ably pointed out the manifold beauties in all 50 of the States and I wish we had him to speak for us in the older communities of the world, because undoubtedly he would attract many, many people to this country by the colorful way in which he would describe the beauty of our country. I would be greatly disappointed if it would not result in a value as great as the value of our tourist trade in Florida, which itself is more than enough to offset the unfavorable balance of payments which the Senator from Washington has just mentioned. I find as many beautiful places and as many intriguing sights that many of us like to see in almost every other State I have visited as I find in my own. Surely, by uniting in a movement of the kind proposed not only can we make hundreds of thousands and millions of friends that we do not have now, but we can, as the Senator has so ably pointed out, by one stroke offset the large factor in our unfavorable balance of payments.

I congratulate the Senator, and I will help him in every way I can.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator. I should like to add one matter. I have discussed the subject with President Kennedy. The Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] also discussed this matter with me. Some of the aspects of the bill must be done by law; other aspects can be accomplished by Executive order. The purpose is to eliminate some of the redtape—I do not know what else it can be called except redtape—and make it easier for bona fide tourists to visit the United States. I have stated before that it is harder for tourists to get into the United States than it is to break into jail.

If one wants to travel to the United States, he must go to some functionary in an embassy, and then he receives a long form. I wish I had a form with me to put into the RECORD. The distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], knows about this. Some of the questions that are asked are so embarrassing that one does not know whether he wants to come to the United States after all. If the person is an unmarried woman, the first question she is asked is, "Are you coming to the United States for immoral purposes?" They ask you, "Have you got a return ticket?" "Have you a good friend"—like the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], for example, who is present on the floor—"who is going to support you while you are in the United States, if you are fortunate enough to know him?" [Laughter.]

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me complete my statement first. That person is required to know someone in the United States who can take care of him, if necessary.

Most of our immigration laws were based on the idea of protection, so that people would not come to this country in droves and take away jobs from Americans. The whole attitude has been that that is what would happen with regard to persons coming into the United States.

We have not made any attempt to make it easier for bona fide tourists to come to the United States, just as Americans visit foreign countries. It is something the executive department can do something about, and I know it will.

I envision the day when the Immigration Service, the Customs Bureau, the State Department, and the Commerce Department, under the new Assistant Secretary, will sit down and say, "Let us see if we cannot simplify it and make it easier, so that someone who wants to tour the United States can feel that he is welcome."

Frances Knight, in the passport department, has done an excellent job in the last 18 months, since this effort was started, in trying to simplify the procedure. There could be established pilot branch offices in Paris, Rome, London, Tokyo, New Delhi, Sydney, Rio, and other cities in South America, and so forth. Those would be places where persons who wanted to tour the United States could get the necessary information on making a tour to this country.

The day may come, although it may be a little difficult for me to realize at this time, when all a tourist will need will be a white or blue card in order to visit our country, converse with us, communicate with us, and see the many things we have.

Other countries do this, and rightly so. I suppose if one stopped long enough in front of the window of the Italian Tourist Bureau on Fifth Avenue in New York City, he would soon go inside and find he was on his way to Italy, merely as a result of looking at the window.

We have no such establishments. I have no criticism of the State Department or the consuls as individuals, because that is the practice that has grown up under the law. The average person who wants to travel does not understand as much as the businessman or world traveler does about such matters. He is scared to death when he gets into an embassy and obtains the form. He practically gives up. It takes weeks to get anywhere.

I think we can do something about the situation.

In the field of advertising, when England wants travelers to come to the British festival, for example, or France wants visitors to visit its country, or Italy wants visitors to visit that country, they do some good, solid advertising to the Americans in English.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I certainly support what the Senator says. I ask the Senator if it is not true that with respect to the countries overseas, within the United States a number of individual States do a lot better job of inviting tourists into those States than the United States does?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course they do. I think pretty nearly every State in the Union does a little of this, and much more than the Federal Government has done, or could do, overseas.

Mr. BUSH. And the States have demonstrated by their promotional campaigns that within the United States the campaigns are effective.

I certainly congratulate the Senator for what he is saying and for the bill he is pressing upon the Senate, because I believe we have been very cold about this situation.

As I have traveled about the world I have observed the absence of any invitational organization of any kind with respect to having people visit the United States. When one walks along one of the main streets in the capital of a foreign country one finds a travel bureau of Italy, a travel bureau of Britain, a travel bureau of Switzerland, or of some other country, but never a travel bureau of the United States.

I think it is high time that we got down to business, as the bill will permit us to do. We should organize a welcome and invitation to people to visit the United States. Not only is this the proper thing to do in this time of tension, to make it possible for more people to better understand us, but also as the Secretary of the Treasury says in his report, it is important in connection with the balance-of-payments problem.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will yield to the Senator in a few minutes. I should like to finish my remarks. This will only require a few minutes.

Mr. President, the bill also provides for:

Second. Cooperation with private industry for improving tourist facilities within the United States, and for meeting the special requirements of foreign guests.

A Travel Advisory Board, which will represent transportation and tourist interests, for all the people involved, is to be created to assist in this effort.

Third. A coordinated attempt by all Government agencies concerned to ease barriers to travel and to assure that prompt and courteous treatment is given to persons seeking to visit this country.

This bill authorizes an initial appropriation of $5 million for this program. This is at least $3 million less than what foreign governments spend here to promote travel abroad by Americans. It is considerably less, per capita, than the amounts allotted every year by all but two of our own States to promote travel within the United States.

President Kennedy has asked the Departments of Commerce, State, and Treasury to report by April 1 on details for conducting the program authorized in this measure. I urge immediate passage by the Senate in order to permit enactment of S. 610 prior to that date.

I am much pleased that the leadership on both sides of the aisle, and so many members of my committee, have jointly sponsored the bill. We are moving the bill along as speedily as we can.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the White House in regard to the bill.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1961.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You will recall that in my message to the Congress on the state of the Union I stressed the importance of action to ease the balance of payments deficit, including measures to attract foreign travel to this country. I, therefore, appreciate your prompt introduction and consideration of the bill (S. 610) which will help greatly in achieving this objective.

As the program outlined in S. 610 will open up a long-neglected channel for improving international understanding of the United States, as well as help our payments problem, the proposed U.S. Travel Service should be allowed to attract personnel of superior caliber. For this reason, it is my thought that the Director's salary and status might well be elevated from the relatively low level now indicated in the bill to the rank of an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in regard to the bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS REGARDING S. 610

Adoption of S. 610, which would establish a U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce, is the culmination of many years of legislative effort. My own long period of work on the new means for greatly increasing tourist travel to the United States dates back to the 83d Congress when I conducted the first hearing on this effort as chairman of the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and subsequently brought in a bill. It was also evident by my amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1957 which resulted in the selection of the Honorable Clarence Randall by President Eisenhower to make a special study and to bring in recommendations for increasing foreign tourist travel. His report led to legislation which I introduced in the 85th Congress to effectuate the recommendations of his Commission. Subsequently, I have worked on this effort with the chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Senator MAGNUSON, who took a great interest in this matter and has made a great contribution to the Nation in respect of our contemplated action today.

In the last Congress, Senator MAGNUSON and I cosponsored S. 3102 which contained the same provisions as the present bill and which was adopted by the Senate but failed of action in the House.

The encouragement of foreign tourism is also of critical importance to my own State of New York. New York is a tremendous attraction for foreign tourists—600,000 visitors from abroad come to New York City

every year and those who remain there spend on an average of $300 each during their stay.

We are the only major free world power that makes no special effort to develop tourism as a matter of national policy, and one of the consequences of this failure is the ever-widening gap between what American tourists spend abroad and the relatively modest expenditures of foreign visitors here. Currently that deficit, or gap, is close to $1.2 billion a year, and that is the largest single element in our overall balance of payments deficit—our major international economic problem right now.

The potential tourist flow from overseas to our shores could result in a substantial and favorable impact on our economy. The bill provides for a program costing about $5 million annually, which is just about half of the sum expended by foreign nations in the United States through U.S. agencies and offices to exploit their tourist attractions. It would include the establishment of tourist centers abroad in selected countries and expenditures for advertising—but would not do any business done by U.S. private travel or tourist agencies. There is a tremendous need for brochures, pamphlets, and other promotional materials of all kinds on U.S. travel for distribution in foreign countries. Very little is available today to the foreign traveler who wants to visit the United States.

Moreover, we do very little to make it easy for the foreign travelers to take a short vacation in the United States. We still require them to obtain a visa, often causing several weeks delay, and with much trouble filling forms, producing letters and documents, and so on. On the other hand, most Western European countries waive the visa requirement for visitors.

Except in a few European capitals, however, redtape, extra expense, and aggravating requirements more often discourage the prospective visitor from even trying to get here. Some progress has been made in waiving fingerprinting and other requirements, but much more streamlining remains to be done if we are to make tourism as attractive as possible.

We have been very tardy in our efforts to arouse the interest of the foreign tourist in visiting the United States. We can transform the appeal of the United States for the tourist into active participation with consequent benefits to our economy as well as to the dissemination of our ideals by making the practical effort now even in the minimal terms represented by this bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the discussions on S. 610 a statement by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] enthusiastically supports this measure.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR GALE W. McGEE ON SENATE BILL 610

As one of its cosponsors I am happy to express my enthusiastic support for S. 610 which our colleague, Senator KEATING, has aptly described as the "sell America bill." I should also like to compliment our chairman, Senator MAGNUSON, who is the principal author of this legislation, for his leadership in bringing it out of committee and to a vote without unnecessary delay. Virtually this same bill was passed without opposition by the Senate last June, but because there was not enough time remaining for adequate consideration by the House we lost 1 valuable year in getting a travel program underway. This must not be allowed to happen again.

My only misgiving is that inspiration for this measure had to await the advent of a major balance of payments crisis—and that so much of the justification given for S. 610 is still clothed in terms of "closing the travel gap." I would contend that America's real investment in foreign visitors is not something we can measure by import and export statistics, or by the state of accounts at Fort Knox. I would support this legislation just as strongly if the U.S. international fiscal position were the reverse of what it is today.

My own State of Wyoming—which has no balance of payments—has appreciated the real value of tourist promotion for years. Today we spend nearly $400,000 annually for this purpose, about 16 times as much per capita as the extremely modest amount which this bill authorizes for a national program. We do this, not just because it is good business and helps to bring millions of dollars of new money into our State each year. We do it because it is the best way we know of making friends for Wyoming. Every person who visits our State, whether he stops at Yellowstone, the Tetons and our other more spectacular scenic attractions, or just drives through the awe-inspiring desolation of our mountains and prairies, takes away with him a finer and fuller appreciation of the kind of people we are, an understanding never achieved in a whole lifetime of seeing cowboy movies or reading western novels. In other words, Wyoming—and every other State for that matter—has based its public relations program upon the benefits of first-hand acquaintance.

Our national public relations policy, however, has been built almost entirely around second-hand representations of America and Americans. The Federal Government spends over $100 million every year on the Voice of America and on USIA films, pictorial displays, libraries, and so forth. Our only attention to presenting the United States at firsthand has been through the relatively costly vehicle of Government-sponsored exchange-of-persons programs. The passage of S. 610 will finally mark our recognition that travel promotion on the national level is the most direct, economical and efficient way of winning friends for America.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I should like to make it clear, or have the distinguished Senator from Washington make it clear, that an affidavit of support from the Senator from Nevada is not required as a condition precedent in respect to passage of this bill. I am sure the Senator will agree.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. I intended to say that it is necessary for a tourist to have someone who will be responsible for him in this country. That perhaps would take weeks. Sometimes it is felt necessary to have a Dun & Bradstreet report, or something else. This frightens people, including those who have mothers or fathers or other relatives who have been in the "old country," who may wish to come to the United States to see their children before they pass on.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. The distinguished Senator from Washington has made some very, very important points. I represent in part a State in which the percentage of business relating to this one industry is higher than the percentage relating to any other industry. We have learned from experience in our State that advertising what we have, to display to people who may be interested in coming to see us, is a most important key to getting visitors to come to the State.

Over and above the advertising itself, visits by people who come to see our State result in a much better understanding between those people and the people in our State.

As a result of having people come to see our country, we may well develop a much closer relationship, a much more friendly feeling, and a better understanding between the peoples of foreign countries and the people of our own country.

I know from personal experience, as well as from observations in the Senate, that when distinguished Members of this body visit abroad in foreign countries, remaining there perhaps 2 or 3 days—and, as some say, thus becoming experts—after they return they make speeches before the Senate about the things they have learned, some of which they did not know existed. As a result there is a better relationship. People learn to become better acquainted, and they enjoy better relationships with each other as a result of visits to different countries, even though the visits are brief.

I am sure this is a very important point we shall be able to develop once the bill is passed and becomes a law.

A third item is that I think this is extremely important in connection with the flow of gold, which the Senator from Washington so eloquently covered. This is a very important method which can be used to reverse the so-called flow of gold, about which we are so much concerned.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Washington. I support the bill wholeheartedly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank my friend from Nevada.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the bill I wish to join my colleague in stressing the importance of favorable consideration of this bill.

In my mind this proposed legislation is an important step in the right direction not only to promote tourism in the United States for its economic value but also to promote the many wonderful things this country as the leader of the free world has to offer.

There is no better way to get to know your neighbor than to visit his house, and some of the misconceptions of the American way of life can best be clarified by visits of our neighbors from across the sea.

As Mr. Raymond Hering of the American Society of Travel Agents pointed out at the time of his appearance before our committee "increased international travel leads to international understanding."

I believe that subsection 3 of section 2 is one of the most important provisions of this legislation. That provision directs the Secretary of Commerce to "actively encourage progressive elimination, reduction or simplification of bar-

riers to travel." As I pointed out in the course of the hearings one of the great barriers a citizen of another country meets is the restrictive regulations and redtape when applying for a visa. Although Executive order can correct this impediment to increased travel within the United States, I feel the above section will do much to create a favorable atmosphere.

The State of Pennsylvania has much to offer to the foreign tourist.

Historic sites so closely associated with the birth of our Nation; a battlefield which is significant in the growth of our Nation and industrial areas which represent the strength of our Nation. All of these along with the many wonders which the other 49 States have to offer cannot fail to bring out the real beauty and greatness of our country.

Economically increased foreign travel will benefit many if not all segments of our business community.

It is for these reasons, Mr. President, that I give my complete support to this legislation.

Mr. President, all of us who have been abroad have had the experience of speaking to people who have said, "I should like to visit the United States if it were not so much trouble."

The purpose of the bill is to reduce the feeling which our friends in foreign countries have that they are surrounded by difficulties, to make it as easy to travel to the United States as it is to travel from one part of Western Europe to another, as well as to recognize the shrunken size of the world, the lowered cost of travel as compared to travel of a similar distance over the years, and the decrease in the time involved.

We wish to bring to all the peoples of the world not only an understanding of the United States but also a realization that we do indeed share common problems.

This will have, of course, economic advantages as well. I commend the purposes of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, some committee members, including the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Senator from Maryland, and the Senator from Texas are present in the Chamber. I am happy to say that the committee is in almost unanimous agreement on the bill.

We have discussed this subject on many occasions, and I am sure that those who operate the airlines, the railroads, the bus lines, the hotels, and the motels in instances where people travel by car, will voluntarily work out procedures so that one may travel in the United States as cheaply as anywhere else in the world.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, with great pleasure I support the passage of this forward-looking measure, whose principal sponsor is the distinguished Senator from Washington. We all owe him a great deal for his leadership in this field.

This bill surely provides the most agreeable way of attacking our balance-of-payments problem and easing our gold drain. Last year the United States had an unfavorable balance of trade on tourist expenses with other countries of over $1 billion. Certainly we do not wish to curb the tourism of our own citizens, if at all possible. How much better it is to encourage our friends abroad to visit us and enjoy our great natural beauties and the excitement of our cities.

I recently talked with some Australian students. Despite the great areas of their country and the relatively wide expanses of open space in comparison with ours, they paid tribute to the national park system of the United States as the greatest thing they had seen in their travels around the world, to give relief and relaxation to our own people and to encourage tourists. They said they were going to return to Australia and encourage the people of Australia to create something like our national park system out of their remaining natural beauties.

So the people of other countries can come here and enjoy not only the greatness of our cities, but also the great natural beauties and wonders that have no counterpart in the limited-space areas in the entire world.

The bill contemplates setting up an office in the Department of Commerce which would provide leadership and inspiration in increasing the flow of tourists to this country both through encouraging efforts in this direction by the other branches of the Government, and by telling the facts about the pleasures and benefits of American travel to those abroad who are interested. For example, one notion widely heard abroad is that travel in the United States is very much more expensive than in other areas of the world. On the contrary, competent studies have shown that there is no great disproportion between travel costs in this country and those abroad, hence more tourists should investigate the facts and come to America.

They need encouragement to investigate these facts. We can hardly expect them to investigate them if we discourage the investigation.

We may find it hard to believe that there are those who have not heard of the great scenic areas and natural wonders to be found in America or the great cultural and artistic activities which take place here, but it is evident that further advertisement of these attractions abroad will result in an increased tourist flow in this country.

In that regard I am reminded of a statement I recently heard made by a young man who had been to Washington and then went on military duty overseas to Europe. When he returned he said he was enchanted by the beauty of Washington that he had never seen before. He said he had never been enchanted with its beauty prior to his foreign service. He said it was amazing to him to look at the most beautiful city he had ever seen and to realize that our people had built all this in less than 200 years, when Rome and Paris had been been in process of being built for more than 2,000 years. Nevertheless, he thought Washington was the most beautiful city of them all. That is an example of the benefit of having our people travel.

Furthermore, Mr. President, one way to stop the gold flow is by encouraging foreign people to come here to see the beauties of our country. Many people in the Old World think of us as a country of frontiers and of skyscrapers, and they think that we build skyscrapers like shoeboxes, to serve only commercial interests. We want them to see what this country really looks like.

Aside from the encouragement of tourist travel, the new Office of International Travel could do much toward providing leadership and coordination within the executive branch to reduce policies which in the past have sometimes discouraged tourists from coming to this country.

On that point, the distinguished Senator from Washington, in his presentation of the bill, alluded to the procedure involved in the issuance of visas and the long questionnaires which the procedure involves. All of that discourages people from coming here. I recall one instance of an around-the-world cruise ship which touched at Miami as one port of call on its visits to many cities around the world. Of the 400 passengers on that around-the-world cruising ship, only 2 passengers got off the ship when it touched Miami, because of the great difficulty involved in getting an American visa.

Our procedure for issuing visas is surely one of the most difficult and cumbersome in the world for a potential tourist to surmount. Our committee in the hearings on this bill heard testimony that in some cases the operations of our representatives abroad discouraged potential tourists from visiting our country because the difficulty of obtaining the visa would not be worth the trouble to them.

Travel agencies in foreign countries discourage tourists from coming to the United States because it is necessary for these potential tourists to wait too long to get visas. The travel agents tell people overseas, "We cannot book you if you are going to include America in your tour, because of the difficulty of getting a visa."

It is to be hoped that the new Office will take the lead in eradicating this type of thinking abroad and return our posture to our traditional one of encouraging all to come and visit our great democratic Republic. How much better it is than spending millions on telling our story overseas, to encourage those people to come to America and see for themselves what a free society is like.

The authors and sponsors of this measure can take great pride in this work and I am sure that it will again be passed by the Senate by a vote of confidence such as it received last year.

I hope that the House of Representatives will concur in the action of the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I must confess that I was shocked to learn of the disproportionate difference between what American tourists spend abroad and what foreign visitors spend in this country. Last year the difference amounted to over $1 billion and accounted for a considerable part of the imbalance of payments which currently afflicts the American economy.

One effective and even obvious way to eliminate this difference is to encourage more foreign travelers to come to the United States through a systematic program directed by that Federal agency concerned with the problem—the Department of Commerce.

With that solution in mind, I join with the distinguished and knowledgeable Senator from Washington in asking that the Senate support S. 610.

As I understand its provisions, the bill will concentrate its promotion program on Europe with the Middle East and the Far East close behind. At present approximately 70 percent of the foreign travel expenditures in the United States is accounted for by visitors from Canada and Mexico. The rapid and dramatic recovery of the European nations, with generous assistance on our part, makes them excellent prospects for trips to the United States if they are encouraged and attracted properly.

Furthermore, the great majority of the visitors to this country are not tourists in the ordinary sense, but businessmen, government officials, exchange students, and so forth. We must draw the true tourists to the United States, which is fortunately blessed with nearly every natural and manmade splendor the world knows.

Many of them, I must add with justifiable pride, are contained within the borders of Maryland, often described as America in miniature. In western Maryland, there is a mountaintop playground with facilities for hunting, skiing, camping, golfing, fishing, and swimming.

In that same region can be found historic Fort Frederick, built during the French and Indian War and the Antietam battlefield, scene of the Civil War's bloodiest battle.

On the outskirts of the city of Baltimore is Fort McHenry, the birthplace of the Star Spangled Banner and within the city such famous institutions as Johns Hopkins University and the Peabody Institute of Music.

On the Eastern Shore are some of the finest duck blinds in the Nation as well as hundreds of miles of stream and rivers for fishing. Colonial homes centuries old dot the landscape of the shore and its mode of living charms every visitor, particularly those who have wearied of the hurly-burly of our modern metropolises.

And of course on the Atlantic shore at Ocean City there are beaches, sand, and sun for bathers and beachcombers alike.

Mr. President, Maryland is indeed America in miniature.

I anticipate that this bill would bring about an increase in the number of visitors to Maryland and a corresponding rise in profits for the State's parks, monuments, and related businesses.

Evidence that the travel gap is rapidly widening makes action imperative. For example, in 1949, American tourists spent $805 million abroad while foreign visitors to this country were spending $445 million. In 1959 the figures were $2 billion and $970 million. If the present pattern were maintained, the United States would accumulate a foreign travel deficit of over $20 billion during the next decade. This must not be allowed to happen.

I believe that with proper implementation and administration, the bill with its proposed Office of International Travel will help to close the travel gap. That gap, Mr. President, will not close itself. But it can be significantly narrowed by a comprehensive program utilizing all appropriate media of public information and communication to encourage people of other lands to learn what we already know—that the United States is a wonderful place to live, play, and do business in.

President Eisenhower last year, and President Kennedy this year, have indicated their approval of such a program, which is, after all, a comparatively simple one of selling a most attractive product—the United States. I hope that the Congress will approve this bill before the end of the current session.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I wish to join my distinguished colleagues to urge enactment of the pending bill creating a U.S. Travel Service. It is my privilege to be a cosponsor of S. 610 along with the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and many other of my Senate colleagues who believe as I do in the solid merit and attainable purpose of this bill.

S. 610 has as its central purpose the closing of the existing tourist gap, which is now amounting to $1.2 billion. This sum now represents nearly one-third of our balance of payments deficit.

Of all the gaps we have discussed, the tourist gap is the most readily identifiable, the most commonly agreed upon, and the easiest to close.

In this single measure, the Senate of the United States has a unique opportunity to serve the American people simultaneously in several salutary respects: by providing a positive means to create more jobs for American workers, by helping to remedy the present adverse differential in American tourist dollars spent abroad and foreign tourist dollars spent here, and by building good will for America among other peoples of the world.

By attracting more travelers from abroad to partake of our Nation's scenic and manmade wonders, of our diverse climate and geography, and of our summer and winter playgrounds, America will receive a much-needed injection of tourist dollars into our economy.

Tourist dollars work hard in a community, for they represent new money—not just existing dollars changing hands—but new money which will find its way quickly into pay envelopes and ultimately into Government coffers.

Dollars spent by more and more foreign tourists here would increase the demand for American goods and services and would create more and more jobs for Americans. Transportation facilities, tourist agencies, hostelries, restaurants, places of entertainment, and recreation—these and many more related industries would benefit.

For the nominal sum of $5 million, the U.S. Travel Service provided in S. 610 would, through offices overseas, promote America as a tourist mecca. Compared with an annual 2 billion tourist-dollar potential market that exists, according to testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee, the $5 million authorized by S. 610 for the first year is minimal.

In these days when the Federal budget is in such precarious balance, Members of Congress very understandably may hesitate to establish a new Federal agency, fearing it may only consume an ever-increasing number of tax dollars. The travel agency provided under this bill, however, will create revenue—not only for American workers and business but also for the U.S. Treasury.

As stated in the Commerce Committee report:

> A conservative estimate is that 1 out of every 10 tourist dollars spent finds its way into the Public Treasury.

There is indeed every evidence that tourist promotion generally earns much more than its costs. We demonstrate this every year in my own State of Hawaii, where we have had considerable experience with tourism.

At the outset, our tourist agency, Hawaii Visitors Bureau, received an appropriation of about $500,000 for every 2 years. This was later increased to $1 million, with half a million dollars additional provided by private sources. Currently, the biennial expenditure on the tourist business is $1½ million—$1 million appropriated by the State legislature and the other one-half million dollars from private sources.

And what a return we get on that investment.

In 1960, Hawaii was host to 296,517 overnight and longer visitors—this was an increase of 21.9 percent over 1959.

These visitors spent $131 million in Hawaii, an increase of 20.2 percent over 1959.

In Hawaii, tourism is our No. 2 private industry, exceeding pineapple and surpassed only by sugar. Tourism is not only big business in Hawaii, it is good business as well. But it could be much better if America would only make a determined, organized, worldwide effort to attract foreign visitors.

Today there are 29 States, including Hawaii, that rank tourism as one of their three most important industries. These and the remaining 21 States all would unquestionably benefit by an influx of foreign visitors into America.

Whereas 15 years ago, most foreigners did not have the wherewithal to travel, today millions of people in foreign lands have the leisure, the means, and the desire to travel. Other nations have been quick to tap this market and have well-established government travel promotion bureaus luring visitors to their borders.

On page 94 of the Senate Commerce Committee hearings on S. 610 is a table showing Great Britain spends $2.8 million to attract foreign visitors; France, $2.6 million; India, $2.5 million; and the Bahamas, $1.3 million. It may come as a surprise to some to learn that the Philippine Islands spends $400,000, Haiti, $200,000, and Puerto Rico, $3.5 million—

compared with the U.S. figure of $75,000. Even the Belgian Congo and Cyprus spend more for tourist promotion than we do.

As a Nation, we have been asleep at the switch, failing to recognize tourism as a substantial source of jobs and income for our people. Let us today make up for lost time and take steps to close the tourist gap.

Last year, the Senate approved a bill similar to S. 610. This year, with the committee amendments, the Senate has before it an even better bill. The need today is even more urgent, for the travel deficit has increased by nearly $150 million.

President Kennedy has already taken commendable action to encourage foreign travel in the United States. On February 6, he announced the Secretary of Commerce would report, by April 1, on a new travel program to include establishment of travel offices abroad; new advertising campaigns, action to simplify visa and entry procedures for temporary visitors, and efforts to relax foreign restrictions on travel to the United States.

The President acted in anticipation of favorable congressional action on measures authorizing a travel program. Congress would be remiss in its duty if it failed to approve S. 610, which will create jobs for Americans, strengthen the American dollar, and make friends for America.

Mr. President, April 1 is only a few weeks away. I urge the Senate to enact S. 610 and send it to the House for approval, which I trust will soon be forthcoming, so that a U.S. Travel Service may quickly get down to the immediate business of closing the tourist gap and the long-range business of building a thriving tourist industry for all America.

Mr. President, up to now I have talked about the tangible benefits we can expect from increased foreign travel in America. Before I conclude, I should like to emphasize one of the intangible benefits: the stimulation of greater understanding of ourselves among peoples of other lands.

This may well prove the most important gain from the work of the U.S. Travel Service. Tourism would become another of our arsenal of peaceful weapons employed in the battle for men's minds.

Since World War II, we have initiated many programs, both Government and private, to assist other peoples to foster greater understanding. The Federal Government has extended a strong hand of friendship to some 80 countries of the world, providing more than $75 billion—a story of generosity without parallel in history.

Time after time, America has rushed to aid millions of distressed people in far-distant lands—unfortunate victims of flood, famine, earthquake, and all manner of disaster.

We have both Government-sponsored and privately sponsored cultural exchange programs, athletic exchange programs, and teacher and student exchange programs. Only last year, Congress authorized a new program to help bridge the gap between America and her neighbors in Asia and the Pacific which is now underway in Hawaii. I refer to the East-West Center, where almost 100 students from Asia will be in residency in Hawaii this month.

Yet, despite our truly massive efforts, peoples in some other lands still regard us with mistrust and suspicion.

For the past 15 years, Americans have traveled all over the globe, both as Government employees on official duty and as tourists. So far as the local populace was concerned, the image of America created by these Americans was their only image of America. Sometimes it was a good image, sometimes it was not so good.

It is, therefore, timely to initiate a new phase of our relations with other peoples. Let us entice more and more tourists from around the globe to our home territory, where they can observe for themselves the face, the heart, and the spirit of America.

Organization at the national level, coupled with realism and fired with imagination, could do a selling job for America that badly needs doing. Today's trickle of foreign visitors would become tomorrow's steady stream of travelers watching America at work, at play, and at worship.

The greater the interchange of people, the greater the opportunity for building friendship and good will.

Viewed in this context, the pending proposal for a U.S. Travel Service becomes a down-to-earth, practical, attainable, low-cost, people-to-people program. I hope the Senate will promptly approve S. 610 and that the House will follow suit.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I overlooked mentioning in my general statement on the bill a point which I believe will interest the Senator from Hawaii. The bill also provides that the proposed Travel Service can use counterpart funds.

Mr. FONG. That is an excellent provision in the bill. I think that with the use of counterpart funds a number of tourists from foreign lands can be induced to come to the United States.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I am honored to be associated with the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and other distinguished Senators in the sponsorship of S. 610. There is no doubt about the need for the enactment of the bill we are now considering.

I hope the Senate will approve the bill without opposition, and I also hope the House of Representatives will act on the measure without delay.

It is most appropriate that the Office of International Travel, as proposed in this measure, be made a part of the Department of Commerce. Secretary of Commerce Hodges is unusually well qualified to take full advantage of the opportunities such an Office would offer to expand the tourist industry in America.

During the time he was Governor of North Carolina, Secretary Hodges gained worldwide recognition for his promotional work in behalf of North Carolina. As a result of his unusually effective work, hundreds and hundreds of new industrial plants were located in North Carolina, and the tourist industry—which is now our third largest industry—enjoyed unprecedented growth.

There is no doubt that the pending proposed legislation would offer ways and means of helping correct our serious balance-of-payments problem. There is no doubt that we can get dollars-and-cents results from encouraging foreigners to visit and vacation in America.

But far beyond the tangible, measurable results, we have a tremendous opportunity to make travel in America one of the greatest and most effective weapons for freedom in the cold war.

We need to let the people of Europe, the Middle East, and Asia see the beaches, the fishing villages, and the beauty of our vast shorelines along the Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Pacific coast.

We need to let those same people see and know the people—as they live—in the mountain regions of the Appalachians and the Rockies.

We need to let the people of the world see firsthand for themselves how we in America live and work as free people in North Carolina, in California, in New York, in Arizona, and in all the other States.

To be sure, expanded travel by foreigners in the United States will help bring dollars back home, but such travel will also bring a new understanding of America and our people.

I am particularly glad that one provision of the bill authorizes the use of counterpart funds derived from sales under Public Law 480 for the purpose of promoting travel in the United States. In many cases, we have seen where promotional campaigns financed in part with Public Law 480 funds have created new and increased demand for American farm products in foreign nations. I think it is wise also to use some of the same funds to encourage people to visit the United States.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, S. 610 is a measure which does credit to the knowledge and craftsmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. It is my privilege to be joined with the Senator from Washington and other Senators, on both sides of the aisle, in the sponsorship of this legislation, and I think that had a similar bill which was sponsored by the Senator from Washington during the 86th Congress become law, we would have found beneficial results flowing from it even now.

There are few educated Americans today who remain unaware of the existence of our balance of payments deficit. But I wonder how many of them are aware of what proportion of this is due to the so-called travel dollar deficit. Our able colleague from the State of Washington first brought this to the attention of the Senate nearly a year ago when he pointed out that the travel dollar deficit accounted for nearly one-fourth of our total balance of payments deficit.

Since that time it has assumed even greater significance, in 1960, amounting to a deficit of $1.15 billion, or nearly one-third of our total deficits in foreign payments, and more than the cost of maintaining all of our service dependents overseas.

As was also pointed out before this body not long ago, spending by American tourists abroad has exactly doubled since 1953—with no corresponding increase in the spending of foreign visitors in the United States. This disparity is not accounted for by any equivalent rise in our population, our disposable income or our economic development. It is accounted for largely by the massive program of travel promotion and market development engaged in by foreign tourist and transportation industries under the creative leadership of their respective governments. To illustrate, in the current issue of a weekly magazine devoted to general cultural affairs—and one which takes comparatively little advertising—I noted 7⅔ pages of advertising devoted to travel abroad, much of it sponsored by national governments, and one strikingly effective 2-page advertisement carried by the European Travel Commission for 21 participating countries.

It is my hope that the present administration and the Congress are determined to take more than merely restrictive action on the travel dollar deficit. Rather than make it more difficult for Americans to travel abroad—which is one approach to the problem—we must work to make it easier and more appealing for other nationals to visit the United States. It is my belief that S. 610 is a step in this direction.

It is paradoxical, to say the least, that the United States, which desires so to be understood and appreciated by other peoples of the world, has done so little officially to foster travel and tourism in this country by foreign visitors. Indeed, some of our practices in admitting foreign visitors seem calculated to turn many of the less persistent and more sensitive ones away.

Yet no other nation in the world can offer, unhampered by internal customs and travel restrictions, virtually an entire continent to the tourist. And no other nation of the Western World can offer our scope and variety of scenic beauty and the multiplicity of our cultural patterns.

My own State of West Virginia—which is indeed a land overlooked—offers a quality of rugged and unspoiled natural beauty which is unexcelled by any land in the world. Our fine system of State parks and forests, as well as the Monongahela National Forest, offer a wide variety of inducements to those who would walk with nature. The Monongahela National Forest alone, in 1959, received a total of almost 1 million visits to its 50 special recreational facilities.

Second only to the appeal of the natural and scenic values of West Virginia is the rich historical lore of our State. American history was formed in large measure by the Appalachian Mountains as the route of southward migration of the Scotch-Irish and German settlers, and the Ohio River as the gateway to the West. At a time when we are reexamining our own cultural roots in order to clarify our sense of national purpose and destiny, and when we are striving to communicate this sense to the peoples of the world, American history as it was lived in West Virginia has much to contribute.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that West Virginia would be one of the States to benefit from a stimulation of foreign tourism in the United States. For this reason, among the others I have cited, I am happy that during the hearings on S. 610 and also in my brief remarks here on the Senate floor I have been privileged to include my strong endorsement of the pending measure.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am grateful for this opportunity to speak in behalf of S. 610. I am also delighted to be a cosponsor of the bill.

The chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], wrought well when he proposed the bill and brought it before the Senate, because the bill can be very meaningful in many ways.

I am concerned, first, with the relation of S. 610 to the problem of increasing foreign travel to the United States as a whole and, second, with the relation of S. 610 to the specific problems of Alaska.

It has been said that, properly implemented, legislation of this kind can have a bearing upon the balance-of-payments situation.

That is doubtless true; but perhaps it will take some little time for that phase of the bill to become completely effective. In the meantime, and immediately, it will have a real consequence, I should think, in the respect mentioned by the Senator from North Carolina and other Senators—namely, in enabling people from other parts of the world to come to know better the United States and its citizens. That is vitally important, these days.

So I believe it highly important that this bill become law at the earliest possible moment.

Only next year, Mr. President, Century 21 is to open at Seattle, in the State of Washington. It will be the first international fair to be held since 1939. I commend to the reading of my colleagues an article on Century 21 which appears in the current issue of the Rotarian, the publication of the Rotary International. It is a thrilling account.

It is no wonder that it is anticipated that 10 million people will visit Century 21 during the few months it will be open; and when some of those 10 million desire to travel farther, to explore the scenic wonderland which Alaska is, we of the 49th State will welcome them. The scenic values there are so magnificent that they do not need to be detailed here.

The problem of improving our balance of payments through increasing foreign travel to the United States has been intensively treated at the hearings. Moreover, President Kennedy in his February 6, 1961, message on the balance of payments and gold outflow has stressed the large and insufficiently tapped potential of the foreign travel market as a powerful means for achieving long-term equilibrium in our balance of payments.

To point out the importance of S. 610, let me cite several crucial facts which were brought out in the hearings: First, in 1958, earnings from foreign residents visiting the United States ranked fourth among U.S. commodity exports; second, expenditures by U.S. residents for foreign travel in 1958 exceeded those for any other U.S. commodity import; third, in 1958, as measured by comparative government budgets, the United States ranked above Cyprus, but below Singapore, the Philippines, the Belgian Congo, and Czechoslovakia, in government spending for official travel offices.

It seems to me that whatever actions we take to reduce the travel gap, each action is based, either implicitly or explicitly, on a theory concerning such questions as why there is a travel gap, what are the barriers to foreign travel, and what are the best means for reducing the gap and removing the barriers.

As I see it, the barriers to foreign tourism in the United States include lack of information, visa and currency restrictions, and the cost differential.

The enactment of S. 610 should help to reduce each type of barrier. For example, the publicity program which S. 610 proposes can help to remove the information barrier; it can remove some of the mistaken ideas of how expensive it is to travel in the United States, and it can inflame the foreign tourist's already existing desire to visit the United States. The Office of International Travel can, in conjunction with other Government agencies, work to make what visa and currency barriers exist more favorable for foreign travel in the United States.

Of the various causes for the lack of foreign travel in the United States, I feel that the cost-differential factor is probably the most important and perhaps the most difficult barrier to remove or to lower. However, the information program proposed by S. 610 can serve to puncture some of the exaggerated ideas of how much it really costs—at given levels of luxury—to sightsee in the United States. In addition to the information programs to create a favorable and realistic image of the United States, to spur the desire to travel in the United States, and to disseminate correct cost information, we shall also have to do something about the costs themselves. We should make it possible for the average middle-income foreign tourist to travel and sightsee on a large scale and within his budget. This middle-income person is perhaps a person who would like to tour the United States, but when vacation time comes he chooses to travel and spend his time and money where he thinks his vacation budget will go further.

It seems to me that accurate cost information about alternative U.S. vacations, plus the stimulation of his desire to travel in the United States, could cause him to choose a U.S. vacation. Accurate information in combination

with a program for enabling the foreign tourist to sightsee and travel cheaply—for instance, via model tours and charter groups—combined with publicity designed to stimulate his preexisting desire to visit the United States, would practically make it inevitable that this person and many like him would visit the United States.

Alaska's needs for, and potential benefits from, S. 610 are great. Many studies of the economy of Alaska have pointed out that tourism is an insufficiently tapped resource which Alaska has yet to develop fully. To remedy this situation, the State of Alaska is engaging in expanded programs encouraging travel.

From the point of view of foreign travel, Alaska is in a unique and strategic position. On the polar route between European countries and the Orient, Alaska is a natural and proper stopping place. In fact, the only first-hand impression which some transpolar foreign tourists ever have of the United States is that which they receive when their planes stop to refuel in Alaska.

The pity of the present situation is that the only view many of these foreign tourists receive of the United States is at the airport, during the refueling stop. This is because of our present policies concerning stopover privileges on transpolar flights.

Whereas we should be encouraging these foreign tourists to stay and to see Alaska and the United States, while on their way to Europe or the Orient, we tell many, instead, in effect, "Your plane can stop, to refuel; but we do not want you to leave the airport or see the rest of Alaska if you are to continue your journey on the same airline ticket." As a result, ticket agents in Europe tend to discourage transpolar travelers from sightseeing in Alaska, since they would have to change airlines.

It seems to me that this view and this condition contravene the purposes and intent of encouraging foreign travel to this country.

From the point of view of national policy, we want these foreign transpolar travelers to stop over for longer than it takes to serve them a meal and to refuel their planes.

It is anomalous that this great opportunity to encourage foreign tourism in the United States is thwarted by a "no stopover policy." Is it not a shame that the foreign transpolar traveler is not given an opportunity and encouragement to sightsee in the one and only part of the United States which he may visit, a part that is one-fifth as large as all the rest of the United States?

We Alaskans want to extend a hearty welcome to these transpolar travelers, in behalf of the United States as a whole. We want them to stay, to look around Alaska. And, who knows, they may even be enticed into taking a look at the other States, before traveling on to their original destinations in Europe or in the Orient. We should encourage them to stop over. We should welcome them, and we should make it possible for European ticket agents to encourage these tourists to stop over and visit the United States, and then continue on the same airline. Since that will be for many travelers the first, and perhaps the only, contact with the United States, we want their impressions to be favorable and lasting. Under the present conditions, I can imagine that for the foreign transpolar tourist who is not allowed to stop over, even though his plane is allowed to refuel, the impressions are lasting, but not favorable.

It is my hope that the proposed Office of International Travel and the Travel Advisory Board will look into situations such as those we find involved in the stopover problem in Alaska, and that some means will be created to encourage these transpolar foreign travelers to stop and to visit us, and that we shall be allowed to give them a hearty Alaskan welcome on behalf of the United States as a whole.

All in all, Mr. President, I think this is an appropriate major piece of legislation to come before the Senate so early in the session, and I trust that the vote in favor of the passage of this bill will be a unanimous one.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on February 2, I testified before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in support of S. 610, of which I am a cosponsor. I am delighted that the committee has acted so promptly on this very important piece of legislation, and that it is today before the Senate.

In the Congress, we have been used for some time to talking about the Buy America Act. I regard the bill before us today—the bill to set up an International Travel Office—as the Sell America Act.

We hope under this bill to sell America to millions of people all over the world. We want them to come here, to see our country, to meet us, and to acquire a feeling for the spirit of democracy, which is of such fundamental importance to every American. As an added dividend, these efforts should have a highly favorable effect upon our international balance of payments.

Mr. President, I attended a considerable portion of the hearings on S. 610, held under the chairmanship of Senator MAGNUSON. I was very much impressed by the active interest which the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee took in this proposal. I was also very much impressed by the concern which the committee demonstrated in regard to the need to reduce redtape barriers, which so often discourage people from overseas from visiting our Nation.

It was pointed out by several witnesses, as well as by members of the committee, that some of our consuls overseas have been all too zealous in checking visas when what they actually seek, and should seek, is to keep out of the country burglars, felons, pickpockets, and eligible daughters. In the energetic pursuit of this objective, they have often discouraged interested and solid citizens of the countries in which they are stationed from visiting America. This situation can, and should be, remedied.

Every other country of the world encourages tourism and welcomes travelers with open arms. Why should the United States submit them to the "third degree" before they can, on their own initiative, visit our great land?

Reducing visa redtape is not the primary function of the International Travel Office; but it is clear that much of its orientation would be, and should be, to put out the welcome mat, and to put away the unwelcome mat.

Mr. President, this is an extremely serious question. Underlying the suspicion with which we regard those who apply for visas is the present unfortunate and outdated structure of our immigration policies. The prejudices which are reflected in these policies are also reflected in the attitude we often take toward visitors.

I hope the very worthwhile discussions the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee had on this subject indicate that in the Congress there is a growing sentiment in favor of revising, bringing up to date, and making more equitable our country's overall immigration policies.

Mr. President, America is a great land of opportunity, of freedom, and of natural beauty. It is a great attraction to peoples of every land.

While we are on the subject of our natural attractions, I want to say as I look around the Chamber that New York State certainly should not take second position to the great States of West Virginia, Washington, Alaska, Montana, Illinois, Oregon, and the many other fine States which are so ably represented in this body. I want visitors to our shores to know that from the great cultural-financial-industrial center which is New York City to the Niagara frontier, they will find some of the greatest sights and pleasure spots in the world. And, in all the area in between those two points, are the beautiful valleys and hills of New York as well as many other very worthwhile sights to be seen and enjoyed.

We must do everything we can to make it easier for people from overseas to visit us, and we must encourage them to do so. The establishment of an International Travel Office definitely would be a long step in the right direction. It would be more than just an office. It represents a spirit of friendship and freedom, a spirit in which we enthusiastically welcome all people to our land. This spirit and the implementation of it through active promotional campaigns and cutting down barriers of redtape are urgently needed.

I agree fully with those who initiated this measure, and I want to mention particularly the fine leadership in this area taken by the Senator from Washington. I could not agree more fully with those who initiated this measure, and I have been happy to support and to cosponsor it in the Senate.

I urge the speedy, wholehearted enactment of this worthwhile and far-reaching program to sell America.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must courteously, but firmly, protest the discrimination of my distinguished friend, the Senator from New York, because he failed to include the great Common-

wealth of Rhode Island, the State so ably represented by the distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. PELL].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, that was a great oversight. I also failed to include the States—including Nevada and other fine States—of many of our colleagues who are here today. I was referring to only a few States as an illustration of my point, that the beauties of New York are at least equal—and those of us who live there think they exceed—those to be found in any other State. I thank my colleague.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure the potential travelers under the provisions of this bill will wish to visit the great Commonwealth of Rhode Island.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure they will, too.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Because much of interest is to be seen there. I trust it will come up to the expectation of those who have sponsored the bill. In measuring the purchasing power and the money other people can expend in coming to America. I am never very sanguine when I think back to some journeys over the world. Whether or not the number can be increased over and above the number that go from here to other countries remains to be seen. I only hope this expectation will materialize.

I point out only one other thing: If we want people to come, we must be ready for them. There is a good deal of organizational work to be done. If we do not do it, I am afraid that after they come to the State represented by my distinguished friend the Senator from New York, they will then go back, having seen only the Empire State Building, the Statue of Liberty, 42d Street, and Broadway. I think the bill would miss its mark. After all, we would want them to absorb some of the culture of the country. I would like to see them come to the Middle West. I think the distinguished chairman of the committee would like them to come to the Far West and enjoy the beauties and delights of the Pacific seaboard.

I trust that, along with the functions and duties that are imposed upon the Director, there will be a little coordination of the facilities to lure people here.

I was about to make a suggestion to the chairman of the committee. I hope that, on page 4, line 7 of the bill, where an annual report is provided for, we may require a quarterly report.

After all, this is a new venture, and there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $5 million. I do not know whether the plan will succeed. Whether it will become just another bureaucratic venture, remains to be seen. The only way of keeping abreast of the progress that is to be made, since many facilities are to be established abroad, is for the Congress to be reasonably well informed on the progress that is being made.

Instead of waiting for an annual report, I think, we could very well require a quarterly report. In addition, there is this to commend the proposal. We must not forget that the Immigration and Naturalization Service obviously has an interest in the people who come here. I hope we can gather figures week by week and carefully check them; but I would be willing to accept provision for a quarterly report, if the chairman would accept an amendment on page 4, line 7.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The chairman of the committee has no objection. Perhaps it might provide for beginning August 1; although it does not make any difference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We could start with the fiscal year, and make it July 1.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the committee amendments have not yet been agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not offered an amendment yet. I am first talking informally with the chairman, to see whether he would be agreeable to that kind of amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is suggesting that on page 4, line 6, we should provide that the Secretary shall submit to the President and to the Congress a quarterly report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Start the sentence with:

Beginning with the fiscal year 1962, the Secretary shall submit to the President and to the Congress a quarterly report on his activities under this act.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask that the bill be modified in that respect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has not yet acted on the committee amendments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Have not the committee amendments been acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, as suggested by the Senator from Illinois, on page 4, line 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, beginning on line 6, page 4, the amendment will read as follows:

Beginning with the fiscal year 1962, the Secretary shall submit to the President and to the Congress a quarterly report on his activities under this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have one further point to make. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] submitted an amendment to the bill which I think is a very wise amendment. It provides that local currencies now in the Treasury may be used to establish travel agencies abroad, and the language appears in two places, but particularly on page 8 of the bill, where the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act is modified to read:

For financing the establishment and operation of travel offices and other activities authorized by the International Travel Act of 1961, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts.

It keeps a check in the Appropriations Committee. The committee will then be able to see that allocations of local currencies are made which can be used in every country where a travel office is established. It is a prudent way, I think, to use local currencies.

In connection therewith, I submit for the RECORD and ask unanimous consent to have printed, on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is not present, a statement which he has prepared.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

I want to express my support for S. 610. The function of the International Travel Office would be to promote by all reasonable means travel in the United States by citizens of other countries. This country is at present losing over a billion dollars a year to foreign countries because American tourists spend that much more on their trips abroad than do foreign tourists traveling in the United States.

The International Travel Office would seek to correct this disparity by attracting more foreign tourists to the United States. It would advertise such travel, it would provide trip-planning assistance to prospective tourists, it would cooperate with travel agencies and transportation companies, it would do all things reasonably conceived to promote greater foreign travel in the United States.

The sponsors of this bill have adopted an amendment which I suggested to allow use by the International Travel Office of moneys accumulated to the U.S. Government through the workings of Public Law 480.

By utilizing Public Law 480 moneys, acquired through the sale of our agricultural surpluses, the International Travel Office would demand fewer taxpayers' dollars in performing its functions. It would also impose a lesser burden on the U.S. balance of payments.

There are, in many countries of the world, large sums of money idle in accounts of the U.S. Government. This money is not to be taken out of the countries where it is located because such withdrawal would pose a threat to the local currency and to the balance of payments position of the host country. Most particularly, this money is not to be converted into dollars.

These funds could easily and without damaging the balance of payments of the countries in which they are located be utilized for promoting within these countries travel to the United States.

Perhaps more important, these funds could be used in one country, where the United States holds large reserves of the local currency, for preparing advertising copy or travel literature to be distributed in another country where the United States holds less or no local currency resulting from the workings of Public Law 480.

For example, the United States has accumulated billions of rupees in India. This money should not be removed from India. Part of this money could be spent in India to prepare there materials which would be used in Western Europe to promote touring by Europeans in the United States.

In an effort to better our own balance of payments position and in an effort to stimulate the touring service segment of our own economy, this bill should be enacted into law.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, my own State is suffering more than most from the unemployment and the economic malaise which has been affecting our country. Therefore, I welcome the imaginative proposals which President Kennedy has been submitting to the Congress. I also welcome the introduction of S. 610 by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], which would encourage more visitors from abroad to visit our country.

Rhode Island, with its lovely Narragansett Bay and South County woods and beaches, is particularly proud of its tourist facilities. Tourism is one of our major industries, and we would warmly welcome more visitors from other countries. In addition, we are particularly lucky in our State in that many of our people whose families have come from Europe, have preserved original language skills and cultural habits, which would tend to make our visitors from abroad particularly welcome.

The city in which I live, our former capital, Newport, is often called the Queen of Seaside Resorts. Not only did President Eisenhower speak very highly of Newport as a resort, but we in Newport hope that President Kennedy will come to our fair city, too.

Finally, Mr. President, I believe that increased tourism would promote a better understanding of our country and help to close the balance-of-payments gap.

For all the reasons I have outlined, I hope that the Senate will take quick action on S. 610.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the establishment of an Office of International Travel in the Government would be of great benefit in improving our fiscal position and our foreign relations. By bringing more tourists to America, it would help stop the outflow of gold. But even more important, by exposing those from other lands to America's scenery, history, and people it will increase the outflow of good will and friendship.

The Office of International Travel would establish tourist offices abroad, and use posters, movies, and other advertisements to present a realistic picture of America. It would also work to reduce the visa restrictions and other hindrances which confuse and discourage potential visitors.

My own State of Massachusetts would be a mecca for tourists the world over. Tourism is already our third largest industry. People abroad, as well as people from other States, would be interested in enjoying the golden beaches of Cape Cod and the fishing towns of the north shore; in skiing in the Berkshires or fishing in our mountain streams.

If they have a mind for history they will want to visit Plymouth Rock, Boston, the battlefields of the Revolution and the Mohawk Trail, where they can follow in the footsteps of the Indians. If they love music they can hear the Boston Symphony, which is the equal of any orchestra in Europe. They can hear it in Symphony Hall or under the shade of the green trees at Tanglewood.

Most of our tourism would be, at first, with the people of Europe. As a State settled by 300 years of European migration, we in Massachusetts could give them a welcome second to none. They would find many people who could speak their native tongue, giving them a feeling of a home away from home.

Mr. President, I hope this bill will become law. If it does, my own State will cooperate in every way with the Office of International Travel to make America the No. 1 tourist attraction in the world.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, as a sponsor of S. 610, I would like to discuss briefly my reasons for supporting it.

I feel that it is important to improve international understanding. One of the best ways to do this is by encouraging foreigners to visit the United States and to get a first-hand glimpse of what America is like.

Through such visits foreign guests will be assured that Americans and America desire to live in peace. This is one of the greatest weapons we can use against the misleading statements made about our country by Khrushchev and the other leaders of communism. They can see at first hand what we are like and they can arrive at their own conclusions. I am confident that their judgment will bear out what our leaders say about the United States.

The second reason why this legislation should be approved is because it is one answer to our gold problem. We have witnessed in recent years a heavy outflow of U.S. gold. One-third of our total balance of payments deficit, $1.2 billion, is caused by foreign travel. Americans spent over $2 billion last year for foreign travel while foreigners spent only $1 billion for travel in the United States. We cannot afford to permit this to continue.

The United States is the only major nation of the world with no office to encourage travel. The amount of money necessary for such an office is modest, but the work it would be capable of doing is limitless. I earnestly hope the Senate will approve this legislation.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I am deeply interested in S. 610, which I was happy to cosponsor this year after wholeheartedly supporting S. 3102, its predecessor, in 1960.

This measure gives hope of offsetting a major part of our serious gold and dollar drain. It also appears to be an important step in the direction of worldwide understanding of our great country and people. As the noted commentator Eric Sevareid remarked in a column published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on February 12:

The more I have investigated anti-Americanism in Europe, the clearer it has become that those who are most virulently anti-American are nearly always people who have never seen America, and that the most pro-American Europeans are those who have visited or lived in America.

More than this, S. 610 also promises to be a boon to businesses large and small in the entire Nation. In my own State of Colorado, where tourism is the third ranking industry, it is often said that tourist money is new money. That is, it comes from outside and does not deplete any natural resource in the process. Needless to say, it passes through many hands as well. It helps the filling station operator, the small motel and guest ranch, the cafe owner, the cleaning and laundry establishments, the sporting goods stores, even the bootblack on the corner, just as it helps the big airline, the railroad, and the famous hotel.

There are other aspects to the phenomenon of the tourist dollar which bear examination. The staff of the Senate Commerce Committee estimated last year that 10 cents out of every tourist dollar entering this country eventually finds its way into Federal, State, or local treasuries, through payment of excise and other taxes.

It is well known that State and local governments in the United States are hard pressed for revenues because of the upsurge of population and rising demands for services. They need every dime they can get.

Unfortunately, accurate figures on the benefits of tourist spending to local government treasuries are scarce, but it certainly is safe to say that my home city of Denver, for example, derives hundreds of thousands of dollars annually from tourists through its 1 percent municipal sales tax and its cigarette tax. Recognizing this fact, Denver for years has contributed tax funds to the budget of the Denver Convention and Visitors' Bureau. This privately managed organization gets most of its money from realistic businessmen who likewise know the value of the tourist dollar.

The most recent figures available to me from the Colorado Yearbook—the official publication of the State planning division—indicate that tourists pay considerably more than $8 million a year to the State treasury alone. This represents more than 6 percent of all State gasoline taxes collected; about 6 percent of all State sales taxes; nearly 7.5 percent of all State beer, wine, and liquor taxes; nearly 20 percent of all parimutuel racing taxes, and more than 35 percent of all State game and fish license fees.

Realizing this, the State of Colorado for years has maintained a tax-supported State advertising and publicity department to spur tourism.

Every State in the Union derives some financial benefit from the tourist trade. Yet, because we have neglected fully to develop the potential of international tourism, we have been taking in each other's washing. The tourist dollar in Colorado comes largely from residents of Kansas, Iowa, Illinois, California, and other States. This is not fully in line with the "new dollar" concept on a national basis. Developing a tourist market among residents of other nations would do the job.

Sylvia Porter, in a column published in the Washington Evening Star 1 week ago, observed:

Most authorities expect only minor help from changes in what U.S. tourists spend on foreign travel and duty-free imports and what foreign tourists spend on U.S. travel and goods. I think they'll be astounded at how major the help can be if we only apply our genius for salesmanship and we wake up to how much we alone can achieve.

As Miss Porter says, this country has no shortage of top flight salesmen. For an example of what can be done with a little planning, Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I recently received from Mr. William C. Mueller, a well-known Denver travel agent with many contacts in the German-speaking countries of Europe.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article in the Denver Post of February 12 by Bruce Hamby, travel editor of that newspaper, entitled "Overseas Travel: A One-Way Street."

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

UNIVERSITY PARK TRAVEL CENTER,
Denver, Colo., February 11, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: For some time I have been watching the efforts made to encourage Europeans to visit the United States of America. The time is ready now to sell the United States of America abroad and I would like to do my share in this plan.

Looking over critically the efforts made in the past, I would like to make the following suggestions, especially for German-speaking countries:

1. Determine which parts of America would attract Europeans the most.

2. What would they like to see when they are over here.

3. Arrange certain package tours sold overseas.

4. Person-to-person contact with leading travel agents in Europe.

The following program was worked out by a foreign airline in cooperation with domestic air carriers: "This type of package is suggested: New York City, Washington, D.C., Niagara Falls, Las Vegas, Grand Canyon, California." What about Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico? I am often in contact with Europeans coming over here through the International Institute of Education. When asked what interests them most, they say they have always heard of the Rocky Mountains and the Grand Canyon. A visit to a real working or dude ranch and a chance to observe American Indians as one sees them in New Mexico pueblo life makes a European feel he is really seeing America. The average European travel agent knows nothing about our West. Here are some suggestions:

Arrange meetings with leading travel agents and representatives of airlines in the following cities: Duesseldorf, Cologne, Frankfurt, Stuttgart, Munich, Zurich, and Vienna. Show short movies of the West; have an exhibit of good photographs and travel folders; give a short lecture in German about our West. Have several all-inclusive package tours ready (in German) to distribute like: Denver, Rocky Mountain Park, 2 days at a ranch in Middle Park, Aspen, Mesa Verde, Taos, and back to Denver. Or: Denver, Rocky Mountain Park, 2 days at a ranch in Middle Park, Jackson Hole, Teton, and Yellowstone Park, continue to California.

As I have had quite a few years experience in selling tours for Americans to take abroad I believe I might be helpful in laying out plans to help promote the United States of America in Europe.

Most sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. MUELLER.

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 12, 1961]

OVERSEA TRAVEL: ONE-WAY STREET

(By Bruce Hamby)

The magic lure of oversea travel apparently has no limit for the American tourist.

Each year for the past 10, American citizens have been taking off in ever-increasing numbers to travel abroad to Europe, South and Central America, the Caribbean, the Far East, and the Pacific.

In 1950 the grand total of Americans visiting foreign lands—excluding Canada and Mexico—was 676,000. Figures for the year just ended show a record 1,934,953 went abroad.

There is every indication the total will easily surpass 2 million this year.

Add to this the 5 million Americans who will cross the border into Canada and 750,000 more who will visit Mexico and the impact of foreign travel on the U.S. way of life and economy assumes major proportions.

Normally this tourist flood beyond our borders would be little more than an interesting statistic. But in view of the present concern over the imbalance of gold, it has become a matter of vital importance to both Government and responsible citizens.

For it so happens that spending by Americans on foreign travel accounts for nearly one-third of our international payments deficit.

Last year, for example, while 1,934,953 Americans went abroad, only 455,457 foreign visitors came to the United States. And while our citizens were spending a whopping $2.2 billion for their travels, our visitors spent only $1.1 billion.

This $1 billion deficit poses some questions: (1) Why do more Americans travel abroad every year and (2) why does the total of Americans going overseas so greatly exceed the number of foreign visitors to our shores?

A few years ago the answer to both questions was simple: Americans had both the desire and the income to travel while few foreigners could afford the cost of a ticket overseas.

This answer no longer holds good since many nations of the world are as economically stable—some more stable—as the United States.

The answer still is a simple one: Americans travel abroad because they not only have the disposable income but are lured by the extensive promotional campaigns waged by foreign nations and by the absence of travel barriers, such as complicated visa and customs procedures.

Foreigners, on the other hand, are given little if any incentive to visit the United States. And those who do come often do so in the face of time-consuming, often embarrassing U.S. redtape.

For the United States in the only major nation that does not spend a single penny, as a government, to attract tourists. The only oversea promotion is carried on by U.S. airlines and steamship lines. European travel agents, eager to gain the commissions on sale of trips and tours to the United States complain that little if any tourist or resort literature is available. They further point out that our visa and customs procedures are highly discouraging to prospective visitors.

While we do nothing as a government to promote tourism, foreign governments spend millions in the United States to entice Americans to their countries. Great Britain alone spends more than $1 million annually on tourist advertising in U.S. newspapers and magazines. France, Switzerland, Germany, Italy, Israel, Japan, India, Australia and other countries annually spend amounts in six figures in behalf of tourism.

So it comes as a pleasure to learn the United States at long last appears to be waking up to the possibilities of such promotion.

President Kennedy reportedly is highly sympathetic to a proposal the United States start an international travel office which would seek to increase the flow of tourists by advertising the wonders of our land.

This program has been spelled out in a bill just introduced in the Senate by Senator MAGNUSON of Washington, who claims his bill could cut the $1 billion gap by half.

MAGNUSON'S bill would provide for establishment of a high-level Office of International Travel in the Department of Commerce. The Office would be authorized to spend up to $5 million a year in travel advertising and other promotion and to set up travel information offices abroad.

At the same time President Kennedy has been quoted as favoring Presidential encouragement to lower legal and other barriers to foreign visitors. The word would go to consuls and the immigration service to be more courteous and reduce redtape.

Such moves, together with President Kennedy's proposal of last week to lower duty-free limits on foreign purchases by Americans, would go a long way to ease the tension caused by the precarious imbalance of international payments.

And it certainly would meet wide approval in the travel industry which has long advocated such a move. As a matter of fact, one such program is already underway, sponsored by a foreign airline.

Scandinavian Airlines System, with the cooperation of five U.S. travel firms—American Airlines, Eastern Airlines, Western Airlines, Sheraton Hotels, and Greyhound Bus Lines—has its own visit-U.S.A. program already underway. A team of U.S. domestic travel specialists are in Europe conducting training workshops, with the objective of explaining U.S. attractions and suggesting itineraries, shattering the misconception travel in the United States is too expensive for Europeans and supplying much-needed travel and resort literature.

Meanwhile, gold imbalance or no, the oversea rush by Americans is well underway The low-cost, 17-day economy fares helped keep off-season travel up and by the middle of June the oversea movement will become a flood.

This year it appears there will be little if any shortage of tourist space on airlines, steamships and, in most countries, of hotel rooms.

For this summer the jet age will be in full bloom, with nearly every international airline offering pure jet service. In the 6-week period starting June 1 there will be more jet seats available across the Atlantic than during all of 1960. On any given day in that period between 60 and 70 big jetliners, capable of carrying 125 to 150 passengers, will leave New York's Idlewild Airport for European destinations.

In addition there will be scores of other jet flights leaving other east and west coast gateway cities, for Europe via the polar route, for South America, the Caribbean, the Orient, and the Pacific.

In the meantime, those of us staying nearer home might find it beneficial to brush up on our French, Spanish, and German in anticipation of the hoped for rush of foreign visitors to our shores.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

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

The bill (S. 610) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce, improve the foreign payments position of the United States, and promote international understanding and appreciation of the United States of America by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally.

SEC. 2. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as "the Secretary") shall—

(1) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program, utilizing all appropriate media of public information and communication, designed to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by the residents of foreign countries for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities conducive to better international understanding of the people and institutions of the United States;

(2) encourage the strengthening of tourist facilities, programs, and other arrangements within the United States for assuring a friendly welcome and meeting the special requirements of foreign visitors;

(3) coordinate all travel facilitation activities of the United States Government, and actively encourage progressive elimination, reduction, or simplification of barriers to travel;

(4) assist in the implementation of foreign technical assistance and economic development projects in the travel industry field; and

(5) collect, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics and technical information relating to international travel and tourism.

(b) In performing the duties set forth in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) utilize the facilities of existing agencies of the Federal Government to the fullest extent possible;

(2) consult and cooperate with individuals, businesses, private organizations, and local, State, Federal, foreign government, and international agencies engaged in or concerned with international travel;

(3) obtain by contract and otherwise the advice and services of qualified and experienced professional agencies, consultants, and specialists in the fields of travel, advertising, public information, and mass communication;

(4) establish such travel offices in foreign countries, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, as he deems to be necessary and desirable;

(5) refrain from conducting any activity or furnishing any service which might result in adverse economic competition to persons engaged in the business of providing transportation, accommodations, or other facilities to persons traveling between the United States and foreign countries.

(c) Beginning with the fiscal year 1962, the Secretary shall submit to the President and to the Congress a quarterly report on his activities under this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Commerce a United States Travel Service (hereinafter referred to as "the Travel Service").

(b) The Travel Service shall be headed by an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Travel (hereinafter referred to as the "Assistant Secretary") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Assistant Secretary shall be in addition to the other Assistant Secretaries provided by law for the Department of Commerce. All duties and responsibilities of the Secretary set forth in section 2 of this Act shall be exercised through the Assistant Secretary.

(c) In the absence of the Secretary the Assistant Secretary shall represent the Secretary on any interagency committee, board or other organization established within the executive branch to deal with travel matters.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Travel Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as "the Board") which shall be composed of twenty members who shall be appointed by the Secretary and who shall serve for such terms as may be designated by the Secretary. Such members shall not be officers or employees of the Federal Government and shall be individuals who, by reason of interest, training, or experience, are qualified to carry out the duties provided for in section 5 of this Act. At least ten of the members of the Board shall be representatives of the travel and related industries.

(b) The Board shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from its members.

(c) Any vacancy in the Board shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Twelve members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

(e) Each member of the Board shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of his duties; and, while away from his home or regular place of business and engaged in the actual performance of his duties, he shall also receive travel and subsistence expenses in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Board or as an expert or consultant under section 2(b)(3) of this Act shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18, or of section 99 of title 5 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceedings, or matter involving the United States, except insofar as such provisions of law may prohibit any such individual from receiving compensation in respect of any particular matter in which such individual was directly involved in the performance of such service.

SEC. 5. The Board shall—

(1) advise and consult with the Assistant Secretary with respect to the activities of the Travel Service and from time to time shall submit to the Assistant Secretary recommendations for programs and policies to be adopted; and

(2) submit to the Secretary and the Congress from time to time, but not less than once a year, reports containing appraisals of the effectiveness of the programs and activities being carried on by the Travel Service and setting forth recommendations the Board has made to the Assistant Secretary and such other matters as it may consider pertinent.

SEC. 6. Section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 408, Eighty-third Congress) is amended by striking the period at the end of subsection (r) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by inserting after such subsection a new subsection as follows:

"(s) For financing the establishment and operation of travel offices and other activities authorized by the International Travel Act of 1961, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts.".

SEC. 7. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $5,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and thereafter such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "International Travel Act of 1961".

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a United States Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the majority leader is not present. I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for the time he has permitted us to proceed in getting this very important bill acted upon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oregon if he is to speak at length, and if he proposes something that might call for a record vote of some kind that I do not foresee?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak at some length, but I shall not ask for any action this afternoon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So Senators may assume that there will be no record votes.

Mr. MORSE. As soon as I complete my statement I shall move to adjourn or recess in accordance with whatever previous order was entered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure the Senator will make a very inspiring speech, and I hope I shall be present to hear all of it.

Mr. MORSE. I am always pleased to have the Senator from Illinois present, but I assure him that his reading ability will make it possible for him to grasp everything I have to say from a reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I was pleased to cooperate with the leadership of the Senate and withhold my remarks until this time, because I have certain statements to make, for the RECORD; and because I have withheld my remarks so long, and because the administration has asked me to attend a very important conference at 5 o'clock, I will not be able to yield for any purpose between now and the time I finish my speech.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise first in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to make a few comments on the President's special message on education today, and to announce the procedural course of action of my subcommittee. I shall make the latter comment first.

Because I will make so many specific references to the message, I should like to incorporate the message as part of my remarks. I ask unanimous consent that the message be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. Our requirements for world leadership, our hopes

for economic growth, and the demands of citizenship itself in an era such as this all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity.

The human mind is our fundamental resource. A balanced Federal program must go well beyond incentives for investment in plant and equipment. It must include equally determined measures to invest in human beings—both in their basic education and training and in their more advanced preparation for professional work. Without such measures, the Federal Government will not be carrying out its responsibilities for expanding the base of our economic and military strength.

Our progress in education over the last generation has been substantial. We are educating a greater proportion of our youth to a higher degree of competency than any other country on earth. One-fourth of our total population is enrolled in our schools and colleges. This year $26 billion will be spent on education alone.

But the needs of the next generation—the needs of the next decade and the next school year—will not be met at this level of effort. More effort will be required—on the part of students, teachers, schools, colleges, and all 50 States—and on the part of the Federal Government.

Education must remain a matter of State and local control, and higher education a matter of individual choice. But education is increasingly expensive. Too many State and local governments lack the resources to assure an adequate education for every child. Too many classrooms are overcrowded. Too many teachers are underpaid. Too many talented individuals cannot afford the benefits of higher education. Too many academic institutions cannot afford the cost of, or find room for, the growing numbers of students seeking admission in the sixties.

Our twin goals must be: A new standard of excellence in education—and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it.

I. ASSISTANCE TO PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

A successful educational system requires the proper balance, in terms of both quality and quantity, of three elements: Students, teachers, and facilities. The quality of the students depends in large measure on both the quality and the relative quantity of teachers and facilities.

Throughout the 1960's there will be no lack in the quantity of students. An average net gain of nearly 1 million pupils a year during the next 10 years will overburden a school system already strained by well over a half-million pupils in curtailed or half-day sessions, a school system financed largely by a property tax incapable of bearing such an increased load in most communities.

But providing the quality and quantity of teachers and facilities to meet this demand will be major problems. Even today, there are some 90,000 teachers who fall short of full certification standards. Tens of thousands of others must attempt to cope with classes of unwieldy size because there are insufficient teachers available.

We cannot obtain more and better teachers—and our children should have the best—unless steps are taken to increase teachers' salaries. At present salary levels, the classroom cannot compete in financial rewards with other professional work that requires similar academic background.

It is equally clear that we do not have enough classrooms. In order to meet current needs and accommodate increasing enrollments, if every child is to have the opportunity of a full-day education in an adequate classroom, a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed during the next 10 years.

These problems are common to all States. They are particularly severe in those States which lack the financial resources to provide a better education, regardless of their own efforts. Additional difficulties, too often overlooked, are encountered in areas of special educational need, where economic or social circumstances impose special burdens and opportunities on the public school. These areas of special educational need include our depressed areas of chronic unemployment and the slum neighborhoods of our larger cities, where underprivileged children are overcrowded into substandard housing. A recent survey of a very large elementary school in one of our major cities, for example, found 91 percent of the children coming to class with poor diets, 87 percent in need of dental care, 21 percent in need of visual correction and 19 percent with speech disorders. In some depressed areas roughly one-third of the children must rely on surplus foods for their basic sustenance. Older pupils in these schools lack proper recreational and job guidance. The proportion of dropouts, delinquency, and classroom disorders in such areas is alarmingly high.

I recommend to the Congress a 3-year program of general Federal assistance for public elementary and secondary classroom construction and teachers' salaries.

Based essentially on the bill which passed the Senate last year (S. 8), although beginning at a more modest level of expenditures, this program would assure every State of no less than $15 for every public school student in average daily attendance, with the total amount appropriated ($666 million being authorized in the first year, rising to $866 million over a 3-year period) distributed according to the equalization formula contained in the last year's Senate bill, and already familiar to the Congress by virtue of its similarity to the formulas contained in the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction and other acts. Ten percent of the funds allocated to each State in the first year, and an equal amount thereafter, is to be used to help meet the unique problems of each State's areas of special educational need—depressed areas, slum neighborhoods, and others.

This is a modest program with ambitious goals. The sums involved are relatively small when we think in terms of more than 36 million public school children, and the billions of dollars necessary to educate them properly. Nevertheless, a limited beginning now—consistent with our obligations in other areas of responsibility—will encourage all States to expand their facilities to meet the increasing demand and enrich the quality of education offered, and gradually assist our relatively low-income States in the elevation of their educational standards to a national level.

The bill which will follow this message has been carefully drawn to eliminate disproportionately large or small inequities, and to make the maximum use of a limited number of dollars. In accordance with the clear prohibition of the Constitution, no elementary or secondary school funds are allocated for constructing church schools or paying church school teachers' salaries; and thus non-public-school children are rightfully not counted in determining the funds each State will receive for its public schools. Each State will be expected to maintain its own effort or contribution; and every State whose effort is below the national average will be expected to increase that proportion of its income which is devoted to public elementary and secondary education.

This investment will pay rich dividends in the years ahead—in increased economic growth, in enlightened citizens, in national excellence. For some 40 years, the Congress has wrestled with this problem and searched for a workable solution. I believe that we now have such a solution; and that this Congress in this year will make a landmark contribution to American education.

II. CONSTRUCTION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACILITIES

Our colleges and universities represent our ultimate educational resource. In these institutions are produced the leaders and other trained persons whom we need to carry forward our highly developed civilization. If the colleges and universities fail to do their job, there is no substitute to fulfill their responsibility. The threat of opposing military and ideological forces in the world lends urgency to their task. But that task would exist in any case.

The burden of increased enrollments—imposed upon our elementary and secondary schools already in the fifties—will fall heavily upon our colleges and universities during the sixties. By the autumn of 1966, an estimated 1 million more students will be in attendance at institutions of higher learning than enrolled last fall—for a total more than twice as high as the total college enrollment of 1950. Our colleges, already hard pressed to meet rising enrollments since 1950 during a period of rising costs, will be in critical straits merely to provide the necessary facilities, much less the cost of quality education.

The country as a whole is already spending nearly $1 billion a year on academic and residential facilities for higher education—some 20 percent of the total spent for higher education. Even with increased contributions from State, local, and private sources, a gap of $2.9 billion between aggregate needs and expenditures is anticipated by 1965, and a gap of $5.2 billion by 1970.

The national interest requires an educational system on the college level sufficiently financed and equipped to provide every student with adequate physical facilities to meet his instructional, research, and residential needs.

I therefore recommend legislation which will—

(1) Extend the current college housing loan program with a 5-year, $250-million-a-year program designed to meet the Federal Government's appropriate share of residential housing for students and faculty. As a start, additional lending authority is necessary to speed action during fiscal 1961 on approvable loan applications already at hand.

(2) Establish a new, though similar, long-term, low-interest-rate loan program for academic facilities, authorizing $300 million in loans each year for 5 years to assist in the construction of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related structures sufficient to enable public and private higher institutions to accommodate the expanding enrollments they anticipate over the next 5 years; and also to assist in the renovation, rehabilitation, and modernization of such facilities.

III. ASSISTANCE TO COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

This Nation a century or so ago established as a basic objective the provision of a good elementary and secondary school education to every child, regardless of means. In 1961, patterns of occupation, citizenship and world affairs have so changed that we must set a higher goal. We must assure ourselves that every talented young person who has the ability to pursue a program of higher education will be able to do so if he chooses, regardless of his financial means.

Today private and public scholarship and loan programs established by numerous States, private sources, and the student loan program under the National Defense Education Act are making substantial contributions to the financial needs of many who attend our colleges. But they still fall

short of doing the job that must be done. An estimated one-third of our brightest high school graduates are unable to go on to college principally for financial reasons.

While I shall subsequently ask the Congress to amend and extend the student loan and other provisions of the National Defense Education Act, it is clear that even with this program many talented but needy students are unable to assume further indebtedness in order to continue their education.

I therefore recommend the establishment of a 5-year program with an initial authorization of $26,250,000 of State-administered scholarships for talented and needy young people which will supplement but not supplant those programs of financial assistance to students which are now in operation.

Funds would be allocated to the States during the first year for a total of 25,000 scholarships averaging $700 each, 37,500 scholarships the second year, and 50,000 for each succeeding year thereafter. These scholarships, which would range according to need up to a maximum stipend of $1,000, would be open to all young persons, without regard to sex, race, creed, or color, solely on the basis of their ability—as determined on a competitive basis—and their financial need. They would be permitted to attend the college of their choice, and free to select their own program of study. Inasmuch as tuition and fees do not normally cover the institution's actual expenses in educating the student, additional allowances to the college or university attended should accompany each scholarship to enable these institutions to accept the additional students without charging an undue increase in fees or suffering an undue financial loss.

IV. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The National Vocational Education Acts, first enacted by the Congress in 1917 and subsequently amended, have provided a program of training for industry, agriculture, and other occupational areas. The basic purpose of our vocational education effort is sound and sufficiently broad to provide a basis for meeting future needs. However, the technological changes which have occurred in all occupations call for a review and reevaluation of these acts, with a view toward their modernization.

To that end, I am requesting the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to convene an advisory body drawn from the educational profession, labor-industry, and agriculture as well as the lay public, together with representation from the Departments of Agriculture and Labor, to be charged with the responsibility of reviewing and evaluating the current National Vocational Education Acts, and making recommendations for improving and redirecting the program.

CONCLUSION

These stimulatory measures represent an essential though modest contribution which the Federal Government must make to American education at every level. One-sided aid is not enough. We must give attention to both teachers' salaries and classrooms, both college academic facilities and dormitories, both scholarships and loans, both vocational and general education.

We do not undertake to meet our growing educational problems merely to compare our achievements with those of our adversaries. These measures are justified on their own merits—in times of peace as well as peril, to educate better citizens as well as better scientists and soldiers. The Federal Government's responsibility in this area has been established since the earliest days of the Republic—it is time now to act decisively to fulfill that responsibility for the sixties.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the administration has honored me by an invitation to introduce the legislation and to serve as its floor leader in the Senate and as its leader in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, I shall speak at length today only because of the fact that I shall not be present after today for the rest of the week. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance at the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week, because the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate is sending me as one of the delegates to the Parliamentary Conference which will be held at Bermuda starting on Wednesday.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, after consultation with the Parliamentarian, I ask unanimous consent that an education bill be introduced today in behalf of the administration and lie on the desk until 5 p.m., Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in regard to the President's message, I wish to congratulate the President of the United States for the statesmanship portrayed by his special message on education sent to both Houses of the Congress today.

There will always be those who may think the President's message and the bill which will shortly accompany the message do not go far enough or go too far.

As one who is very happy to assume the responsibility of doing what I can in my humble, inadequate way, to seek to carry the administration's bill through the committee and through the Senate, I wish to stress that, in my judgment, the bill represents a fine start in the development of a Federal aid to education program.

We have fought on this battleground in the Senate every year of my membership in the Senate, which is now going on 17, and the struggle for some Federal aid to education predated my coming to the Senate. The need in the educational crisis has intensified every year, due in large part to congressional inaction to meet the crisis.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, Mr. President, I believe this has ceased to be solely a domestic issue. This issue now takes on some very serious international implications, because there is a very important race going on in the world for the minds of men. The contestants in that race are the free nations of the world running against the Communist nations of the world.

Mr. President, the enlightenment of the human brain does not exclude the Communists. The evidence and the data presented to our committee last year—in fact, in the last several years—leave no room for doubt about the fact that the Communist segment of the world considers the bringing of educational enlightenment to the young of the countries of the world to be one of its major foreign policies.

NATIONAL INTEREST IN EDUCATION

I do not think we are going in any way to help in this debate by spending much time on a comparison of education in the United States with education in the Soviet Union. I simply want the RECORD to note that we cannot afford, in my judgment, to permit the educational processes of Russia to surpass those of the United States.

There is an emergency need, Mr. President, for us to recognize that the problem of raising educational standards in the United States is a national problem as well as a State problem. There is a national responsibility for this problem, and one cannot read the President's message without being impressed with his recognition that the Federal Government should be willing to assume its fair share of that responsibility, making clear at all times that the safeguards and local control of the educational processes must be protected and must continue to be guaranteed to the States and to the local school districts.

At the very outset of his message the President said, in the first sentence:

> Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education.

That is a statement of truth. That has been stated in various language forms throughout our history, starting with Thomas Jefferson, who put the same principle and thought in these words:

> Democracy can be no stronger than the enlightenment of its people.

So when President Kennedy said:

> Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education—

He, in other language, has stated the unanswerable truism which Thomas Jefferson laid down at the very beginning of the life of this Republic.

President Kennedy today called to the attention of the Nation another thought that needs to be emphasized:

> The human mind is our fundamental resource. A balanced Federal program must go well beyond incentives for investment in plant and equipment. It must include equally determined measures to invest in human beings—both in their basic education and training and in their more advanced preparation for professional work. Without such measures, the Federal Government will not be carrying out its responsibilities for expanding the base of our economic and military strength.

I am very happy that President Kennedy started early in his message to lay the foundation for that emphasis, because when we talk about education, we are also talking about the security of this country, both its economic and military security.

The President has referred to human resources. I think one of the saddest things in the American scene today is the great waste of our human resources, and we find that waste really at its height in connection with our educational processes.

We are sending tens of thousands of American boys and girls to elementary and secondary schools whose standards of education are so low that we in effect deny a college education to those who graduate from such secondary schools, because they do not maintain a standard of education sufficient to qualify their graduates even for admittance to college.

It is interesting, when we take a look at the so-called academic casualty list of colleges in this country, as many of our educators have done—and they have supplied our congressional committees with their research findings—to note that those casualty lists bear a direct relationship to the academic standards of the high schools from which the students came. So President Kennedy is to be commended and praised, in my opinion, for calling the attention of the American people in his statesmanlike message today to the need to conserve our human resources and to develop the educational potential of the young men and women of our Nation.

NEED FOR LOCAL CONTROL

Also, at almost the beginning of his message—in fact, in the fifth paragraph of the message—President Kennedy once again stated, as he used to state on the floor of the Senate, and as he stated over and over again in his historic campaign for the Presidency, that the control of education must remain in the States and the school districts. It continues to be his view that the Federal Government's part in the educational process of our country is to aid the States in their financial assistance to local school boards. The Federal aid would pay the costs that can be fairly attributed to the Federal Government as its share because of the Federal interest in guaranteeing to every boy and girl in this country, regardless of where he or she happens to be born, the minimum standards of education necessary to give assurance that that boy or girl will have an opportunity to develop to the maximum of his ability.

In the fifth paragraph of his message the President said:

> Education must remain a matter of State and local control, and higher education a matter of individual choice. But education is increasingly expensive. Too many State and local governments lack the resources to assure an adequate education for every child. Too many classrooms are overcrowded. Too many teachers are underpaid. Too many talented individuals cannot afford the benefits of higher education. Too many academic institutions cannot afford the cost of, or find room for, the growing numbers of students seeking admission in the sixties.

It might very well be said that in that well-written paragraph the President has submitted his bill of particulars in advocating passage by this session of Congress of what I consider to be the very modest educational program he has offered in his message. I can assure the Senate that it will be offered within a few hours in a bill that the White House itself will sponsor. The President said in his message:

> Our twin goals must be: a new standard of excellence in education—and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it.

The President has spoken about the need for classrooms, improvement in teachers' salaries, better teachers, scholarships, and assistance to institutions.

He further said:

> But providing the quality and quantity of teachers and facilities to meet this demand will be major problems. Even today, there are some 90,000 teachers who fall short of full certification standards. Tens of thousands of others must attempt to cope with classes of unwieldy size because there are insufficient teachers available.

Let me make very clear—because we shall drive this point home time and time again in the days immediately ahead—that the decision as to how much of the Federal allocation to a State shall go to teachers' salaries is to be left to the States. If the State decides that it wants all the Federal allocation to go to school construction, that is its business, and there will be nothing in the bill that will prevent a State from making that choice. If, on the other hand, a major problem confronting any State is the problem of teachers' salaries, if its problem is the problem of an inadequate supply of teachers because of inadequate pay, the State should have the right to use all or most of the money allocated to that State from the Federal Government for teachers' salaries, so far as our elementary and secondary schools are concerned.

I surmise what will happen in most instances is that the State will weigh its relative needs as to physical facilities and teachers' salaries, and that part of the money will be used for teachers' salaries and part of it for school construction.

SUPPORT OF ADMINISTRATION BILL

There are sections of the bill that may result in some difference of opinion both in committee and within the Senate. However, I wish to make clear what the position of the senior Senator from Oregon will be on the President's bill. I will support the major provisions of the President's bill. As chairman of the subcommittee, I shall owe to the President the duty, as legislative counsel, so to speak, to do everything I can to secure approval of the President's bill in committee and passage of it on the floor of the Senate.

The President understands, as I am sure all of my colleagues in the Senate understand, that of course I reserve the right to support any amendment in my capacity as a Senator, representing the people of Oregon, that I believe to be appropriate to the bill.

I shall not offer any major amendments to the President's bill, because, disagree as anyone may with me, if I am going to serve to the best of my capacity as the floor leader of the bill, then I owe it to the President to try to get his bill through in the form in which he proposes it, subject always, of course, to further instructions from the President in case he should at any time see fit to advise us that he finds a particular amendment acceptable.

Of course, I take this position only because I have long favored and worked for the objectives of the President's message. If I opposed any major measure under the jurisdiction of my subcommittee, I would not undertake to serve as floor manager for it.

I shall have something more to say about my position as legislative counsel in regard to the bill in just a moment. However, I wish to call attention now to the part of the President's message that reads as follows:

> Based essentially on the bill which passed the Senate last year (S. 8), although beginning at a more modest level of expenditures, this program would assure every State of no less than $15 for every public school student in average daily attendance, with the total amount appropriated ($666 million being authorized in the first year, rising to $866 million over a 3-year period) distributed according to the equalization formula contained in the last year's Senate bill, and already familiar to the Congress by virtue of its similarity to the formulas contained in the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction and other acts. Ten percent of the funds allocated to each State in the first year, and an equal amount thereafter, is to be used to help meet the unique problems of each State's areas of special educational need—depressed areas, slum neighborhoods and others.

FORMULA FOR AID DISTRIBUTION

This raises the formula debate. We always have considerable difference of opinion among us as to what formula should be applied in any Federal aid to education bill. In my consultations with spokesmen for the administration in regard to the bill, I have come to the conclusion that the President in his recommendation on formula, which I have read to the Senate, is offering a formula which in my judgment is good ground for agreement.

I will not quarrel with the right of Senators, in committee or in the Senate, to suggest a change in the formula. However, I will constantly put this question to them: "Do you really want a bill?" I believe that when we come to grips with the formula we come to grips with the most important question as to whether we are going to have a bill enacted at all.

Here is a formula fair to all the States concerned. I do not believe it can be used by any State as a reason for opposing the bill. Here is a formula that is workable. It is entitled to a trial.

I say it most respectfully to any Senator who disagrees with me that support of this formula is a test as to whether we want to join the President and give him the support to which I believe he is entitled for the trial period proposed in the bill.

That causes me to point out that the President is not asking for permanent legislation in the bill. He is offering a bill for a trial period. Members of the press said to me in the pressroom a few minutes ago, "Senator, you know we need Federal aid to education on a permanent basis. Why is the administration sending up a bill that is not on a permanent basis, but proposes a 2- to 5-year program?"

Mr. President, this proposal commends itself to the Senate, because the bill offers a ground for common agreement among us for the trial period for which

the President offers it. Therefore, I make a plea now, in advance of our hearings, and in advance of our debate in the Senate, for the maximum of unity and the maximum of agreement among us in the Senate—yes, for a maximum of waiving of individual Senator's personal preferences in regard to what the formula should be, to the end that we can get started this year with a Federal aid to education bill for the trial period asked for by the President.

I do not speak for the President when I put it this way, but I certainly speak for myself. Let us give the President's proposal a trial, reserving to future sessions of Congress the responsibility and the duty, on the basis of what the results of that trial period show, a perfecting of the bill, if it is discovered that imperfections are, in fact, contained within it.

So much of our debate on Federal aid to education has to be in the realm of speculation anyway. Therefore, I wish to make the plea to Democrats and the Republicans alike in the Senate, to recognize that this is a reasonable proposal on the part of the President.

The President says:

> This is a modest program with ambitious goals. The sums involved are relatively small when we think in terms of more than 36 million public school children, and the billions of dollars necessary to educate them properly. Nevertheless, a limited beginning now—consistent with our obligations in other areas of responsibility—will encourage all States to expand their facilities to meet the increasing demand and enrich the quality of education offered, and gradually assist our relatively low-income States in the elevation of their educational standards to a national level.

I stress the President's comment that this is a modest proposal. In fact, there are those in the Senate who have said to me, since the message came to the Senate, that it does not go far enough. They have indicated that they think it is too modest. I think it is modest, too, in terms of the total need. But it is a good bill in terms of a measure which we have a real prospect of enacting into law.

In offering the modest bill, the President is offering a bill which is a good start. Once it is put on the statute books, it will soon prove to the American people the legislative soundness of the philosophy that is involved in the bill.

START IN MEETING FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY MUST BE MADE

That is what is needed, perhaps more than anything else in regard to a Federal aid to education bill today. What is needed is an education bill which will help to educate the American people as to the soundness of the legislative philosophy behind a Federal aid to education bill. The bill proposed by the administration is a great educational instrument for that purpose, too.

It is rather paradoxical for me to be saying this on the floor of the Senate, because all one has to do is to turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of years gone by and read that the senior Senator from Oregon has always offered and advocated a bill which provides more than this bill will provide. Many Senators have supported me in that effort and I think that our efforts can be seen in this measure. However, I am satisfied that the President is more right than we would be if we took the position we have taken in the past, and asked for what might be considered to be a more perfect program from the standpoint of providing all the aid that we really ought to provide to the schools of America. I also point out that with steadfast support from the administration, we may be able to wind up with a better bill than by starting with a more far reaching one.

This bill is a good beginning. I make my plea for it because it is a good beginning and because we ought to make a start now. With the agreement on the part of Senators who wish to go further that they will accept this much for this year, we can give reasonable assurance not only to the President but also to the country that we can pass this year a Federal aid to education bill which the President can sign.

ROLE OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS IMPORTANT

Mr. President, I now turn to a paragraph in the President's message which will elicit some controversy in our committee hearings and in our debate. Undoubtedly, it will elicit opposition from some groups in our country. It is a paragraph which in the past has found me on the other side of the issue from the President of the United States when he was a Senator from Massachusetts.

However, let me make it very clear now that I stand with the President in this session of Congress in support of his immediate recommendation. As I have in the past, I shall not offer amendments on this particular subject matter, because I shall practice what I preach when I urge Senators to be willing to set aside some of their favorite proposals of the past, sincerely offered, as I have always offered my own, because they thought their proposals were in the interest of strengthening the Federal aid to education bill. In asking them to set their proposals aside in order to make a start this year, I shall practice that policy myself in respect to the subject matter to which I now turn.

The President says in the paragraph to which I refer:

> The bill which will follow this message has been carefully drawn to eliminate disproportionately large or small inequities, and to make the maximum use of a limited number of dollars. In accordance with the clear prohibition of the Constitution, no elementary or secondary school funds are allocated for constructing church schools or paying church school teachers' salaries; and thus nonpublic school children are rightfully not counted in determining the funds each State will receive for its public schools. Each State will be expected to maintain its own effort or contribution; and every State whose effort is below the national average will be expected to increase that proportion of its income which is devoted to public elementary and secondary education.

This paragraph involves two subjects of controversy in the Senate, based upon our past debates on Federal aid to education. It involves, first, the question as to whether any Federal funds should ever go to the benefit of a child who is being educated in a private school. It should be noted that the President has made very clear in the language of this paragraph that he is talking about grants, because he says:

> In accordance with the clear prohibition of the Constitution, no elementary or secondary school funds are allocated—

That is, on a grant basis—

> for constructing church schools or paying church school teachers' salaries.

I completely agree with the President. I have taken the position consistently in the Senate that under the doctrine of the separation of church and state, grant money should not be made available to private schools.

My difference in the past with the President of the United States, when he was a Senator from Massachusetts, was in connection with loans, for which interest is paid, to a private school, for the construction of school facilities. I have argued before—and if I were to offer my amendment this year, which I shall not do, I would argue again—that the private schools of this country perform a very important public service to all the taxpayers.

If anyone has any question about that, he has only to look at the hypothetical I always raise in debate on this subject matter: Suppose that today it were decided to close every private elementary and secondary school in America, and the children now attending those schools appeared tomorrow morning at all the public schools in the United States. Then I think all the taxpayers of the country, probably for the first time, would have a clear understanding of the public service which is rendered the taxpayers by the private schools of the United States, because those private schools, in fact—and the parents who support those private schools—reduce considerably the school tax burden of all the parents of America who send their children to the public schools.

So I never lose sight of two things in the debate on this matter: First, the public service which is rendered by the private schools; and second, the child. Too often in our debate on this subject we lose sight of the beneficiaries of the program we seek to enact—the children themselves. I am interested in making certain that the child who goes to a private school also has the advantage of those minimum standards of education which will make it possible for that child in the private school to develop his intellectual potential to the maximum extent possible.

We do not serve the cause of education well by practicing a discriminatory policy against the child in a private school by denying that child the maximum development of his intellectual potential.

However, no Member of this body is a more ardent defender of the constitutional doctrine of separation of church and state than the senior Senator from Oregon. I did not teach that doctrine for years and years in the law school only to walk out on it simply because I entered politics.

However, the doctrine has nothing to do with a loan program, so far as constitutional law is concerned. If the Federal Government makes a loan to a private school, whether it be a Catholic school, a Baptist school, a Presbyterian school, or a nonsectarian school, it is not a financial grant to an institution for religious purposes. To the contrary, it is a loan to an institution which is performing a very worthwhile educational function in this Republic.

Whenever we grapple with this problem in debate the precedents are on my side, because Congress has followed a loan policy in regard to many private institutions in this country. We have provided for loans which bear interest and, therefore, do not cost the taxpayers a red cent. We have recognized the right of the Government to be of assistance to institutions which perform a great service in keeping this democracy strong.

We make loans to Baptist hospitals, for example. We make loans to other hospitals which are sponsored and supported by church denominations. We make loans under the National Defense Education Act to provide loans to high schools, universities, and colleges which are church schools. We have heretofore debated this constitutional question.

So I repeat today, simply for the record, my challenge to anyone to establish by legal argument any violation of the Constitution of the United States in providing a policy of lending to private institutions in this country, whether they are private schools or other private institutions.

Then, of course, there is another phase of this argument. We should not lose sight of what the separation of state and church doctrine really means in our constitutional history. When our Republic was born, 9 of the 13 Colonies had State churches or Colony churches; a church had been designated as the church of the particular Colony. The so-called separation of state and church doctrine was written into the Constitution in order to make clear that there was a prohibition against setting up a national church. That is the meaning of the separation of state and church doctrine.

It never was contemplated that it should be broadened to include denial by the Federal Government of the making to a private institution of an interest-bearing loan to be of assistance to that institution in carrying out a secular purpose.

Mr. President, when we are dealing with the educational function of a private school, we are dealing with small children. I do not propose ever to lose sight of them when I am talking about seeing to it that the children of America—irrespective of the religion of the families into which they are born, irrespective of the happenstance of birth—are never denied the right to have a chance for the maximum development of their intellectual potential.

We know the kind of old, bewhiskered argument that is used; it is said that there is nothing to stop their parents from sending them to public schools. But, Mr. President, liberty and freedom also encompass, in my judgment, the matter of parental choice in regard to the precious, sacred right of parenthood to judge, as parents, according to their sights, the environment in which they wish their children to be brought up. The state should not lose sight of the state interest in seeing to it that the mental resources of our country are not wasted by denying to children who attend private schools the maximum opportunity for the development of their intellectual potential.

So, I make this statement because I want the RECORD to show clearly that in no way have I retreated from my belief and my conviction that it falls within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and in no way is a violation of the separation of state and church doctrine, to have a program of loans to private schools, with the money to be spent solely in connection with the educational processes of those schools.

But it is well known that when the President of the United States was a Senator from Massachusetts, he opposed my amendment. He opposed it as a candidate for the Presidency. I respect his point of view. I call attention to the fact that my amendment is not a part of his message, and his message makes very clear that he is opposed to any grants to private schools. And so am I; and I made that very clear, last year.

But this afternoon the press—always looking, you see, for some basis for saying that a conflict exists between Members of Congress and members of the administration, and, may I say—and I do not think I am unduly sensitive about it—particularly looking, always, for a chance to show the existence of some conflict between the senior Senator from Oregon and either his colleagues in the Senate or the administration—wanted to know what I was going to do about the Morse amendment I offered last year for construction loans to private schools. I announced to the press, and I repeat now, that I am just not going to offer the amendment. I am going to keep faith with the plea I made a few moments ago to my colleagues in the Senate, when I asked them to resolve their differences of the past in regard to Federal aid to education, and to recognize that the President has offered a modest but sound program, a program that gives us the greatest chance of any we have had in years to establish in the legislative policy of this country a Federal aid to education bill. This will not be, and should not be, the last word on the subject. The fact that it is only of 3 years' duration assures us of an early review of it.

In that spirit of complete cooperation with the President of the United States, and in keeping, I believe, with the soundest legislative policy we can follow at this session of Congress, I announce, Mr. President, that I will not offer my amendment of the past, which sought to establish a loan program for private elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the remarks of the Senator from Oregon on education.

Eight years ago, when I came to the House of Representatives, my first committee meeting attendance was as a member of a special subcommittee headed by Representative KEARNS, of Pennsylvania; and we came in—in a Republican Congress—with a recommendation that Federal aid and Federal support of education be provided. In all the 8 years since then, I have worked for some sort of Federal aid to education, in order to carry out the declaration made by that committee. The distinguished Senator from Montana, whose seat I now occupy, Senator Murray, and I introduced what we believed to be a minimum bill. In fact, many schoolteachers throughout the Nation think my first name is Murray, because of the Murray-Metcalf bill. We wanted to have $25 a pupil provided as a minimum program, to start with, and going up to $100 in the fourth year.

The program the President sent to Congress calls for less than that. However, I agree with the Senator from Oregon. Let us begin. Let us have a minimum program, to start with.

I am going to support the President's bill, just as the Senator from Oregon has said he is going to support it, because this is a way to get Federal aid to education "on the road," and because the educational crisis we now face is our gravest domestic crisis.

I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that 24 years ago I served as a member of the House of Representatives of the Montana State Legislature, and at that time I voted for a transportation bill to permit school buses to pick up the Catholic boys and girls and the Baptist boys and girls who were attending parochial schools. I voted for that bill because I saw no reason why the school buses should leave those children standing beside the roads, without any further cost to the State of Montana.

I would support the Senator's amendment as submitted last year; but again I think it is wise to start with a minimum program, and see where we are going, and reevaluate it 3 years from now.

I listened with a great deal of pleasure when I heard the Senator from Oregon state that this is a basic program. It is not enough, in my opinion. It is not enough in the opinion of the great Senator who preceded me. But this is a beginning in an effort to solve a grave domestic problem, and we must start.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator from Montana, and to pay tribute to him today in the RECORD. In the Subcommittee on Education, the Democratic side of the committee has thought so highly of the views of the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] on education and has been so well aware of the many years of devoted service he has rendered to the cause of education in the House, that we have taken him with us in all our conferences with spokesmen for the administration.

Mr. METCALF. I have been very grateful to the chairman of the sub-

committee for allowing me to participate in the conferences and discussions. It has been a real pleasure to work with the subcommittee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a great deal of education must be done in the country with respect to my amendment of last year. There is a great deal of opposition to it in many parts of the country based on a misunderstanding and a failure to appreciate the philosophy behind it. I do not want to jeopardize this bill by getting involved in any controversy we do not need to get involved in. I make this plea to my colleagues to follow the example that I seek to set, myself, as the leader who has the responsibility to do what I can to get this bill through the Senate.

Furthermore, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] just spoke about legislation which was passed 24 years ago in the Montana Legislature. Such legislative power vests in all the legislatures of the country. After all, if it is believed in any State that there is any public interest in the proposal I have made in the past in regard to loans to private schools, there is nothing that can stop a State legislature from following such a policy in its own State.

INCONSISTENT OPPOSITION TO PRIVATE EDUCATION AID

This amendment always stirs up highly emotional reactions in various parts of the country, although I want to say, in passing, that I have never been able to see the consistency in the position taken by some of my colleagues that they are against interest-bearing loans to private secondary and elementary schools, but vote for loans to private higher educational institutions that function under a denominational sponsorship.

Nor do I see very much consistency in that position when it also holds that it is all right, in the granting of a scholarship program, to permit the student to select a school—and it may be a private denominational school—and then, have an additional payment made to that college or university for the cost of educating the student over and above the cost covered by the tuition.

However, in order to protect my own record, and to avoid the charge that I am following an inconsistent course of action in regard to this bill, I have made this statement in regard to my stand concerning loans to private schools.

I repeat, first, in my judgment, they are clearly constitutional.

Second, I think they would be in the public interest.

Third, I shall refrain from offering any amendment now because I think we ought to make a start this year with this bill and we ought to seek to eliminate from our discussion every controversial proposal that we can which would in any way jeopardize the objectives of the administration bill.

Without taking the time to read it all, I ask unanimous consent that paragraphs of the message containing the President's recommendations in regard to the current college housing loan program and a low interest rate loan program for academic facilities be inserted at this point in my remarks.

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

1. Extend the current college housing loan program with a 5-year, $250 million-a-year program designed to meet the Federal Government's appropriate share of residential housing for students and faculty. As a start, additional lending authority is necessary to speed action during fiscal 1961 on approvable loan applications already at hand.

2. Establish a new, though similar, long-term, low-interest rate loan program for academic facilities, authorizing $300 million in loans each year for 5 years to assist in the construction of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related structures—sufficient to enable public and private higher institutions to accommodate the expanding enrollments they anticipate over the next 5 years; and also to assist in the renovation, rehabilitation, and modernization of such facilities.

Mr. MORSE. Here again I think the President has proposed a modest program, a program we ought to readily accept and put through the Senate.

Now I come to the matter of scholarships.

There always seems to be greater support of and interest in the Senate in a scholarship program than in almost any other phase of an education bill.

In his message, the President says:

Today private and public scholarship and loan programs established by numerous States, private sources, and the student loan program under the National Defense Education Act are making substantial contributions to the financial needs of many who attend our colleges.

While I shall subsequently ask the Congress to amend and extend the student loan and other provisions of the National Defense Education Act, it is clear that even with this program many talented but needy students are unable to assume further indebtedness in order to continue their education.

I have in my hand a letter written by the president of the Associated Students of the University of Oregon. The president of this group points out that the student loan fund at the University of Oregon is completely depleted and that there is great need for a deficiency loan, so that National Defense Education Act funds can be matched. I completely support the position of the president of the Associated Students of the University of Oregon, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have referred be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS,
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, Oreg., February 8, 1961.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A crisis situation has recently come to our attention concerning student loan funds at the university. It seems that borrowing has been so heavy in the last few months on our student loan program that the fund is depleted and if all of the present loans are established, the fund will be reduced to only $488 and at the time that this was written, the controlling accountant for the university had 10 applications for loans on his desk.

As a result of this general loan fund depletion, it is impossible for the university to match national defense loan funds, even though we still have some credit available in national defense loans before reaching our maximum.

This deficiency of loan funds may mean that students who are operating on a restricted budget will be unable to finish out the term or attend next term because there are no emergency funds available in our own general loan fund to tide them over.

Our emergency funds can come only from endowments and gifts.

I know you will recognize the situation that this puts many students in. Is there any possibility of emergency legislation to help avert this situation? Any action you can take would be greatly appreciated.

We sincerely thank you for your presentation of the myrtlewood gavel to President Boland and are anticipating your attendance at the Model United Nations in April.

Enclosed you will find a statement of our loan situation.

Sincerely yours,

STEVEN R. SCHELL.

Mr. MORSE. The President of the United States talks about the need for scholarships and the need for offering some assistance to the institutions that are selected by the winners of scholarships to pay for part of the cost of educating these students over and above the tuition costs. In his message, he says the scholars "would be permitted to attend the college of their choice, and free to select their own program of study. Inasmuch as tuition and fees do not normally cover the institution's actual expenses in educating the student, additional allowances to the college or university attended should accompany each scholarship to enable these institutions to accept the additional students without charging an undue increase in fees or suffering an undue financial loss."

It is a very good proposal. It is identical with the proposal I offered as an amendment to the National Defense Education Act when it was first before the Senate; and I am sure the President of the United States will enjoy my good-natured comment when I say that at the time I offered it, he, as a Senator from Massachusetts, as I recollect, opposed my amendment.

Although none of the scholarship features of that bill became law, a similar grant to the institution is provided for fellowship awards for postgraduate study.

The President has demonstrated, as he does so frequently, that he believes in following where the facts lead. I judge from this recommendation that he has come to understand the soundness of the position many of us took in the Senate when, at the time the National Defense Education Act was before us, we offered as an amendment the very same recommendation he now offers in his message to the Senate. The President may be sure that he will have our wholehearted cooperation in doing what we can to see that the bill which is passed will contain that proposal.

HEARINGS PLANNED NEXT WEEK

Mr. President, I shall close my comments on the President's message as I turn to another subject by announcing

that, subject to the approval of my subcommittee, I hope hearings may be begun by Wednesday of next week on the administration's bill. It may be, because of a conflict in schedule within the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, that we cannot start Wednesday of next week, because we may not at that time have completed certain hearings which have already been arranged on other subject matters. I hope that if we cannot start on Wednesday of next week we shall be able to start on either Thursday or Friday of that week.

I think that will give the Senate ample opportunity to consider the bill. It will give interested groups, which may wish to send witnesses to the committee, adequate time to prepare for the hearing. The hearing should be held at the earliest possible date. We should get the bill from the committee to the Senate. I am going to strive to get a bill to the Senate not later than March 20, and I hope I can do so at an earlier date.

I close this part of my speech this afternoon by congratulating the President again on the great message he has sent to us and on the statesmanship portrayed by his proposal on a Federal aid-to-education bill.

FEDERAL ACTION TO STRENGTHEN HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the American Council on Education has recently released what it calls a proposed program of Federal action to strengthen higher education.

The American Council on Education includes, in its membership of 1,209, more than a thousand educational institutions and 144 educational organizations. It includes approved universities, colleges, teachers colleges, junior colleges, technological schools, and certain private secondary schools, State departments of education, city school systems, private school systems, selected educational departments of business and industrial companies, voluntary associations of higher education in the States, and large public libraries.

Because the needs of higher education will constitute an important subject for the 87th Congress to consider, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this program be printed in the RECORD.

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

A PROPOSED PROGRAM OF FEDERAL ACTION TO STRENGTHEN HIGHER EDUCATION

The magnitude and chief characteristics of the crisis facing higher education in the next decade have been documented through numerous studies by Federal agencies, State planning commissions, and independent groups. There is general agreement that enrollment is in the process of doubling, with an anticipated increase of at least a million full-time students between 1958 and 1965 and another million between 1965 and 1970. There is also agreement that colleges and universities, in the next 10 years, must nearly double both the number of qualified faculty members and the salaries paid them. Furthermore, it is clear that the proportion of research and instruction at advanced levels will become greater and that consequently the cost of necessary buildings and equipment will increase at a higher rate than that caused by expanding enrollment alone, with a corresponding increase in general operating expenses.

A recent comprehensive study by the U.S. Office of Education [1] states that by 1965 the colleges and universities of this country will have to spend $9 billion on physical facilities, and that an additional $10 billion will be needed between 1965 and 1970. Several leading economists have estimated that between 1959 and 1970 general expenditures, excluding those for capital outlays, will mount from $3.7 billion to more than $9 billion a year.

All the major studies show that after traditional sources of income, including student tuition and fees, have been stretched to the limit, there will still be a large gap that can be filled only by greater support from the Federal Government.

The American Council on Education, in consultation with its 1,200 institutional and organizational members, has been developing a general policy toward Federal support of higher education for many years. The situation is complicated for at least three important reasons. First, more than 40 agencies of the executive branch of the Government have programs that directly affect higher education. Second, at least a dozen congressional committees have authority to act on one or more of these programs. Third, these Federal programs differ not only in magnitude and scope, but also in kind and effect.

The last point is of special significance, because many Federal programs use colleges and universities merely to provide services required by the Government. Whether provision of those services depletes or augments the resources of these institutions to perform their central function of education is of no particular concern to the Federal agency. For example, the armed services have admitted for 15 years that ROTC programs constitute a drain on the resources of participating institutions, but have as yet offered no relief. Again, several of the programs in which colleges and universities participate under the National Defense Education Act have the purpose of strengthening secondary education rather than higher education. It seems clear that institutions of higher learning cannot continue indefinitely to undertake such service functions unless they receive additional support to strengthen their basic resources of staff, facilities, and general income.

It is the purpose of this statement to focus attention on proposed congressional actions that will strengthen the basic functions of the institutions. This approach does not imply lack of interest in other types of programs, a partial list of which appears hereafter.

In determining what kinds of support can appropriately be requested from the Federal Government, the character of the existing system of higher education suggests important limitations. More than half the colleges and universities, enrolling nearly 45 percent of the students, are privately supported. All types of institutions must be expanded and improved if the essential national goal of providing for future students is to be met. Hence the American Council on Education, representing higher education as a whole, does not ask general assistance from the Federal Government in paying faculty salaries.[2] Nor does it ask direct assistance from the Federal Government in meeting general operating expenses.[3] The basic recommendations presented below deal with assistance (1) in providing housing and academic facilities, (2) in augmenting the number and improving the quality of teachers and research workers, and (3) in offering able students with limited means the opportunity of a college education.

There are priorities even among these three major types of assistance. Additional financial aid to students is advocated only as a supplement to adequate support for new buildings and augmented staff. Helping more students to demand admission to college without at the same time supplying buildings to accommodate them and faculty to teach them would merely make more serious a problem already acute.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Federal Government can and should provide greater financial assistance to approved institutions of higher learning for expansion and improvement of facilities

1. The college housing loan program, which has proved extraordinarily effective during the past 10 years, not only should be continued, but also expanded on a basis that will permit institutions to plan further ahead. The funds authorized last summer will almost certainly be allocated early in 1961, and applications are being received by the Housing and Home Finance Agency at the rate of approximately $350 million a year.

An additional $150 million should be authorized as soon as possible to keep the program moving forward through June 1961.

A further authorization of $1.4 billion should be made for a 4-year period, beginning July 1, 1961, with equal allocations for the 4 fiscal years.

Adequate funds should be appropriated to administer the augmented program effectively and promptly.

2. A new program of federally administered assistance to institutions of higher learning, for construction of academic facilities of the kinds they require to meet their needs in improvement of quality as well as expansion of enrollment, should be established, offering each institution the following options on each separate project: (a) a grant to defray up to 50 percent of the cost of construction, or (b) a low interest 40-year loan to finance such construction, the interest rate to be determined under the same formula approved for the college housing loan program.

A long-range program is recommended, with initial authorization for 4 years and with funds supplied at the average rate of $1 billion a year. A survey of member institutions by the American Council on Education indicates that of its annual amount approximately 70 percent should be appropriated for matching grants and 30 percent authorized for loans.

It is in the national interest that the building program of each institution reflect with integrity its educational goals and ob-

[1] U.S. Office of Education, "Ten-Year Objectives in Education: Higher Education Staffing and Physical Facilities, 1960–61 through 1969–70" (Washington: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1961).

[2] The council considers it entirely appropriate, however, for the Federal Government to pay the full cost of the portions of faculty time devoted to federally financed programs of instruction and research and to continue the existing type of support to the land-grant institutions.

[3] The council considers it entirely appropriate, however, for the Federal Government to pay that portion of general operating expenses allocable to federally financed programs of instruction and research, and to continue the existing type of support to the land-grant institutions.

jectives. This principle should determine the criteria for eligibility set by the Government.

3. The existing program of matching grants for construction of research facilities in the health fields should be continued and expanded, and similar grants to support allied teaching facilities in these fields should be authorized.

4. The National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Defense Department, and other Federal agencies that sponsor and support research in colleges and universities should be authorized and encouraged to increase provision for the physical facilities and equipment required for such research; and additional appropriations should be made to them for this purpose.

II. The Federal Government can and should provide greater assistance in increasing the supply and improving the quality of college teachers

1. Such programs as the graduate, postdoctoral, and faculty fellowship programs of the National Science Foundation should be expanded as rapidly as qualified candidates can be discovered.

2. The graduate fellowship program under the National Defense Education Act should be extended for at least 4 more years, with immediate provision for awarding fellowships to alternates if the original recipients withdraw. Each institution should receive a grant of $3,000 a year for each graduate student enrolled under this program.

3. According to reliable estimates by those who have administered the present NDEA fellowship program, at least 1,500 more doctoral candidates could be accommodated in programs of instruction now offered by graduate schools. Consequently, a new fellowship program for these candidates should be established under the NDEA, in which there is no requirement that an institution have a "new or expanded program" of graduate instruction.

4. To improve faculty competence, another program should be established under the NDEA which would provide 1-year fellowships for college teachers who are within 1 year of completing the requirements for the doctorate. An experimental program of 500 such fellowships a year would be a significant beginning.

5. There should be a substantial increase in funds appropriated for exchanges of faculty members with foreign countries and for grants to actual and prospective college teachers to study abroad. Such exchanges help American institutions to solve one of their major academic problems—broadening their instruction to include the cultures of the entire world.

III. The Federal Government can and should provide greater assistance in removing financial barriers to higher education for qualified students

American colleges and universities have traditionally assumed, as part of their service to the people, heavy financial burdens in order to offer educational opportunities to students from families with low incomes. In addition to the very large benefits conferred by public institutions through low tuition and fees, the colleges and universities constitute the largest single source of undergraduate scholarships. This burden will obviously be greatly magnified by the needs of the additional 2 million students in the next decade. It is already increasing because of the necessary rise in student charges. One of the council's own surveys shows that charges for tuition, fees, room, and board, at both public and private institutions, have risen as much in the past 4 years as in the preceding 8 years or in the 20 before that.

Scholarships and loans offered by the institutions themselves and by other agencies have not kept pace, and the participation of the Federal Government has been declining as educational benefits under the World War II and Korean GI bills draw to an end. The loan program under the NDEA has helped many families in the middle-income brackets, but qualified students at the very low income levels are finding college entrance more and more difficult. The institutions need substantial assistance if equality of opportunity in the future is to be more than an abstract slogan.

1. The student loan program under the National Defense Education Act should be continued, with certain modifications, through its fourth year. At that time, funds in hand or on loan by educational institutions should be granted to them as permanent revolving loan funds. Additional appropriations should be made each year for grants to reimburse institutions for portions of loans forgiven under the law to meet the needs of increasing enrollments, and to establish loan funds for institutions new to the program.

2. Recognizing the priorities indicated above, and assuming the continuance of the student loan program, a new program of 4-year undergraduate scholarships should be established, with the objective of seeking out and assisting students of high academic promise in greatest financial need.

Stipends should be variable, according to need, with a maximum of $1,000 a year.

The scholarships should be awarded by the institutions themselves, using funds allocated in approximately the same manner as Federal student loan funds.

There should be an appropriation of $25 million for scholarships the first year, with the annual total rising to $100 million in the fourth year. These sums would provide a minimum of 25,000 new scholarships each year.

Each scholarship should be accompanied by a grant to the institution which the scholarship holder attends. A reasonable amount to defray part of the educational costs beyond tuition and fees would be half the amount of the scholarship. Additional appropriations will be needed for this purpose and for the expenses of administration.

3. Funds for undergraduate and graduate student exchanges with foreign countries should be increased. More care should be taken to insure that each foreign student has adequate funds for his educational expenses. Furthermore, the institutions should be reimbursed by the Federal Government for an equitable portion of the costs of special services needed to make the visitors' experience fully effective. One university has estimated that it spends an average of $200 each year on every foreign student beyond the normal expense of educating an American student—for special admissions procedures, help in finding appropriate housing, academic counseling, and, often, instruction in English.

IV. Additional approved proposals

As foreshadowed in the introduction, the program outlined above is deliberately restricted to major projects that will add to the basic strength of institutions of higher learning and that call for congressional action. These items by no means exhaust the list of Federal activities, current and proposed, in which the council's membership is interested.

For example, 50 universities are deeply involved in institutional projects abroad under the International Cooperation Administration. They have faced serious problems, but the solutions lie primarily with ICA rather than with Congress. Similarly, even more colleges and universities have large programs of federally sponsored research. Since Federal support of on-campus research reached $462 million in fiscal 1960, the amounts involved are important to the financial soundness of these institutions. But the effort to secure full payment for their services, which has been underway for more than a decade, will succeed or fail because of action by the Bureau of the Budget supported by research-financing agencies of the executive branch. The only congressional action needed is the deletion from future bills appropriating funds for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the legislative rider limiting payment of indirect costs to an arbitrary 15 percent.

A partial list of additional proposals calling for congressional action is presented below. Higher education, as represented by the American Council on Education, is interested in all of them. But highest priority should be given to the basic program, which will help colleges and universities to construct needed buildings, recruit essential faculty, and serve the increasing numbers of young Americans who need and deserve higher education.

The American Council on Education is ready to provide educational representatives who will testify in support of the following additional proposals, as well as those described above, before appropriate congressional committees, when invited to do so. This list is not complete but is meant to suggest areas of special interest. Included are recommendations of the commission on education and international affairs, the committee on television, the special committee on urban renewal, and the special committee on sponsored research, as well as those of the committee on relationships of higher education to the Federal Government.

1. Extend, expand, and strengthen the counseling and guidance program under NDEA by including personnel from 2-year and 4-year colleges in the institutes, providing stipends to enrollees from private as well as from public schools, inaugurating a program of graduate fellowships, and making funds available for research.

2. Extend, expand, and strengthen the foreign language development program under NDEA by including teachers from 2-year and 4-year colleges, providing stipends for enrollees from private as well as from public institutions, and establishing institutes for rare languages at the undergraduate level.

3. Maintain the present level of support for research and experimentation in the use of the mass media for instruction, under title VII of the NDEA.

4. Eliminate the NDEA requirement of a disclaimer affidavit for those receiving fellowships or loans.

5. Determine a formula for reimbursing colleges and universities for some of the expenses incurred in providing facilities for and operating ROTC units.

6. Establish on a permanent basis a senior office in the U.S. Department of State to coordinate international cultural activities.

7. Pass enabling legislation to make effective the Florence agreement relating to tariffs on books, scientific apparatus, and other cultural materials.

8. Add technical amendments to the Housing Act to make it more advantageous for urban institutions to participate in the Federal urban renewal program.

9. Authorize a program of grants to the several States in support of educational television.

10. Establish a permanent Council of Educational Advisers to the President of the United States to coordinate policies and procedures of the educational programs in the various Federal agencies and to plan on an overall, long-range basis a proper role for the Government in support of education.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the publication School Management for February 1961, carries an article entitled "Can Our States Support Good Schools?"

It is an excellent summary of the problem of financial support of our educational system. An editor's note accompanying the article states:

The issue of Federal aid to education has already been raised in this session of Congress, and there is little doubt that it will be a major question for many months. More than that, no matter what action our representatives take this year, it is destined to remain a major issue on our political scene for some time to come.

The following article is based on a speech prepared by Sam Lambert, research director of the National Education Association. Although Mr. Lambert's position is obviously a partisan one (the NEA has been a leader in the fight for greater Federal aid to education), it is not our intention in presenting this material to take sides in the matter. We do, however, hope to present some facts and figures on past, present, and future support of the public schools that will serve as the basis for constructive discussion of the problem.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of this survey of financial support of education be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

CAN ALL OF OUR STATES SUPPORT GOOD SCHOOLS?

More money is spent on public education each year than on any other single public activity other than national defense. And, within a decade or two, spending for education may actually outstrip spending for defense.

In 1949–50, it cost $5.8 billion to keep our elementary and secondary schools running. Last year, expenditures almost tripled to an estimated $15.5 billion. It has been estimated by many economists and statisticians that, at the present rate of growth and expansion, the public schools will probably cost $31 or $32 billion each year by 1970.

Where is this extra $15 billion to come from?

Some of it is going to come from increased revenues from present taxes. Our gross national product (the value of all goods and services produced in the United States in a single year) is increasing rapidly. At present about 3 percent of the GNP is captured for public education. Assuming that this percentage remains constant, that alone would account for almost one-half of the extra $15 billion in 1970. What about the rest of the money needed for education?

PROPERTY TAXES

The greatest part of school revenue today is raised on the basis of property taxes. These taxes amounted to $129 per person in New Jersey in 1959. In California, $130 per person was being spent on property taxes and in Massachusetts the figure was $133. In 1959, property taxes exceeded $100 per capita in 15 States. For the country as a whole, property taxes now amount to almost 4 percent of personal income.

It is doubtful if these taxes can be raised much higher than they stand now without overcoming tremendous resistance.

STATE TAXES

In recent years, the States have been carrying about 40 percent of the cost of the public schools. Can the growing variety of State taxes continue to carry two-fifths of the cost of public education?

Unfortunately, where local taxes are low, State taxes are usually correspondingly high. This is not always true, but an examination of the levels of State and local taxes will reveal a large degree of inverse relationship. In 1959, State taxes in the State of Washington amounted to $148 per capita, in Delaware $149 and in Hawaii $170. Even in the relatively poor State of Louisiana, State taxes amounted to $137 per capita. In the fiscal year 1959, State taxes amounted to over $100 per capita in 15 States. According to the Bureau of Census, the national average that year was $91 per capita.

State taxes in 1959 amounted to $8.64 per $100 of personal income in Hawaii. In the States of Louisiana and Mississippi, State taxes amounted to $8.37 and $7.24 per $100 of personal income. For the country as a whole, these taxes require 4.2 percent of personal income. These figures are for fiscal 1959. They have gone up since then.

PROPERTY AND STATE TAXES

Since the support of public education is a cooperative enterprise of local and State governments, the only way to make sense out of this picture is to put all State and local taxes together and see how the overall problem looks. For example, State and local taxes combined, for the year 1959, amounted to $265 per capita in California, $253 in New York, and $245 in Nevada. There are 13 States where the combined State and local tax load amounts to over $200 per person in the population. Looking at this another way, in South Dakota, State and local taxes in 1959 amounted to $12.28 per $100 of personal income. There were eight other States where State and local taxes amounted to over 10 percent of personal income (see following statistics):

Total of State and local tax collections per $100 of personal income, 1959

U.S. average	$8.49
Alabama	7.71
Alaska	6.08
Arizona	9.62
Arkansas	8.98
California	9.50
Colorado	9.99
Connecticut	7.06
Delaware	6.45
Florida	9.04
Georgia	8.42
Idaho	9.65
Illinois	6.98
Indiana	8.05
Iowa	9.80
Kansas	10.68
Kentucky	7.59
Louisiana	11.24
Maine	9.48
Maryland	7.87
Massachusetts	9.31
Michigan	8.95
Minnesota	10.32
Mississippi	10.57
Missouri	6.60
Montana	10.90
Nebraska	8.20
Nevada	9.11
New Hampshire	8.28
New Jersey	7.67
New Mexico	9.09
New York	9.24
North Carolina	8.16
North Dakota	12.01
Ohio	7.09
Oklahoma	9.28
Oregon	9.40
Pennsylvania	7.25
Rhode Island	8.50
South Carolina	8.37
South Dakota	12.28
Tennessee	8.17
Texas	7.76
Utah	9.39
Vermont	11.31
Virginia	6.97
Washington	9.51
West Virginia	7.83
Wisconsin	9.54
Wyoming	10.10

"State and local tax revenues combined, doubled between the years 1950 and 1958 and the total has gone much higher since 1958. State and local tax collections per $100 of personal income are beginning to look more like the bite of a Federal income tax than like that of the traditional modest State and local taxes. It should be noted that some of the States putting forth the greatest tax effort at State and local levels still have the most inadequate schools in the country.

The problem of supporting education is not wealth; it is a problem of tax machinery. A property tax, in supporting our country's second largest enterprise, has certain weaknesses. Its growth is slow and not in proportion to productivity and wealth. There are also problems in enacting further increase in State taxes. Many Governors and legislative bodies are worried about competition for business and industry.

IS FEDERAL AID THE ANSWER?

There are certain misconceptions and misunderstandings in the great debate over Federal support of education. The first of these relates to the size of the national debt.

The national debt is high but it actually has decreased from 93 percent of the gross national product in 1949 to 62 percent in 1959. In relation to assets, the Federal debt is not nearly as large as it was 10 years ago. It has gone up only 8 to 10 percent in the past 10 years, whereas State-local debt has gone up almost 200 percent.

Another misconception relates to the "freight charge" on the Federal tax dollar. The common statement is, "Why send a tax dollar to Washington when by the time it gets back to the local government, it has shrunk to 60 cents?" Actually, the Federal tax collection machinery is by far the most efficient we have ever devised. The cost of collecting local taxes is far higher. Experts have estimated that the collection and administration of local taxes cost as much as $10 per $100 collected. The cost of collecting State taxes is estimated on the average in excess of $1 per $100. Federal taxes are collected at the rate of 44 cents for every $100.

A third issue in the great debate involves the charge of Federal control. There have been many Federal grants in past years. Some have involved control and some have not. But the most dangerous control in existence is that exerted by poverty. The thing that really controls important decisions on education at the local level is the lack of money. Suppose a school district decides it wants a summer program in remedial reading. No one makes the decision for that district; it's entirely a matter of whether it can find the money to support such a program.

The same is true of a district that wants to add a third year of mathematics to its high school curriculum. The problem here is whether it can find a qualified teacher to employ at the going salary rate. Again, it is a matter of money.

Some people believe there is something inherently wrong with using Federal money for education. Why? Federal money is used for practically every other purpose.

Look how much Federal money already goes to the States. Over the country as a whole, Federal money flowing into the States in various types of aid equals 47 percent of the total of State tax collections. State and local governments would find it exceedingly difficult to operate without the assistance now received from the Federal Government.

Farmers, doctors, nurses, highway users, and highway builders, retired persons, the physically handicapped, veterans, widows, the unemployed—all derive some benefit from Federal money. Why not the youth of this Nation?

PROBLEMS WHICH CONFRONT THE UNITED STATES IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks I am about to make in respect to some questions of American foreign policy a part of Mr. Drew Pearson's column, appearing in "The Washington Merry-Go-Round," published this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall discuss now some of the problems which confront the United States in the United Nations, a discussion based upon my experience as a delegate to the United Nations from September 20 to December 20, 1960.

I had the great privilege of serving on that delegation with a wonderful colleague in the Senate, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. In a report which I submitted to the Senate I paid tribute to the service of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and that tribute will be found on pages 2 and 3 of the report. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SENATOR GEORGE AIKEN SERVED WITH DISTINCTION

My Senate colleague on the delegation was the distinguished and very able liberal Republican Senator from Vermont, GEORGE AIKEN. He served our country with great distinction. He was particularly adept in puncturing fallacious Russian arguments in the debates in the Fifth Committee on which Senator AIKEN was the U.S. delegate. The major concern of the Fifth Committee involved the matter of financing the manifold activities and operations of the United Nations. Over the years, it has become too much of a habit in the United Nations for the member nations in an almost take-it-for-granted attitude to look to the United States to foot most of the financial bill when some new emergency or important world need arises.

Many of the countries of Europe, as well as Russia, have not paid their just and fair share of the financial expenses and costs of the United Nations. Russia, along with her Communist bloc allies, has adopted a very recalcitrant attitude and parsimonious policy in respect to supporting financially the United Nations.

Time and time again, Senator AIKEN focused the attention of the Fifth Committee on the extent to which the United States has been carrying the financial burden of the United Nations. He made clear that we are perfectly willing to pay our fair share of the costs but that the time has come when other member nations who are now in good economic condition, comparatively, should be expected to increase their payments to the United Nations. He drove home the point that Russia and her Communist associates seem to have made their deliberate, inadequate financial support of the United Nations a definite part of their cold war tactics. He also called attention to the fact that there is a growing concern among the American taxpayers over the fact that the United States large contributions appear to be out of proportion to those made by many other countries.

He tactfully but effectively pointed out that if the inequitable disparity in payments among the nations continued, it would become increasingly difficult in the U.S. Congress to secure approval for United Nations appropriations in the amounts now granted. At the same time, Senator AIKEN made perfectly clear that the United States is a stanch supporter of the United Nations and always can be counted upon to help finance United Nations programs based upon a fair and equitable distribution of the costs among all the member nations in accordance with their ability to pay.

Senator AIKEN was a source of great strength to the U.S. delegation, not only on the Fifth Committee but also in connection with all the other phases of the delegation's work. He happens to be a member of the Senate's Subcommittee on Latin America, of which I have the honor of serving as chairman. Many matters and issues arose during the 15th General Assembly session that called for consultations, negotiations, and very important diplomatic discussions with delegations from Latin America. The Cuban crisis, for example, required our constant attention and called for hours of time day after day in conference with delegates, not only from Latin America, but from all over the world. The false charges of Castro and his Cuban delegation required calm, objective, and persuasive presentation of rebuttal facts and evidence. Senator AIKEN was of great help because of his expert knowledge of Latin American affairs.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also paid tribute in the report to the statesmanship of former Ambassador James J. Wadsworth, who was the head of the American delegation in the United Nations, and I ask unanimous consent that my comments upon his dedicated service be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TRIBUTE TO U.S. DELEGATION—AMBASSADOR WADSWORTH

However, first I wish to pay high tribute to the fine dedicated service which all of my colleagues on the U.S. delegation rendered to our country during the 3 months' session of the General Assembly, lasting between the dates of September 20 to December 20, 1960.

The head of our delegation was Ambassador James J. Wadsworth. For the 2 years previous to his United Nations assignment, Ambassador Wadsworth was our Ambassador at Geneva in charge of the long and trying negotiations with the Russians in an attempt to reach a satisfactory agreement on ending nuclear tests. Although the Russians finally broke up those negotiations by walking out on them, history will record that Ambassador Wadsworth distinguished himself as a very able negotiator and diplomat throughout those 2 years of difficult conferences with the Russians.

In fact, it is to the everlasting credit of our Ambassador that he was able to reduce substantially the areas of disagreement between the United States and Russia concerning the much-to-be-desired ending of nuclear testing. When a new United States mission comes to renew negotiations with the Russians over the issue of nuclear testing and the even broader issue of controlled total disarmament, it will be the beneficiary of the spade work and fertile seeding which Ambassador Wadsworth did at the 1958 to 1960 Geneva Conferences on Nuclear Testing.

It was with the same qualities of nonpartisan statesmanship that Jerry Wadsworth (as he became affectionately known by us) guided and directed the work of our U.S. delegation at the General Assembly. Whenever some of us or all of us on the delegation believed that the instructions we received from the State Department on some issue were not in the best interests of our country, Ambassador Wadsworth saw to it that there was thorough discussion of the matter at a delegation meeting. If such a discussion did not resolve the differences, Ambassador Wadsworth, irrespective of whether he agreed or disagreed with the State Department instructions, saw to it that the views of the members of the delegation were made known through appropriate channels to the responsible officials in the State Department.

Ambassador Wadsworth and all of us on the U.S. delegation were on the firing line, so to speak, at the General Assembly. Every statement we made, every vote we cast, every policy we proposed or opposed added to or detracted from the standing of the United States at the United Nations. Probably more than at any other session in the history of the General Assembly the policies, alinements and votes of the U.S. delegation were bound to be closely scrutinized and coldly appraised by many delegations, including the large number from the new member nations.

However, we served our country as ambassadors bound by the instructions sent to us from the White House or from the State Department. We, in turn, owed a duty to the State Department and, through it, to the White House, to register our respectful dissents, reservations, and suggestions for changes in our instructions whenever we became convinced that the realities and facts which we faced on the United Nations firing line could not be squared with the instructions which Washington had sent us. Surprisingly enough, this happened rather frequently.

Thanks to the leadership and diplomatic qualities of Ambassador Wadsworth, his interventions in behalf of the delegation succeeded in some instances in obtaining either reversals or modifications of some of the particularly unfortunate original instructions. When we had to live with a bad instruction, Ambassador Wadsworth earned our great admiration by making the best possible case out of a bad U.S. position when he came to explain the U.S. vote to the General Assembly. In politics, he is a Republican. In foreign policy, he is a nonpartisan just as we all should be. On the basis of his record of public service, he should not be lost to the diplomatic service of our country in this time of international crisis.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, beginning on page 3 of the report and going over to page 6, I called special attention to the fine service rendered by the other delegates on the U.S. delegation to the United Nations last fall. It is important that my evaluation of them—which I can assure the Senate is shared by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]—be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, so I ask unanimous consent that it be done.

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

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE U.S. DELEGATION WERE GREAT CREDIT TO THE UNITED STATES

If the people of the United States could have heard the many fine things repeatedly said throughout the 3 months' session about all of my colleagues on the U.S. delegation by delegate after delegate from all over the world, they would be just as proud as I am of the delegation. I'm sure the American people also would agree that I should record in

this report in these few words an expression of thanks and appreciation for their fine public service.

FRANCIS WILCOX

Each one of my colleagues on the delegation is a distinguished American in his or her own right. The Honorable Francis Wilcox, until recently an Assistant Secretary of State and now dean of the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University, is a recognized authority on the United Nations. Without his keen insight and foresight, the work of the delegation would have been greatly impaired. He was the U.S. delegate on the First Committee. He handled with great tact and diplomacy the U.S. position on several very delicate and touchy problems such as the Arab refugee problem.

MRS. MARY LORD

Mrs. Mary Lord has served for 8 years on the Third Committee dealing with human rights. She is beloved throughout the United Nations headquarters. Her long record of dedicated public service has made her not only one of the most popular ambassadors at the United Nations but a very effective one for the United States.

AMBASSADOR FRANCES WILLIS

Ambassador Frances Willis is our U.S. Ambassador to Norway. She has been in the Foreign Service of the United States for 33 years. She served as the U.S. delegate on the Special Political Committee. My admiration for her ability is unlimited. Her wise counsel and diplomatic ability was of great help to Ambassador Wadsworth and the entire delegation.

DR. ZELMA GEORGE

Dr. Zelma George, of Cleveland, Ohio, was our delegate assigned to help on the Second Committee which has jurisdiction over economic and financial matters. She is one of the great Negro women of America. Her brilliant record in education, the arts, and on the lecture platform brought a background of training to our delegation that stood us in very good stead throughout the session. Her scholarly and objective approach to all of the racial and human rights problems which are of such great concern, not only in our own country but within many member nations, made her an invaluable member of the delegation. Dr. George's work among the African nations made available to us information which I am sure we never would have been able to obtain from any other source at our command. Very early in the session, she won the confidence and respect of many of the members of the African delegations. We learned through her about some of the problems and misunderstandings concerning the United States which developed within some of the African delegations. Again, with her help, we were able to clear up many of those misunderstandings.

It was Dr. George who provided the General Assembly with one of its most dramatic and heart-touching incidents during the closing days of the session. On December 14, when the colonial resolution calling for early independence for all colonial people who wanted it was voted upon, there were 89 nations voting for it, none against it, and 9 abstaining. The United States, unfortunately, was among the nine abstentions, along with Australia, Belgium, Dominican Republic, France, Portugal, Spain, South Africa, and the United Kingdom. The U.S. vote was a very unpopular vote. It did us great damage. It was a White House instructed vote.

Immediately upon the announcement of the results of the vote, Dr. George arose at her desk within the U.S. delegation and started an applause which broke into an ovation. I sat beside her and vigorously joined her in the applause. Her dramatic expression of deep feeling and enthusiastic approval over the passage of the resolution by such an overwhelming vote caused almost every eye in the huge assembly hall to be focused upon her. I felt that the thunderous applause which broke forth was more of an ovation for Mrs. George than for anything else. It was quickly recognized that her demonstration symbolized one of the great strengths of personal freedom in a democracy. She stood there, living proof of the fact that although our Government on the vote just cast had unfortunately allied itself with the colonial powers, she, as an individual, was free to applaud the passage of a resolution which, in essence, rejected colonialism.

A very humorous incident occurred within our delegation immediately thereafter. The Communist head of the Rumanian delegation walked over to us and said laughingly to Ambassador Wadsworth, "I see you have a couple of rebels in your delegation." Quick as a flash, Wadsworth replied, "Yes, we have and we are proud of them. Of course, in your country they would be shot." Needless to say, all of us who heard the colloquy, including the Rumanian, enjoyed a good laugh, but the moral of Ambassador Wadsworth's comment is worth remembering.

FREDERICK PAYNE

One of the sources of strength of the U.S. delegation was its cross section representation of American life and interests. Thus, Mr. Frederick Payne, a New York City financier, brought to the work of the delegation the expert knowledge of an exceptionally able business leader. His understanding of world trade problems, international finance, and foreign economic trends and conditions in many parts of the world made him a most valuable member of our delegation. His extensive travels abroad enabled him to give us firsthand information on many problems which confronted us. He served as a delegate on Committee Two. His desire to know the facts about any problem and then follow where the facts lead won my admiration for him very early in the session. I felt that every conference with him was an educational seminar on whatever problem we discussed. The services of business leaders such as Mr. Payne are very much needed in government and in the work of the United Nations.

ARTHUR LAMEY

Mr. Arthur Lamey, of Billings, Mont., is a very able lawyer who brought to the work of the delegation a fine mind, a judicious temperament, and a heart full of understanding and sympathy for the myriad of human problems which are enmeshed in the complex international affairs of the underdeveloped areas of the world. He served as one of our delegates on the Third Committee. Mr. Lamey also was of great help to Ambassador Wadsworth in the plenary sessions of the General Assembly, as well as in the general administrative work of the delegation. His analyses of some of the Russian proposals were of great help to the delegation, and his effective committee work in handling the Russians was superb.

JUDGE CHARLES ROSENBAUM

Judge Charles Rosenbaum, of Denver, Colo., was a tireless delegate who championed our country's cause whenever and wherever he met up with a delegate from any foreign country who seemed to be puzzled, or critical, or just seeking information about the position of our delegation on some issue. He was a very effective ambassador of the United States at the United Nations. His discussions at the meetings of the U.S. delegation many times caused us to scrutinize very carefully a proposed policy action. On several occasions, his recommendations helped avoid what I think would have been serious mistakes in the work of the delegation. He served on Committee Six, which considered legal questions, and brought to that Committee the contributions of his fine legal mind.

For many years, Judge Rosenbaum has been a very active supporter of public information programs about the United Nations. He recognizes that an informed American public opinion about the work of the United Nations is essential to continued U.S. support of the United Nations. With his background of knowledge of the United Nations and his keen interest in the legal and judicial institutions of the United Nations as instruments for promoting peaceful settlement of international disputes, Judge Rosenbaum was a very effective member of our delegation.

At the risk of seeming to blow a horn of fulsome praise about the work of my colleagues on the U.S. delegation at the 15th General Assembly, I have made the foregoing remarks about them because I know them to be deserved. Furthermore, I wanted to leave this record of my appreciation of their splendid service to their country and of my indebtedness to them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I turn to the reports which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and I have made. The joint report was issued to the press last Friday, accompanied by the excellent supplementary views of the Senator from Vermont, and an appropriate press release. The supplemental views of the senior Senator from Oregon were sent to the press last Saturday, for release today with, I hope, an appropriate press release.

I wish to say goodnaturedly that a reading of the press would cause one to wonder when the Senator from Vermont and I were going to release our reports, because such releases have been treated, as the press has a perfect right to treat them, with thunders of silence, for the most part.

But the American people are entitled to know some of the conclusions that were reached by designated delegates of the Senate of the United States in respect to the functioning of the United Nations, and therefore I shall take some time, for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to call attention to some of the major recommendations that the Senator from Vermont and I have submitted to the Senate, and, through the Senate, to the Government of the United States, and through the Government of the United States, to the people of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the press release which I issued last Saturday in regard to my supplementary views, taking the form of a report on my service in the General Assembly.

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

MORSE SAYS UNITED STATES MUST STOP SUPPORTING COLONIALISM

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, today filed with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a supplemental report on his work as a U.S. delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations. In it, MORSE described in detail his assignment to the fourth, or trusteeship, committee of the assembly. The joint report by Senators AIKEN and MORSE, and Senator AIKEN'S supplemental report on his committee assignment, were filed last week.

The Morse report condemned the policy followed by the United States at the U.N. last fall in support of continued colonialism by some of America's allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He also urged that differences of opinion between the U.S. delegation at the U.N. and the State Department be settled by the President. He said in summary:

"I regret to report that on the major issues before the committee and the full Assembly involving colonialism, the U.S. delegation was directed by our State Department to side with the colonial powers, and against the proposals offered to end colonialism. This opposition customarily took the form of an abstention from voting, which on these issues still amounts to placing the United States on the side of the colonial powers.

"Because of this unfortunate voting record on the colonial issues in the 15th General Assembly, the United States branded itself as a supporter of colonialism.

"This was very costly to the standing and prestige of the United States within the United Nations, and it must be changed starting in the renewed session of the General Assembly in March if we are to have any hope of winning the confidence and good will of the many non-Communist, neutral, and uncommitted nations in the world whose delegates frankly state that they are at a complete loss to understand the voting record of the United States. * * * This record was especially unfortunate because it contrasted sharply with our opposition to the Communist brand of colonialism."

"Because of this position," MORSE said, "we rejected our own history, and allowed the Communist bloc to champion the cause of those millions of people who are trying to gain independence."

He pointed out that the United States is historically in the best possible position to champion the cause of those people seeking independence:

"Historic American sympathy for and actions in support of independence movements constitute one of the strongest reasons for the leadership of the United States in the free world today. We are fortunate that this push of U.S. idealism coincides with the trend of political events. Independence movements are succeeding. Nothing can stop this process; people everywhere want governments of their own choosing, and the colonial powers know or should know that the end of colonialism is near."

He attributed this American position to Pentagon interests, and to our membership in NATO, whose success is very important to us.

"It is my opinion that our policymakers in the Pentago Building are not sufficiently sensitive about the policies and practices of some of the colonial powers in respect to human rights of the indigenous people whom they rule and dominate. In the name of military defense, the United States has spent huge sums of money for bases and military installations in dictator countries, resulting in great economic benefit to colonial powers and dictatorships. It is very doubtful that the overall effect of any of these military installations has been to strengthen the security of the United States.

"If one scratches deeply enough into the mistaken U.S. positions on colonial issues, one will probably find a U.S. military influence. The Department of State has seemed to lack the necessary disposition either to question the military need for such requirements or to balance their importance properly against other policy objectives. Once the Joint Chiefs of Staff have spoken, that tends to end the discussion."

Referring to NATO in particular, he said that recent history has changed its relative importance.

"The purposes of NATO are specific and limited; it was designed to forestall possible Soviet aggression across Europe with large masses of troops. But that was 10 to 12 years ago. The Russians have plainly found it much easier to go around NATO than to go through it, and they are doing so by seizing on the hopes and aspirations of people in former colonies or in so-called underdeveloped countries all over the world.

"It is simply folly for America to throw away all the natural and historic advantage we have with these people by siding with a few NATO powers who are also the powers seeking to prolong colonialism."

He was especially critical of the extent to which we have been guided by Great Britain on colonial issues.

"In my opinion, we have for too long allowed the British to influence us unduly on colonial questions. United States positions in the United Nations on this subject have served British interests better than American interests. It is time to put a stop to this. I place this topic high on the list of urgent foreign policy questions for the new administration."

He said that the delegates of the former British colonies believe that the United States gives Britain more credit than is due her for her colonial policies.

"They charge that the condition of the British exchequer has exercised a much greater influence on British colonial policy than any sense of justice toward indigenous people. They call attention to the fact that the United Kingdom is still the largest colonial power in the world, and that her position on the colonial resolution in the 15th General Assembly was motivated more by her economic advantage in delaying independence than her desire to prepare colonies for independence.

"They also state with obvious intense feeling that in almost every instance they were not granted their independence—but in fact won it—from a reluctant Britain."

MORSE listed each issue involving colonialism at the U.N. last fall, and the position taken on it by the United States. He also described several discussions within the delegation and with State Department officials regarding the position to be taken by this country. On target dates for independence:

"The instructions of the Department of State to the U.S. delegation have been to vote 'no' on a resolution inviting administering authorities to set up independence target dates. If we are to match our deeds with our words, the United States should cosponsor such a resoltuion, or at least vote 'yes.' "

On urging Portugal to report to the U.N. on her oversea territories:

"Such a resolution was adopted by a vote of 45–6–24, but instead of voting 'yes' on the question the U.S. delegation was instructed by the State Department to abstain. The vote was very costly to U.S. prestige in both the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly.

"It is common knowledge in the United Nations that Portugal has threatened the United States with the loss of the use of the Azores as an airline landing base if we join other nations in rejecting Portugal's absurd claim that she does not have foreign territories, but only oversea metropolitan provinces.

"It is to be hoped that the U.S. delegation will not again be instructed to abstain on the Portugal colonial issue and thereby seem to support the legal fiction advanced by Portugal that she has no territories."

On sending an observation team to South-West Africa, a mandate of the Union of South Africa, which he said the State Department "fumbled and bungled":

"The proposal to have a committee go into South-West Africa embodied the same principle as that embodied in the Hungarian question. We have sought for several years to have the U.N. committee go into Hungary and make observations and report back to the U.N. The final resolution on South-West Africa passed the Fourth Committee by a vote of 65 to 0, with 15 nations abstaining, including the United States. The resolution was clearly within the jurisdiction of the U.N. Charter, and was salutary in its objectives. The U.S. delegation should have voted for it. The U.S. vote of abstention on this resolution was very harmful because once again, we appeared to be sustaining policies of a colonial power whose policy in South-West Africa has aroused deep resentment among many African nations."

The Ambassador from the Union had previously gone to the State Department to protest a MORSE speech in the Fourth Committee, and had declared that if the U.S. position continued, there might have to be a suspension of further discussions for location of a U.S. missile-track station in the Union of South Africa.

"I would not mention these negotiations if they were in fact a secret," MORSE said, "but U.S. plans to establish a missile track station in the Union of South Africa were told to me by African delegates before I even knew about them from my own Government."

He quoted from a wire he had sent to Secretary Herter at the time, stating: "Any threat from Union of South Africa to delay negotiations on a military tracking station should be repudiated by State Department by making clear to Ambassador of Union of South Africa that U.S. support of human rights will not be traded for tracking stations." However, MORSE was unable to gain State Department support for the resolution.

On the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and people:

"This resolution was sponsored by 43 Asian and African States. It was not referred to the Fourth Committee, but was put directly on the agenda of the full assembly for debate and decision. The United States should have voted in favor of the resolution. Instead, we abstained. The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly by a vote of 89 to 0, with 9 abstentions."

MORSE described the discussions over the American position in some detail, because it was on this vote, that, upon pressure from Great Britain, President Eisenhower made the decision to abstain. Said MORSE: "But for this pressure from the British Government, the United States would have voted in favor of the resolution."

On Algeria:

"The General Assembly approved a resolution which recognized the right of self-determination by the people of Algeria, recognized the need for guarantees of that right, and recognized a responsibility on the part of the United Nations for implementing this right of self-determination. But the United States abstained."

Senator MORSE was also highly critical of State Department procedures for handling the U.S. activities at the United Nations. He said that major policy decisions were too often made at a very low level in the State Department, even in overruling the opinion of the delegation at the United Nations. Occasionally, he said the U.S. delegates "knew that although the overruling instructions were signed nominally by the Secretary, the decision behind the instruction had actually been made by an Assistant Secretary of State, or even lower level in the Department of State. This, it seems to me, is very bad practice. It is even worse when such decisions are made by a desk officer, and transmitted orally.

"Calling signals from the bench may be an acceptable way of running a football team; calling signals from an Assistant Secretary's desk in the State Department in Washington on diplomatic plays to be run by the U.S. delegation at the United Nations in New York City is no way to run American foreign policy. It resulted in our being thrown for a great loss within the United Nations on the South-West African issue.

"It is my opinion that the permanent U.S. representative to the U.N. should not be overruled by anybody having a lower position of responsibility in the Department of State. This means that overruling instructions should originate with someone who is senior to an Assistant Secretary of State. In view of the higher responsibility, and the special knowledge of events and opinions in the United Nations forum which are possessed by the permanent representative, his judgment should prevail over that of an Assistant Secretary of State, or any official or group of officials of lesser responsibility in Washington.

"There is no responsibility of the President and the Secretary of State more important from the standpoint of the very survival of our country in the years immediately ahead than the questions of foreign policy which become involved in the functioning of the United Nations. The line of command, reaching U.S. decisions and determining U.S. policy at the United Nations, should be a direct one from the President to the Secretary of State to the U.S. Ambassador at the United Nations.

"It should be understood that the President will be advised in the event the Secretary of State or the Ambassador at the United Nations, or both, believe that some issue involving a choice of policy is of such importance to the interests of the United States at the United Nations, that the President should be consulted about it. I am not moved by any argument that the President should not be asked to intervene in such matters. The policies which our country follows in the United Nations in the next few years in respect to a considerable number of major issues may very well spell the difference between war or peace for the world."

MORSE had high praise for the American delegates with whom he served last fall. In particular, he said of former Ambassador Wadsworth that "on the basis of his record of public service, he should not be lost to the diplomatic service of our country in this time of international crisis."

The appendix to the report gives the text of the speeches made by Senator MORSE for the United States, and texts of the resolutions involving colonialism.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the press release that was submitted to the press dealing with the joint report of the Senator from Vermont and myself, together with the press release and the supplementary views of the Senator from Vermont.

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

U.S. SENATE AIKEN-MORSE REPORT ON FUTURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, and Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, members of the delegation of the United States to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, today released their report to the Committee on Foreign Relations containing their observations on problems facing the United States in the United Nations.

The two Senators summarized their conclusions in the report as follows:

"1. Owing to the present discrepancy between the great hopes placed on the United Nations Organization and the resources and power which members have been willing to place at its disposal, the Organization has reached a critical stage in its development.

"2. The objectives of most nations, except the Communist countries, would be served by the strengthening of the United Nations. Since the underdeveloped, uncommitted nations perceive that they have the most to gain from the United Nations, and since the political direction of these countries may be decisive in the struggle for survival, neither the Communist countries nor the United States and its friends are likely from preference to withdraw from the United Nations.

"3. It seems certain that if something like the present political composition of the General Assembly continues, increasing responsibilities, both in security cases and in economic and social fields are going be vested in the Secretary-General and in the United Nations agencies. It will continue to be in the best interest of the United States, for the reasons and within the limits discussed in this report, to support, financially and otherwise, such an improvement in United Nations activities. The burden and inhibitions of being host to the United Nations are substantially counterbalanced by the benefits and opportunities thus afforded.

"4. Among the problems which require special policy attention by the U.S. Government, along the lines suggested in this report, are: The continuing efforts of the Communist countries to undermine the effectiveness of the United Nations; the chance that Communist China will soon be represented, with or without the agreement of the United States; the strong drives for the ending of the remaining colonial relationships; and the financial and administrative strains resulting from the response of the United Nations to emergency situations."

The report lays heavy stress on the need for the United States to face up to the issue of Chinese representation and to the inadequacy of past policies on colonial issues. Equal emphasis is given to the necessity for countries believing in the worth of the United Nations to match their words with financial support.

The Senators reached these conclusions on Chinese representation:

"The question of Chinese representation in the United Nations will be dealt with first in the General Assembly where there is no veto and where the question of seating Red Chinese representatives will probably be decided by a majority vote.

"In the Security Council the question of representation would likely be deemed a procedural matter and therefore not subject to a veto by the United States. An attempt by the United States to use a veto to prevent the Council from concluding that the question is procedural (that is, to attempt a double veto) would probably fail.

"It seems reasonable to conclude that future U.S. policy must be based upon the assumption that Red China could be seated in the United Nations as early as the 16th General Assembly session, whether we agree or not. How high a price would the United States have to pay to defeat the next effort to seat representatives of Communist China? Does the United States have sufficient bargaining power left to insure representation for Formosa? If so, should we attempt to negotiate an arrangement whereby 'two Chinas' might be represented or would it be better to continue present policy, come what may? These questions ought to be the subject of urgent policy studies."

On colonial questions the report stated: "The bitter irony of the situation is that the Soviet Union, which has enslaved more alien people than any nation in history, is succeeding in posing as the great champion of people in colonies and the implacable foe of colonial powers."

"The third reason for Soviet success is that the United States has too often been found voting on colonial issues in the company of the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Spain, Union of South Africa, Portugal, and other colonial powers. It is the conclusion of this report that such an attitude has weakened the real anticolonial position of the United States."

Senator MORSE will shortly release a supplemental report spelling out in considerable detail the background of several unwise votes by the United States in the General Assembly on colonial issues.

With respect to the current financial crisis in the United Nations, Senators AIKEN and MORSE said:

"It would be invidious to list here friendly countries which have been in arrears on their payments toward the regular United Nations budget and toward the UNEF operation in Gaza or have been vague as to what they are prepared to do toward meeting the costs of the Congo operation. It is to be hoped that United Nations members will see their true interest in the survival of the United Nations and will not permit failure for lack of funds.

"The need for the United Nations to take on important additional tasks will probably continue to grow. The willingness of United Nations members to face the financial consequences of their decisions is unfortunately now in doubt. The United Nations must urgently explore ways and means of adding the necessary financial resources and flexibility in the administration of United Nations emergency activities."

Senator AIKEN is releasing simultaneously with this joint report of the two Senators his own supplementary observations dealing largely with financial problems. That supplementary report concludes as follows:

"Efforts to enforce peace, however, will not be decisive until the member nations both great and small are willing to support such efforts. According to Secretary General Hammarskjold's estimates, the current costs of world armament amount to $320 million a day. If each nation would contribute only 1 day's cost to an international police force each year, it is possible that all expenses in this field could be met.

"It will take more than money alone to enforce peace in the world. It will take the desire for peace and the willingness to meet equitable demands and to accept the verdict. We are still far from reaching that goal. The road toward it is exasperating and frustrating, but we cannot give up."

Senators AIKEN and MORSE believe the advantages and opportunities which come with the holding of United Nations meetings in New York are much more significant than the burdens.

On the question of the Communists taking over the United Nations the Senators stated: "It seems proper to conclude that if the day comes when the United States is faced with a hostile majority that situation will be a reflection of a deteriorating world order so serious as to make an adverse U.N. vote seem a minor matter."

The Senators are critical of the so-called Connally reservation (p. 4). They call for financial aid to the New York police on account of the high cost of protecting certain U.N. delegates (p. 6). They urge a real effort on the part of the United States to negotiate an international covenant on human rights (p. 12). They call for a reexamination of the various points of view with respect to the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund (SUNFED) (p. 23) and they urge serious study of a U.N. peace and security fund to pay for emergency U.N. interventions (p. 26).

VIEWS IN UNITED STATES ABOUT UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MORSE. My views can be summarized by repeating my conviction, after serving 3 months as a member of the U.S. delegation at the United Nations, that the best hope for peace in the world is to be found in strengthening,

preserving, and perpetuating the United Nations. I am concerned about the number of references, even including some editorials, that one finds in the press these days, raising questions as to the value of the United Nations as a preserver of the peace of the world.

There are anti-United Nations forces at work in our country, and if they should ever prevail, in my opinion mankind would lose one of its best hopes for establishing a system of international justice through law for the settlement of issues that threaten the peace of the world.

Sometimes in recent weeks I have suspected that what appears to be a new wave of opposition to the United Nations in some parts of our land is due to the fact that it is increasingly recognized that the United States has lost an automatic majority vote in the United Nations. And so we have. But we do not need an automatic vote to prove the soundness of our case. All we need is a forum where we can present to responsible delegates from the nations of the world the merits of our case, and we will win.

I am convinced of one thing, among many, as a result of my 3 months at the United Nations, and that is that when the merits are on our side we will win a majority vote, and when a majority of the nations of this world in their opinion find us not right on an issue, in keeping with their obligations to their governments we must expect them to vote against us.

One parliamentary tactic of the past that has characterized some of the U.S. operation in the United Nations, namely, the pressure tactic, has lost most of its influence and impact, and I am convinced also that the American dollar sign no longer will produce votes in the United Nations for U.S. course of action. And I think that is all to the good, because if we are to maintain a leadership in the world, in the interest of promoting peace, we must do so on the merits of our case.

Even in the last session of the United Nations there lingered some influence of the United States, in my judgment, connected with our foreign aid program, or the promises of a foreign aid program, or the fear of not offending Uncle Sam, with resulting negative effects upon the aid program that caused us on some issues to receive a few votes contrary to the convictions of the delegates casting the votes. But I am pleased to report to the Senate that those votes were rare, and I think they were fewer toward the end of the session than they were at the beginning.

I wish it were possible to submit to the Senate a report on the operations of the United Nations in the last session, as far as U.S. participation is concerned, that was completely favorable to American policy. But I cannot do so, any more than the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], in connection with some of the operations of the Fifth Committee, which was the Committee on so-called fiscal matters of the United Nations on which he was the U.S. delegate, could make a report to the Senate completely favorable to the policy of the United States.

It was the policy of Ambassador Wadsworth to assign each delegate to one of the standing committees of the General Assembly with the full responsibility—in consultation, of course, with the delegation and the Ambassador, and, when necessary, the State Department—of representing our Government in the work on the Committee.

The Senator from Vermont represented the United States on the Fifth Committee. I represented the United States on the Fourth Committee, which is the Committee that has jurisdiction over all questions involving those areas of the world where the indigenous population is still non-self-governing. In other words, the Committee had jurisdiction over all colonial issues, save and except the Algerian issue, which was referred to the First, or Political, Committee, and the overall colonial resolution, which was considered by the General Assembly itself in plenary session.

My criticism of U.S. foreign policy in relation to the United Nations as set forth in my report goes primarily to the U.S. position on colonial policies; second, to what I consider to be the undue influence of the Pentagon in the promotion of American foreign policy with special reference to colonial policies; third, the existing procedures in regard to the line of command between the White House, the State Department, and the U.S. delegation at the United Nations in New York.

GENERAL POLICY ON COLONIALISM BAD

In my judgment, if the United States continues to support the colonial policies it has supported in the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations, we will continue to lose the support of an overwhelming majority of the nations of Africa, an overwhelming majority of the nations of southeast Asia, and an overwhelming majority of the nations of Latin America. We have already lost much of their support and confidence.

Time and time again on colonial issues in the 15th General Assembly we voted against them. They voted against us with some understanding, in the sense that they appreciated the fact that the United States was seeking to be of assistance to colonial powers, particularly NATO powers, in the hope that those allies, of their own will, would see the handwriting on the wall and change their policies, so that at another General Assembly the United States would not be in a position of seeming to be saving the face of our allies by smudging our own face.

As I point out in my report, the historic policy of the United States is to support independence of indigenous people. One of the reasons that we have been admired around the world has been our historic stand for the self-determination of people and allowing people to be independent of foreign masters. We put that principle into practice in our own Declaration of Independence against the British Crown.

However, the undeniable fact is that in our votes in the United Nations we have been voting in support of colonial powers who are practicing upon millions of people around the world such atrocious acts of inhumanity to man that the United States cannot justify on any moral grounds being associated with those colonial powers in any votes which aid and abet their colonial practices.

SOUTH-WEST AFRICA ISSUE

There are many examples which I cite in my report. However, in the brief time I wish to take this afternoon, I shall limit my comments to two examples. The first is South-West Africa. The people of South-West Africa comprise about 11 million blacks, indigenous Negroes, and 3 million whites, living there under an old League of Nations mandate growing out of World War I, a mandate which was granted to the British Crown; the British Crown in turn delegated the administrative functions under the mandate to the Government of the Union of South Africa.

The Union of South Africa, in keeping with its apartheid policy of race separation and atrocious conduct toward the Negroes of South-West Africa, in proven instance after instance, obviously is seeking to make South-West Africa a part of the Union of South Africa.

I speak solemnly, I speak advisedly—yes, I speak cautiously—when I say that my observations at the United Nations thus far convince me that if the Union of South Africa continues its inhumane policy in South-West Africa, as soon as the other African nations become strong enough to come to the assistance of South-West Africa, and the United Nations does not adopt a course of action that will prevent such a catastrophe, the rivers of South Africa and South-West Africa will run red with the blood of the whites. There is no doubt in my mind that South-West Africa has the making of a major war in Africa, unless the 11 million colored people of South-West Africa are given protection from the repressive policy of the Government of the Union of South Africa in South-West Africa.

We sat, as the Fourth Committee in the United Nations has sat now for 14 years, and listened to petitioners who were smuggled out of South-West Africa. Let us remember that the Union of South Africa will not even let a United Nations observing committee go into South-West Africa. The Presiding Officer of the Senate could not get into South-West Africa. Conditions in South-West Africa are such that the Union of South Africa has sought to seal it off from the rest of the world, because what a person would see in South-West Africa would raise a storm of protest wherever the observer thereafter went. We listened again this year to petitioners from South-West Africa cite incident after incident of the brutality and exploitation that prevails in South-West Africa, practiced upon that population by the Government of the Union of South Africa.

Of course every time the subject matter is raised in the Fourth Committee, the delegation from the Union of

South Africa stalks out of the Committee. His Government refuses to listen to the petitioners, and refuses to reply to the documentation that is presented to the Committee. This year we became involved in very serious conflict on the South-West African resolution, which ended up in a conflict between a majority of the U.S. delegation and the State Department itself.

There was first proposed a resolution by Guinea, sponsored by four or five other nations. In my opinion it was a very unsound resolution on South-West Africa, because the effect of the resolution sought an end to the League of Nations mandate.

The question of the application of the League of Nations mandate, the jurisdiction of the Union of South Africa under the mandate—yes, the limits of the jurisdiction of the United Nations involving questions of international law—should be settled by judicial processes, and not by resolutions passed through the Fourth Committee and subsequently through the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The subject involved a procedural debate, and it was within my jurisdiction and prerogative and duty to participate in that procedural debate. So I protested the Guinean resolution. I pointed out that the effect of the Guinean resolution was to bring to an end the League of Nations mandate while there was pending before the World Court a contentious case filed by Ethiopia and Liberia, seeking to have the World Court rule on the respective rights of the Government of the Union of South Africa and the indigenous population of South-West Africa and the U.N.

In keeping with a system of international justice through law, the U.N., through the Fourth Committee, should not seek to exercise jurisdiction to the extent of bringing the mandate to an end until the World Court had handed down its decision. Of course, it could take from 2 to 3 years to get that decision; and when one deals with a situation so volatile and so highly charged with emotion as the issue of South-West Africa, it is rather difficult to get people to wait 2 or 3 years for a determination of what they consider to be their legal rights—rights which they believe have long been denied.

I presented a series of objections to the resolutions and closed that speech with the suggestion that a new resolution be offered which in essence would provide that the Government of South-West Africa be asked to invite the United Nations Subcommittee on South-West Africa to visit South-West Africa and make a survey and inspection of conditions in South-West Africa, and report both to the Union of South Africa Government and to the United Nations. My speech appears in the appendix to the report.

I pointed out, in making that recommendation, that the delegates of the Union of South Africa out in the lounges, in the corridors, and in the cloakrooms told us that the information we were receiving, both from the petitioners and from our own Subcommittee on South-West Africa, the chairman of which was a great delegate from Uruguay, contained misrepresentations, falsehoods, and a very slanted opinion as to conditions in South-West Africa. My reply was:

> Why don't you come in and say it on the record? Why don't you present your rebuttal on the record?

The delegates from the Union of South Africa hid behind their own fallacious contention that the Committee does not have jurisdiction. So far as I know, there are not more than three members of the United Nations, who really believe that the United Nations does not have jurisdiction over conditions existing in South-West Africa to the extent, at least, of seeking to make recommendations to the Union of South Africa Government concerning the steps which need to be taken to bring to an end the tensions existing there, tensions which, in turn, raise a very serious threat to the peace in Africa.

As the result of some negotiations which followed my speech, a new resolution was offered. The new resolution adopted every criticism which the U.S. delegation had made to the original Guinean resolution. It included a section which provided for the suggestion I had offered, namely, to invite the Union Government to ask the United Nations own Subcommittee on South-West Africa to make an inspection of conditions in South-West Africa, and report its finding to the Union Government and to the United Nations.

The proposal I made and the resolution which resulted therefrom were discussed, as was the proposal of Ambassador Wadsworth, at a meeting of the U.S. delegation, and it met with complete approval. We made that recommendation to the State Department.

It is necessary to keep in mind that those of us who sit on delegations to the United Nations do so as Ambassadors. We have the obligation of voting in accordance with the instructions which come from our Government. To our complete surprise, we received instructions from the State Department, at an assistant secretary's level, that we should abstain from voting on a resolution which was in no small measure the product of the intercession and intervention of the U.S. delegation. To say that we were shocked is to put it mildly.

There then followed a series of conversations with the Assistant Secretary of State concerned. It became perfectly clear to me at the beginning of those conversations that he was surprisingly unaware and wholly unappreciative of the symbolic importance of the resolution to the prestige and standing of the United States, not only in the Fourth Committee but in the General Assembly, as well.

Aside from its merits, it was the same proposal we were seeking to have passed regarding Hungary.

There is no question about what happened. The Government of the Union of South Africa protested to the State Department. The Ambassador from the Union of South Africa registered a strong protest. It was perfectly obvious that the Government of the Union of South Africa did not want any sightseers within South-West Africa. I am satisfied that I know why. The sights would not be sights which they would want to have reported to the world.

MILITARY INTEREST

Moreover, at this point we came in contact with the Pentagon on this issue. As I state in the report, the information about a proposed U.S. missile tracking station in the Union of South Africa came to us from a considerable number of African delegations who reported to us in great criticism their knowledge that negotiations were proceeding for the establishment of a tracking station in the Union of South Africa.

They raised two serious objections, and I agree with both of them. First, they questioned whether there should be a tracking station there at all. They pointed out that a tracking station would only intensify the cold war in Africa, and would only serve as an invitation to Russia to make a countermove.

In the second place, they pointed out that it would be a concealed form of economic subsidy to the Union of South Africa. Every Member of the Senate knows the difficulty any administration would have in seeking to have Congress pass a foreign aid bill which sought directly to provide economic aid to the Union of South Africa, in view of the inhumane apartheid policy of that country. They pointed out that a good many millions of dollars would be spent in this kind of project, and that what it would amount to would be an economic subsidy to the Union of South Africa to strengthen the economy of that country, and subsidize the shocking, inhumane territorial policy which it exercises over 11 million colored people in its own country, and in South-West Africa.

Bear in mind that the people of South-West Africa are often kept in compounds, are not allowed free movement in their own territory, that tribes are prohibited from intermingling with each other; and in some instances man and wife are separated for periods of time, allegedly for the reason that it might help keep down the population of the colored people in South-West Africa.

Mr. President, all I wish to say is that here is a human volcano, and it is bound to erupt. But I pray that my country will cease being an aider and abetter of the inhuman policies that prevail in South-West Africa.

Therefore, Mr. President, we protested rather vigorously in opposition to the instructions we received. I wrote a letter to Ambassador Wadsworth about the matter, and sent a telegram to Secretary Herter. Both documents appear in my report.

When it became clear that the instructions had to stand, I exercised, on that occasion—the only time in a 3-month period that I did so—the right of personal privilege, and advised the State Department that a Foreign Service officer would have to sit in my seat and cast that vote, because I would never lend my lips, even in an ambassadorial capacity, to casting a vote that I knew was as

unconscionable, unjustifiable, and contrary to the best future interests of my country as that vote of abstention on the South-West Africa issue.

Mr. President, an overwhelming majority of the members of the Committee and, later, an overwhelming majority of the members of the Assembly, voted—and voted rightly—against the policy of the United States in regard to that great colonial issue.

There were other colonial issues on which we voted unwisely, Mr. President. In fact, as I point out in my report—and it is interesting that the press does not see fit to call the attention of the American people to the point of view taken on this issue by the official delegate of the United States at the United Nations—for 3 months the United States did not vote correctly in the United Nations on a single colonial issue of any major importance. The result was that on December 20, when the General Assembly adjourned, our prestige and our influence in the United Nations, as regards the whole colonial issue, were just about nil. Bad as the South-West African position was, our position on the general colonial resolution was even worse, because it has broader implications, and its effects are more worldwide.

U.S. ABSTENTION ON GENERAL QUESTION OF COLONIALISM

Khrushchev's strategy at the early part of the General Assembly session was to "drop in the hopper," as we say, a typical Communist propaganda resolution. With it, he took on the role of being "the great defender" of the indigenous people of the world under foreign domination, by proposing immediate independence for every area of the world now ruled by any foreign power. That was a typical Communist grandstand play. To the everlasting credit of the neutral and the uncommitted nations of the world, they saw through it immediately. What happened? We were able to beat the Khrushchev resolution.

Then 43 nations cosponsored the so-called general resolution on colonialism. Our country should have been one of the cosponsors of that resolution. It was bad enough that we were not one of the cosponsors. But it was inexcusable for us to receive official instructions to abstain from voting on the resolution. But 43 cosponsors introduced the general resolution on colonialism. In essence—and I have made the resolution a part of the appendix to my report—the resolution simply stated that immediate steps should be taken toward the granting of independence to remaining nonself-governing territories.

Of course, Mr. President, it is impossible ever to draft a resolution in such a way that every delegate is able to agree with every word contained in it, or, at least, in such a way that no delegate will prefer to have some other word substituted for some word in it. But that resolution was so well drafted that it was acceptable to an overwhelming majority of the member nations of the United Nations. The U.S. delegation was unanimous in support of the resolution.

In a delegation meeting, we talked about the resolution. Yes, we wished to change a phrase here or there. But let me say that, once again, with the diplomatic brilliance of Ambassador Wadsworth, we were able to obtain some modifications of the so-called general resolution. A considerable amount of perfecting occurred. We were aghast, however, when, the day before the vote on the resolution was to occur, we received from the White House instructions to abstain on the resolution.

Mr. President, it is well understood that the British Prime Minister made very clear to the White House that, as an ally, Britain would appreciate a vote of abstention on the resolution. And the United States abstained. Mr. President, that will cost us dearly for a long time, in that great council of the world, because when we abstained on that vote, we abstained on a vote on a resolution which was voted for by 89 of the members of United Nations. Not a single one of them voted against it. Our fellow abstainers, Mr. President, were the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, the Union of South Africa, the Dominican Republic, and Australia.

Mr. President, that is really all one needs to say, in order to point out the inexcusability of the U.S. vote. When we cast that vote, we served notice on the world that we do not mean it when we use these fine sounding phrases—as did the President of the United States, in his speech before the United Nations. So far as that speech is concerned, let me say it was one of the greatest speeches given at the United Nations.

The sad thing is that the instructions on the colonial resolution cannot be squared with his speech. If we take the language of the President's speech before the United Nations, then it follows, as night follows day, that our instructions should have been to vote for the resolution.

In fact, if we were to keep faith with the President's own language before the United Nations in our support of freedom, we should have been a cosponsor of the resolution.

When the U.S. vote of abstention was announced in answer to the rollcall, a rumble—an audible rumble—passed through the hall, and it was not a rumble of confidence. In fact, I think it was only a split second that determined whether that rumble would be turned into jeers and hisses.

To the everlasting credit of a great delegate, a great colored woman, a great Republican, a Ph. D. from the University of Chicago, an educator of distinction, an ex-opera singer of note, one of the leaders, may I say, in America in connection with this whole delicate problem of race relations, Dr. Zelma George, stood at her desk, at the announcement of the 89 to 0 vote, and started the applause that produced an ovation which lasted at least 2 minutes. It was an ovation in support of the passage of the resolution by a vote of 89 to 0, with only 9 nations, the United States, to its discredit, being among them, abstaining.

Sitting beside Dr. George, I did my best to cooperate with her in helping with the applause. The Senate may enjoy a humorous incident that occurred in connection with it. When the ovation subsided, the Communist leader of the Rumanian delegation walked over to Ambassador Wadsworth and, laughingly tapping him on the shoulder, said:

I see you have a couple of rebels in your delegation.

To which Ambassador Wadsworth quickly replied:

Of course, we have, and we are proud of them. Of course, in your country they would be shot.

And the Rumanian representative and others enjoyed the quick repartee of our Ambassador.

Yet I believe that Dr. Zelma George deserves credit for saving the face of the United States in the General Assembly of the United Nations by the dramatic move she made in order to demonstrate to the General Assembly that, although under instructions that the U.S. delegation abstain, the delegation, or at least some on the delegation, wanted the General Assembly to know that we did not agree with such unsound instructions.

CHANGES IN PROCEDURE NEEDED

There are other votes that were cast which I could deprecate as well, but I have said enough to lead me to the next to the last point on the report we have filed with the Senate. This shows, in my judgment, the need for some changes in procedure in respect to the relationships between the U.S. delegation to the United Nations and the State Department and the White House.

I discuss these changes in my report. I point out that the Ambassador at the United Nations is the ambassador of the President of the United States. That fact seems to be lost sight of by many persons who are inclined to talk about the relationships between the U.S. delegation to the United Nations and the Government of the United States. Ambassadors have the duty of seeing to it that the President of the United States is informed on problems which arise in their jurisdiction.

But the ambassadorship at the United Nations, Mr. President, differs in many respects, from the standpoint of responsibilities and obligations, from any other ambassadorship we have anywhere else in the world, because we cannot have the U.S. delegation at the United Nations going one way and the U.S. State Department going another way. No one recognizes that fact more than I do.

There is need for the closest coordination and correlation between the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. delegation at the United Nations, and also between the Secretary of State and the permanent Ambassador at the United Nations, on the one hand, and the President of the United States, on the other. Some people seem to be very much concerned about the formalizing of the procedure with respect to these relationships. Yet it is said, "Well, Senator, if you formalize it, it is likely to result either in upgrading the Ambassador at the United Nations, or downgrading the Secretary of State."

I deny it. I think that is purely an objection of form, without any substance in it. Why? Because, in my judgment, any Secretary of State and any Ambassador at the United Nations will recognize that each has the mutual obligation of seeing to it that he thoroughly discusses major issues which involve U.S. policy at the United Nations, and, if they have any variance in point of view, they have a mutual obligation to see to it that the President is aware of any differences over what the U.S. policy should be at the United Nations.

If there were a formalization of procedure, my judgment is that seldom would we have a difference. The differences would be ironed out between the Ambassador and the Secretary of State. But, in all probability, there would be some sincere, good-faith difference of opinion or question as to whether policy A, or policy B, or some other policy, should be followed. In that instance, I think it is pretty clear that both public servants have the duty to see to it that the President of the United States is informed of the problem.

Oh, but, it will be asked, Should the President of the United States be bothered with those matters? My answer is unequivocally yes. I do not know of anything the President of the United States could possibly be called upon to do that would be more vital to the interests of our country than to see to it that he keeps fully informed as to policies in the United Nations, particularly when alternative policies may be followed, and particularly when there is a possibility that the Secretary of State and the Ambassador at the United Nations may have variances in point of view.

Here again, in my judgment, a conference between them would not only resolve, in most instances, the differences, but would result in a unanimity of opinion as to the course of action which should be followed.

So I make this recommendation in my report, cognizant of the fact that some bureaucrats who want to hold onto long-established, but undesirable, policies will try to find sophistic reasons for opposing such a recommendation.

My confidence in this administration is such that I am inclined to believe the administration will take judicial notice of the commonsense of the recommendation and will have the good sense to practice the recommendation which I have suggested.

I have also talked to many people with experience in the State Department and in the United Nations about it, and it was my pleasant surprise to find remarkable agreement between them and me in regard to the recommendation.

What happens now, Mr. President? I am satisfied, as I say in the report, that we frequently receive instructions from the State Department purportedly signed by the Secretary of State which have never seen the desk of the Secretary of State. They are signed by officers at a lower echelon level in the State Department, particularly by Assistant Secretaries of State.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that for a long time the Department of State has been European oriented. That is natural. That is understandable. Our major problems for a long time have been European.

Some of the most delicate problems which confront the peace of the world today arise in areas outside Europe and, in my judgment, the European slant needs to be removed from them. Therefore, I hope this administration will make it very clear that the next delegation to the United Nations representing the United States will get its instructions on any major matter after personal attention has been given to it by the Secretary of State and, if necessary, by the President of the United States himself.

I am convinced that procedurally, this is one of the great defects in American foreign policy and one of the reasons why American foreign policy has taken a toboggan ride in recent years to the point that we now occupy a new low position so far as prestige in the United Nations is concerned—or at least we did on December 20, 1960.

The remarkably fine leadership which Governor Stevenson has already given to the U.S. mission at the United Nations, greatly buttressed by that brilliant speech he made in opposition to the Russians in the Security Council the other day with respect to the Congo issue, has done much to raise the standing of the United States in the United Nations. But we can lose standing again quickly unless the new administration pays some attention to the need for improvement of procedure so far as the line of command between the White House, the office of the Secretary of State, and the office of the Ambassador of the U.S. Delegation to the United Nations is concerned.

UNDUE PENTAGON INFLUENCE ON U.S. POLICY

Let me turn now to what I consider to be the undue influence of the Pentagon on U.S. foreign policy, including U.S. policy in the United Nations.

In my opinion one cannot scratch the surface of any issue involving colonialism without running into Pentagon policy. As I point out in my report, it is regrettable that the Pentagon has not shown the sensitivity and understanding it ought to show in respect to the problems affecting the indigenous people of the world now living under foreign rule.

The Pentagon has not for a long time past been duly appreciative of the colonial problems confronting the United States and the world. I think also the Pentagon has been permitted to unduly influence American foreign policy because of the military obligations which we have assumed in connection with NATO.

The time has come when it ought to be made clear to our allies in NATO that NATO is a mutual defense organization, that NATO was agreed to not only for the defense of the United States but also for the defense of every member of NATO.

When we enter into a mutual defense treaty we do not enter into any obligation to support or defend the policies of any member of NATO with respect to their practices in those parts of the world where they exercise domination and control—yes, subjugation of millions of indigenous people.

One cannot explain, Mr. President, the instructions which we received from the State Department in regard to the Portugal resolution without running directly into the attitude of the Pentagon in relation to Portugal. As I say in the report, it is well known that Portugal in the past—and in the recent past—has threatened the United States with the loss of landing rights in the Azores if we oppose Portuguese colonial policy.

In the United Nations these days, a U.S. delegate is instructed by the State Department to abstain on a vote which involves really, if it were not so serious, a humorous legal fiction that Portugal seeks to defend in the United Nations. What is the fiction? Portugal pretends it has no territory subject to jurisdiction under section 73 and section 74 of the United Nations Charter.

Why? Because Portugal, by its own legislative processes, has defined its oversea areas as Portuguese provinces; therefore, they are provinces and no one can question them because the Portuguese say they are provinces.

Try to sell that argument to the United Nations. Try to sell it to the millions of people subjugated by Portugal, which is, again, maintaining colonial policies to which we should give no support.

This came up in the Fourth Committee, as we listened to a long legal argument by the Portuguese delegate seeking to defend the legal fiction that Portugal had no territories, but only provinces. It was said that Goa, in India, is no territory but is a Portuguese province; that Angola, in Africa, is no territory, but is a Portuguese province.

Such an argument produced a mixed reaction in the Fourth Committee. For a time delegates smiled and laughed, and then when they realized that the Portuguese delegate really proposed to get by with that legal fiction the feeling turned to resentment.

This involved a procedural debate, because it involved the question of jurisdiction of the Fourth Committee.

The Portuguese took the position that we had no jurisdiction to pass a resolution which merely proposed that the colonial powers, including the United States—and we happen to have a few colonies of our own, by definition—should voluntarily submit information once a year to the United Nations as to political activities within their territories.

Portugal does not want to submit such information voluntarily. The United Kingdom would prefer that it would not have to, although it does. So we received instructions to abstain on that resolution.

We discussed the subject at a delegation meeting. There was no question as to where the delegation stood. Again we wanted to take our country out from under the kind of attack we would get if we carried out an instruction to abstain, because the charge was, "You are doing it because Portugal is a NATO member. You are doing it also because the Pentagon wants the use of the Azores."

Such statement is denied by the State Department, but let me say for the record again, as I said in my report, that I found the State Department completely unconvincing on this subject. I say as a Senator and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate that I am satisfied that the Pentagon exercises undue influence on the State Department in respect to colonial policies and our position on the colonial policies of our NATO allies.

UNDUE INFLUENCE OF BRITAIN

That subject causes me to comment on British policy. There is a tendency in the Senate and in many places to seek to exclude Great Britain from criticism when we deal with colonial problems. The argument runs in this manner: "Great Britain is the one country that has trained people within the indigenous population to become civil servants. Great Britain has trained the doctors and the lawyers in civil service." That is true. In fairness I wish to say Great Britain has the best record.

But listen for a moment to what the people and the representatives of the countries that were once British colonies have to say about British policy. Listen to what delegations from many other countries in the United Nations say about British policy.

They point out that Great Britain has never granted independence to a single colony until years after independence should have been granted. Great Britain has never granted independence to a single colony until many years after the so-called training of civil servants, the training of leaders in the indigenous population, had been completed. They pointed out that if one really wished to evaluate British colonial policy, he would need to take a look at the policies of the British Exchequer.

That is the dominating influence in British colonial policy. Time and time again U.S. delegates to the United Nations were instructed, as we were, to vote to support British colonial policy, something which the Canadian delegation did not do.

We were asked, "When is the United States going to declare its new declaration of independence of the British Crown?"

There is some merit in the suggestion because I regret to inform the Senate of the United States that in my judgment Great Britain has exercised entirely too much influence on the U.S. State Department in respect to our votes on colonial issues.

I would have the record show that Great Britain is, of course, the largest of the remaining colonial powers in the world. In Africa alone, she still has the British territory of the Federation of Rhodesia, involving southern Rhodesia, at the present time a self-governing colony; northern Rhodesia, a protectorate; and Nyasaland, a protectorate.

In the High Commission Territories she has Basutoland, Swaziland, and Bechuanaland. She has a United Nations trusteeship in Tanganyika; a protectorate in Zanzibar; she has Kenya, a colony; Uganda, a protectorate; Gambia, a protectorate; Sierra Leone, a protectorate, scheduled for independence this year; and the British Cameroons, a United Nations trusteeship, about to be given independence.

Some of these British areas are troubled areas. As I said in my reply to the Portuguese delegate, if one wishes to test whether or not Portugal or any other of the remaining colonial powers has colonies and territories, there are a few questions that one might ask and then take judicial notice as to the answers.

First, in these areas do they exercise dominion, control, and rule over a large majority of a population which is an indigenous population? The answer is "Yes" in all the Portuguese territories; the answer is "Yes" in all the British territories; the answer is "Yes" in the territories of France, Belgium, and Spain, and the Union of South Africa. The answer is "Yes" in regard to every remaining colonial power in the world.

Second, are these areas, areas of high human tension? One takes judicial notice that the answer is "Yes."

The next question is this: Does this high human tension in these areas threaten the peace of the area? One takes judicial notice that the answer is "Yes."

When one takes judicial notice of the answers to those three questions, he must admit the jurisdictional rights of the United Nations, because all of these colonial powers are signatories to the charter, and they have pledged themselves to accept jurisdiction in connection with those issues that threaten the peace.

There is no doubt about the fact the peace is threatened in those areas. Therefore, I am not very much moved by the legalisms of Great Britain, France, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, the Union of South Africa, or any other colonial power.

I should prefer to take my stand with the Canadians who, more recently than the United States, were a British possession. I quoted at length in my report, and I recommend to the Senate a reading of the argument of the delegate from Canada in support of the colonial resolution. Great Britain was not able to get Canada to sustain the position of Great Britain on the colonial issue.

I have mentioned these subjects with my reference to the Pentagon because it is my hope that the new administration will make perfectly clear to the Pentagon that the job of the military is to carry out and administer a foreign affairs policy and a military policy determined by the civilian heads of this Government and not by the military. It is my hope that this administration will make it clear to the Pentagon that after it has received its advice and its opinion in regard to the effects of a foreign policy upon America's military commitments, it will understand that when the final decision is made, the Pentagon will carry out the decision.

It is my hope that this administration will make it clear to the Pentagon that we have heard for the last time of the brass in the Pentagon notifying the United States and the world what the U.S. Navy is going to do in the Formosa Straits or in the Caribbean or in the Mediterranean or anywhere else in the world, but that such notification will come from the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States; that any military officer who does not see fit to carry out these instructions will have the privilege of wearing civilian clothes shortly after he interferes with the formation of American foreign policy.

Furthermore, I hope that the new administration will give serious consideration to these procedural reforms which I believe are necessary in order that we can make a better substantial record than we have been making at the United Nations. Under the new administration we have a President of the United States who recognizes the direct relationship between procedural practices and the protection of substantive rights. That is true in the field of foreign policy as well as in the field of domestic policy.

I close by saying that we have offered these reports on some matters of great importance to American foreign policy. I shall from time to time, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, discuss various other phases of them. Because the General Assembly of the United Nations will convene within the next few days, I thought it important to call the attention of the Senate to at least some of the conclusions I reached and set forth in my supplementary reports, and some of the conclusions the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] reached which he has set forth in his supplemental report on his work on the Fifth Committee, and some of the conclusions both of us reached jointly and which we set forth in our joint report to the Senate.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 20, 1961]

KENNEDY GOES ALL OUT FOR U.N.

(By Drew Pearson)

President Kennedy has taken a long gamble on the United Nations which, if it pays off, should pay off big. If it doesn't pay off, the alternative will be eventual war.

Last fall, after Khrushchev finished his attacks on Dag Hammarskjold at the U.N., the British quietly proposed to Mr. Eisenhower that the West set up a separate organization of free nations. They argued that the U.N. was being more and more dominated by Africa and Asia, would degenerate into a propaganda sounding board for Soviet spokesmen.

Mr. Kennedy, when he entered office, considered the British proposal but turned it down. He decided to go all out in supporting the U.N. This was one reason he sold Adlai Stevenson on becoming Ambassador to the U.N.

The President figured that the U.N. had become the symbol of small nations, that foreign ministers and visiting prime ministers appreciated the fact that here was one place where they could meet the great leaders of the world on equal terms. He decided that the more the United States supported the U.N. the better would become our position in the eyes of the world.

He dropped some hints along this line in his press conference last week. But in private talks he has spelled it out in greater detail.

Since the Lumumba crisis in the Congo, Adlai Stevenson has reported back to Mr. Kennedy that he is confident the smaller African-Asian nations will rally around the

U.N. and even around Dag Hammarskjold, despite Russia's attacks. Another healthy development has been the ire of neutralist Premier Nehru of India, who is now willing to send Indian combat troops to the Congo. Hitherto he wasn't.

All this adds up to a probable diplomatic victory over the long haul. Nobody inside the State Department or the White House thinks it's going to be easy. But in the end, Mr. Kennedy hopes to make the Statue of Liberty, not Stalin's tomb in Red Square, the symbol of the world—even in Darkest Africa.

CANADA'S FARM PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. L. E. McDonald of Oregon City, Oreg., has brought to my attention a most interesting article which appeared in the October 6, 1960, issue of the Oregon Farmer. The article is entitled "Canada's Farm Program." It was written by the Honorable Douglas S. Harkness, Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion of Canada. Because of the widespread interest of Senators in our neighbors to the north, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I allude be printed in the RECORD.

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

CANADA'S FARM PROGRAM

(By Douglas S. Harkness, Minister of Agriculture, Dominion of Canada)

Agricultural policies followed in our respective countries are bound to have effects on both sides of the border and, in many cases, on our mutual markets or possible markets in other countries. For example, the parity system of price support which you have had in effect for many years in the United States has had a very powerful influence on the thinking and the demands of our Canadian farmers and farm organizations.

This has been particularly true in regard to wheat. Our prairie wheatgrowers have for many years been complaining about the fact that whilst they were receiving from $1.25 to $1.50 a bushel for wheat, depending on the grade, their neighbors across the border in Minnesota, North Dakota, and Montana were receiving upward of $2 a bushel or more. Naturally their demands have been very strong that Canada should adopt the same kind of parity price method of support which you have had here.

In fact the word "parity" has come to have a sort of mystic significance and, in the eyes of most of our western farmers, as well as large numbers in other parts of Canada, parity or a parity price has come to represent to them the solution of all their problems. When asked to define what they mean by parity, most, I find, will reply "a price which will give us a good standard of living."

During the Second World War agricultural production and prices were controlled in various ways in Canada in order to meet the emergency situation which existed. With the end of the war, these controls and supports were removed and there naturally ensued a strong demand for a peacetime system of price support.

To meet this demand an Agriculture Price Support Act was put into effect in 1946, which gave the Government the power to support prices of agricultural products, as the Government might decide was necessary from time to time. Under this act a very limited number of products were supported; they were chiefly dairy products, eggs and hogs. The only other products which were supported prior to my becoming Minister of Agriculture were: potatoes, apples, dried white beans, honey, and cattle.

All were supported for limited periods to meet emergency situations such as the foot-and-mouth disease outbreak in 1952 as far as cattle were concerned.

The pressure for a more adequate system of price supports continued to mount and, when the present Government was effected some 3 years ago, we introduced a new bill, which became law in the form of the present Agricultural Stabilization Act.

As the Minister responsible for the drafting and subsequent administration of this measure, I made a careful study of the price support system in effect in the United States and of those in several other countries. This study convinced me that any rigid system of support was bound to become unmanageable and lead to a piling up of unsalable surpluses.

As a result, in our Stabilization Act, I attempted to maintain as much flexibility as possible, but at the same time provide some of the basic definite guarantees which were almost universally being demanded by our farmers.

The main features of our Stabilization Act are as follows:

First. Any agricultural product is eligible for support. The decision as to which products will be supported from time to time is the responsibility of the Government.

Second. Nine basic commodities are, by the act, under support at all times. These commodities are: cattle, hogs, sheep, butter, cheese, eggs and, except in the three prairie Provinces, wheat, oats, and barley.

The reason for this exception is that these three cereal grains, produced in the prairie, are marketed by another Government Board—the Canadian Wheat Board—which provides a type of floor price by the initial payment which it makes on each of the three grains as they are delivered each year. To have had two Government boards attempting to handle the same products would, of course, inevitably have resulted in confusion and difficulty.

The support provided to the nine mandatory commodities is, by law, at a minimum of 80 percent of the average price of these commodities, at selected markets across Canada, during the previous 10 years. In other words, what is known as the base price, is the 10-year moving average of the previous 10 years, and the mandatory support price for the nine commodities mentioned is 80 percent of this base price.

The support actually provided for these nine key commodities has, in most cases, been above the mandatory level of 80 percent since the act has been in effect. For example, butter has been supported at 107 percent of the base price.

Third. All other agricultural products can be supported at any level which the Government decides is justified. During the past 2 years some 12 to 13 of these commodities have been under support at one time or another, at levels ranging from 54 percent of the base price for turkeys, to 113 percent for wool.

Fourth. The Stabilization Act provides for three general methods of support: (1) By the purchase method, with which you are all very familiar here; (2) by means of deficiency payments—that is, the difference between the average price which the producers of the commodity have received during the year and the support price which was set for the commodity; and (3) any other method, such as flat payments, which the Stabilization Board may consider most appropriate to meet the need.

Fifth. A revolving fund is provided for out of which the Stabilization Board can draw money to make purchases, deficiency payments, etc. This fund is replenished at the end of each fiscal year.

Sixth. The act provides for a stabilization Board to administer the operations under the act. It consists of three members of the Canadian Department of Agriculture. There is also an advisory committee of 10, consisting of farmers and representatives of farm organizations, who are appointed by myself as minister of agriculture.

You can see from this brief outline that the two basic concepts in our price support legislation are the provision of minimum support prices, in effect at all times, on nine basic commodities, in order to give a certain guarantee of stability of income to the bulk of our farmers; and, apart from this as much flexibility as possible, both as far as support of other commodities is concerned, and the actual level of support which will be provided for the basic commodities at most periods.

I should perhaps add that our Stabilization Act laid down, in respect to setting the support prices "that these shall bear a fair relationship to the cost of production of such commodities." This has resulted in considerable argument and complaint, because cost of production statistics are not very good, and those which exist show considerable variations from one part of the country to another and from farm to farm. However, every effort has been made to set prices which would meet this requirement as far as it is possible to do so.

When our Stabilization Act was passed, a little over 2 years ago, dairy products, hogs, and eggs had been supported by the method of purchase for some years past, and this was continued under the new act, although the level of support was varied somewhat. At that time we were already in difficulties with skim milk powder, of which there was a big surplus—practically all of it being held by the stabilization board. At the same time production was continuing to increase very rapidly. To meet this situation we reduced the support price for spray-process skim milk powder to 10 cents a pound, and for roller-process to 8 cents, and announced a definite cutoff date, of September 30, 1959, when support would be withdrawn altogether. This resulted in ending the expansion of the previous 2 years in the installation of dried skim milk plants, but not a reduction in the amount being produced. The dry summer in Europe last year and the strengthening in the prices of dried skim milk, together with extensive gifts to international relief organizations, enabled us to dispose of most of our heavy stock.

For some years past, production of eggs and hogs increased considerably under the dual impetus of abundant supplies of feed grain at cheap prices, and a support price by means of purchase, which meant that the Government would buy all that was produced. We were, in fact, being required to purchase constantly increasing amounts of both pork and eggs, which it became more and more difficult to find markets for, even at heavily subsidized prices. Under these circumstances, it became apparent that we would have to abandon support of these commodities by means of purchase, and, to meet the situation, we devised the method of deficiency payments on a limited amount of production per farm unit for both hogs and eggs.

Reviewing the statistics for these products, it was discovered that some 90 percent of Canadian hog producers in a year marketed fewer than 100 A and B hogs each—our two top grades. We therefore set a limit of 100 A and B hogs which could qualify for deficiency payments, per producer. The arithmetical calculations showed that the minimum support price allowed under the act for hogs, of 80 percent, would give a national weighted average support price of $22.65 per hundredweight, warm dressed weight for grade A carcasses. For the year 1960 has been set as the support price. If the national weighted average price received by producers is under this amount, each producer will be paid the difference between the national weighted average price actually received and

the support price, up to the limit of 100 A and B hogs. This means, of course, that no support is provided for lower quality hogs, and serves as a strong incentive to quality improvement.

A misconception in regard to this method of support existed on the part of many of our farmers and, from what I have been led to believe, was almost universal in the United States.

That is, it was thought that if, for example, the support price for a 200-pound hog was $30, and a farmer sold his hog for $20, the Government would pay him the other $10; or, if he sold it for $15, the Government would pay the other $15. As a result of this idea, I understand that a large number of American farmers were under the impression that, with the deficiency payment method of support, hog producers in Canada would not care how much they sold their hogs for and, as a result, very low priced Canadian hogs would flood the American market. The actual fact is that, if a farmer sells his hog for a low price, he is just out that much money, because the deficiency payment which he will receive is the difference between the average price received by producers across Canada and the support price. A system such as many believed this to be—of making a deficiency payment on each individual sale—would be uneconomic and wasteful of the taxpayers' money, as it would mean the individual farmer would have no incentive to get the best price possible for his product. In addition to that, of course, it would be administratively very expensive.

In order to insure that no subsidized pork enters the U.S. market, we have put into effect a system of export licenses, under which permits to export are only given for pork purchased at our support price. This means that the exports which have taken place in the past few years, at prices several cents a pound in excess of your prices, will continue on the same basis. This is possible because of a limited demand here, at a premium price, for our lean bacon and hams. Since the new method of support came into effect on January 11, until about a month ago, prices in Canada were generally lower than the support price and exporters were required to pay an export license fee, which brought the price of the pork up to the support level, and thus insured that there was no subsidized export to your market. In recent weeks our prices have moved up to and above the support price so that no export fee is required at the moment.

With eggs, the system is exactly the same as for hogs. In this case 4,000 dozen grade A large eggs—our top quality—is the maximum amount of production on which the producer can receive deficiency payments. This is the production of a good laying flock of 450 to 500 hens, and our surveys showed that some 85 percent of all egg producers have flocks of 500 or fewer hens. They represent, however, only something over 40 percent of the total production of eggs and, on the other hand, approximately 5 percent of the producers account for approximately 40 percent of the total production.

It is this latter small group, in the terms of total producers, who have been chiefly responsible for the rapid increase in egg production, and for the resulting surplus. It was my view that this was the group who should be called upon to cut their production, as a reduction here would have the least unfavorable effect on the general farm economy and the prosperity of the average farmer.

This method of supporting the price of farm commodities by means of deficiency payments on a limited amount of production, I believe, holds the greatest hope of producing the two results which one must look for in any price support policy or method. That is, first, to provide some reasonable measure of income guarantee and stability to the average farmer; and, second, to prevent the piling up of unsalable and unmanageable surpluses.

Another advantage of this type of support is that the consumer gets the benefit of the tax money used, in the form of lower prices for the food he has to buy, whereas under the method of purchase, the consumer really has to pay twice; first, in the relatively high prices which are maintained for the food products concerned; and, secondly, to subsidize the sale of the surplus at very low prices abroad, or its disposal as gifts.

The introduction of the deficiency payment method of support for hogs and eggs has not, as you may imagine, met with universal acclaim in Canada. The large producers have opposed it very vigorously, on the grounds that it is discriminatory against the most efficient producers. Some marketing organizations have opposed it on the stated grounds that it would completely disrupt markets, but actually, I believe because it places on their shoulders once more the task of selling the products. Many of the small producers have complained because their immediate returns are. They are not familiar with the system, and by no means feel sure that they will eventually receive a deficiency payment, because of the possibility of increased prices later in the year. I have had a very large number of representations, and have been under great pressure to return to the method of support by purchase. However, I have every hope that the deficiency payment method will prove itself during this year and, as a result, will win widespread acceptance by the bulk of our farmers.

The results to date of the introduction of support by means of deficiency payments on a limited amount of production per farmer, for hogs and eggs, have been interesting. The production of eggs, from January 1 of this year to the middle of June, shows a reduction of 9.3 percent from the corresponding period of 1959. During the same period, hog production is down 13.5 percent this year as compared with 1959.

It is thus evident that the method has been successful in bringing production down into line with what can be marketed. This has had, as you would expect, the beneficial effect of improving prices. The weighted average price received for eggs during the March–April period was above that received in the corresponding period in 1959 when support by purchase was in effect. During May and June egg prices have been below those of a year ago due to the heavy deliveries in this period, but it is generally expected that they will improve and be at considerably higher levels for the last 6 months of this year than prevailed in 1959.

In the case of hogs, for the first few months prices declined, but as deliveries eased, the prices gradually came up and are now considerably above the support level.

We are making some surveys to attempt to determine the size of operation in which the decline in production has taken place, but these have not yet progressed far enough to enable any definite statements to be made.

One thing we do know is that the change to the method of support has had a very important effect in reducing contract farming and vertical integration in hog raising. Most of the feed and other companies which were carrying on these operations served notice last fall, following my announcement that the new method of support would be put into effect, that they would not renew their contracts. I believe this method of support will go a long way to prevent the bona fide farmer, who operates an average-sized farm, being driven out of production by large commercial companies.

On the subject of agricultural price supports generally, my experience and investigations have led me to a few general conclusions. The first is that no one method of support is best in all circumstances. In any workable program I think that one must employ several different methods. The method best adapted for use for a particular commodity depends on a considerable number of factors, some of the more important of which are: supply of the product; distance from market; availability of market outlets; perishability of products; basic cause of price and income decline; storage and disposal problems; and long-term market outlook.

Second, the method of support by means of purchase is almost bound to produce surpluses if the support price is set at a level acceptable to producers. The reasons for this are obvious. The farmer has not only a guaranteed price, but a guaranteed market—the Government. In my opinion the latter has been more instrumental than the former, in many cases, in producing surpluses, because of the fact that it is not possible to set a low-enough price to discourage the more efficient producers and at the same time provide a level of support which will protect the average producer. A situation in which there is no worry about selling everything produced inevitably leads to all producers attempting to produce the maximum amount possible.

Third, it should be recognized that support prices are a form of crutch, and should not be necessary except in periods of emergency, when prices for any reason are unnaturally low in relation to the cost of production. If the farm economy of a country is on a healthy basis, price supports should not be necessary, and the aim should be by other means to produce conditions in which an unsupported agriculture can be carried on profitably.

During the past 20 to 30 years a great technological revolution in agriculture has coincided with very unsettled world conditions and markets. The result has been unstable conditions in the industry, caused by a greatly increased ability to produce with surpluses and consequent low prices, whilst at the same time the farmers' costs of production have been rapidly going up. We are in the midst of a period of adjustment to these new conditions, and until we reach a more stable era, there will undoubtedly be a need for price support measures. Our agricultural productive capacity is now so great on this continent that, if our farmers are to receive adequate prices for their products, production must be curtailed to what can be marketed at reasonable prices on this continent and in other countries. Any system of price support which encourages increased production for products now in surplus supply, must be judged a failure.

The present Canadian Government, during the past 3 years, has been attempting to put into effect a long-range policy for agriculture, designed to bring health and prosperity to the industry. The program has six main prongs:

1. The Stabilization Act, designed to give a certain amount of stability of prices and income to the majority of our farmers without, at the same time, piling up surpluses.
2. A drive for increased markets, both at home and abroad, on the basis of improved quality and more intensive selling.
3. Considerably improved and expanded credit facilities for farmers.
4. Crop insurance to remove at least a considerable proportion of the weather risk, which is very considerable in our climatic conditions.
5. A soil and water conservation program.
6. A rural development, or redevelopment program somewhat similar to the one you are carrying on in the United States, designed particularly to deal with the many problems associated with the rural population on small, uneconomic units.

I have already dealt with the Stabilization Act, and indicated what we are trying to accomplish under it. It is, of course, too

soon as yet to say how successful our efforts will be, but the scheme is in full operation.

The second of our objectives—to increase markets—we are working toward by offering incentives of various kinds to our farmers to continually improve the quality of their products. For example, premium payments on top-quality hogs; price support for only the top grades of any commodity; continual improvement in stricter control of grading and marketing of products, etc. We have attempted to increase sales by various promotional campaigns, extending financial assistance to commodity groups in advertising; by the making of trial shipments to other countries which have not been buyers of our products, and so forth.

During recent years our farmers have increasingly complained that the amount of credit available to them, from mortgage companies, banks, etc., has been decreasing whilst at the same time their needs for credit have greatly increased. To meet this situation, we have three forms of Government sponsored, or guaranteed, credit available to agriculture. Some years ago a Government agency—the Farm Loan Board—was set up to make long-term mortgage loans to farmers. At the last session of Parliament we established the Farm Credit Corporation, which absorbed the previous Farm Loan Board, and is empowered to grant mortgages up to $27,500, on the basis of 75 percent of the appraised value of the land, buildings, and chattels on any individual farm enterprise. Supervision and farm management counseling is provided for, along with a low rate of interest and long repayment period. The basic consideration for the granting of a loan is that it will result in an economic farm unit.

Under the Veterans' Land Act somewhat similar assistance is provided to veterans who wish to go into agriculture and they are, in addition, entitled to certain grants. Short-term credit is provided by the Farm Improvement Loans Act, under which the Government guarantees loans by the chartered banks to farmers.

At the last session of Parliament we passed a Crop Insurance Act, under which the Federal Government will put up 50 percent of the administration costs and 20 percent of the premiums, for any approved provincial crop insurance scheme. In addition the Dominion Government will make loans to any province, covering approximately 75 percent of the deficit, which may result in the early years of any crop insurance scheme in spite of the fact that it may be on a sound actuarial basis.

Conditions vary so much from Province to Province that it was left no Dominion scheme, which must of necessity provide the same conditions for all parts of the country, would be workable. Thus we decided to encourage crop insurance by this assistance to provincial schemes. Under the provisions of our act, any crop may be insured, but the decision as to which crops will be insured is the responsibility of the Province, which will administer the scheme within its own borders.

The Province of Manitoba has already set up three test areas, each covering a considerable acreage, in which crop insurance will be tried out this year. There is a strong possibility that Saskatchewan will do the same thing in 1961, and several other Provinces are studying the matter. If, as we hope, crop insurance schemes are put into effect in all the Provinces in the course of the next few years, a great deal of the weather risk, and thus instability of farm income in individual cases, will be removed.

The soil and water conservation projects are handled in Canada chiefly by the department of agriculture. The long drought period of the 1930's, during which there was a great loss of fertile soil by wind and, at the same time, a great shortage of water for both livestock and irrigation, led to the passing of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, under which many thousands of farm dugouts have been constructed and large numbers of small and large irrigation projects have been developed. The biggest of these is the South Saskatchewan River Dam, which is now under construction. This is an earth-filled dam 210 feet high (or equivalent in height to a 17-story office building) and almost 3 miles long, which is being constructed at an estimated cost of $100 million, and will create a lake 140 miles long. It will make possible the irrigation of 500,000 acres of land and will be a great step forward in aiding the diversification of agriculture in Saskatchewan, and particularly provide the basis for a greatly expanded livestock industry.

Under the act, my department operates a large number of community pastures and has carried out numerous drainage schemes in low-lying areas, et cetera.

A similar organization, under the Maritime Marshland Rehabilitation Act, has been carrying on diking and drainage operations in the Atlantic seacoast Provinces. A Dominion-Provincial coservation conference is now being organized, as a result of which it is hoped a national soil and water program can be evolved.

Up to date very little has been done, in a practical way, on rural redevelopment. During the past 2 years we have had a considerable number of people making studies of the problem. As a part of this work we had a group of our agricultural economists and sociologists down here studying what you have been doing along this line. The situation in Canada is that just over one-third of what were listed as farms in the 1951 census showed a cash income of less than $1,200 a year. The aim of our rural development scheme is to consolidate as many of these as possible into a greatly reduced number of economic farm units, and to provide alternative employment for the remainder of the people affected, by retraining, decentralization of industry, etc. This, of necessity, is a lengthy program and it will be many years before the problem is effectively dealt with.

The agricultural problems which face us in Canada are, by and large, the same ones which concern you in the United States. Our economies are so closely connected that any solution and improvements which are effected in one country will have beneficial effects in the other. As agriculturists, we have the greatest possible interest in seeing our industry in a strong position in each other's countries. If you produce a surplus in any commodity and the price is depressed as a result, the same low price will inevitably follow in Canada. If we produce a surplus with low prices, although the effect on you will not be as extreme, nevertheless it will bring prices down to some extent in your country.

The effect of geography is such that the price of an agricultural product in British Columbia is much more affected by the price in Washington than it is by the price of the same commodity in Quebec, and in many cases the reverse is true. For example, the price of potatoes in Maine is influenced to a greater extent by the prices in our Maritime Provinces, than it is by the Washington price. These facts being apparent, it is readily understandable why we, in Canada, take such an interest in agricultural developments and prices in the United States, and vice versa. This is, naturally, more so in our case than in yours. Because of your population being 10 times that of Canada's your prices and policies, of course, affect us a great deal more than ours do you.

PROBLEMS OF OREGON LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, increasingly my mail indicates to me the difficulties faced by Oregon farmers. One such letter, under date of January 23, 1961, from Mr. Don Ollivant, president of the Douglas County Livestock Association, sets forth in clear detail the situation directly experienced by livestock producers in the Douglas County area of southwestern Oregon.

On behalf of the Douglas County Livestock Association, Mr. Ollivant closes his letter with the request that careful consideration be given to a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative O. C. FISHER, of Texas. In my judgment, a factual review such as is contained in Mr. Ollivant's letter will be most helpful to the Members of the Senate in the consideration of farm legislation, especially that concerning itself with our domestic sheep industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have alluded be printed in the RECORD.

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

DOUGLAS COUNTY
LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
Roseburg, Oreg., January 23, 1961.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Douglas County Livestock Association wishes to bring to your attention some critical items affecting the sheep industry. Most important to the sheep producer, is the importation of live and dressed lamb products. Lamb imports have increased from less than a million pounds in 1956 to over 9½ million pounds in 1960.

We cannot agree with the Tariff Commission findings that dressed lamb imports are not in direct competition with the product we produce. A survey conducted by Drs. Burton Wood and S. Kent Christensen of Oregon State College and presented to the Tariff Commission does indicate a direct depressing effect on our prices. A survey conducted by our livestock association of 125 sheepmen in the area is summarized as follows:

Number of lambs raised for market in 1959	21,121
Number of lambs raised for market in 1960	21,551
Number of lambs usually on hand August 1	2,015
Number of lambs on hand on August 1, 1960	11,360
Average price received for fat lambs in 1959, per hundredweight	$18.67
Average price received for fat lambs in 1960, per hundredweight	15.59
Average price received for feeder lambs in 1959, per hundredweight	16.89
Average price received for feeder lambs in 1960, per hundredweight	13.35

The average date sold in 1960 was about July 15, and many people had not sold at the time the survey was taken in the middle of August. In this survey, two items stand out. First the number of lambs unsold on August 1 of this year and the prices received for fat and feeder lambs.

We still believe that we are being sacrificed to further free trade in subsidized manufactured goods and crops. A bill is to be introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman O. C. FISHER of Texas. This bill, H.R. 13208, is designed to establish quotas on live sheep and dressed lamb imports.

We ask that you study and consider supporting this bill.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS COUNTY LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
DON OLLIVANT, *President.*

MOBILE HOMES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a petition addressed to the Congress of the United States which I have received from the Oregon Trailer Park Association.

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

PETITION BY OREGON TRAILER PARK ASSOCIATION

PORTLAND, OREG.

To the Congress of the United States:

Whereas it is the desire of the Government of the United States and of all local governmental authorities to increase and improve the low-cost housing in this country; and

Whereas thousands of citizens live in mobile homes located in communities generally designated as mobile home parks, and that many such parks, because of age, are in need of improvement, and in many cases funds are not available for such improvements; and

Whereas home improvement loans are presently available at low interest rates to owners of private residences, hotels, apartment houses, and practically all housing projects except mobile home parks; and

Whereas such exception appears to be discriminatory and not in the best interests of the country as a whole: Now be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to make the necessary amendments to present laws which will allow the Federal Housing Authority to make title I loans to owners of mobile home parks.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN PRINEVILLE, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the city of Prineville, located in the center of the State of Oregon, has been recently hard hit by the growing economic recession in the country.

The Prineville-Crook County Chamber of Commerce advises me that in the past 2 years a major sawmill and two molding plants have closed permanently in the Prineville area, and that another mill may close soon. As a consequence of this loss of basic economic industry, several commercial establishments are also closing their doors. I am advised that in the last week of January alone, four commercial establishments went out of business.

This situation is especially unfortunate because, like so many other areas of our State, Prineville has so many other advantages to offer for business locations. The Prineville-Crook County Chamber of Commerce has prepared and published a booklet entitled "Economic Survey," outlining the economic and social resources of the area. In forwarding this booklet to me, the Prineville-Crook County Chamber of Commerce pointed out:

We discovered in gathering the data for this that Crook County has many advantages in raw resources needed to attract new industries to our area. Among the raw resources it was determined that there was a need to utilize our byproducts of lumber, such as chips for hardboard plants, pulp mills, etc. We are one of the major producers of an exceptionally fine grade of potatoes, suitable for processing—yet we do not have a processing plant.

Prineville is located at the geographical center of Oregon and is also the center of a vast Oregon cattle industry. We do not and should have a meatpacking plant. We have set aside for industrial usage 15,000 acre-feet of water from the new Crooked River Dam, for which you worked so hard in securing for this area. This alone should be an attraction for various industries.

Now, for the other advantages as shown in the brochure, our climate is the finest in Oregon. Our taxes are the lowest in the State. Our recreational facilities are unsurpassed. We are located in the exact center of the State of Oregon. We have available an abundance of good sites for industry, stores, and homes.

To any business, group, or individual who is interested in the commercial attractions available in this part of my State, I would suggest that he obtain a copy of this pamphlet from the Prineville-Crook County Chamber of Commerce, Post Office Box 546, Prineville, Oreg. In it he will find a summary of the geography, climate, population, income, housing, recreation, civic, transportation, and other factors of interest to business enterprise.

CHALLENGE OF NEW FRONTIER IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last night I had the pleasure of addressing an audience of more than 4,500 people at the Miami Beach Civic Auditorium, at a meeting sponsored by the Washington Federal Savings & Loan Association of Miami Beach. It was an open forum meeting. The subject of my speech was, "Meeting the Challenge of New Frontiers in Latin America." I ask unanimous consent that my speech may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MEETING THE CHALLENGE OF NEW FRONTIERS IN LATIN AMERICA

(Remarks of Senator WAYNE MORSE, Miami Beach Civic Forum, Miami Beach, Fla., sponsored by Washington Federal Savings & Loan Association of Miami Beach, February 19, 1961)

Few occasions have afforded me more personal pleasure and enjoyment than the occasion of this visit to Miami Beach at the invitation of the Washington Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Arthur Courshon and Jack Gordon are long-time acquaintances and, indeed, personal friends of mine. Their work in the area of savings and loan associations is matched by their interest in the foreign policy problems of the United States with the other nations of our hemisphere and, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I have known for a long time of their interest in Latin America.

If it can be said that Americans decided last fall that a new frontier attitude was required to reinvigorate our country, the new frontier spirit is really rampant in the countries of the Caribbean and of South and Central America.

The new frontier in Latin America really bears little resemblance to our own. It is not a spirit that seeks to give fresh impetus to past policies; it is a spirit that seeks to change some of the basic living habits and basic economies of Latin America.

I also think it is safe to say that great numbers of the people in those countries are so determined to change these social and economic structures that they are not particularly concerned right now with how they do it. The Castro revolution probably looks better from far off than up close, but to millions of people in Latin America it remains as one way of achieving social and economic reform, if more peaceful and transitionary means fail.

To borrow from another famous American political slogan, many people in this hemisphere are determined to have a new deal for themselves, and they don't care much how they get it.

This was the overwhelming impression I brought back with me in December of 1959, after touring six countries in South America. Particularly in Brazil, but in each country I visited, I was told that great masses of people there were tired of being told that it was uneconomic for them to push the great public works programs for homes, schools, hospitals, roads, and so forth, at the rate on which they were insisting. Their people were demanding these programs, and there was much fear that if they could not be started under a democratic regime, the masses of the people were willing to consider some other kind of regime. It was President Kubischek of Brazil who initiated the Operation Pan American dedicated to finding the ways and means of providing these things throughout Latin America.

We must remember that for generations, words like "democracy," "free enterprise," "personal liberty," and the like, have been just words for the great majority of people in Latin American countries. Too often, the words that we live by in the United States have been empty slogans to poverty-ridden masses not only in Latin America, but in Asia and Africa, too.

Fortunately, there has in recent months been a growing understanding in America of just what is motivating the revolutions which have occurred in the hemisphere in the last 2 to 5 years. It is a sad thing that it took stones thrown at our Vice President in Caracas, and a Fidel Castro in Cuba, to arouse our interest and understanding.

It was due to such efforts as that of Arthur Courshon and David Krooth in 1958 that Americans began to improve their appreciation of events in Latin America. One of the ablest surveys of living conditions in a South American country was the report by these two gentlemen done for the U.S. Operations Mission to Chile, on the housing problem in Chile and some recommendations for coping with it.

One of the great obstacles to a better understanding within the hemisphere has been the economic theories about land reform, government-owned business, housing, education, medical care, and what might generally be lumped together as welfare programs, which have prevailed among responsible Government officials in the United States. This prevailing thinking was a great roadblock to the kind of program which Arthur Courshon and David Krooth proposed.

These prevailing theories have held that land reform, for example, is not something that the United States should include in its economic loan programs in Latin America. I do not know just what the basis for that theory is. We have had the institution of eminent domain in this country dating back to our earliest colonies. Perhaps there is something that smacks of property confiscation about a land reform program which requires that parts of large estates be purchased by the government and made available on long-term payment terms to the families which will work them.

But the land reform programs we had refused to assist were accompanied by proper payment to the former owners. I was told in several countries that land reform was the really basic issue. The existence of large landholders amid great masses of landless people was rapidly becoming intolerable.

Redistribution was essential, and they preferred that it be done by due process of law, with suitable compensation.

I think we should have been willing right from the start to extend loans for soundly conceived land reform operations in these countries. In my report of a year ago, I urged that the lending policies of the U.S. Development Loan Fund be revised to permit the lending of the initial capital for land reform, and agricultural and housing credit.

Another area which needs urgent attention in Latin America is that of education. It is not only high illiteracy rates which need to be overcome in Latin America; their people are in great need of agricultural training and vocational education, too. The only way any people can raise themselves from poverty is to learn to produce more. An educated upper and middle class is needed, but Latin America already has that. What she does not have in too many places is a trained labor force and productive farm operators.

I do not know of any amount of capital that can overcome these deficiencies in any country. So we cannot exclude education from our consideration when it comes to formulating assistance programs in Latin America.

A third major area where change and progress are needed in Latin America is in housing. The objections among American foreign aid and foreign policy officials to any help from this country in the housing field has been based on age-old economic theories which really do not stand the test of investigation.

It has been held by classical economists that good housing is a reward for the achievement of high living standards, not a component in reaching a high living standard. People were, in effect, not expected to have decent homes until after they had formed an industrial economy.

I want to mention in this connection the work which Mr. Stanley Baruch, of the Housing Division of the International Cooperation Administration, did in demolishing this contention. Mr. Baruch decided it was time someone analyzed the analysis. He found that home construction had been a major element in the development of an industrial economy in this country.

Largely as a result of his efforts, there has been some new thinking in the ICA about the importance of housing, not just because of the social need, but because of the contribution it can make to economic development.

The Courshon-Krooth report of July 1958 has this to say about housing needs in just one country—Chile:

"Housing should be the backbone of the economy of a nation, as it provides a market for raw materials and manufactured products and provides employment. This is true of the housing industry in the United States, where in a peak year 1,500,000 homes are constructed and in recent 'poor' years, 1 million homes have been produced. In Chile, we do not have an adequate and healthy housing industry which can make its necessary contribution to the economy and provide a large market for Chilean products, increased employment, and national income.

"There is a need for a large volume of housing construction in Chile. To build enough homes just to keep up with the increase in the population, a total of 30,000 homes are required each year. If, in addition, proper and adequate housing is to replace the substandard housing, Chile should work toward a goal of 50,000 homes a year."

I might point out that this report was prior to the earthquake disaster in Chile, which rendered homeless many thousands more.

Last year, these cumulative efforts to change official American policies on social development in Latin America began to get some results. It was due in no small part to the efforts of the then Under Secretary of State, Douglas Dillon, who gave great backing to the $500 million fund which Congress passed last year to assist in this social and economic reform.

This fund was our contribution to Operation Pan America. It is intended to assist in establishing those essential services of roads, schools, hospitals, and housing, too, which are not always revenue producing in themselves, but without which large-scale business and industrial investment is impossible.

It was my privilege to have gone down to Bogotá, Colombia, last fall, when under the leadership of Under Secretary Dillon, we joined representatives from the other members of the Organization of American States in implementing Operation Pan America.

What emerged from that conference was the Act of Bogotá, a hemispherewide program of social reform to accompany the existing programs of economic development. The act consists of four parts—measures for social improvement, creation of a special fund for social development, measures for economic development, and multilateral cooperation for social and economic progress.

The measures for social improvement are listed under general headings relating to improvement of conditions of rural living and land use, improvement of housing and community facilities, improvement of educational systems and training facilities, improvement of public health, and the mobilization of domestic resources.

The special fund for social development is to be administered through the Inter-American Development Bank, as a revolving fund.

Another instance of the change in the American attitude was the amendment in 1960 of the Mutual Security Act to permit the Development Loan Fund to make loans for certain types of housing activities. This amendment makes it possible for the Development Loan Fund to participate in so-called self-help housing projects in the countries of the hemisphere. Peru was the first country to take advantage of this provision, and negotiations are going on with several other Latin American countries.

Still another measure is one offered by myself and Senator SMATHERS last year, to make it possible for American savings and loans institutions to invest a small portion of their capital in mutual savings associations for home construction in other countries. Hearings were held last year by the Senate's Housing Subcommittee. It gave friendly consideration to the proposal, and asked for a report on it from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Unfortunately, the housing bill in which this request of the committee was formally put was among the many housing bills which did not complete the legislative process.

However, a considerably revised version has already been introduced, and I look forward to its reconsideration this year. The measure limits the amount which any one American savings association can invest abroad to a tiny fraction of its assets—one-hundredth of those assets.

I have dwelt here on the belated recognition of the part which the United States can and should play in promoting reform in Latin America. But we would make a great mistake to delude ourselves, or the people of the hemisphere who are looking to us for help, by thinking that American capital can do all, or even much, of the job.

The capital needs of Latin America are far in excess of what any one country of the world could possibly furnish. Moreover, unless the small contribution we do make is accompanied by extensive economic reform and self-help within the recipient country, American financial help will make no dent at all on their backlog of needs.

The real obstacle which the Nations of Latin America must overcome is not simply one of apathy and disinterest in the United States; it is the obstacle of their own stratified social and economic structures. It is this stratification that has left them so far behind the countries of North America and Europe in the march toward better living conditions.

This was a major point we made at the Bogotá Conference. We made clear that we were ready to enter into a partnership with them, but that implied that they must do their share, too.

As I told the Conference myself on September 8, 1960; concerning congressional approval of the special fund:

"Of all the elements, I think the one which loomed biggest in the congressional view was the emphasis upon self-help. This, in turn, was based upon the concept for which history provides ample support, that the basic, the most important factor in development is people who really want development, and who want it badly enough not only to work for it but make their own substantial economic contributions as well as give up certain traditional customs in order to get it. Unless this basic urge is present, no amount of outside assistance will be effective.

"Real development means adjusting the social, economic, and political institutions of a country so that the poor do not stay poor while the rich get richer * * *. It is a factor which undoubtedly will be taken into account in further congressional implementation of this program."

It is a sad fact that the countries of Latin America, while there are notable exceptions, are typically characterized by oligarchic economies, the absence of any real middle class, a concentration of land holdings in a few large and unproductive holdings, a regressive tax structure and poor enforcement of what income taxes do exist, education largely confined to the aristocracy, and luxury housing for the few surrounded by appalling slums for the masses.

Unless and until these elite upper classes are willing to relax their grip on the economic and social institutions of their countries, American capital and investment will not reach the people who want it. What is likely to happen in such instances is what happened in Cuba.

There is simply no possibility that the United States can "buy up" these countries from communism, even if we wanted to. We can urge, persuade, instruct, and plant some so-called seed capital, but we are not omnipotent.

The future of Latin America lies with the people of Latin America, not with us. I hope we will continue to do everything possible to cooperate with those elements in each country who recognize that what they hope for must essentially come from within their countries, not from without.

I hope we will be able to impress upon them that the living standards to which they aspire have been made possible in America only by such sound institutions as a progressive tax system, antitrust laws, farm cooperatives, competitive civil service, and the concept of equal justice for all regardless of economic condition.

Perhaps the most effective proposal yet made in this area of housing in Latin America, is that of the Courshon-Krooth report, recommending the establishment of mutual savings institutions in Chile, and in other countries with a similar housing problem. One of the problems they face is the devastating effect of inflation upon savings of any kind. Inflation in Chile and elsewhere in South America has prevented either the wealthy or the small saver from ever getting

the habit of investing savings in his own country. The wealthy commonly bank their money abroad, and generally invest it in the United States or Western Europe, but not at home.

Here again, they cannot expect American capital to take the place of their own wealth, when it comes to reinvestment of savings.

But some techniques have been worked out to minimize the effects of inflation upon the small savings account. As recommended by Mr. Courshon, Chile adopted such a system in an effort to provide the long term mortgage loan money essential to large-scale home construction and family ownership.

This system provided that money accumulated in a newly established savings department in the state bank would be earmarked for housing construction. It was turned over to a special corporation called Corvi. When a savings account reached a fixed level, the saver was eligible for a mortgage loan, according to the amount the saver had accumulated and according to the savings plan he had selected.

The mortgage amount was made adjustable. The amount of principal of the contract would be increased by the amount of the inflation that might have occurred between the date of the contract and the time the saver received his funds. Similarly, the mortgage and the savings would be repaid on a readjusted basis.

The plan went into operation a year ago. Last April, the Government of Chile also set up an independent savings and loan system, again with savings and mortgages insured and adjustable to the inflation.

I have taken this description of what has been done in Chile from Mr. Courshon's report of December 1960. In it, he also makes some additional suggestions for the operation of these savings and loan programs in Chile. He points out that some American investment in the Chilean associations would be helpful in getting them started, and while he mentions development loan funds for this purpose, some investments by our independent savings associations could also be helpful in indicating the personal interest we have in showing others in the hemisphere just how it was that America was able to make so much progress toward family homeownership.

So far, such programs as this have been slow in getting started in Latin America. Pilot housing programs, either through the savings and loan system, or cooperative housing, are still few and far between. There is not much yet that the DLF or our local associations can contribute to, because the initiative for them must come from the country involved.

I hope this program, along with that of land reform and education, can be stepped up because we—and the hemisphere itself—are in a race against time.

ADDRESS BY HON. CLAUDE PEPPER AT INTER-AMERICAN BAR CONFERENCE, BOGOTÁ

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the former distinguished Members of this body, one of the great constructive liberals of America, in my opinion, former Senator Claude Pepper, of Florida, spoke recently at a luncheon of the Inter-American Bar Conference in Bogotá on February 3, 1961. He was one of the delegates of the bar association who attended that convention of lawyers in Bogotá. He made, as usual, a very able and thoughtful speech, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA, AT A LUNCHEON OF THE INTER-AMERICAN BAR CONFERENCE IN BOGOTÁ, FEBRUARY 3, 1961

To come here again to beautiful and hospitable Bogotá vividly reminds Mrs. Pepper and me of our last visit here in December of 1944 with our dear friend Col. James W. Flanagan, as guests of Colombia's president, Alfonso López, who like Colombia's distinguished President Lleras Camargo, will be remembered as one of the great men of our time. I also happily recall that I had the honor to address the Senate and House of Colombia upon that visit.

Then my country and Colombia and many other sister nations were engaged in the greatest of world wars in which millions had died and were to die before we had stopped wars of aggression and conquest and brought peace to mankind.

You remember how we all prayed for that peace and determined that we would set up organizations to keep the peace of the future.

You remember how we determined that we would all work together to preserve freedom and to promote the well-being of all peoples everywhere in the world.

Now nearly 16 years after the end of that war we are in a state of tension and fear of another war which with the terrible weapons of today would destroy civilization and perhaps every living creature upon the earth.

Now we know that hundreds of millions of human beings, made in the image of God, born with the right to be free, are in the bonds of tyranny and slavery.

Now we know that much more than half of the human race is, as President Roosevelt once said about some of his fellow countrymen, "ill fed, ill clothed and ill housed."

All over the world people pray for peace, cry out for freedom, beg for a better life.

What can we lawyers do to preserve the peace, assure the freedom and promote the welfare of people everywhere in the world?

The lawyer by his training and experience is, we believe, the best fitted of all the professions to formulate and to advocate the ways and means, by which peace, freedom and progress may be attained.

Our first concern must be to set up the courts and develop the law, by which disputes among nations will be settled by law and not by force, and persuade governments and people everywhere to accept and support this rule of law.

We have made a beginning with the establishment of the International Court of Justice, under the Charter of the United Nations and the development of a substantial body of recognized international law. But the Court must be strengthened; its jurisdiction must be accepted by the nations of the world, especially the most powerful nations, and the law which such Court shall administer must be developed and recognized throughout the world. We must, as Dean Roscoe Pound of Harvard Law School has recommended, also develop and administer international law in the courts of our respective countries where its enforcement shall be the same as the domestic or municipal law and shall not be dependent upon some international enforcement machinery. This is the task of the lawyer, trained in the law, experienced in the establishment and administration of institutions by which men are wisely and justly governed, and their lives, their liberties, and their properties protected.

It is also the task of the lawyer, the greatest advocate among men, to show the people of the world that the rule of law is the only way the human race under the dangers of today's weapons, can survive and that in a world of law alone can mankind have freedom and the good life he deserves.

In the United States, for example, we are spending over 40 billions of dollars every year upon the defense and security of our country against the danger of war. If the threat of war could be removed from us and we could reduce by even one-half these expenses, we could increase by ten times the aid we could give to other nations as to help their people to own their homes and their farms and to enjoy better health and education. If we could assure peace through law in the world, we could make over the earth and lift men everywhere to heights of happiness for which they have dreamed and fought throughout the ages.

World peace through law have now become the great aim of the inter-American bar and the associations of lawyers all over the world.

Our committees are planning to meet in every continent and in many countries; and finally we are soon to have a great world conference of lawyers to further this noble dream and to arouse people everywhere to its support. And we must be not only defenders but the bold champions of the United Nations and the Organization of American States.

It is also the task of the lawyer to help men to be free, for he knows the constant threat to freedom and that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." He knows that freedom for mankind is found only when there is equal justice under law. He knows that equal justice under law lives only where there are competent, independent, and fearless courts and able and courageous lawyers dedicated to freedom and justice.

He knows when the freedom of the people is being threatened by deception and he must unmask such deception and show the people how it may be thwarted. For example, if a foreign power were to land troops in any nation of our hemisphere today we would all spring to the defense of that nation under the solemn agreements we have reached with one another for common defense against such aggressions. Yet, if a group of men should in any nation come to power and then invite a foreign, Communist, imperialistic power to come into such country and dominate it and from it further its designs against the freedom of other republics in our hemisphere, is it not the task of the lawyer to establish judicial institutions by which such aggressions may be adjudged and effectively resisted by the other republics without violating any of our irrevocable agreements against intervention in the internal affairs of any American Republic?

And it must be the courageous lawyer, the able and eloquent advocate, who will show the people and their governments the wisdom, the right and, indeed, the necessity of such a course if their precious freedom fought for by Bolivar, San Martín, Santander, José Marti, and many other great liberators, is not to be lost to a tyranny far more despotic than that against which they fought. Yes, as President Kennedy said in his inaugural address, we shall show the world, we in the Americas "are the masters of our own house."

And the lawyer must find ways and means to show all people today that they do not have to sell their freedom for a mess of pottage. They can now have bread and freedom; they can have health and education and freedom. They can now have their homes and farms and freedom; they can have these blessing in the democratic way without the price of their freedom when all nations and people work together under democracy and law and in peace to provide them.

The lawyer, of course, must be the able advocate and defender of such cooperation among all nations and especially the nations of the Americas.

I know, we lawyers of my country believe, that a new Good Neighbor Policy between the United States and our sister republics is coming to birth and soon to a gratifying maturity and meaning under our great new President, John F. Kennedy, and we are going to support such a policy with all our hearts.

Indeed, we believe a new era is opening for all the Americas, our country as well as our sister republics, as democracy throughout our hemisphere takes on new life and vitality under dynamic, courageous leaders whom the people are raising up to lead them to a better life under law and in peace.

Let us lawyers, in these critical days, rise to our historic role as the leaders of men, as the architects of their worthy institutions, as the advocates of their causes, the defenders of their rights and their freedom, as the designers of their progress and their happiness.

And let us work and pray above all else for the happy day of which Tennyson dreamed:

"When the war drums throb no longer and the battle flags are furled,
In the parliament of men, the federation of the world,
There the commonsense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law."

FUNERAL SERMON FOR PATRICE LUMUMBA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a sermon which was delivered last Sunday night, February 19, 1961, by Bishop Smallwood E. Williams of Washington, D.C., of the Bible Way Church, with respect to the death of Mr. Lumumba of the Congo, during the course of which sermon Bishop Williams, in my judgment, called attention to some very important matters we ought to consider relative to American foreign policy.

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

FUNERAL SERMON FOR PATRICE LUMUMBA

(An address delivered by Bishop Smallwood E. Williams at the Bible Way Church on Sunday, February 19, 1961)

The murder of Patrice Lumumba was an international political tragedy which might have been avoided were it not for five important mistakes. These five mistakes are the basic elements of the compounded confusion which now reigns in the Congo. Let us review what these mistakes were and who made them.

First, Belgian colonial policy was mistaken in not having governed their colony with the view of preparing the Congolese for the inevitable day when they must rule themselves and control the vast expanse of that mineral-rich country.

Secondly, Patrice Lumumba was mistaken in not clearly recognizing that the salvation of his country and the future of all the emerging nations of Africa was dependent upon the preservation of a stable world order and that, at this moment in history, all hope is placed in the United Nations to accomplish this task.

Thirdly, the Western Powers of the United Nations were mistaken in not foreseeing the questions and doubts in the minds of African nationalists who were understandably cautious about placing all of their trust in an organization where their former colonial masters played such a prominent part. It is difficult for these new nations to believe that those who were so recently on African soil as colonizers and exploiters will have fundamentally changed their motives just because they happen to be dressed in United Nations blue.

Fourthly, along with the Western Powers, the Soviet Union was mistaken in not limiting its U.N. role to constructive criticism aimed at checking the West, while, at the same time making some positive contribution to a collective effort to settle conditions in the Congo. It seems that, on the international scene, the concept of responsible opposition is a difficult one for nations to learn and practice. Both East and West, motivated by the terms of the cold war, focus their efforts on preserving their own positions and not on creating and preserving peace for all.

Lastly, the United States was mistaken and has been persistently mistaken in not having a more imaginative and perceptive vision of African nationalist ambitions. They have thought as they have been conditioned to think—literally and figuratively—in terms of black and white. In the literal sense, they have allowed segments of our population to continue in immoral and outdated practices of discrimination in such a manner that it has cost us the respect and good will of peoples of color all over the world. In the figurative sense, they have failed to see the difference between nationalism and neutralism, on the one hand, and communism, on the other. They have taken similarities of African policy statements with Russian policy statements automatically to mean Communist influence on the Africans and never vice versa. Our policymakers have failed to see that Russia has often pushed forward African policy lines because they saw the propaganda value of doing so. Our policymakers have rushed headlong into statements placing one or another African nation "very definitely in the Communist bloc." Our policymakers have allowed their NATO link with the colonial powers to determine their positions on some of the most important moral and political issues of our times, such as our hesitancy to aid Guinea at the moment of her independence, our abstention on important U.N. votes on the South African situation, and our more recent abstention on the U.N. vote on colonialism.

Lumumba's death represents the compounded effects of all of this—of a Belgian colonial policy which thrust an ill-prepared patriot into an international scene dominated by the cold war between two powerful blocs which have not yet found the way to subordinate their own private interests to the cause of peace and a better life for all men.

PROBLEMS OF THE UNEMPLOYED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am always pleased when it is possible for me to give deserved praise to the press, especially when it appears to me that a newspaper is performing its major public function of educating the responsible citizens of the community through news stories and editorials highlighting matters of grave concern locally.

The Washington Post and Times Herald, in my judgment, has performed a distinct and needed public service in the past weeks through the able reporting of Miss Eve Edstrom and Mr. Luther Jackson and through an editorial entitled "Hungry Children," which appeared on February 17, 1961. Illustrative of the excellent reporting are two articles, the first headed "Jobless Parents' Families Need Aid" by Miss Edstrom and the second, captioned "Bricklayer's Family of 13 is Now Destitute" written by Mr. Jackson.

There also appeared in the Sunday, February 19, 1961, issue an article signed by Mr. Bernard W. Scholz, Chief of the Public Assistance Division of the District Department of Public Welfare, under the headline "Life on Dole No Joy in Nation's Capital." Mr. Scholz presented an expanded version of the printed story earlier in the year before the District League of Women Voters.

Publication of the articles and the editorial support given them by the newspaper should do much to dispel popular myths concerning public assistance in the District. An unemployed man who is able to work, even though he cannot find work, and even though he may have exhausted his unemployment benefits, cannot at present be given public assistance to feed and house his family.

There is obviously something wrong with a policy based upon regulation which permits such a shocking situation to exist. I have asked the Department of Public Welfare what steps are necessary to change the regulation which has such tragic consequences to our fellow human beings caught in an economic vise here in the District.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum replying to my request be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
February 20, 1961.

In response to your telephone request of this morning we wish to state that our general public assistance program is being operated solely under the language of the Appropriation Act (Federal Payment to District of Columbia, Public Law 86-412, 86th Cong., H.R. 10233, Apr. 8, 1960). There is no statute specifically authorizing a general public assistance program in the District. The language authorizing our current program will be found in the Appropriation Act under the heading "Department of Public Welfare" and reads as follows:

"Department of Public Welfare, including relief and rehabilitation of indigent residents, maintenance, pending transportation of indigent persons, burial of indigent residents of the District of Columbia, * * *". It would be our opinion, which of course would need to be confirmed by the Office of the Corporation Counsel, that, provided necessary funds are available, the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia could authorize the initiation of a program of unemployment relief under this broad appropriation language. If this action should be taken, the cost of needed staff and equipment would be chargeable entirely against District government funds as no Federal matching of such expenditures would be available.

We hope that this is the information you wanted.

Sincerely yours,

GERARD M. SHEA,
Director of Public Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it seems to me quite clear that the Department of Public Welfare, its advisory body, and

the Commissioners of the District of Columbia should review most carefully existing regulations and policy with a view to modification in order that the public responsibility in this area can be met. We cannot afford, in my judgment, the human attrition and waste, especially as it affects children, caused by unemployment to erode further the families of decent hardworking citizens of the District. It is a shocking reflection upon our institutions when in the Capital of the United States, an administrative remedy to alleviate hardship is not used.

The President of the United States has moved swiftly through an expansion of the surplus food program to take the necessary steps on a national level through strong executive action to alleviate economic hardship. In the District we can take administrative action in a parallel fashion and by changing our regulations governing the granting of general assistance meet, in good measure, the local problem.

It will be objected that the District does not have the money. My answer to this plea, always raised when programs designed to assist people are proposed, is that there are supplementary appropriation bills being considered through which funds can be sought. There are other programs for which money has been appropriated from which, temporarily, money can be diverted. If there is a will to do something about the problem, the technique to do it can be found easily and speedily.

In this connection, Mr. Scholz has hit the nail on the head in his article to which I earlier referred. He put it thus:

Where is the money coming from? is the question always raised when these proposals are brought up in the meetings of the mighty. The money is there, I assure you; the real problem is only a matter of choice. This whole discussion reminds me of my own situation. Although my wife and I are working and earn good salaries, we were "too poor" this past Christmas to give ourselves a color TV set—because we had just bought a new hi-fi and a Volkswagen as a second car.

The District is in the same deplorable condition. It is building a beautiful "depressed" 12th Street under the Mall and is planning to dig a tunnel under the Lincoln Memorial; it has just spent $1 million to pave over the Wisconsin Avenue streetcar tracks which have not bothered anyone for the past 50 years, and it is therefore unable to raise $800,000 to meet its relief payroll.

Clearly the money is there, the challenge is there, the experts, the blueprints, the solutions are available. It is only a matter of choice, a matter of conscience, a matter of farsightedness as to what action we choose.

Mr. President, the problem has been posed, the solutions have been offered, the challenge can be met—only the decision to do, the decision to act, is lacking.

For my part, in this session of the Congress, as in the sessions of the 85th and 86th Congresses, I shall give early and careful attention to the legislative proposals contained in the united public assistance bill presented by the Commissioners. The Senate Committee on the District of Columbia has twice reported similar legislation to the Senate, and the Senate has twice passed the reported bill. In view of this, I would anticipate that an acceptable measure would again pass in this session. But what I am strongly suggesting today needs no legislative actions; it demands, instead, administrative action and appropriations. I hope, most sincerely, that a quick response will be made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles and editorial to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks, and I again extend to the Washington Post and Times Herald my congratulations upon the leadership it has shown in underlining this deplorable situation.

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

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 17, 1961]

HUNGRY CHILDREN

It is a disfigurement of America that any child should suffer hunger in this land of bursting granaries and comfortable living. Yet all about us this bitter winter there have been families feeling the pinch of want—because their breadwinners could not find jobs, because the country in its complacency closed its eyes to the spreading and continuing joblessness, because our laws, in many places, make no provision for helping those capable of working.

The stark, terrible truth is that some 600,000 Americans, able and willing to work, have been out of jobs for so long that they have exhausted the unemployment benefits which are their due under the social security program. In some States, as in the District of Columbia, no direct relief assistance is provided for such employable persons. In short, their families are left to freeze or starve. There exists, in consequence, the tragic anomaly that, although the children of the incapacitated and even the children whose fathers have deserted them receive relief, the children of those who want to work are ignored.

It is heartening that the President and the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare have looked at this situation realistically and with an appropriate sense of urgency. It would be unconscionable for Congress to delay action on the remedial measures they have requested—an extension of unemployment compensation benefits by a maximum of 13 weeks and the provision of public relief for the children of unemployed parents.

To speak of Federal aid in this connection—Federal aid to keep children from starvation—as usurping the prerogatives of the States is to betray an indifference to human life. This is America. No child should go hungry here.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 7, 1961]

WHY FORCE FATHER TO DESERT?—JOBLESS PARENT'S FAMILIES NEED AID

(By Eve Edstrom)

A major breakthrough in establishing a national relief program based on family need and not on the absence of fathers will be achieved if Congress enacts President Kennedy's proposal to aid children of unemployed parents.

This has not been done before because it shatters an American dream.

That dream holds that only special categories of people are in need in this country. Therefore, you can receive Federal relief payments if you are blind, disabled, old, or the child of a father who is dead, incapacitated, or has deserted.

But if you are the child of an unemployed father you cannot receive Federal relief. This is because any able-bodied man worth his salt is supposed to be able to provide for his family.

The facts, however, don't support that dream.

ABOVE 5 MILLION

Nationally, unemployment last month climbed above 5 million to the second highest level since the start of World War II. Of that number 1.3 million had been jobless for 15 weeks or more.

In the Washington area, unemployment was placed at 23,600, in Virginia at 63,350, and in Maryland 75,000. In the 3 jurisdictions, 8,002 have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits.

These workers are not ne'er-do-wells. They are like the father of eight who showed up at the Salvation Army here last week.

He had never appealed for help before in his life, he had tried to find all sorts of odd jobs to support his family but he just couldn't make it, Salvation Army workers reported.

Agencies like the Salvation Army do not have the wherewithal to help families for weeks on end. They can give an emergency food order, they can help pay a light or rent bill in a time of crisis but they cannot give extended aid to maintain families.

JOB FOR PUBLIC AGENCIES

That is a job for public agencies. But except for a short time in the 1930's prior to the establishment of the WPA, the Federal Government has not provided funds for needy children of unemployed parents.

Some States have provided for these children through local and State general assistance funds. But usually such programs fall far short of need and are below the Federal-State grants given to children whose fathers have deserted them.

In Maryland, for example, only a handful of counties has elected to participate with the State in a relief program for the unemployed and payments are so restricted that no family—no matter how large—can receive more than $100 a month. In Virginia payments cannot be made to such families for more than 3 months in any given year.

But many States and the District of Columbia do not even have these limited programs. The hardship that this imposes on families was pointed up forcefully by Bernard W. Scholz, head of the District's public assistance program, last month when he told the League of Women Voters that there was "no freedom from want" in the Nation's Capital.

UTTER DISTRESS FOR MANY

"We hear so much about people who are chiselers and who are enjoying a life of ease and comfort on the dole yet many people fail to realize that there are large segments of the population who are in utter distress and for whom there is no public relief available at all," he said.

"There is no unemployment relief in the Nation's Capital. No matter how urgent the need, no matter how hungry the children, no matter how cold the home, no matter how sick the mother: If the man is employable but is out of a job and has used up his unemployment benefits, there is no public relief whatsoever available to him in the city of Washington."

The shortsightedness of this policy was pointed up more than a year ago by Junior Village Project Committee. The committee's study showed that when unemployed fathers remained in the home, children frequently became public charges at the District Junior Village at a cost to taxpayer 10 times greater than that of maintaining them on relief.

Even more tragically, the committee cited case after case in which families were split up because fathers had deserted to qualify their families for the Federal-local relief program.

That fact was well recognized by former Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Arthur S. Flemming who, in 1959, said that, in many instances, the present Federal law "makes it necessary for a father to desert his family in order to have that family obtain public assistance."

Therefore, Flemming said, the aid to dependent children's law should be amended to authorize dependent children's grants based "strictly on need" and "not on the presence or absence of the father."

ARE IN ACCORD

On that point, Flemming and the new Kennedy administration are in accord.

A first step in that direction is the President's proposal to amend the law to permit grant to dependent children of unemployed parents beginning April 1 and continuing through June 30, 1962. For that period, the program is expected to aid 750,000 children at a cost of $305 million. Hearings on the measure begin Wednesday before the House Ways and Means Committee.

Prior to the expiration date of this program, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff expects to have ready for Congress a family and child welfare services plan which would bring together all Federal relief programs and social services aimed at helping needy families.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 17, 1961]

AFTER 2 MONTHS OF SNOW—BRICKLAYER'S FAMILY OF 13 IS NOW DESTITUTE

(By Luther P. Jackson)

Before the first snowfall in December, the Washington bricklayer was living with his wife and 11 children in a 6-room apartment. Six snowfalls later, the family is rooming with his wife's 70-year-old grandmother in her one-room basement flat.

The grandmother sleeps in a bed; the family of 13 sleeps on the basement floor.

The 33-year-old bricklayer, who shall be called Louis Wilson, is one of about 20,000 Washington area construction workers who have been idled by the severe weather. Most of these workers have drawn on their savings, or turned to relatives and friends. The United Givers Fund is trying to help such families in a limited emergency appeal for $58,000.

While the Wilsons were evicted for not paying rent for January and December they could turn only to the grandmother who lives on the $57.47 a month that she receives from the Department of Public Welfare under the old-age assistance program.

But when Wilson applied for public assistance, he was told there is no public program which could help his family. As long as he kept his health and remained at home, he was ineligible under the special welfare programs for the elderly, the blind, the disabled, and dependent children. He was told to try the Salvation Army.

So Wilson took his place yesterday in a line of silent men wearing heavy work clothes. None could draw unemployment benefits. They are paid by the hour, and get nothing when they do not work.

Most of the men were construction laborers—the men who mix concrete, haul bricks and lumber, grade streets and highways. Wilson had once been a laborer himself, but he soon advanced to bricklayer's helper, and finally he became a bricklayer.

Before the snow came, Wilson was earning $130 a week; not bad for a high school graduate, but not good enough to permit a man with 11 children, aged 2 to 15, to put anything aside. But Wilson had kept his growing family together and the rent, $60, was reasonable. Wilson's children attended Sunday school and two of his boys were Boy Scouts.

But after he was idled by the snow, Wilson rented a cab, but had to quit driving it when he could not meet his payments. He got a warning from his landlord on the December rent. At the end of January, he came home one day from job hunting to find his furniture and household goods out in the snow. His belongings had been looted by his neighbors.

"They even took my trowels, my levels, and joiners," the bricklayer recalls.

So Wilson picked up his family and moved in with his wife's grandmother, a matriarch who is known in her building for her kindnesses to neighbors and friends.

Yesterday her little room was spilling over with the 5 of 11 children, an aged, shriveled man with a cane, and her son. The five preschool children were seated in quiet bewilderment in a row on the only bed.

Wilson came home last night with a bag of food from the Salvation Army. He also will get clothes and a month's rent, if he can find another place to live.

The UGF special appeal is designed to shore up the dwindling cash reserves and supplies for the Salvation Army and six other agencies who serve the poor and the temporarily poor. Those seeking to contribute to the appeal may address their checks or money orders to the United Givers Fund Emergency Appeal, 1101 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Help will have to come soon to help the Wilson family. Wilson is bitter because he could get no help for his family from the welfare department "after I had worked all my life, only to have everything wiped out in 2 months."

Unless help comes, Wilson says there is only one way out. He said he would leave his wife and 11 children so that they would be eligible for public assistance under the program of aid to dependent children.

"I'll leave my family so they can get some help," he said. "My kids will have to get up off that basement floor. That's all there is to it."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 19, 1961]

LIFE ON DOLE NO JOY IN NATION'S CAPITAL

(By Bernard W. Scholz)

We hear so much about people who are chiselers and who are enjoying a life of ease and comfort on the dole, yet many people apparently fail to realize that there are large segments of the population which are in utter distress and for which there is no public relief available at all.

There is no unemployment relief in the Nation's Capital. No matter how urgent the need, no matter how hungry the children, no matter how cold the home, no matter how sick the mother, if the man is employable but is out of a job and has used up his unemployment benefits, there is no public relief whatsoever available to him in the city of Washington.

Similarly, there is no public aid for the underemployed. When a man's earning power is inadequate to support his growing family, when he falls behind in his rental payments, when his lights are turned off, when the car in which he drives to work is repossessed, when he can't pay his doctor bills, when his children are missing school because they have no shoes or warm clothes, there is no public aid available in the District of Columbia. As long as he is employable, no matter how inadequate his wages, the Department of Public Welfare cannot touch him.

And, finally, there is no supplementation from public funds in cases of sudden emergency. If a husband and wife have both been working and have been providing adequately, but in a marginal way, for their family, and the mother has to go to the hospital on account of a new pregnancy, there is no agency that can use public funds to substitute for the mother's missing wages. As long as the head of the household is able to work, whether he does work or not, whether his earnings are adequate or not, the doors to public aid are closed.

NO PRIVATE RECOURSE

According to a recent estimate, there are twice as many families living below assistance standards in Washington as there are actually on assistance. And the fact that the public agency is not able to help does not mean that one of the red-feather agencies will pick up the tab.

There is not one private agency in town that is prepared financially or programwise to give long-range economic support to low-income families. That is expected to be the public agency's prerogative.

Family and child service, Catholic charities, Jewish social service or the Salvation Army will come to the rescue with an individual payment. When a family has been evicted, they may pay 1 month's rent. When the wage earner's check has been lost or stolen, they may be able to replace it in part as a one-shot action. But not one agency in town would be able to assume financial responsibility for a family week in and week out, month in and month out, possibly for years, as does the department of public welfare in the cases which it does accept.

TRANSFERABLE BURDEN

But even those families of which the community thinks as theoretically eligible for assistance face any number of restrictions that may bar them from badly needed aid. A mother whose husband is in an institution or has deserted automatically becomes the head of the household, and the same criteria that applied to the man in the examples mentioned above now suddenly apply to her. If her children are in school so that she is not needed to care for them during the day, and if she is physically well, then she is an employable head of the household and not eligible for aid.

When a woman and her children are receiving assistance and an employable boy friend moves into the home, not only she but all of her children become ineligible for assistance, although the man has not the slightest legal or other responsibility for them.

When a child becomes 18 or drops out of school at 16, he becomes ineligible for assistance regardless of whether he has a job or is equipped to look for a job. Unless he is physically or mentally handicapped and, therefore, eligible for assistance in his own right, he will be cut off and become a burden to the rest of the family.

If a man has had an accident and can no longer do the type of work he did before, but is still employable for some kind of work, no matter how much diminished his earning power may be, he is considered as again available for work on the competitive labor market and he and his family are ineligible for assistance.

When an aged woman can no longer support herself but has a grandchild living in Washington who has managed to pull himself up by the bootstraps and find a good job, then the grandmother suddenly becomes a millstone around the neck of the grandchild, who under the law becomes responsible for her support no matter how completely family ties may have been severed in the intervening generation.

So you can see that it is very much a matter like the Biblical camel passing through the needle's eye to become a relief recipient in Washington. And still the relief load is steadily increasing.

No matter how much prosperity the country as a whole enjoys, no matter how steady employment in the Nation's Capital may be, the number of welfare cases keeps going up, month after month and year after year, much to the consternation of those who have to approve the public welfare budget and those who foot the bill. What is the reason for this?

The fact is that, from a social and economic standpoint, there is no such thing as a District of Columbia. There is only a large metropolitan area centered around the old city of Washington and extending in sprawling suburbs into the Maryland and Virginia countryside.

What makes this picture so unbalanced is the ugly and painful truth that segregation and discrimination have set up an iron curtain along the District line and along the Potomac. Young people may grow up within the confines of the District of Columbia, but when they come of age, when they marry, when their earning power increases and they are ready to raise a family, then they move out into the suburbs to own what one city planner called a play yard with a house on it and become citizens of suburbia if they are white.

If they are Negroes, they are not welcome in Maryland or Virginia and have to stay in the District, but even in the District they are facing job discrimination. High school graduates and even graduates of teachers colleges and Howard University find that jobs as busboys, charwomen, maids, taxi drivers, janitors, or typists are open to them, but when it comes to the better paying jobs, discrimination begins. The jobs of waitresses in the better restaurants and hotels, or of saleladies in the better stores, are still reserved for white applicants.

We recently read that one Negro has finally been admitted as an electrician on a federally financed project, and at long last we have a few Negro streetcar conductors and bus drivers. But just as we still have to see the first Negro play in the National Symphony, so we find that throughout the city the better paying jobs are firmly held in white hands.

And thus the Negro population, whose birth rate is higher than that of its white fellow citizens, is artificially held down to a lower economic level where it is less prepared to meet old age, sickness, and other emergencies.

And where this low-income Negro population is kept from enjoying the benefits of suburban living and equal job opportunities, life is made more and more complex and expensive in the confines of the city, where large-scale slum clearance projects are fast eliminating the residual low-cost private housing, driving rents up to ever higher levels, causing ever-increasing overcrowding, forcing refugees from renewal areas into formerly thinly populated sections of the city and spreading the blight that of necessity goes with unhealthy housing conditions, because public housing fails to make up for the loss of wrecked low-cost dwellings.

Thus it comes about that while the District is actually losing population, it is forced by the noose of segregation to contain the entire low-income population of the whole metropolitan area, and that it creates by its own discriminatory practices social conditions which perpetuate marginal existence, dependency, delinquency and the high cost of social services.

As was pointed out before: In order to be eligible at all for relief in the District of Columbia, one has to be aged, totally disabled, blind, or a dependent child whose mother conducts herself in a way that raises no question of eligibility. But let no one tell you that life on the dole is a joy in Washington.

The rent paid to a single person is $36 a month, and you can well imagine what kind of housing is available at that price level. Small allowances for heat, utilities, and refrigeration bring the total shelter allowance up to $47 monthly, to which is added $25 for food and $11 for clothing, personal incidentals, and household needs, resulting in a monthly relief payment of $83.

Just to explain to you why I am so exercised about our public assistance situation, let me remind you that public assistance expenditures have been higher this year than the official forecasts. As a result, our agency has at this point spent $800,000 more than was anticipated, and unless Congress comes through with a deficiency appropriation, we will have to do the unthinkable, scandalous thing of cutting these starvation allowances by 20 or more percent for the remainder of the fiscal year.

Engineer Commissioner Welling, shortly before he left the city, became very much concerned about the progressive deterioration of the second precinct, and as his swan song, as it were, he initiated a project aimed at the social and spiritual rehabilitation of the area, urging that ways be found to instill in the inhabitants of the second precinct a sense of pride in their community and a feeling of belonging.

I have been wondering ever since what it would feel like to be a resident of the second precinct: to see the hordes of clerks and officials of my local government swarm in from their suburban homes in Maryland and Virginia in the morning, tell me how to spend my money, how to run my life, and leave again in the evening to their "play yard with a house on it" in the suburbs, where they vote, go to church, send their children to school, and hold office in civic organizations.

And left behind in the night are the people of the second precinct, without vote, without representation, whose public health clinic was taken away when the old Polk School was razed, whose public welfare offices were removed when the old Business High School was torn down, whose trees were chopped down and whose front yards were taken away when New York and Rhode Island Avenues were widened so people could pass the second precinct faster and in whose midst was planted a huge dump of police-impounded wrecked automobiles as a monument to civic pride and "a sense of belonging."

Obviously, the problems facing Washington are not problems the Department of Public Welfare can solve; they are problems pervading every facet of community life and requiring the imagination, effort and cooperation of every community agency for their solution.

But let no one think that much research, study, and planning are needed before the attack on these problems can begin. Studies have been made, research has been done, plans have been outlined, blueprints have been drawn; all we need to do is to follow them.

Where is the money coming from? is the question always raised when these proposals are brought up in the meeting of the mighty. The money is there, I assure you; the real problem is only a matter of choice.

This whole discussion reminds me of my own situation: Although my wife and I are working and earn good salaries, we were "too poor" this past Christmas to give ourselves a color TV set—because we had just bought a new hi-fi and a Volkswagen as a second car.

The District is in the same deplorable condition. It is building a beautiful depressed 12th Street under the Mall and is planning to dig a tunnel under the Lincoln Memorial; it has just spent $1 million to pave over the Wisconsin Avenue streetcar tracks which have not bothered anybody for the past 50 years, and it is therefore unable to raise $800,000 to meet its relief payroll.

Clearly, the money is there, the challenge is there, the experts, the blueprints, the solutions are available. It is only a matter of choice, a matter of conscience, a matter of farsightedness as to what action we choose.

Family of Four Needs $84 a Week Minimum

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—By their own appraisal of living costs, Americans figure that it requires almost three times as much money to get along today as it did 24 years ago.

For nearly a quarter-century, the Gallup poll has maintained an index of the minimum amount which the public believes a family of four needs each week. In 1937—when this index was started—$30 a week was the average amount named.

Today, the median average figure cited is $84 a week.

The Federal Government maintains an index of consumer prices for urban families. Admittedly, however, this does not measure the standard of living or the many other things that go today to make up the cost of living.

To establish the public's own cost of living index, the Gallup poll has regularly asked this question of a cross-section of persons from all regions of the country:

"What is the smallest amount of money a family of four (husband, wife, and two children) needs each week to get along on in this community?"

The median average of replies (meaning half named a higher sum, half a lower one) is $84. Two years ago, the minimum amount that was felt to be needed averaged at $79—or an increase of $5 since 1959.

Following is the trend since 1937:

Week:	
1937	$30
1947	43
1948	50
1950	50
1952	60
1954	60
1957	72
1959	79
Today	84

The minimum amount of money varies among regions of the country to a substantial degree. The sum is highest in the fast-growing Far West, where the average of replies was $104 per week.

Here are the results by regions:

Week:	
East	$95
Midwest	84
South	66
Far West	104

Poverty, Dependency: Can a Community Organize To Solve These Problems?

(By Bernard W. Scholz)

(SPEAKER'S NOTE.—The following address was delivered on January 11, 1961, before the League of Women Voters of the District of Columbia, following a paper by John W. Limbert of the U.S. Employment Service, in which he showed how in Utica, N.Y., an aroused community, through concentrated effort of its coordinated services and facilities, constructively dealt with even those of its multiproblem cases which had hitherto resisted all efforts at rehabilitation while absorbing almost all of the community's welfare services. Without any intent of minimizing the tremendous progress made in Washington over the past 10 years in such areas as school integration, construction of model welfare institutions, or rehabilitation of its public hospital facilities, this paper is trying to alert the community to the threat posed to its future development by unmet critical social needs.)

To assure that we are all clear about the magnitude and the nature of the problems facing the District of Columbia, permit me to begin by sketching out, in broad strokes, the social situation as we face it today:

NO FREEDOM FROM WANT

We hear so much about people who are chiselers and who are enjoying a life of ease and comfort on the dole, yet many people apparently fail to realize that there are large segments of the population who are in utter distress and for whom there is no public relief available at all.

There is no unemployment relief in the Nation's Capital. No matter how urgent the need, no matter how hungry the children, no matter how cold the home, no matter how sick the mother: If the man is employable, but is out of a job and has used up his unemployment benefits, there is no public relief whatsoever available to him in the city of Washington.

Similarly, there is no public aid for the underemployed: When a man's earning power is inadequate to support his growing family, when he falls behind in his rental payments, when his lights are turned off, when the car in which he drives to work is repossessed, when he can't pay his doctor bills, when his children are missing school because they have no shoes or warm clothes, there is no public aid available in the District of Columbia. As long as he is employable, no matter how inadequate his wages, the department of public welfare cannot touch him.

And finally, there is no supplementation from public funds in cases of sudden emergency: If a husband and wife have both been working and have been providing adequately, but in a marginal way, for their family, and the mother has to go to the hospital on account of a new pregnancy, there is no agency that can use public funds to substitute for the mother's missing wages. As long as the head of the household is able to work, whether he does work or not, whether his earnings are adequate or not, the doors to public aid are closed.

According to a recent estimate, there are twice as many families living below assistance standards in Washington as there are actually on assistance. And don't misunderstand me: The fact that the public agency is not able to help, does not mean that one of the red-feather agencies will pick up the tab. There is not one agency in town that is prepared financially or programwise to give long-range economic support to low-income families. That is expected to be the public agency's prerogative.

Family and Child Service, Catholic Charities, Jewish Social Service, or the Salvation Army will come to the rescue with an individual payment: When a family has been evicted, they may pay 1 month's rent: When the wage earner's check has been lost or stolen, they may be able to replace it in part as a one-shot action. But not one agency in town would be able to assume financial responsibility for a family week in and week out, month in and month out, possibly for years, as does the Department of Public Welfare in the cases which it does accept.

CHARITY FOR FEW

But even those families of whom the community thinks as theoretically eligible for assistance, face any number of restrictions that may bar them from badly needed aid. A mother whose husband is in an institution or has deserted, automatically becomes the head of the household and the same criteria that applied to the man in the examples mentioned before, now suddenly apply to her: If her children are in school so that she is not needed to care for them during the day, and if she is physically well, then she is an employable head of the household and not eligible for aid.

When a woman and her children are receiving assistance and an employable boyfriend moves into the home, not only she, but all of her children become ineligible for assistance, although the man has not the slightest legal or other responsibility for them.

When a child becomes 18 years old or drops out of school at age 16, he becomes ineligible for assistance regardless of whether he has a job or is equipped to look for a job. Unless he is physically or mentally handicapped and therefore eligible for assistance in his own right, he will be cut off and become a burden to the rest of the family.

If a man has had an accident and can no longer do the type of work he did before, but is still employable for some kind of work, no matter how much diminished his earning power may be, he is considered as again available for work on the competitive labor market, and he and his family are ineligible for assistance.

When an aged person can no longer support herself but has a grandchild living in Washington who has managed to pull himself up by the bootstraps and find a good job, then the grandmother suddenly becomes a millstone around the grandchild's neck who under the law become responsible for her support no matter how completely family ties may have been severed in the intervening generation.

So you can see that actually it is very much a matter like the biblical camel passing through the needle's eye to become a relief recipient in Washington.

A GROWING RELIEF LOAD IN A PROSPEROUS CITY

And still the relief load is steadily increasing. No matter how much prosperity the country as a whole enjoys, no matter how steady employment in the Nation's Capital may be, the number of welfare cases keeps going up, month after month and year after year, much to the consternation of those who have to approve the public welfare budget and foot the bill. What is the reason for this?

The fact of the matter is that from a social and economic standpoint, there is no such thing as a District of Columbia. There is only a large metropolitan area, centered around the old city of Washington, and extending in sprawling suburbs into the Maryland and Virginia countryside. What makes this picture so unbalanced, is the ugly and painful truth that segregation and discrimination have set up an iron curtain along the District line and along the Potomac. Young people may grow up within the confines of the District of Columbia, but when they come of age, when they marry, when their earning power increases and they are ready to raise a family, then they move out into the suburbs, to own what one city planner called "a play yard with a house on it" and become citizens of suburbia—if they are white. If they are colored, they are not welcome in Maryland or Virginia and have to stay in the District, but even in the District, they are facing job discrimination: High school graduates and even graduates of teachers' colleges and of Howard University find that jobs as busboys, charwomen, maids, taxi drivers, janitors or typists are open to them, but when it comes to the better paying jobs, discrimination begins. The jobs of waitresses in the better restaurants and hotels, as saleslades in the better stores, are still reserved for white applicants. We recently read that one Negro has finally been admitted as an electrician on a federally financed project, and at long last we have a few Negro streetcar conductors and bus drivers. But just as we still have to see the first Negro play in the National Symphony, so we find that throughout the city the better paying jobs are firmly held in white hands. And thus the Negro population, whose birth rate is higher than that of their white fellow citizens, is artificially held down to a lower economic level where they are less prepared to meet old age, sickness, and other emergencies.

And just as this colored low-income population is kept from enjoying the benefits of suburban living and of equal job opportunities, so life is made more and more complex and expensive for them in the confines of the city where large-scale slum clearance projects are fast eliminating the residual low-cost private housing, driving rents up to ever higher levels, causing ever increasing overcrowding, forcing refugees from renewal areas into formerly thinly populated sections of the city, and spreading the blight that of necessity goes with unhealthy housing conditions, because public housing fails to make up for the loss of wrecked low-cost dwellings.

Thus it comes that while the District is actually losing population, it is forced by the noose of segregation to contain the entire low-income population of the whole metropolitan area, and that it creates by its own discriminatory practices social conditions which perpetuate marginal existence, dependency, delinquency, and the high cost of social services.

DISTRESS ON THE DOLE

As was pointed out before: In order to be eligible at all for relief in the District of Columbia, one has to be aged, totally disabled, blind, or a dependent child whose mother conducts herself in a way that raises no question of eligibility. But let no one tell you that life on the dole is a joy in Washington.

The rent paid to a single person is $36 a month, and you can well imagine what kind of housing is available at that price level. Small allowances for heat, utilities, and refrigeration bring the total shelter allowance up to $47 monthly, to which is added $25 for food, $11 for clothing, personal incidentals, and household needs, resulting in a monthly relief payment of $83.

You may wonder where this munificent sum of $25 monthly for food comes from. Well, it is what used to be the "low-low" food budget of the Department of Agriculture, which was recommended for brief emergency periods, and was not considered adequate to sustain what is called a sense of health and well-being. The Department of Agriculture has ceased quoting this "low-low" figure, because too much mischief was done with it, and uses only the low income budget today. But we in the District continue to use the "low-low" figures of April 1957—and as you know there has been a steady increase in the cost of food, clothing, and shelter ever since that time.

Just to give you a few other figures: $33 a month is the average allowance for a child in aid to dependent children, $110 is what is supposed to pay for room, board, and nursing care; and any other income a family may have, be it from survivors insurance, from a veterans pension, from workmens compensation, or from a legally responsible relative, has to be deducted from these meager figures.

Just to explain to you why I am so exercised about our public assistance situation, let me remind you that public assistance expenditures have been higher this year than the official forecasts of the District of Columbia. Budget Office would admit; that as a result our agency has at this point spent $800,000 more than had been anticipated and that, unless Congress comes through with a deficiency appropriation, we will have to do the unthinkable, scandalous thing of cutting these starvation allowances by 20 or more percent for the remainder of the fiscal year because there is no money from any other source with which we could make up the deficit.

To me, this calamity overshadows everything else we have today been talking and thinking about: That it should be possible in the capital of the richest nation of the world to take an appropriation deficit out of the hide of the most impoverished, the most defenseless, the disfranchised poor of the community. In Belgium, as you know, there have been street riots, because the Premier's austerity program threatened the pensions of the aged, the widows, the orphans and the disabled. But here in Washington there has been no public outcry,

there have been no newspaper headlines, there have been no protest meetings, there has not been any evidence at all of an uneasy stirring of the social conscience of the community at the spectre of taking the bread from those who are already hungry, of taking the clothes from those who are already inadequately clothed, and of impairing the health and happiness of 18,000 dependent children whom on the Fourth of July we proudly refer to as the future citizens of the community.

THE COMMUNITY'S UNEASY CONSCIENCE

Of course, deep down, the community's conscience is uneasy, and measures are therefore taken to serve as tranquilizers. Nothing is being done, to be sure, to attack the core of the problem, to take real constructive and preventive measures and to spend real money. Instead, little fringe benefit programs have been established that have reassuring names, that can be pointed to as taking care of what the broad programs are not providing for. Surplus food is being distributed to thousands of families at a rate of $7.11 per head per month, a school lunch program provides free lunches to hungry children during 180 of the year's 365 days, a displaced families unit gives counsel and consolation to large families who have been displaced by District government action and for whom adequate lodging is simply not available, and finally a new project has just been authorized for the upgrading and social rehabilitation of the shameless second precinct, the well-known area between Massachusetts and Florida Avenue, 14th and North Capitol Streets, the area with the city's highest delinquency rate, highest illegitimacy rate and highest density of relief recipients.

Let us be clear about this: The community conscience has not been stirred enough to create any preventive program. The department of public welfare may only step in after the breakdown has occurred, when a family has fallen apart, when a man is in the hospital, when sickness or old age have taken their toll to the point of unemployability: Then the public assistance division is there to lend a helping hand; when children have been abandoned, mistreated, or neglected into delinquency, then the juvenile court and the child welfare division leap into the breach with receiving home, Junior Village, foster home placements and the magnificent children's center at Laurel. But there is no money, no staff, no facility and no program for the prevention of social breakdown.

The fire department has its fire prevention bureau, the health department its division of preventable diseases and its director of health education, the police department has its traffic school and learns through its accident investigation division the lessons necessary for accident prevention, but there is no counterpart to any of these organizational units in the department of public welfare. We are nothing but a wrecking crew, an ambulance, or a grave digger. You may have seen that splendid British movie, "Sapphire," where at the end the young detective proudly says, "Well, we finally solved this one," and the old inspector wryly says, "We didn't solve a thing—we merely picked up the pieces," and that is what our department is largely restrained to do at the present time.

THE FEELING OF BELONGING

Engineer Commissioner Welling, shortly before he left the city, became very much concerned about the progressive deterioration of the second precinct, and as his swan song, as it were, he initiated a project aimed at the social and spiritual rehabilitation and restoration of the area, urging that ways be found to instill in the inhabitants of the second precinct a sense of pride in their community and a feeling of belonging.

I have been wondering ever since, what it would feel like to be a citizen of the second precinct: To see the hordes of clerks and officials of their local government swarm in from their suburban homes in Maryland and Virginia in the morning, tell them how to spend their money, how to run their lives, and leave again in the evening to their play yards with a house on it in the suburbs where they voted, went to church, sent their children to school, and held office in civic organizations.

And left behind, in the dark of night, would be the people of the second precinct, without vote, without representation, whose public health clinic was taken away when the old Polk School was razed, whose public welfare officers were removed when the old Business High School was torn down, whose trees were chopped down and whose front yards were taken away when New York and Rhode Island Avenues were widened so people could pass the second precinct faster, and in whose midst was planted a huge dump of police-impounded wrecked automobiles as a monument to civic pride and a sense of belonging.

TOTAL WAR ON POVERTY AND DECAY

Obviously, from what we have seen, the problems facing Washington are not problems the Department of Public Welfare can solve—they are problems pervading every facet of community life, and requiring the imagination, effort, and cooperation of every community agency for their solution.

But let no one think that much research, study, and planning are needed before the attack on these problems can begin, before total war on poverty and decay in the District can be waged. Studies have been made, research has been done, plans have been outlined, blueprints have been drawn, all we need is to follow them.

The study undertaken by the Health and Welfare Council under the title "What Price Dependency?" and the report prepared by our Department at the request of Commissioner Karrick in October 1959 on "Public Assistance in the District of Columbia" which became known as the Karrick report, are full of 92 concrete proposals that only need to be picked up and carried out. The only obstacle so far has been the unwillingness of the community to do so.

"Where is the money coming from?" is the question always raised when these proposals are brought up in the meetings of the mighty. The money is there, I assure you; the real problem is only a matter of choices. This whole discussion reminds me of my own situation: Although my wife and I are working and earn good salaries, we were "too poor" this past Christmas to give ourselves a color TV set—because we had just bought a new hi-fi and a Volkswagen as a second car. The District is in the same deplorable condition: It is building a beautiful "depressed" 12th Street under the Mall and is planning to dig a tunnel under the Lincoln Memorial; it has just spent $1 million to pave over the streetcar tracks on Wisconsin Avenue which have not bothered anybody for the past 50 years, and it is therefore unable to raise $800,000 to meet its relief payroll. Clearly, the money is there, the challenge is there, the experts, the blueprints, the solutions are available. It is only a matter of choice, a matter of conscience, a matter of farsightedness as to what action we choose.

Congress has found itself unable to appropriate the $7 million which would make the difference between the $32 million promised Federal payment and the $25 million we actually received. Yet every time one of those $5 million shots at Cape Canaveral misfires, these same legislators just shrug their shoulders: Just one of these things. Not that this $7 million payment would make the difference. We could still spend it for any number of worthwhile civic projects, and still not have the money to meet the social crisis of our community. The real trouble is our failure to recognize that to safeguard the future of the 18,000 children now on relief is the most important long-range investment we could make.

This is where the League of Women Voters could do its most valuable job: Not by looking at poverty, delinquency, dependency and decay as problems that had best be swept under the rug by an increased welfare appropriation, but by a conscious campaign for better housing, better clinics, better recreation facilities, better job opportunities for young colored boys and girls, and a clearer recognition of the fact that the future of a community is as bright as the future it offers its children.

NEGLIGENCE IN THE MANAGEMENT OF THE INVENTORY OF THE U.S. ARMY JAPAN DEPOT-COMPLEX

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss a situation involving inexcusable negligence in the management of the inventory of the U.S. Army Japan Depot-Complex.

The Comptroller General has recently submitted a report to the Congress calling our attention to the inexcusable failure to catalog the inventories at this depot, with the result that they were turning down orders for supplies on the basis that the material was not in inventory when in reality had their records been up to date they not only had the material but in many instances had an oversupply. In fact, in one 5-month period the warehouse refusal rate averaged 22 percent; however, with the inventories' readjustment following the Comptroller General's audit approximately 3,000 line items which had been determined as not being available were released to fill customer requisitions.

These unsatisfactory inventory stock records resulted in the overstocking of many items. For example:

First. At the Yokohama Commissary they had enough insecticide in their inventories to fill their requirements for over 60 years.

Second. They had enough furniture wax to last almost 10 years.

Third. They had more than a full year's requirement of spices.

Fourth. They had enough seasoning in inventory to last them approximately 7 years.

Many other items found in their inventories were sufficient to fulfill their maximum requirements for more than the next 10 years.

At some of the depots, their inventory records were so loose that they were selling as surplus certain materials while at the same time they were buying the same products in the front office. For example:

At one property disposal yard they sold 25 new generators for $3,400 and 1 reconditioned maintenance truck for $405. The record shows that requisition orders were on hand at the same time for this same type of equipment with valuations of $31,200 and $12,000, respectively.

In addition, tires valued at $89,000 were found in the property disposal yard about to be sold as surplus although their records showed that these tires were needed to fill MAP and Army requirements in Japan and Korea.

On July 15, 1959, the MAOT–C reported that rework of certain vehicles was being performed at an additional cost to MAP of $159,630 although the vehicles were reported acceptable without the rework. Members of the Military Assistance Observation Team C, MAOT–C, which was established to insure worldwide uniformity in the application of MAP standards, accompanied the Comptroller General's audit team on its tour of the depot-complex reconditioning line, and those qualified inspectors agreed that this unnecessary work was being performed.

The Comptroller General said that the failure to use such assets to fill their requirements occurred because in most instances stocks which were declared surplus had not been screened against requirements for over a year.

Altogether, this report of the Comptroller General is a shocking indictment of mismanagement of the procurement policies of the U.S. Army at this depot.

The Comptroller General specifically charged that the supply management of the transportation ordnance, and quartermaster's stocks at the depot complex was not being performed in an effective manner. A summary of their review disclosed that requirements had been overstated by approximately $2.2 million and stock valued at $775,000 was being reserved or retained to fill requirements which no longer existed.

As the result of the Comptroller General's report calling these matters to their attention the depot officials canceled orders on continental U.S. sources for supplies valued at approximately $1.7 million, and they released for use in other areas material in the amount of $775,000 which was being reserved for equipment rebuild programs that had since been completed.

As the result of the new warehouse inventory which was completed following the Comptroller General's criticism, material valued at $27.8 million was added to the stock records, and material valued at $19.3 million was deleted.

The time is long past due when we can be satisfied with mere promises by these services that they will make corrections and do better the next time.

In private industry such loose management would not be condoned and those responsible would be fired, with competent men selected to take their place. These Government agencies should be conducted on the same businesslike basis. This is taxpayers' money.

Over a period of the past several years the Comptroller General's office has done an excellent job in calling our attention to these examples of inefficiency. At a time when our budget is already overstrained, certainly more affirmative action is needed.

What puzzles me is, if these agencies do not know within millions how much inventory they have on hand, how do they balance their books?

RESEARCH IN THE FIELD OF METEOROLOGY—MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF VOTE ON THE PASSAGE OF A BILL AND REQUEST FOR HOUSE TO RETURN PAPERS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on Thursday, February 16, under the heading "Research in the Field of Meteorology," at page 2200 of the RECORD, the RECORD shows that the Senate passed Calendar No. 44, S. 681, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences.

The RECORD at that page shows that I inquired of the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], whether it would be possible under the proposed legislation for contracts to be made under which a contractor would be permitted to retain patent rights.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] advised:

> To the best of my knowledge, the answer is that the bill contains no such provision and does not affect such situations.

Actually, the bill broadens somewhat the power presently available to the Secretary of Commerce to let contracts to private parties for research in the field of meteorology and it does permit the result which the Senator from Montana did not think the bill would permit.

That being the case, I would have been compelled to object to the bill had I fully understood what was in the measure. Accordingly, I discussed the subject with the majority leader, and he agrees with me that the measure should be and could be properly reconsidered.

Therefore, I enter a motion that the vote by which Calendar No. 44, S. 681, was passed be reconsidered, and I move that the House be requested to return the papers on that measure to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, February 22, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 20, 1961:

The following-named persons to the offices indicated:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Roger W. Tubby, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

John H. Leddy, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

James M. Quigley, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Newell A. George, of Kansas, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Kansas for a term of 4 years, vice Wilbur G. Leonard.

Lawrence Gubow, of Michigan, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Michigan for the term of 4 years, vice Frederick W. Kaess, resigned.

James P. O'Brien, of Illinois, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years, vice Robert Tieken, term expired.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

William A. McRae, Jr., of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida, vice William J. Barker, retired.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Richard S. Morse, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

William F. Schaub, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice George Holmes Roderick, resigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE RESERVE

The following named officers for appointment in the Air Force Reserve to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 35, title 10 of the United States Code and sections 8373 and 8376, title 10 of the United States Code, as amended by Public Law 559–86th Congress:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. William P. Farnsworth, AO922626 (brigadier general, Air Force Reserve) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard L. Meiling, AO370824, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. John H. Foster, AO284572, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Frank T. McCoy, Jr., AO310412, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Jay G. Brown, AO289764, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Jess Larson, AO190462, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Ramsay D. Potts, Jr., AO431039, Air Force Reserve.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Andrew B. Cannon, AO383870 (colonel, Air Force Reserve) U.S. Air Force.

Col. William R. Lovelace, AO337848, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Benjamin W. Fridge, AO365107, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Nicholas E. Allen, AO373452, Air Force Reserve.

Col. John W. Richardson, AO290829, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Robert W. Smart, AO1178629, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Thomas H. King, AO919798, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Joseph T. Benedict, AO317956, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Wilbur A. Smith, AO230815, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Howard W. Cannon, AO383170, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Alexander B. Andrews, AO900076, Air Force Reserve.

Col. William C. Lewis, Jr., AO944440, Air Force Reserve.

Col. John I. Lerom, AO532225, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Russell F. Gustke, AO659814, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Edward J. Haseltine, AO287957, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Asa W. Candler, AO341742, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Roger L. Zeller, AO659439, Air Force Reserve.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 835, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Lt. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll, 23161A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Richard T. Coiner, Jr., 619A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Troup Miller, Jr., 559A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William T. Thurman, 1034A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John D. Stevenson, 1320A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Henry R. Spicer, 1487A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Wendell W. Bowman, 596A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Harold C. Donnelly, 647A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Arno H. Luehman, 1080A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Stanley J. Donovan, 1089A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Dolf E. Muehleisen, 1144A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles M. McCorkle, 1224A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Lloyd P. Hopwood, 1261A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Don O. Darrow, 1270A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Victor R. Haugen, 1292A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Edwin B. Broadhurst, 1350A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles B. Westover, 1351A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Ben I. Funk, 1500A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Marvin C. Demler, 1550A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William E. Eubank, Jr., 1741A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. William C. Kingsbury, 923A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Frank P. Corbin, Jr., 929A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William J. Bell, 930A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Jermain F. Rodenhauser, 933A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Allen W. Rigsby, 943A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph E. Gill, 2071A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William L. Rogers, 1060A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George B. Dany, 1061A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William H. Wise, 1083A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Albert T. Wilson, Jr., 1086A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John W. White, 1087A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas J. Gent, Jr., 1130A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Cecil E. Combs, 1203A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Dwight O. Monteith, 1205A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Conrad F. Necrason, 1246A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles B. Root, 1258A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Homer A. Boushey, 1269A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Chester W. Cecil, 1298A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Augustus M. Minton, 1301A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jack N. Donohew, 1319A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Nils O. Ohman, 1321A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert Taylor, 3d, 1347A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Curtis R. Low, 1349A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Henry G. Thorne, Jr., 1514A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William B. Keese, 1531A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Avelin P. Tacon, Jr., 1566A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Delmar E. Wilson, 1587A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John W. Carpenter, 3d, 1647A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig Gen. James B. Knapp, 1668A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jack G. Merrell, 1687A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Marvin L. McNickle, 1721A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James C. McGehee, 1746A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Arthur C. Agan, Jr., 1759A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Paul S. Emrick, 1801A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas E. Moore, 1804A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James E. Roberts, 1846A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Horace M. Wade, 1872A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Austin J. Russell, 1980A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert H. Warren, 1987A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Francis C. Gideon, 1993A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Theodore R. Milton, 2026A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James W. Wilson, 1711A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. L. Render Braswell, 19065A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert S. Brua, 19063A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Aubrey L. Jennings, 19073A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

The following named officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Richard L. Bohannon, 19067A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Brig. Gen. Clifford H. Rees, 630A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William J. Bell, 930A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Allen W. Rigsby, 943A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph E. Gill, 2071A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John M. Breit, 1016A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William L. Rogers, 1060A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William H. Wise, 1083A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. L. Render Braswell, 19065A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Cecil E. Combs, 1203A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Nils O. Ohman, 1321A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Avelin P. Tacon, Jr., 1566A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Delmar E. Wilson, 1587A (colonel Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John W. Carpenter, III, 1647A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James B. Knapp, 1668A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert E. Greer, 1672A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John B. Bestic, 1682A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jack G. Merrell, 1687A (colonel Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Perry M. Hoisington, II, 1694A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Marvin L. McNickle, 1721A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Paul S. Emrick, 1801A (colonel Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas E. Moore, 1804A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Austin J. Russell, 1980A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert H. Warren, 1987A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Francis C. Gideon, 1993A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Theodore R. Milton, 2026A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Stewart S. Maxey, 913A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John M. Hutchison, 1079A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John R. McGraw, 19123A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Willis F. Chapman, 1121A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Jack E. Thomas, 1187A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Wilbur W. Aring, 1265A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Douglas E. Williams, 1285A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Boyd Hubbard, Jr., 1290A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Linscott A. Hall, 1342A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Jack A. Gibbs, 1384A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Baskin R. Lawrence, Jr., 1515A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Murray A. Bywater, 1586A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John H. Chick, 1607A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Kenneth R. Powell, 1614A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Kyle L. Riddle, 1617A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William S. Rader, 1636A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Thomas B. Whitehouse, 1677A, Regular Air Force.

Col. George M. Higginson, 1686A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William T. Smith, 1689A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert R. Rowland, 1806A, Regular Air Force.

Col. James W. Chapman, Jr., 1810A, Regular Air Force.

Col. David M. Jones, 1811A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John T. Fitzwater, 1827A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Pinkham Smith, 1859A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William W. Veal, 1902A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Tarleton H. Watkins, 1910A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Adriel N. Williams, 1970A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Alvan C. Gillem, II, 2025A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Rollen H. Anthis, 2053A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Horace A. Hanes, 2060A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Paul W. Norton, 2679A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Marion C. Smith, 2751A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Arthur W. Kellond, 1832A, Regular Air Force.
Col. George H. Krieger, 2953A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Oran O. Price, 3563A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Benjamin G. Willis, 3815A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Gerald F. Keeling, 3827A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Fred J. Ascani, 4036A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Gordon T. Gould, Jr., 4040A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Lewis E. Lyle, 4115A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Harry J. Sands, Jr., 4145A, Regular Air Force.
Col. John W. O'Neill, 4155A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Charles H. Roadman, 3379A, Regular Air Force, Medical.
Col. John H. Bell, 4185A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Arthur G. Salisbury, 4224A, Regular Air Force.
Col. John A. Roberts, 4380A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Donald E. Hillman, 4885A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Abe J. Beck, 5831A, Regular Air Force.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

CAPTAIN TO MAJOR

Line of the Air Force

Abrams, Edwards, Jr., 38122A.
Abramson, Emanuel M., 37586A.
Adair, Toby W., Jr., 38044A.
Adams, Michael E., 37342A.
Adams, Roy W., 37346A.
Ainsley, Edward J., 37912A.
Akers, Charles H., 38023A.
Albright, Mack E., 37258A.
Alexander, Jack D., 38465A.
Alexander, William J., 38299A.
Alford, Frank B., Jr., 37300A.
Algeo, John B., 23925A.
Algorri, Antolin, Jr., 37621A.
Allan, James B., 37393A.
Allbright, William F., 37927A.
Alldritt, Roy J., 38297A.
Allen, Bert P., 38393A.
Allen, Bryant R., 38095A.
Allen, Guy T., 38319A.
Allgood, Vernon L., 37783A.
Along, Joseph D., 38401A.
Alton, Noel S., 37792A.
Amato, Charles, 37448A.
Amend, Billy T., 37472A.
Ames, Douglas M., 22584A.
Andersen, Howard J., 37148A.
Anderson, Guveren M., 37150A.
Anderson, Hugh B., Jr., 37999A.
Anderson, James R., 37707A.
Anderson, John D., 38196A.
Anderson, Philip B., Jr., 52332A.
Anderson, Stanley L., 25532A.
Andrews, Charles P., Jr., 38145A.
Anken, Ross J., 38199A.
Armen, Leslie H., 52466A.
Armistead, Victor, 37546A.
Armstrong, Donald N., 37449A.
Arney, Cloyd L., 37866A.
Arnold, Howard B., Jr., 17651A.
Arpke, Charles K., 23834A.
Arriaga, Eusebio, 38463A.
Arrington, Harry B., 38414A.
Ash, William O., 38118A.
Ashland, Maurice I., 37856A.
Atterbury, Wilferd R., 37700A.
Aubel, Clark L., 37498A.
Aulbach, Charles E., 37386A.
Ault, Clyde E., 37806A.
Auser, Cortland P., 37465A.
Averett, John B., 38374A.
Avery, Sherwood T., 38285A.
Babits, George F., 37299A.
Bachman, Jay G., 20752A.
Bachtelle, Stewart M., 38024A.
Bacon, Thomas R., 38054A.
Bacon, William P., 38200A.
Badger, Paul R., 37769A.
Bagnard, Richard W., 37225A.
Bailey, Cecil D., 38407A.
Bailey, Myrl K., 37901A.
Bailey, William K., 37316A.
Baird, Jack R., Jr., 52480A.
Baker, Bert L., 37384A.
Baker, Charles E., 38146A.
Baker, Dwight R., Jr., 37201A.
Balch, Clayton L., Jr., 23734A.
Baldwin, Ernest A., 37653A.
Ballew, Monte, Jr., 37155A.
Ballweg, James E., 38316A.
Bamber, Edward A., 37594A.
Barfield, Herman E., 38462A.
Barger, Richard D., 38303A.
Barker, Clyde E., 38471A.
Barker, William R., 23880A.
Barnard, John R., 17920A.
Barnes, George W., Jr., 21467A.
Barnes, Levi A., 37143A.
Barnes, William B., 52378A.
Barnhill, Charles E., 37514A.
Barnhill, James W., 37863A.
Barrett, Alfred E., 37730A.
Bartell, Stephen D., 37622A.
Bartenstein, Edwin, 37367A.
Barth, Jack E., 37676A.
Barthel, George J., Jr., 38419A.
Bartlett, William H., Jr., 37212A.
Barton, Hugh H., 37612A.
Barton, James R., 38087A.
Basco, Johnnie M., 37493A.
Basler, Sterling A., 52529A.
Bastek, Edmond W., 37876A.
Bateman, Cecil E., 38131A.
Batson, Gerald W., 24365A.
Bauer, James H., 38420A.
Baumgartner, Jack E., 37482A.
Bavuso, Joseph K., 52488A.
Baylor, Melvin W., 38138A.
Beal, Frederick R., 37717A.
Bean, William S., 37197A.
Beardsley, Leonard N., 25514A.
Beatie, Charles F., Jr., 33143A.
Beaumont, Lee C., Jr., 37685A.
Beaver, Robert R., 52527A.
Becker, Clarence E., 37356A.
Becker, Jack K., 37422A.
Beckett, James V., 36430A.
Bedell, Charles H., 37948A.
Beese, Kenneth W., 37815A.
Beeson, William W., Jr., 37656A.
Bell, John C., Jr., 37611A.
Bell, William I., 37345A.
Bellovin, Milton, 17686A.
Bengston, Dean F., 37162A.
Bennert, Raymond T., 37375A.
Bennett, Gayle M., 38034A.
Bennett, Wesley E., 52435A.
Bennett, William A., 38016A.
Berbec, Cornelius P., 37741A.
Berggreen, Cole J., 23941A.
Berkovitz, Martin, 37347A.
Berman, John J., 37284A.
Berner, Lawrence E., 52402A.
Bernier, Joseph P. L., 37264A.
Berry, Charles H., 37956A.
Beseler, Eldon S., 38193A.
Bessler, Joseph F., 38176A.
Bianco, Frank J., Jr., 37755A.
Bigelow, Ralph J., 37495A.
Biggs, Buford B., 17679A.
Bijold, Eugene J., 38329A.
Birkhead, Herbert C., 52380A.
Bishop, Russell, 27678A.
Bissell, Eugene P., 37229A.
Bixler, Kenneth, 37914A.
Black, William E., 38282A.
Blackburn, William R., 38403A.
Blair, Emerson B., 37246A.
Blanchard, Felix A., Jr., 17692A.
Blanchard, Lionel D., 37667A.
Blandin, Robert W., 23735A.
Blythe, E. C., 37631A.
Blythe, John J., 37788A.
Bock, Leonard R., 37713A.
Bocken, Richard C., 25612A.
Bogusz, Leonard E., 37894A.
Bohne, Robert E., 38018A.
Bold, John E., 52407A.
Bolstridge, Leslie J., 37719A.
Bond, Joseph C., 38076A.
Bone, Vernon F., 37861A.
BonTempo, John C., 37280A.
Booth, Joseph B., 37723A.
Boots, Maurice J., 24392A.
Borini, John N., 38159A.
Borresen, Edward W., 25786A.
Boster, Charles F., 37552A.
Bouldin, Richard J., 38338A.
Bourke, Donald W., 38055A.
Bourque, Arthur D., 38328A.
Bouvier, Arthur O., Jr., 38012A.
Bowen, Robert W., 37743A.
Bower, John A. B., 37630A.
Boyce, James T., 37626A.
Boyd, John H., 38015A.
Boyd, William C., 28319A.
Boyle, Joseph M., 37731A.
Boynton, John B., 37826A.
Brady, Francis R., 37620A.
Brady, Joseph C., 48803A.
Brady, William A., 37446A.
Brashear, Wesley C., 37818A.
Braun, James A., 37978A.
Braun, Leo M., 52423A.
Breding, Robert H., 52344A.
Breedlove, James M., 17671A.
Breehl, John W., 37617A.
Brennan, Herbert O., 17653A.
Breslauer, Irving H., 37525A.
Brewer, James L., 52489A.
Brewer, William M., 37917A.
Brickates, Robert E., 55744A.
Bridges, Benjamin E., 38111A.
Bridges, Wilbur A., 36980A.
Bright, Bruce B., 38312A.
Bright, William A., Jr., 37591A.
Brisick, Edward J., 21480A.
Brittain, Joseph F., 38421A.
Brochmann, Michael J., 38074A.
Brooks, Joseph E., 37600A.
Brooks, William L., 38186A.
Broshek, John A., 37406A.
Brothers, Walter F., 37592A.
Brower, Walter L., 37526A.
Brown, Edward G., Jr., 52416A.
Brown, Francis O., 52342A.
Brown, John I., 3d, 37196A.
Brown, Lewis E., 37549A.
Brown, Walter A., Jr., 52419A.
Brown, William Y., 37149A.
Bruner, Evan R., 37359A.
Bryant, Charles S., 37722A.
Bryant, Robert L., Jr., 38270A.
Bryant, William A., 17271A.
Buckland, Richard K., 37159A.
Bueker, Frederick L., 37786A.
Bulger, Arthur R., 52439A.
Bullard, Thomas L., 52403A.
Bulow, Charles W., 37957A.
Bunch, Charles L., 37857A.
Burchfield, James E., 37858A.
Burckle, Alton G., Jr., 24267A.
Burgenheim, Miles E., 37829A.
Burgnon, Eugene L., 52464A.
Burke, Wesley A., 37444A.
Burkett, Homer H., 52413A.
Burlington, Donald R., 48800A.
Burnett, William R., 25798A.
Burney, Morris, 37852A.
Burns, Erit L., 37590A.
Burns, Warren L., 38237A.
Burry, Frank J., Jr., 52338A.

Burton, James E., 37657A.
Burton, Roy J., 37989A.
Butcher, Budd H., 37241A.
Butler, Eugene H., 38135A.
Butler, Kerwin O., 38058A.
Butz, Roy E., 38373A.
Byrne, Joseph K., 37294A.
Cahall, Donald R., 52376A.
Cain, Earl W., 37838A.
Cairl, Earl R., 37648A.
Caldwell, Charles E., 37994A.
Callahan, Joseph H., 37425A.
Callanan, William E., 38100A.
Cameron, Robert J., 37941A.
Campbell, Jack O., 38349A.
Campbell, Oliver F., 37698A.
Cann, James P., 37438A.
Cann, Robert E., 37810A.
Cannop, Carl R., 37599A.
Card, Edward R., Jr., 38347A.
Carey, Woodrow T., 52382A.
Carleton, Raymond E., 37721A.
Carley, Joseph G., Jr., 37461A.
Carlisle, Joe L., 37728A.
Carlson, Donald D., 17916A.
Caroom, Hiram C., 37370A.
Carothers, Earle T., Jr., 37817A.
Carpenter, William S., Jr., 17667A.
Carr, Charles C., 38365A.
Carson, Anthony H., 38386A.
Carson, Robert K., 37410A.
Carter, Braxton, 23726A.
Cartwright, Lewis E., 38052A.
Case, Richmond B., 38371A.
Caselman, Everett, Jr., 32406A.
Cassil, John F., 38056A.
Castillo, Bennie, 52507A.
Castleberry, Woodie O., 37361A.
Caswell, Roger W., 37538A.
Cattrell, Harry R., 24358A.
Caughron, Kenneth D., 38038A.
Cecil, Floyd M., 37799A.
Chalker, Albert E., Jr., 37629A.
Chamberlin, Lloyd W., Jr., 38246A.
Chandler, Charles B., Jr., 37341A.
Chapman, Jack W., 38228A.
Chapman, Kenneth E., 52331A.
Chapman, Lewis T., 37331A.
Chase, Fred C., 38072A.
Chase, Levi R., 37352A.
Chason, Robert L., 27680A.
Chernis, Philip B., 52526A.
Chiba, Milan A., 52346A.
Childers, David C., 37828A.
Christian, Harold K., 37908A.
Christian, William S., Jr., 38269A.
Church, Frank C., 37759A.
Ciccolella, John E., 38197A.
Clark, Allen C., 37250A.
Clark, Donald M., 38355A.
Clark, Frederick W., 38443A.
Clark, Howard W., 38309A.
Clark, Jack W., 37378A.
Clark, Leonard H., 38289A.
Clark, Reese W., 37407A.
Clees, Robert J., 38162A.
Clement, Leonard L., 37496A.
Clemovitz, Fred, 37938A.
Clinger, Bordean W., 23878A.
Clough, Leland U., 38070A.
Coapman, A. Lincoln, 52503A.
Cochran, Robert W., 38233A.
Cochran, William F., 38302A.
Cockman, Chester W., 37639A.
Coffin, Orman M., 37764A.
Cogan, Eugene J., 37770A.
Cohn, Murray E., 37932A.
Cole, John S., Jr., 37763A.
Coleman, James W., 37702A.
Coleman, Robert D., 37257A.
Collins, John R., Jr., 37942A.
Collins, John W., 37455A.
Collins, Robert W., 37907A.
Comstock, William P., 37182A.
Conklin, Theodore H., 38382A.
Conn, Richard D., 52462A.
Connor, James J., Jr., 38413A.
Connors, Arthur F., 37157A.
Connors, John A., 38105A.
Conrey, Robert L., 37355A.
Consta, Arthur L., 23718A.
Coon, William R., Jr., 37762A.
Cooper, Robert W., 37171A.
Cooper, W. Lee, Jr., 22999A.
Cooper, William E., 52496A.
Copeland, Bert F., 38459A.
Corbin, William D., 38164A.
Cornett, Edgar L., 52365A.
Costenbader, Ralph K., 38293A.
Cottongim, John E., 17626A.
Coulter, John M., 37454A.
Coulter, Richard R., 38096A.
Coumbs, Thomas J., 52427A.
Cousins, Richard D., 37961A.
Covarrubias, Robert W., 37705A.
Covi, Angelo G., 38475A.
Cowan, William M., 38318A.
Coyne, John M., Jr., 17688A.
Craft, Lee J., 37732A.
Cramer, Clyde C., 37420A.
Crawford, Milton N., 38241A.
Crawford, William A., Jr., 21797A.
Critchlow, Howard T., Jr., 37411A.
Crook, Frank D., 37545A.
Crook, Lonnie H., 37251A.
Cross, Cecil J., 52457A.
Croucher, William R., 37140A.
Crowder, Jess W., 37292A.
Crozier, Harry J., 37357A.
Crumley, James R., 38376A.
Crumpler, John R., 37189A.
Cullen, Ray W., 38379A.
Cumberledge, Robert S., 37867A.
Cummins, Charles O., 52393A.
Cunningham, William A., 38294A.
Custer, Samuel A., 37711A.
Czekaj, Walter A., 24356A.
Daggett, Stanley A., 37439A.
Dahl, John C., Jr., 37980A.
Dailey, Warren, 37849A.
Dakan, Spencer G., 52522A.
Daniels, William L., 38357A.
D'Arcy, Edward J., 38022A.
Daries, Stanton G., 25779A.
Darilek, Allen H., 52472A.
David, Lester T., 37832A.
Davis, Benjamin W., 37892A.
Davis, Frank R., 37809A.
Davis, Howard S., 21521A.
Davis, John G., 37254A.
Davis, Robert J., 38125A.
Davis, Shadrach E., 38046A.
Davison, Fred, 37219A.
Dean, John C., 38225A.
DeBellefeuille, Jean O. W., 38422A.
Deegan, Thomas J., 28320A.
Degraw, Ernest G., 37972A.
DeJonghe, Joseph J., 38009A.
Delaney, Louis A., Jr., 38405A.
Delaune, Herman L., 17915A.
Dempsey, William E., 37190A.
Desens, Sherwin G., 38449A.
Desmond, James A., 38244A.
Detrick, William R., 23733A.
Devitt, John R., 37811A.
DeWitt, John E., 52442A.
Dewland, John J., 52432A.
Dey, Howard E., 52506A.
Dicker, Gordon K., 17612A.
Dicks, Norman R., 37610A.
Dickson, Harry H., 37929A.
diDonato, Louis V., 28031A.
Diehl, Carl W., Jr., 37397A.
Dilley, Riley N., 37757A.
Dixon, Jack C., Jr., 24263A.
Dixon, Joseph P., 52401A.
Dombrowski, Joseph A., 37616A.
Donnell, Woodrow W., 37358A.
Donnelly, John R., 48809A.
Dooley, Paul D., 38104A.
Dorfman, Herman, 37511A.
Dorries, Garland W., 38252A.
Doty, John C., Jr., 52362A.
Doughty, David H., 20722A.
Dowd, Robert H., 37207A.
Dowd, William H., 52366A.
Downey, William J., 52421A.
Downhill, Jack E., 24587A.
Drake, Flavious F., 26773A.
Drake, Marvin E., 52406A.
Driskill, Sanford G., 52458A.
Druary, John W., 38222A.
Drumm, William H., Jr., 28224A.
Duame, Donald D., 37925A.
Dubisher, Francis E., 38396A.
Duesberry, Philip T., 37222A.
Dukes, Sterling W., 24420A.
Dulin, John W., 37312A.
Dunham, David M., 17663A.
Dunlap, Jack R., 37153A.
Dunn, Edward W., 37327A.
Dunn, James M., 25800A.
Dunn, Roscoe B., 52490A.
Dunning, Hal H., 37575A.
Dunstan, Albert J., 52434A.
Dutton, Dutton C., 38126A.
Dye, William H., Jr., 38136A.
Earle, Guy C., 37025A.
Early, James W., 38342A.
Easley, Richard K., 52347A.
Eastman, Burns R., 22782A.
Eatman, Jack B., 38108A.
Eaton, Alfred F., 37683A.
Eberle, Harold J., 17628A.
Eccles, Clifton W., 52356A.
Eckenroth, Philip L., 38351A.
Eckerlin, Robert C., 17917A.
Eddy, Egbert B., 23728A.
Edmisten, Stamy E., Jr., 52470A.
Edwards, Harry L., 37962A.
Ehrlich, Robert M., 17697A.
Ellet, Marshall J., 37701A.
Elliott, Robert A., 37333A.
Ellis, Leonard L., Jr., 37240A.
Ellis, Stanley H., 37812A.
Ellison, William E., 38247A.
Ells, David E., 48812A.
Elmendorf, Harry H., 38291A.
Elvin, Bruce M., 37969A.
Elwood, John E., 52351A.
Emminger, Robert M., 37430A.
Engel, Henry J., 38305A.
Engelhardt, Raymond E., 52474A.
Ennis, Richard, 52388A.
Enos, James W., 17645A.
Entwistle, Harry G., 37194A.
Enyeart, Robert E., 52377A.
Erickson, Robert E., 38658A.
Ervin, Delbert J., 37255A.
Erwin, Otis H., 37185A.
Evans, Carl V., 52519A.
Evans, James D., 37221A.
Ewan, Ernest O., 37213A.
Fabiani, Henry L., 37297A.
Fagan, James B., 22834A.
Fahrney, John W., 25608A.
Faour, George F., 37268A.
Farar, Marvin B. D., 37951A.
Farnham, Arthur E., Jr., 38178A.
Feeley, Thomas A., 26463A.
Feeney, Vincent G., 38017A.
Feezel, Ralph S., 37585A.
Fels, Edward T., Jr., 37551A.
Fennell, William E., Jr., 37733A.
Fenton, John S., 52397A.
Fenton, Melvyn, 38179A.
Fergerson, Jack B., 37796A.
Ferguson, George W., 52345A.
Fernandez, Gonzalo, 17577A.
Ferranti, Anthony J., 38412A.
Ferraris, Robert E., 52452A.
Fields, Edward R., 52411A.
Finn, Lawrence R., 37890A.
Fioretti, Edward A., 52521A.
Fiorillo, John A., 37252A.
Fisher, James B., 37481A.
Fisher, James L., 52473A.
Fithian, Ben L., 38256A.
Flaherty, Leo F., 24711A.
Flanders, Donald V., 37244A.
Fleckenstein, George J., 52483A.
Fleischer, Herbert L., 37536A.
Fleming, Glenn E., 37335A.
Fleming, Paul F., 37475A.
Floto, Carl T., Jr., 38216A.
Floyd, Donald S., 22812A.
Flusche, Raymond P., 37509A.
Folmar, William E., 37414A.
Fontanella, Charles E., 37530A.
Ford, James J., 24350A.
Foster, Charles T., 38148A.
Foster, D. B., 52479A.
Fouts, Sidney L., 37158A.

Fowkes, William, 37870A.
Fowler, Norman J., Jr., 23730A.
Fox, Cecil E., 17600A.
Fox, Morris B., 48811A.
Franklin, Earl N., 52449A.
Frasier, Foster F., Jr., 38288A.
Frazer, Paul V., 20654A.
Frederick, James A., Jr., 52361A.
Frederick, Lowell W., 21507A.
Freeman, Melvin B., 52440A.
French, A. Lee, Jr., 37141A.
French, Charles E., 54924A.
French, Fay E., 23716A.
Frey, Raymond E., 52381A.
Friend, Robert W., 37875A.
Fries, Edward F., 37823A.
Fry, James H., 52513A.
Fry, Kenneth L., 38192A.
Fuerst, Milton, 38051A.
Funk, Dale R., 52477A.
Gaffney, Joseph H., 37844A.
Gafford, William F., 37443A.
Gagnier, James L., 37382A.
Gahagan, James D., 37734A.
Galgan, John C., Jr., 37724A.
Gall, Joseph A., 52441A.
Gallagher, Raymond T., 38400A.
Galyean, Marcus W., 38415A.
Gambel, Burrel B., 37195A.
Gannon, William J., 37542A.
Garcia, Jan, 38383A.
Gard, Samuel A., 38001A.
Gardner, John F., 23784A.
Gardner, Richard B., 38049A.
Gardner, Robert G., 37893A.
Garland, Jack C., 37833A.
Garrabrants, Edson L., 17622A.
Garrett, Charles A., 52355A.
Garrison, Edward L., 37953A.
Garvin, John G., 38260A.
Garwood, David E., 52415A.
Gaumond, George W., 37309A.
Gausche, Dean S., 17655A.
Gautschi, Frederick H., Jr., 21490A.
Gayle, Benjamin B., Jr., 37992A.
Gemmell, Charles J., 37981A.
Genung, Garold, 37660A.
Gerhart, Paul E., 38026A.
Gerwig, John W., 37703A.
Giannarelli, Errico G., 37680A.
Gibson, Fred W., 37778A.
Giel, William G., 37154A.
Gieseman, Earl R., Jr., 38275A.
Gilbert, Reginald G. M., 37200A.
Gilchrist, Guy G., Jr., 38234A.
Giles, Garland E., 37281A.
Gilligan, Thomas C., 37146A.
Gillis, Mallon A., 38364A.
Gilmer, Harold P., 37557A.
Gingland, Richard P., 38163A.
Glauch, Alden G., 37574A.
Glesener, Cletus E., 52350A.
Goddard, George J., 37615A.
Godsey, John C., Jr., 37554A.
Gohsler, Harry R., 38171A.
Goldberg, Lester B., 37715A.
Goldberg, Oscar, 48806A.
Goldman, Sidney A., 37584A.
Good, James O., Jr., 37987A.
Goodale, George G., 37581A.
Goodson, Howard P., 37478A.
Goodwin, Norman E., 38248A.
Goot, Albert H., 38327A.
Gordon, Lawrence T., 37548A.
Gosser, Delbert L., 52509A.
Gouchoe, Maurice W., 38020A.
Graham, Monroe W., 37243A.
Graves, James M., 38092A.
Gray, Edmond D., 22746A.
Gray, William W., 17589A.
Green, Milton A., 37669A.
Green, Roger N., 37263A.
Green, William M., 37839A.
Greene, Edgar M., Jr., 37328A.
Greene, John K., 37727A.
Greenhorn, Alvin E., 37655A.
Greer, Orson P., Jr., 37152A.
Gregory, George T., 37872A.
Gregory, Newman S., 37735A.
Gremillion, William N., 37598A.
Griffin, Arthur W., 37253A.
Griffin, David H., 38460A.
Griffin, Frederick J., 37879A.
Griffith, James M., 38061A.
Griffith, Robert B., 17602A.
Griffith, Wallace H., 17586A.
Grindstaff, Ernest W., 37773A.
Grits, George H., 37661A.
Grossman, Harold W., 38215A.
Groves, Alonzo W., 38243A.
Gruye, Curtiss H., 37704A.
Guisinger, Ralph C., 38441A.
Gunderson, Herbert L., 37432A.
Gunn, William E., 38306A.
Gutches, William H., 37453A.
Guyote, Tarlton A., 38423A.
Gwinnett, Allen F., 38165A.
Haberman, Dale F., 37710A.
Haek, Jack J., 37911A.
Haesecke, Herbert L., 37679A.
Hagen, Earle Q., 37249A.
Hagerstrom, James P., 37787A.
Haggstrom, Robert J., 37237A.
Hagin, Elbert J., 38133A.
Haines, Franklyn W., 37484A.
Hales, Ermine L., 22826A.
Hall, Billy J., 37419A.
Hall, James M., Jr., 37963A.
Hall, Robert W., 52485A.
Hall, William W., 50435A.
Halstead, Warren W., 38155A.
Hamant, Vincent F., 21484A.
Hamel, Robert B., 38286A.
Hamilton, Jack M., 37217A.
Hamilton, Ralph W., 38004A.
Hamlin, Horace C., 38411A.
Hamm, William A., 37193A.
Hamner, Winford E., 37855A.
Hand, Clarence B., 37555A.
Hanna, Theodore M., 37970A.
Hansen, Richard J., 37541A.
Hanson, Quentin D., 52409A.
Harbst, Kenneth E., 37304A.
Harker, Douglas C., Jr., 52348A.
Harlan, Henry H., 37898A.
Harley, Ernest G., Jr., 38078A.
Harmon, Frank F., Jr., 37973A.
Harriger, Russell E., 38152A.
Harrington, George F., 17620A.
Harrington, Henry A., 38134A.
Harrington, William J., 38185A.
Harris, Robert G., 37247A.
Harrison, Philip P., 37636A.
Harrison, William B., 38350A.
Harrop, John V., 37851A.
Harry, Arthur S., 38062A.
Hart, Allen C., 24418A.
Hart, Gene, 37891A.
Hart, Max E., Jr., 37934A.
Hartman, Dwight W., 37223A.
Hartwell, Norris E., Jr., 38065A.
Harvey, Edward S., Jr., 37160A.
Haskins, William A., 37164A.
Hastings, Brian T., 21486A.
Hasty, William L., 37291A.
Hatcher, William D., 38258A.
Haugen, Warren G., 26786A.
Hauk, Arthur H., 38141A.
Hayden, Harold T., 52433A.
Haymond, Richard, 37637A.
Haynes, Albert L., 38278A.
Heard, Lyman B., Jr., 37513A.
Heard, Malcolm W., 38113A.
Hearn, Johnnie L., 37758A.
Heath, John G., 37175A.
Heath, Marvin W., 37936A.
Heath, Paul, 38006A.
Heckman, Edward C., Jr., 37913A.
Hedblom, George G., 37897A.
Hedges, Walter N., 38308A.
Heflin, Felder F., 38007A.
Heiser, William J., 37749A.
Heller, Emerson E., 23678A.
Helling, Donald C., 17632A.
Helms, Carl E., 38348A.
Hemm, Robert V., 37363A.
Henderson, Jack B., 52370A.
Henderson, Robert A., 37374A.
Hendricks, Ernest L., Jr., 37462A.
Hendricks, Junior, 37651A.
Henehan, Alva D., 37945A.
Henley, Frank O., 38424A.
Hennessy, Donald G., 52424A.
Hennings, Merwin D., 37882A
Hensel, Leon A., 37984A.
Heppler, Harold S., 38326A.
Herbst, Clay E., Jr., 38339A.
Hermann, Oscar H., 37275A.
Hernandez, Mario M., 38410A.
Herndon, Burkhead M., 37571A.
Herren, Blaine A., 37840A.
Herrera, Rudolfo L., 37329A.
Hess, Alfred S., 24353A.
Hexberg, Caspar J., 37779A.
Hezlep, William H., Jr., 38213A.
Hickman, Ivan L., 38147A.
Hickson, John H., 37226A.
Highfill, Thompson N., 37573A.
Hightower, Edwin C., Jr., 17619A.
Hill, Alvis B., 38066A.
Hill, Charles J., 38195A.
Hill, John C., Jr., 38085A.
Hillis, Dwight N., 38366A.
Hills, Arville W., 37290A.
Hine, Leonard D., 38068A.
Hinerman, Joseph W., 22769A.
Hines, Larry A., 38457A.
Hirr, Herbert, 38425A.
Hitchens, Harold L., 37391A.
Hixson, Jack L., 37868A.
Hobson, Claude I., 38404A.
Hoelscher, William B., 37767A.
Hoffman, John N., Jr., 37881A.
Hoffman, Robert W., 26840A.
Hofman, Dick M., 38340A.
Holland, Ralph T., 37362A.
Hollingworth, George K., Jr., 38343A.
Hollis, Raymond H., 38290A.
Hollowell, John D., 20751A.
Holman, William S., 21487A.
Holt, Hardy L., 37142A.
Holton, Arthur E., 37351A.
Holtzhauser, Robert J., 38322A.
Hooker, Walter P., Jr., 38335A.
Hoppe, George W., 38083A.
Hopple, Victor H., 26839A.
Hoptay, Michael L., 38115A.
Horn, Robert P., 17743A.
Horne, Wickliff H., 37523A.
Hosford, Bowen I., 38377A.
Houchin, Bobbie E., 38207A.
Houck, Warren P., 17232A.
Houston, Carl L., 37211A.
Howard, Murray, 38033A.
Howell, Martin L., Jr., 38025A.
Hower, Doyle D., 38464A.
Howk, Elmer D., 38201A.
Hubbard, Carl J., Jr., 37307A.
Huckabay, James T., 37400A.
Hudgins, Andrew L., 17672A.
Hudgins, Harold, Jr., 37315A.
Huson, Eugene L., 23770A.
Huet, Allan W., 37924A.
Huffman, Robert D., 23761A.
Hug, John H., 38036A.
Hughes, Arthur L., 25780A.
Hughes, Louis T., 52334A.
Hull, Harry E., 37800A.
Humiston, Ray S., 38097A.
Hunt, Bruce E., 37408A.
Hunter, Charles M., Jr., 37165A.
Hurley, Joseph W., 37588A.
Hurley, William T., 37822A.
Hurst, William G., 37186A.
Hushbeck, Elgin L., 37172A.
Hutchins, Hartley F., 37365A.
Hutto, Robert A., 37322A.
Hyde, Bayard W., 37647A.
Hynan, Gerald E., 37689A.
Idtse, Robert P., 38028A.
Ihrig, Maxwell J., 20719A.
Imbornone, Vincent J., 38206A.
Intermont, Robert J., 37965A.
Irving, John C., 38367A.
Isenhower, George G., 37921A.
Isley, Thomas H., 38090A.
Iverson, Martin, 37401A.
Jack, Charles D., 37569A.
Jack, Eugene B., 38438A.
Jackson, Alvin J., 37301A.
Jackson, Donald H., 38283A.
Jackson, Eugene M., 38045A.

Jackson, James L., 37168A.
Jackson, Ottie B., 36246A.
Jackson, Robert L., 38280A.
Jackson, Robert T., 37736A.
Jackson, Urban B., 37428A.
Jacob, Ervin W., 38344A.
Jacobsen, Robert T., 38043A.
Jacoby, Frederick W., 17681A.
James, Harold L., 38356A.
James, Harry E., 37147A.
Jaquez, Arthur A., 37527A.
Jarrell, James R., 3d, 37744A.
Jarvis, David, 17610A.
Jenkins, Robert L., 37434A.
Jenkins, William D., 37395A.
Jennings, George H., Jr., 37486A.
Jennison, John C., Jr., 37458A.
Jensen, Nils B., 38168A.
Jensen, Robert F., 38388A.
Jesperson, Max O., 38473A.
Jewett, Eugene F., 38300A.
Johanson, Alf H., 38129A.
Johnson, Charles R., 37859A.
Johnson, Cordell E., 52475A.
Johnson, Earl E., 38249A.
Johnson, Henry L., 37379A.
Johnson, Leroy H., 52374A.
Johnson, Luverne S., 38447A.
Johnson, Melvin E., Jr., 22741A.
Johnson, Olin H., 37775A.
Johnson, Ralph E., 37919A.
Johnson, Ralph H., 37931A.
Johnson, Raymond A., 37954A.
Johnson, Roger F., 38161A.
Johnson, Thomas R., Jr., 38013A.
Johnson, Walter S., 38032A.
Johnson, Wendell C., 37634A.
Johnson, William C., 37918A.
Johnston, Joe D., 17646A.
Jones, Charles D., Jr., 24359A.
Jones, Dale L., 37563A.
Jones, Finch M., 38360A.
Jones, Howard W., 37916A.
Jones, James T., 21481A.
Jones, John S., Jr., 37539A.
Jones, Joseph L., 24730A.
Jones, Ralph W., 38272A.
Jones, Richard W., 22766A.
Jones, William T., 37847A.
Jordan, Vincent A., 26676A.
Jorgensen, Elmer A., 38456A.
Jory, Francis L., 38214A.
Jowdy, Frank J., 25531A.
Jowers, Joseph J., 37596A.
Joyce, Robert A., 38259A.
Joyner, William R., 37413A.
Judge, James A., Jr., 37350A.
Justinak, Charles A., 37566A.
Kaden, George, 37896A.
Kaericher, Kermit C., 17608A.
Kahn, Frederic J., 37231A.
Kain, Harry R., 17677A.
Kaiser, Charles, Jr., 22786A.
Kalebaugh, George C., 38304A.
Kappe, Ernest J., 37215A.
Kay, Avery, 37824A.
Kaye, Ted, 37677A.
Keheley, Thomas L., 37516A.
Kehl, Raymond H., 37937A.
Kehrer, Richard C., 37922A.
Keiser, Leslie D., 37270A.
Keith, Herbert W., 37543A.
Kellan, Victor, 37900A.
Kelleher, Gerard F., 38390A.
Keller, George R., 37887A.
Kelley, Dwayne E., 38461A.
Kelliher, Joseph R., 37480A.
Kelly, Michael J., Jr., 37904A.
Kelly, Robert H., 37662A.
Kelly, William J., 23183A.
Kenna, James H., 37663A.
Kennedy, Donald E., 38102A.
Kennedy, William E., 37789A.
Kenny, Richard M., 38099A.
Kent, James D., 37816A.
Kentroti, Theodore A., 38188A.
Keplinger, Donald L., 37607A.
Kerr, Charles A., 37670A.
Kerr, Robert C., 38470A.
Keutzer, Eugene F., 38080A.
Keyt, Harold R., 37825A.
Keyte, Kenneth N., 37674A.
Kiernan, John W., 28212A.
Kilby, Robert H., 37795A.
Kilgore, Donald K., 37814A.
Kilpatrick, Albert R., 20720A.
Kilpatrick, Leweir L., 37210A.
Kimball, Richard D., 38307A.
Kimerer, Perry E., 37383A.
Kimsey, Clinton L., 37949A.
Kinevan, Marcos E., 17625A.
King, Tommy O., 37742A.
Kirby, Robert M., 38128A.
Kirk, Thomas M., 37618A.
Kiser, Oscar J., 38048A.
Klein, Carl P., Jr., 38149A.
Knapp, William A., 38098A.
Knauss, Frederick J., 17585A.
Knight, Artemus R., 37996A.
Knipscher, William C., 38000A.
Knowlton, Robert D., 52445A.
Koehler, Walter C., 48802A.
Kondall, Albert R., 21497A.
Konvalinka, Harold F., 36940A.
Koral, Walter J., 37167A.
Korbitz, Fredrick W., Jr., 37748A.
Krahn, Herman J., 52471A.
Kreps, William C., 37173A.
Kress, Lester F., 52469A.
Kretzer, Ralph I., 38361A.
Krick, Arthur W., 37737A.
Krig, Kenneth A., 37138A.
Krom, Frederick B., Jr., 38218A.
Kruse, Kenneth, 38029A.
Kubler, Charles A., 37399A.
Kuder, Wesley L., 37178A.
Kuehn, Robert J., 37533A.
Kuhn, Byron G., 38426A.
Kuykendall, William T., 17636A.
Kuzma, Myron L., 26822A.
Kvamme, Orville J., 17918A.
Laffler, Frank P., 38084A.
Lajeunesse, Conrad N., 17694A.
Lally, Robert W., 37803A.
Lamattina, Frank J., 17642A.
Lamb, George M., 37192A.
Lamborn, Frank P., 37310A.
Lamper, Joseph F., 37947A.
Lane, Gerald R., 23903A.
Langan, John M., 38267A.
Lappo, John S., 37694A.
Larivee, Roger P., 25529A.
Larner, Edward L., 38198A.
Laroche, James N., 38238A.
Larson, James D., 37808A.
Larsson, Campbell E., 38094A.
Laski, Joseph S., 23869A.
Lateano, Guy J., 37888A.
Lawson, Francis R., 20606A.
Layman, Archie H., 37488A.
Layne, Otis L., 38427A.
Leadingham, Joseph E., 38271A.
Learmonth, Allen F., 17682A.
Leavitt, Max V., 37460A.
Lee, James M., 37179A.
Lefler, Harlan E., 52353A.
Lehman, William P., 37134A.
Lehrman, Arthur C., 52494A.
Leland, Harvey K., 38354A.
Lenhoff, Clement J., 37860A.
Lennon, Edward F., 37136A.
Leon, Lawrence L., 37423A.
Leonard, Raymond K., 52512A.
Leone, William E., 37791A.
Lerohl, John K., 17582A.
Letts, Ned M., 37296A.
Levine, Arnold F., 38352A.
Levings, Frank L., 38418A.
Levisen, Martin C., 37471A.
Levy, Joseph E., 37836A.
Lewallen, Charles E., 37388A.
Lewis, Eugene B., 26424A.
Lewis, Francis E., 2d, 37583A.
Lewis, Walter L., 26754A.
Libuse, Frank C., 37556A.
Lilley, J. Robert, 17689A.
Limbacher, Philip C., 37915A.
Lindberg, Earl L., 38239A.
Lindberg, William E., 28308A.
Lindsay, Keith J., 37940A.
Lingel, Lyle E., 23745A.
Lipsey, Alfred E., 38250A.
Lipton, Jules M., 48808A.
Livingstone, Charles D., 37985A.
Logan, James H., Jr., 38253A.
Loisel, Cyriaque J., 38408A.
Long, Atwood E., Jr., 38224A.
Long, Byron E., 38227A.
Long, Chester H., 37986A.
Long, Mahlon H., Jr., 37227A.
Long, William F., 37649A.
Loomis, Donald O., 38089A.
Lovelace, William P., 52417A.
Lovingfoss, Robert B., 37326A.
Lowe, Charles S., 52385A.
Lowry, Edward C., 37841A.
Lucas, Rio G., 37170A.
Ludden, John C., 24360A.
Lupton, Frederick A., Jr., 37277A.
Luthy, Lloyd C., 37751A.
Luttmann, Roger F., 38093A.
Maas, Robert R., 52408A.
MacDonald, Tom S., 23768A.
Mackie, John V., 17298A.
Madden, George W., 37739A.
Madden, Joseph M., 38451A.
Mael, Francis B., 38372A.
Mahan, John V., 37368A.
Maher, Thomas E., 48813A.
Mahoney, Francis R., 38442A.
Mallory, John S., Jr., 17691A.
Malone, Roy W., 38325A.
Mandaleris, Manuel P., 38077A.
Manes, Charles V., 38476A.
Mann, Howard P., 26480A.
Mann, John H., 37349A.
Mann, Lyle E., 24357A.
Marcus, Woodrow C., 37935A.
Marks, Murray, 52504A.
Marsh, Donald C., 37440A.
Marsh, Robert D., 37902A.
Marsh, William A., 38429A.
Martin, Donald E., 38333A.
Martin, James C., Jr., 17909A.
Martin, John M., 52460A.
Martin, Lee R., 37958A.
Martin, Whitfield A., 37266A.
Martin, William M., 38091A.
Marvin, George C., 38226A.
Mason, Floyd H., 37325A.
Mason, Stephen F., 52343A.
Massie, Jack K., 52392A.
Masterson, James M., 37696A.
Mathews, Donell, 37846A.
Mattes, George J., 52379A.
Mau, Jerome R., 37137A.
Maxey, Arthur B., Jr., 37790A.
Maxfield, Arthur, 38430A.
Maxwell, Dewayne J., 37271A.
Maxwell, James E., 37625A.
Maxwell, John W., 24355A.
May, John C., 37807A.
McAnallen, Heyward M., 52437A.
McArdle, Thomas J., 34993A.
McBride, Charles C., Jr., 38231A.
McCabe, John T., 37939A.
McCauley, Robert A., 37489A.
McClain, Clyde F., 37427A.
McCloy, Earl M., 38041A.
McClure, Richard A., 17658A.
McCluskey, John A., 52395A.
McCoy, Franklin E., 38139A.
McCurdy, Arthur, 37288A.
McDaniel, Howard H., 52410A.
McDonagh, John A., 52500A.
McDonald, William L., 24369A.
McDowell, Eurfryn W., 37853A.
McDowell, Robert E., 38416A.
McFadden, John A., Jr., 37605A.
McGraw, Clinton C., 38332A.
McGrew, Gale I., 56541A.
McGuffey, Darrell E., 37718A.
McGuire, Charles S., 52429A.
McHale, Joseph M., 37418A.
McHugh, Aloysius P., 37487A.
McKee, Morris, Jr., 37801A.
McKinney, Ewing, J. W., 37777A.
McKinnon, John P., 37283A.
McLaughlin, Eugene C., 38208A.
McMillan, William E., Jr., 37524A.
McNeil, James E., 52364A.
McPhee, Charles E., 38088A.
McQuown, John R., 23722A.

McVicar, Daniel J., 37977A.
Meade, Walter R., 37459A.
Mehlhoff, Clarence V., 37650A.
Meiklejohn, Milton A., 37959A.
Mercer, Donald J., 37699A.
Merriman, John E., 38466A.
Metivier, Joseph R., 37837A.
Metts, Howard W., 52420A.
Meyen, Herman J., 38394A.
Meyer, Joel L., 37995A.
Meyer, Phil H., 37752A.
Meyers, Harold B., 35750A.
Midkiff, Kenneth A., 38265A.
Miller, David E., 38314A.
Miller, George L., 25508A.
Miller, John P., 38059A.
Miller, Martin L., 37456A.
Miller, Max R., 37712A.
Miller, Noel F., Jr., 38050A.
Miller, Ollie D., 24715A.
Miller, Robert E., 38109A.
Miller, William P., Jr., 21491A.
Miller, William S., 22854A.
Miner, William D., 38184A.
Minner, Connally W., 37336A.
Minow, Thomas G., 37311A.
Misenko, Joseph F., 37746A.
Mishler, Donald W., 38358A.
Mistrot, Ralph W., 37821A.
Mitchell, Ross H., 37261A.
Mix, Robert W., 55742A.
Mock, John E., 17576A.
Modica, Edward S., 38071A.
Modisette, James O., Jr., 23849A.
Moe, Walter S., Jr., 22762A.
Molett, William E., 37976A.
Monday, William W., 52476A.
Moody, Hall A., Jr., 37780A.
Moomaw, Hollis R., 37805A.
Moon, Wilner P., 22760A.
Moore, Charles D., 52498A.
Moore, Charles P., 38174A.
Moore, Forrest N., Jr., 37521A.
Moore, Homer L., 37850A.
Moore, Rexford L., 37714A.
Moore, Robert B., 17664A.
Morgan, Thomas J., 38311A.
Morgan, Tilford H., 37318A.
Morris, Frank W., Jr., 52336A.
Morris, Thomas L., 37267A.
Morrison, Edwin, 52451A.
Morrison, John C., 37380A.
Morrison, Merle E., 37716A.
Morrissey, Joseph M., 24377A.
Morrow, Bernard G., 38170A.
Morrow, Robert W., 52447A.
Morse, John H. I., 37646A.
Morton, Noble L., Jr., 37608A.
Mosher, John F., 37161A.
Mosier, Andrew P., 37782A.
Moss, Charles L., 38158A.
Moulder, James H., 37979A.
Mozley, Curtis N., 37814A.
Mueller, Frederick W., 38019A.
Mueller, Norman F., 18308A.
Mulanax, Arthur G., 37966A.
Mumma, Jack L., 38395A.
Munday, Herbert A., 37426A.
Murphy, Miles J., 38011A.
Murphy, Robert J., 38035A.
Murphy, William J., 52357A.
Myers, Luther R., Jr., 37708A.
Myers, Raleigh B., Jr., 37497A.
Myers, Roy E. R., 37909A.
Myers, William D., 28323A.
Nahodil, Roy F., 37216A.
Namur, Howard M., 37848A.
Nash, Vincent E., 37457A.
Naylor, Joe M., 37433A.
Naylor, William C., 37372A.
Nelson, Allen S., 37492A.
Nelson, Edward D., 37604A.
Nelson, Eugene A., 52367A.
Nelson, Stanley A., 37285A.
Neuwirth, Irving, 37760A.
Neville, Thomas J., 28336A.
Newville, Van H., 52405A.
Nichols, Irwin A., 37169A.
Nichols, Merle B., 38103A.
Nicholson, Benjamin W., 52467A.
Nicholson, Robert W., 37654A.
Nicol, Robert A., 36375A.
Nicoll, Robert W., 38030A.
Nocera, Frank M., 37695A.
Northcott, Clyde A., Jr., 22739A.
Norton, James A., Jr., 52486A.
Nosek, Henry 52524A.
Novak, Eugene A., 21514A.
Novotny, Edmund E., 38455A.
Nowak, Francis V., 52372A.
Nunn, Donald G., 38154A.
Nyland, Edward S., 37515A.
Oates, Elmer R., 37431A.
Oberschmid, Robert E., 37287A.
O'Connor, Frederick M., 37652A.
Odell, David A., 17621A.
Odell, Paul H., 37843A.
Odor, David D., 38042A.
O'Dorisio, Camillo C., 38153A.
Offerman, Donald H., 38389A.
Oiflesh, Gabriel D., 37570A.
Ohnemus, Roman H., 37245A.
Oldham, Richard T., 37889A.
Olinger, Harold R., 38119A.
Oliphint, John H., 25520A.
O'Malley, Patrick J., 38334A.
O'Neil, Robert, 38116A.
Oostdyke, Robert J., 38431A.
Opdahl, Owen R., 37166A.
Osak, Joseph S., 52394A.
Osborne, James W., 37467A.
O'Shea, Timothy G., 22761A.
O'Shields, Hurl E., 52450A.
O'Toole, Joseph P., 38110A.
Ott, Forrest E., 36208A.
Overmoe, Ralph W., 37709A.
Owens, Jack C., 52363A.
Owens, Laurence E., 38323A.
Owens, Raymond E., 37974A.
Oxley, Dan D., 38187A.
Page, Charles C., 37262A.
Pagliuso, Lester C., 37236A.
Pallister, David S., 37750A.
Pallone, Donald O., 38402A.
Palmer, Gordon B., 37990A.
Palmer, Richard W., 52399A.
Palumbo, Rocco, 52539A.
Paquin, Howard M., 37385A.
Paris, George E., Jr., 38175A.
Parker, James A., Sr., 52502A.
Parrish, Henry G., Jr., 22839A.
Paschall, Lee M., 38002A.
Pasho, Robert E., 37688A.
Paterson, David, Jr., 37991A.
Pattenaude, Louis I., 37394A.
Patterson, Ralph O., 52359A.
Pattillo, Charles C., 23720A.
Pattillo, Cuthbert A., 22715A.
Patton, Clifford P., 38391A.
Paulisick, John G., 38189A.
Paxton, Wilmot E. Y., 37274A.
Payne, Earl S., 38346A.
Payne, William G., 38150A.
Paynter, Henry A., 21469A.
Pea, Max A., 38398A.
Pearce, Jack V., 17588A.
Pelszynski, John J., 37139A.
Peltier, Paul J., Jr., 52358A.
Pennington, Harry E., Jr., 52349A.
Penzien, William R., 38142A.
Perry, Aubrey S., 38378A.
Perry, Francis R., 17696A.
Peters, George A., 52481A.
Peters, John L., 37409A.
Petersen, Albert C., 37376A.
Peterson, Harry E., 37886A.
Peterson, Warren H., 37756A.
Pflegl, Robert A., 37128A.
Pfrang, Richard J., 25821A.
Phelps, Ralph E., 37337A.
Phillips, Eugene F., 52339A.
Phillips, Howard R., 37181A.
Phillips, Robert S., 52465A.
Phinisey, Claude W., 37354A.
Phipps, Charles S., 52398A.
Pickard, Walter M., 37819A.
Pickett, Maurice W., 37416A.
Picone, Gregory D., 52456A.
Pierce, Glenn H., 21485A.
Pierce, Heywood W., 37684A.
Pierce, Jack F., 17641A.
Pinkerton, Herbert C., Jr., 17593A.
Pitner, Jean B., 37483A.
Pitsch, Richard E., 38251A.
Pittman, Don D., 37369A.
Plunkett, Sterling L., 52505A.
Police, John L., 52518A.
Poliner, Saul, 37317A.
Poole, James I., 52499A.
Porter, Paul V., 377725A.
Post, Edwin A., 37877A.
Postelnek, William, 52443A.
Potter, William C., 52455A.
Pottorff, Wayne H., 37771A.
Poulos, Theodore, 52383A.
Pound, Alan G., 25526A.
Powell, Harold L., 37404A.
Powell, Kenneth V., 37421A.
Powell, Lucion N., 38166A.
Preston, Ernest A., 38047R.
Proctor, Robert F., 52514A.
Prout, Leslie R., Jr., 37933A.
Prussing, George A., 37532A.
Pugh, Homer H., 38385A.
Putnam, Harry H., Jr., 37230A.
Pyle, William R., 38210A.
Quick, Wade S., Jr., 38204A.
Quintana, Joe R., 25815A.
Quirk, Daniel H., 38031A.
Quirk, William T., 27698A.
Rabourn, Clarence W., 37464A.
Raby, Billy M., 38432A.
Radzinski, John J., 52426A.
Ragan, Harry W., 52337A.
Randel, John W., 26435A.
Rash, Thomas W., 38298A.
Rasmussen, Kenneth C., 37238A.
Ratcliffe, William C., 37502A.
Ratliff, Robert S., 37885A.
Rauch, Richard W., 38485A.
Read, Charles M., 37202A.
Reames, Charles E., 37802A.
Reat, Grover O., 38203A.
Reavell, George E., 37587A.
Reck, William T., 38014A.
Redd, Leonard B., 38137A.
Redmon, William K., Jr., 52390A.
Reed, Robert L., 51690A.
Reed, Walter D., 28021A.
Reeder, Herbert B., 38160A.
Reedy, Walton B., 38172A.
Reeves, Philip N., 52492A.
Reichenbach, Henry J., 37960A.
Reichenberg, Harold E., 37183A.
Reid, William E., 38486A.
Reinsmith, Leonard L., Jr., 38075A.
Reiser, Matt H., 38183A.
Reisner, Horace J., 18271A.
Rennhack, William O., 38127A.
Reynolds, Clyde C., 17630A.
Reynolds, John R., 24710A.
Rhode, Harry T., 38219A.
Rhodes, John R., Jr., 38112A.
Rice, Paul B., 22751A.
Rich, Robert G., 54861A.
Richards, Charles L., 38433A.
Richardson, William G., 37534A.
Rickelman, Thomas E., 52508A.
Rico, Manuel S., 38191A.
Riepma, Marjorie L., 22808W.
Riggle, Lewis E., 38336A.
Riopelle, Warren J., 37259A.
Risher, Thomas R., 3d, 37479A.
Ritchard, Leonard H., 38106A.
Ritchie, Richard L., 52478A.
Ritchie, William A., 37691A.
Rizer, Virgil H., 23736A.
Roark, Bob, 23794A.
Robb, Donald O., 17579A.
Robbins, Tom W., 52368A.
Roberts, Lawrence E., 52422A.
Roberts, Raynor H., 37595A.
Robertson, Alexander, 38273A.
Robertson, Edwin W., 2d, 17580A.
Robertson, Howard N., 37804A.
Robinson, Leroy B., 17573A.
Robinson, Richard E., 52510A.
Rockafellow, John W., Jr., 38301A.
Rodewald, Warren A., 22679A.
Roehm, John F., 52335A.
Rogers, Dow A., Jr., 28214A.
Rogers, Evan Y., 52404A.
Rogers, Norman C., 37278A.

Roper, Willard L., 37424A.
Ropp, George H., Jr., 38317A.
Rose, Boone, Jr., 38060A.
Rose, John S., 37344A.
Ross, Joseph G., 37452A.
Ross, Lawrence S., 38399A.
Ross, Walter F., Jr., 37766A.
Rothery, William J., Jr., 23721A.
Rotter. Gerald D., 38073A.
Rouse, Richard R., 37332A.
Rowe, Calvin S., 52484A.
Rowley, Robert U., 52443A.
Rubin, David S., 52517A.
Ruckman, Joe B., 37845A.
Rudkins, Raymond E., 52352A.
Rush, Willard W., 37869A.
Russey, Richard B., 37339A.
Ryan, James E., 17676A.
Ryan, Thomas P., Jr., 24717A.
Sabourin, Roland E., 37580A.
Sager, William F., 38310A.
Sander, Michael, 37286A.
Sanders, Donald W., 38205A.
Sanders, Lowell L., 37470A.
Sanders, Russell P., Jr., 37926A.
Sanders, Stephen J., 17535A.
Sara, Joseph, 38202A.
Satriano, Joseph, 37830A.
Sattem, Robert, 17633A.
Sautter, Albert L., 52516A.
Savage, George J., 23747A.
Sawin, Robert D., 47519A.
Scanlon. James J., 37248A.
Schauer, Roy E., 38121A.
Schauwecker, Paul G., 21466A.
Scheinkman, Martin, 38381A.
Schestopol, Abe, 37562A.
Scheuring, Francis J., 38081A.
Schlogl, John G., 38086A.
Schneider, Albert G., Jr., 37928A.
Schoppe, John C., 23858A.
Schreiber, Frank, 38330A.
Schwab, Jack C., 22716A.
Schwarzrock, James A., 38362A.
Schwellenbach, Charles B., 52386A.
Scoggin, Lockwood B., 52446A.
Scott, Roy G., 37865A.
Scoville, Winston O., 17640A.
Scowcroft, Brent, 17607A.
Scroggins, William W., Jr., 38167A.
Seaberg, John D., 37184A.
Seabolt, Robert H., 37151A.
Secrest, James K., 26791A.
Self, Melvin L., 38296A.
Selin, Fredrick P., 37381A.
Sellers, Cloyd W., 37658A.
Sellers, Ronald E., Jr., 37343A.
Selsor, William C., 3d, 38211A.
Sencer, Henry J., 38387A.
Senft, Oscar L., 37726A.
Servocky, Charles J., 37577A.
Shank, Robert E., 48804A.
Shaw, Donald N., 37436A.
Sheaffer, Abram B., 52511A.
Shelton, Joseph L., Jr., 52438A.
Sherman, Fred M., 24409A.
Sherrill, Herbert L., 37834A.
Shields, Charles E., 17678A.
Shore, Marshall B., 37761A.
Showalter, Robert E., 37176A.
Shuman. Bradford P., 37560A.
Sibley, Jimmie L., 38240A.
Siegrist, Frederick G., Jr., 37798A.
Simon, King D., 17597A.
Sims, Dorman W., 37561A.
Sims, Joe, 37862A.
Skaggs, John E., Jr., 37645A.
Skartvedt, Paul S., 23782A.
Skipper, Francis H., 23945A.
Skipper, Roy B., 52428A.
Slacum, Donald S., 37520A.
Sleeper, Warren C., 37565A.
Slessman, Dale E., 37690A.
Sletten, Robert P. O., 37205A.
Sloan, Roy O., Jr., 36179A.
Sloop, Everett E., 25610A.
Smedberg, Renwick W., 37156A.
Smejkal, Joseph F., 37214A.
Smith, Bernard M., 52371A.
Smith, Daniel C., 38235A.
Smith, Francis E., 37494A.
Smith, Francis P., Jr., 37233A.
Smith, Grant R., 37305A.
Smith, James E., 37706A.
Smith, James E., 38434A.
Smith, Kenneth S., 38082A.
Smith, Leo E., 38156A.
Smith, Lloyd, 52391A.
Smith, Lloyd D., 22585A.
Smith, Luther E., Jr., 37476A.
Smith, Norman S., 24346A.
Smith, Richard W., 22583A.
Smith, Robert E., 37501A.
Smith, Winston S., 37441A.
Smithcors, Harris E., 38182A.
Snook, Robert R., 37174A.
Snow, Harry E., 37899A.
Sofaly, Raymond A., 38456A.
Sohle, Frederick V., Jr., 37203A.
Sonnenberg, Eugene P., 37988A.
Sonnenschein, Gerald, 37681A.
Sooy, Floyd A., 37451A.
Sorensen, Robert F., 38257A.
Spaduzzi, Robert F., 38008A.
Spann, Walter D., 37567A.
Spalding, John P., 37692A.
Speicher, Henry O., 38444A.
Speiser, Martin A., 37306A.
Spellman, Edward V., 37975A.
Sperber, Harold H., 38217A.
Spicer, Laurence S., 37797A.
Spring, Jesse W., 37272A.
Staats, Aaron C., 37619A.
Stahl, Roy D., Jr., 38380A.
Staley, Raymond M., 38324A.
Stallings, Herbert D., Jr., 38005A.
Stamatis, Milton, Jr., 24727A.
Stanley, James W., 37473A.
Stanley, Paul P., 37348A.
Starke, Robert T., 37518A.
Starling, Andrew L., 52491A.
Starr, Fred W., 37835A.
Staszak, Leonard A., 17605A.
Staver, Arie, 52436A.
Steele, Donald F., 17966A.
Stephan, Leonard P., 38177A.
Stephanidis, James G., 37466A.
Sterling, Eugene B., 37442A.
Stevens, Leslie R., 17599A.
Stewart, Charles C., 17643A.
Stewart, Ernest, 37402A.
Stewart, James C., 37445A.
Stewart, John W., 37228A.
Stewart, Loyal P., 37682A.
Stewart, Roy H., 24726A.
Stewart, Wesley T., 22788A.
Stidd, Cyril C., 38370A.
St. John, Drew T., Jr., 37720A.
Stoddard, Moreau E., 38236A.
Stokes, Jone C., 37589A.
Stolz, John J., 38276A.
Stoneberger, Harold W., 23699A.
Stover, Lawrence P., 37550A.
Strada, Raymond A., 37697A.
Strahan, Hubert W., 37854A.
Strand, John H., 22858A.
Strom, Francis E., 37540A.
Stryker, Jackson R., 37403A.
Stuckey, Daryle R., 55084A.
Stueck, Walter E., 38181A.
Stuk, Martin, 38452A.
Sturtevant, Robert H., 52497A.
Stutzer, Norman H., 38254A.
Suber, Clarence H., Jr., 37187A.
Sugrue, Francis J., 25790A.
Sullivan, James F., 38190A.
Sundborg, Andrew T., Jr., 38123A.
Sundstrom, Oscar J., 37564A.
Surprise, John W., Jr., 38369A.
Surratt, Maurice D., 37390A.
Sussmann, Philip B., 37693A.
Sutterly, Robert A., 38435A.
Sutton, James O., Jr., 37740A.
Sutton, John H., 38468A.
Swain, Charles A., 38173A.
Swant, Gene R., 37781A.
Swanton, Robert T., 37686A.
Sweitzer, Ned N., 37578A.
Swift, Lowell J., 37668A.
Sybenga, Philip M., 37673A.
Sydlowski, Eugene, 38321A.
Taff, Harold A., 37188A.
Tager, Thomas E., 37450A.
Talbot, Louis L., 38445A.
Tappen, Alfred A., 37968A.
Tate, Lawrence H., 38359A.
Taylor, Jack H., 37279A.
Taylor, Mervin M., 17938A.
Taylor, Richard J., 37477A.
Taylor, Robert C., 37628A.
Taylor, William J. D., 38274A.
Teachnor, James J., 38279A.
Teague, Charles E., 22728A.
Tempest, Rone B., Jr., 38313A.
Templin, Albert E., 38439A.
Thacker, Elmer C., 52461A.
Thacker, Jack H., 37895A.
Thalken, Lawrence, 37643A.
Thames, Barney H., Jr., 37273A.
Thaxton, William F., 38384A.
Thiaville, Joseph E., 37323A.
Thomas, Glenn V., 37623A.
Thomas, Ned, 37293A.
Thomas, Richard F., 37435A.
Thompson, Albert L., 37964A.
Thompson, Dennis H., 37463A.
Thompson, George R., Jr., 38027A.
Thompson, Jack H., 37784A.
Thompson, John D., 37360A.
Thompson, Robert W., 37687A.
Thompson, Templeton A., 37559A.
Thompson, Warren C., 38010A.
Thornton, Billie E., 38436A.
Tice, Jack E., 38478A.
Tiernan, Harry J., 38067A.
Tillapaugh, Clayton E., 37504A.
Timmins, Jack L., 38157A.
Tinney, Frank, 37512A.
Tippin, Don A., 37506A.
Titus, Frank A., 17741A.
Titus, Jay D., 37582A.
Titus, Lowell E., 37412A.
Tolbert, Dalphy E., 37499A.
Tolhurst, Robert A., 38169A.
Toombs, Robert H., 37239A.
Torres, Victor, 37997A.
Townsend, Elbert T., 38454A.
Tracey, Ford P., 52375A.
Trachsel, Norman D., 38223A.
Traendly, Eugene W., 24578A.
Trapp, Lansford E., 37366A.
Traylor, Robert S., 37338A.
Trevarthen, Harry A., 38229A.
Triwush, Henry, 37206A.
Tromblay, Clemment W., 49302A.
Troup, Duane H., 37827A.
Truett, Herbert W., 24446A.
Tuck, Elmer L., 37644A.
Tuck, John R., 37260A.
Tuck, Sterling L., 36183A.
Tucker, Carl E., 37568A.
Tucker, Leland C., 37303A.
Tucker, Riggs M., 37671A.
Tucker, Young A., 17670A.
Turcotte, Wilfred N., 37537A.
Turner, Leonard F., 38194A.
Turner, William J., 37982A.
Turner, William L., 37842A.
Tutsock, John J., 38440A.
Tway, Duane C., 37508A.
Tyree, Guy, 37298A.
Udick, Earl W., 37198A.
Ulbricht, Walter E., 37983A.
Ulrich, William A., 37601A.
Upchurch, James H., 52454A.
Vaden, Joe C., 37874A.
Vanderhoek, Paul C., 37289A.
Vandiver, Everett B., 37613A.
Vanek, Gerald J., 37930A.
Van Epps, James S., 38337A.
Vanhorn, Ben A., 38284A.
Vanzee, Glen V., 38375A.
Vaughan, Harry B., 37774A.
Veiluva, Edward F., 37320A.
Velders, Merwin G., 38040A.
Vengelen, Ray F., 52531A.
Verhusen, Ben L., 38180A.
Vetter, Emerson W., 38281A.
Vickers, A. J., 38474A.
Victor, David W., 37392A.
Virgin, Benjamin T., 52444A.
Vogle, George W., 37377A.

Vornbrock, Walter G., Jr., 37675A.
Voss, William R., 38268A.
Vrilakas, Robert A., 37364A.
Wadlington, Irving L., 37276A.
Wagner, Isaac C., 37389A.
Wagner, Michael, 38079A.
Wahl, Eugene A., 37635A.
Waid, Charles L., 25507A.
Walker, John A., Jr., 37884A.
Walker, Lyle H., 37199A.
Walker, Van S., 37265A.
Wall, Frank A., 38230A.
Walter, Harvey P., 18296A.
Walters, Robert E., 37905A.
Walton, Robert W., 37768A.
Warden, Arthur F., 38220A.
Ware, Joseph C., Jr., 36229A.
Warlick, J. D., 38063A.
Warren, Frank H., 37468A.
Washburn, Benjamin M., 51689A.
Washmon, Douzer E., 37602A.
Waski, Raymond, 37324A.
Watkins, James R., 37224A.
Watson, Lewis E., 52431A.
Watts, Blanchard K., 37776A.
Wautelet, Raymond J., 37920A.
Weatherwax, Kenneth C., 52515A.
Weaver, Alvin D., 38107A.
Weaver, Douglas C., Jr., 17583A.
Weaver, Richard E., 38255A.
Weaver, Wilton G., 38437A.
Wegener, Willis B., 37490A.
Weir, Richard H., 37220A.
Welch, James P., 37998A.
Welch, Stanley H., 37485A.
Wells, Harold G., Jr., 52414A.
Wells, Norman M., Jr., 37820A.
Wendell, Harold G., 37633A.
Werdung, Romeyne M., 52387A.
West, Leroy, 37641A.
Westbrook, Luther J., 38242A.
Weydert, Charles F., 37405A.
Whaley, Cecil H., 38315A.
Wheelhouse, Henry L., 37319A.
Whistler, Charles F., 37235A.
Whitaker, Raymond N., 37144A.
White, Alton E., 37558A.
White, Charles J., 37753A.
White, David B., 37572A.
White, Dean R., 38467A.
White, Lee W., 24696A.
White, Robert W., 17618A.
White, Roy J., 52384A.
White, Thomas S., 37665A.
White, Walter A., 37522A.
White, William B., 38037A.
White, Zane W., 38353A.
Wickman, Russel A., 37666A.
Widman, Walter F., 37505A.
Wigley, Erskine, 37794A.
Wilcox, George W., 52333A.
Wilder, Thomas L., 37535A.
Wiley, Thomas J., Jr., 38341A.
Wilkes, Harry T., 37544A.
Wilkinson, William A., 37507A.
Williams, Harry J., 37813A.
Williams, Leonard E., 37371A.
Williams, Marshall G., 22763A.
Williams, Richard M., 37321A.
Williams, William A., Jr., 38261A.
Williams, William F., 38472A.
Willing, Thomas P., 37517A.
Willis, J. Vern, 37417A.
Willsie, Richard E., 38266A.
Wilson, George S., 37491A.
Wilson, Kieth G., 38021A.
Wilson, Samuel G., 37793A.
Wilson, Thomas E., 38245A.
Wimer, Alvin L., 22752A.
Windoffer, Robert A., 38130A.
Wing, Robert L., 37880A.
Winner, Alan M., 37967A.
Winters, Earl E., 37597A.
Wise, Harold C., 37944A.
Wise, William H., 52360A.
Witchey, Francis M., 37729A.
Witt, Harry A., 37429A.
Wittneban, Henry F., 37971A.
Woirol, Warren S., 21506A.
Wojciehoski, Gerald J., 17609A.
Wolbrette, David J., 38392A.
Wolf, Paul J., 52369A.
Wolfe, Ernest R., 37993A.
Wolfgong, William H., Jr., 37547A.
Wood, Crispin M., 38363A.
Wood, James W., 28202A.
Wood, Rodney J., 37883A.
Wood, William L., Jr., 37373A.
Wood, William R., 37295A.
Woodcock, James W., 48805A.
Woods, Gilbert N., 37878A.
Woods, Harold B., 37609A.
Woods, Leo T., 37500A.
Woodson, Frederick P., 37204A.
Wooten, Clyde W., 38003A.
Worth, Willis R., 37398A.
Wray, John D., 25793A.
Wren, Donald B., 37678A.
Wright, Devere M., 37745A.
Wright, Louis A., 37208A.
Wulff, Earl G., Jr., 38417A.
Wynecoop, Joseph A., 37627A.
Wyrosdick, Charles R., 37234A.
Yahle, Joseph G., 38232A.
Yarbrough, John F., Jr., 37946A.
Yeaman, Donald R., 37469A.
Yon, Verus A., 37313A.
Yost, Warren C., 38263A.
Young, Charles G., Jr., 37528A.
Young, Jack A., 24731A.
Young, James A., 38101A.
Young, John M., 17629A.
Young, Lawrence J., 38287A.
Young, William H., 22743A.
Young, William R., 38057A.
Younger, Dale J., 37232A.
Zahn, George A., 37135A.
Zanolli, Louis W., 37437A.
Zartman, Monroe D., 52463A.
Zerbe, Franklin E., 52400A.
Zielke, Richard L., 37955A.
Zorich, Sam, 37903A.
Zwartjes, William J., 37906A.

Medical Corps

Anderson, Claude T., 26701A.
Armour, Thomas D., Jr., 27594A.
Bagli, Vincent J., 24215A.
Billet, Sanford L., 24672A.
Bratt, Harry R., 26354A.
Burwell, Robert R., 26738A.
Cappelluzzo, Vincent P., 24213A.
Cooner, William H., 27604A.
Davidson, Wallace N., Jr., 27602A.
Davis, Gerald, 29622A.
Dunnagan, William A., 29621A.
Griffin, Francis G., 29275A.
Haworth, Wallace G., 27585A.
Jacobs, Paul H., 26697A.
Johnson, Howard H., Jr., 25637A.
Kable, Kelvin D., 26368A.
Koehn, Robert C., Jr., 25732A.
Lancaster, James M., Sr., 26737A.
Mann, Harold J., 32022A.
McCann, Robert J., 24216A.
Metcalf, John S., Jr., 26632A.
Miller, Perry B., 24139A.
Nilan, John E., 27601A.
Odland, Lawrence T., 24135A.
Olson, Robert O., 55852A.
Pierard, Albert A., 27611A.
Randolph, Charles L., Jr., 24217A.
Shea, William H. H., 29771A.
Silvernail, William I., Jr., 26714A.
Spivey, Charles G., Jr., 29772A.
Steck, Willard D., 27626A.
Stone, John H., 32312A.
Stuteville, James H., 27589A.
Thompson, James M., 26364A.
Tredici, Thomas J., 25656A.
Vasnunes, Edward H., 27595A.
Whittaker, Richard L., 29407A.
Wiese, Frederick W., 26383A.
Woosley, Homer E., Jr., 24137A.

Dental Corps

Adams, William C., 23214A.
Adkisson, Sam R., 26749A.
Beidelman, Edward R., 28126A.
Brest, Harold C., 32026A.
Clower, James C., 59484A.
Coons, George F., 23177A.
Cowe, Donald W., 51569A.
Crosby, James F., Jr., 28129A.
Devlyn, John E., 29415A.
Everett, Richard H., Jr., 32572A.
Hicks, Rodeheaver H., 25703A.
Jenkins, Charles A., Jr., 26388A.
Kobler, Milton J., 29653A.
Lindenmuth, James E., 32356A.
Mellow, Emil A., 32571A.
Ridgley, Charles D., 23215A.
Samaha, Francis J., 27496A.
Schutt, Harold E., 51005A.
Seamands, Charles W., 29279A.
Shannon, Ira L., 29300A.
Signorella, Arthur, 49700A.
Slack, Wesley G., 55871A.
Sloan, Roy S., 29865A.
Stansbury, Bruce E., 27525A.
Stewart, Kenneth L., 24679A.
Stewart, Luie D., 25485A.
Tanquist, Robert A., 56157A.
Trovillion, Howard M., 27979A.
Vernino, Daniel M., 25668A.

Veterinary Corps

Barnes, Charles M., 23218A.
Benson, Richard E., 24226A.
Bilderback, William R., 23216A.
Clayton, Frederick W., 23219A.
Davis, Harold C., 23075A.
Garner, Howard S., 25669A.
Moe, Douglas F., 26645A.
Reeves, Johnie L., 23220A.
Ringley, Donald W., 24225A.
Seigneur, Leslie J., 27499A.

Medical Service Corps

Beisner, Arthur T., 48960A.
Broadway, Charles B., 48966A.
Bundrick, George B., Jr., 48952A.
Callaghan, Donald E., 19848A.
Christiansen, Frank R., 48978A.
Cocheres, Thomas L., 48975A.
Colon, Howard, 25337A.
Dillehay, Joseph R., 48957A.
Galati, Ralph H., 48962A.
Gilbert, George E., 48977A.
Hannah, Ernest A., 48974A.
Hobson, Robert W., 48967A.
Kennedy, James M., 48968A.
Krause, Richard E., 48980A.
Loebig, Gordon F., 48971A.
Long, Kenneth H., 48972A.
Morris, Floyd M., 21645A.
Naylor, David B. S., 48973A.
Nichols, Glendal D., 48965A.
Nowell, Wesley R., 25737A.
Patrick, John H., Jr., 48979A.
Preston, Robert J., 48970A.
Prigmore, John R., 55332A.
Quenk, Joseph J., 23230A.
Rhodes, Stanley, 21646A.
Rogers, Georges H., 48961A.
Spaur, Carl L., 23228A.
Stauch, John E., 23079A.
Thacker, Bob B., 48964A.
Thompson, Ralph F., 48958A.
Wolff, Francis E., 48963A.
Worley, Tracy W., Jr., 48969A.

Nurse Corps

Chandler, Glenna L., 21884W.
Holt, Virginia J., 59730W.
Hunt, Eileen M., 55383W.
Peden, Louise S., 25747W.
Porter, Nan L., 25755W.

Medical Specialist Corps

Hayton, Marian J., 29352 W.

Chaplains

Bird, Dallas A., 23206A.
Boardman, William A., 25631A.
Buck, Wesley J., 48610A.
Denhey, John F., 24683A.
Harms, Sudderth A., 32421A.
Huber, Walter H., 48609A.
Meerdink, Vernon J., 48608A.
Ray, Erwin R., 56411A.
Sandrock, Hans E., 27998A.
Schmidt, Hugo G., Jr., 48607A.
Schroeder, Victor H., 23207A.
Schuck, David B., 24682A.
Tollett, Vaughn H., 55115A.

Trapp, Richard D., 55117A.
Waugh, Earl E., 23208A.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Frederick C. Belen, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Harold Francis Linder, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, vice Samuel C. Waugh.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

John Williams Macy, Jr., of Connecticut, to be a civil service commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring March 1, 1965, vice Roger W. Jones.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Aubrey J. Wagner, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the remainder of the term expiring May 18, 1969, vice Brooks Hays.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 20, 1961.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

William J. Crockett of Nebraska, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Harlan Cleveland, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Brooks Hays, of Arkansas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ambassador

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Robert J. Burkhardt, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

John 4:34: *Jesus said, My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work.*

Eternal God, who art standing at the door of our hearts waiting to be welcomed, may we now worship and adore Thee as the light of all who receive Thee and the joy of all who love Thee.

May our thoughts and desires always be attuned to the rhythm of a great longing to have Thy divine purposes mediated unto us and through us.

Grant that our lives may be rich in faith and radiant in hope as we pray and labor to bring ourselves and all mankind into complete obedience to Thy holy will.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 17, 1961, 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.

EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Our progress as a Nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. Our requirements for world leadership, our hopes for economic growth, and the demands of citizenship itself in an era such as this all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity.

The human mind is our fundamental resource. A balanced Federal program must go well beyond incentives for investment in plant and equipment. It must include equally determined measures to invest in human beings—both in their basic education and training and in their more advanced preparation for professional work. Without such measures, the Federal Government will not be carrying out its responsibilities for expanding the base of our economic and military strength.

Our progress in education over the last generation has been substantial. We are educating a greater proportion of our youth to a higher degree of competency than any other country on earth. One-fourth of our total population is enrolled in our schools and colleges. This year $26 billion will be spent on education alone.

But the needs of the next generation—the needs of the next decade and the next school year—will not be met at this level of effort. More effort will be required—on the part of students, teachers, schools, colleges, and all 50 States, and on the part of the Federal Government.

Education must remain a matter of State and local control, and higher education a matter of individual choice. But education is increasingly expensive. Too many State and local governments lack the resources to assure an adequate education for every child. Too many classrooms are overcrowded. Too many teachers are underpaid. Too many talented individuals cannot afford the benefits of higher education. Too many academic institutions cannot afford the cost of, or find room for, the growing numbers of students seeking admission in the sixties.

Our twin goals must be: A new standard of excellence in education—and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it.

I. ASSISTANCE TO PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

A successful educational system requires the proper balance, in terms of both quality and quantity, of three elements: Students, teachers, and facilities. The quality of the students depends in large measure on both the quality and the relative quantity of teachers and facilities.

Throughout the 1960's there will be no lack in the quantity of students. An average net gain of nearly 1 million pupils a year during the next 10 years will overburden a school system already strained by well over a half-million pupils in curtailed or half-day sessions, a school system financed largely by a property tax incapable of bearing such an increased load in most communities.

But providing the quality and quantity of teachers and facilities to meet this demand will be major problems. Even today, there are some 90,000 teachers who fall short of full certification standards. Tens of thousands of others must attempt to cope with classes of unwieldly size because there are insufficient teachers available.

We cannot obtain more and better teachers—and our children should have the best—unless steps are taken to increase teachers' salaries. At present salary levels, the classroom cannot compete in financial rewards with other professional work that requires similar academic background.

It is equally clear that we do not have enough classrooms. In order to meet current needs and accommodate increasing enrollments, if every child is to have the opportunity of a full-day education in an adequate classroom, a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed during the next 10 years.

These problems are common to all States. They are particularly severe in those States which lack the financial resources to provide a better education, regardless of their own efforts. Additional difficulties, too often overlooked, are encountered in areas of special educational need, where economic or social circumstances impose special burdens and opportunities on the public school. These areas of special educational need include our depressed areas of chronic unemployment and the slum neighborhoods of our larger cities, where underprivileged children are overcrowded into substandard housing. A recent survey of a very large elementary school in one of our major cities, for example, found 91 percent of the children coming to class with poor diets, 87 percent in need of dental care, 21 percent in need of visual correction, and 19 percent with speech disorders. In some depressed areas roughly one-third of the children must rely on surplus foods for their basic sustenance. Older pupils in these schools lack proper recreational and job guidance. The proportion of dropouts, delinquency, and classroom disorders in such areas is alarmingly high.

I recommend to the Congress a 3-year program of general Federal assistance for public elementary and secondary classroom construction and teachers' salaries.

Based essentially on the bill which passed the Senate last year (S. 8), although beginning at a more modest level of expenditures, this program would assure every State of no less than $15 for every public school student in average

daily attendance, with the total amount appropriated ($666 million being authorized in the first year, rising to $866 million over a 3-year period) distributed according to the equalization formula contained in the last year's Senate bill, and already familiar to the Congress by virtue of its similarity to the formulas contained in the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction and other acts. Ten percent of the funds allocated to each State in the first year, and an equal amount thereafter, is to be used to help meet the unique problems of each State's "areas of special educational need"—depressed areas, slum neighborhoods, and others.

This is a modest program with ambitious goals. The sums involved are relatively small when we think in terms of more than 36 million public schoolchildren, and the billions of dollars necessary to educate them properly. Nevertheless, a limited beginning now—consistent with our obligations in other areas of responsibility—will encourage all States to expand their facilities to meet the increasing demand and enrich the quality of education offered, and gradually assist our relatively low-income States in the elevation of their educational standards to a national level.

The bill which will follow this message has been carefully drawn to eliminate disproportionately large or small inequities, and to make the maximum use of a limited number of dollars. In accordance with the clear prohibition of the Constitution, no elementary or secondary school funds are allocated for constructing church schools or paying church schoolteachers' salaries; and thus non-public-school children are rightfully not counted in determining the funds each State will receive for its public schools. Each State will be expected to maintain its own effort or contribution; and every State whose effort is below the national average will be expected to increase that proportion of its income which is devoted to public elementary and secondary education.

This investment will pay rich dividends in the years ahead—in increased economic growth, in enlightened citizens, in national excellence. For some 40 years, the Congress has wrestled with this problem and searched for a workable solution. I believe that we now have such a solution; and that this Congress in this year will make a landmark contribution to American education.

II. CONSTRUCTION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACILITIES

Our colleges and universities represent our ultimate educational resources. In these institutions are produced the leaders and other trained persons whom we need to carry forward our highly developed civilization. If the colleges and universities fail to do their job, there is no substitute to fulfill their responsibility. The threat of opposing military and ideological forces in the world lends urgency to their task. But that task would exist in any case.

The burden of increased enrollments—imposed upon our elementary and secondary schools already in the fifties—will fall heavily upon our colleges and universities during the sixties. By the autumn of 1966, an estimated 1 million more students will be in attendance at institutions of higher learning than enrolled last fall—for a total more than twice as high as the total college enrollment of 1950. Our colleges, already hard pressed to meet rising enrollments since 1950 during a period of rising costs, will be in critical straits merely to provide the necessary facilities, much less the cost of quality education.

The country as a whole is already spending nearly $1 billion a year on academic and residential facilities for higher education—some 20 percent of the total spent for higher education. Even with increased contributions from State, local, and private sources, a gap of $2.9 billion between aggregate needs and expenditures is anticipated by 1965, and a gap of $5.2 billion by 1970.

The national interest requires an educational system on the college level sufficiently financed and equipped to provide every student with adequate physical facilities to meet his instructional, research, and residential needs.

I therefore recommend legislation which will:

(1) Extend the current college housing loan program with a 5-year $250 million a year program designed to meet the Federal Government's appropriate share of residential housing for students and faculty. As a start, additional lending authority is necessary to speed action during fiscal 1961 on approvable loan applications already at hand.

(2) Establish a new, though similar, long-term, low-interest rate loan program for academic facilities, authorizing $300 million in loans each year for 5 years to assist in the construction of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related structures—sufficient to enable public and private higher institutions to accommodate the expanding enrollments they anticipate over the next 5 years; and also to assist in the renovation, rehabilitation, and modernization of such facilities.

III. ASSISTANCE TO COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

This Nation a century or so ago established as a basic objective the provision of a good elementary and secondary school education to every child, regardless of means. In 1961, patterns of occupation, citizenship, and world affairs have so changed that we must set a higher goal. We must assure ourselves that every talented young person who has the ability to pursue a program of higher education will be able to do so if he chooses, regardless of his financial means.

Today private and public scholarship and loan programs established by numerous States, private sources, and the student loan program under the National Defense Education Act are making substantial contributions to the financial needs of many who attend our colleges. But they still fall short of doing the job that must be done. An estimated one-third of our brightest high school graduates are unable to go on to college principally for financial reasons.

While I shall subsequently ask the Congress to amend and expand the student loan and other provisions of the National Defense Education Act, it is clear that even with this program many talented but needy students are unable to assume further indebtedness in order to continue their education.

I therefore recommend the establishment of a 5-year program with an initial authorization of $26,250,000 of State-administered scholarships for talented and needy young people which will supplement but not supplant those programs of financial assistance to students which are now in operation.

Funds would be allocated to the States during the first year for a total of 25,000 scholarships averaging $700 each, 37,500 scholarships the second year, and 50,000 for each succeeding year thereafter. These scholarships, which would range according to need up to a maximum stipend of $1,000, would be open to all young persons, without regard to sex, race, creed, or color, solely on the basis of their ability—as determined on a competitive basis—and their financial need. They would be permitted to attend the college of their choice, and free to select their own program of study. Inasmuch as tuition and fees do not normally cover the institution's actual expense in educating the student, additional allowances to the college or university attended should accompany each scholarship to enable these institutions to accept the additional students without charging an undue increase in fees or suffering an undue financial loss.

IV. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The National Vocational Education Acts, first enacted by the Congress in 1917 and subsequently amended, have provided a program of training for industry, agriculture, and other occupational areas. The basic purpose of our vocational education effort is sound and sufficiently broad to provide a basis for meeting future needs. However, the technological changes which have occurred in all occupations call for a review and reevaluation of these acts, with a view toward their modernization.

To that end, I am requesting the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to convene an advisory body drawn from the educational profession, labor-industry, and agriculture as well as the lay public, together with representation from the Departments of Agriculture and Labor, to be charged with the responsibility of reviewing and evaluating the current National Vocational Education Acts, and making recommendations for improving and redirecting the program.

CONCLUSION

These stimulatory measures represent an essential though modest contribution which the Federal Government must make to American education at every level. One-sided aid is not enough. We must give attention to both teachers' salaries and classrooms, both college academic facilities and dormitories, both scholarships and loans, both vocational and general education.

We do not undertake to meet our growing educational problems merely to compare our achievements with those of our adversaries. These measures are justi-

fied on their own merits—in times of peace as well as peril, to educate better citizens as well as better scientists and soldiers. The Federal Government's responsibility in this area has been established since the earliest days of the Republic—it is time now to act decisively to fulfill that responsibility for the sixties.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The WHITE HOUSE, *February 20, 1961.*

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, this message from the President represents a dynamic thrust in an area that has long been neglected. We of the Committee on Education and Labor have geared ourselves to go to work immediately on this subject. We expect the bills themselves to come to us this Wednesday, and the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], chairman of the general Subcommittee on Education, will immediately start hearings; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] will introduce one phase and the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], chairman of the Select Committee on Education, will also immediately start hearings on her phase—scholarships. We expect to move ahead with a minimum of delay in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the 87th Congress will be an exhilarating experience for us all. It will be especially so, I believe, for those of us who have been involved in the continuing and frustrating efforts to secure the enactment of legislation embodying the principle of Federal aid for education.

It will be an experience to serve under the leadership of the distinguished and able gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. To the chairmanship of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. POWELL brings an understanding of the problems of our schools, and a sympathy for those problems which is equaled by few and surpassed by none.

Those of us who have suffered the frustrations of the past 6 or 8 years in this legislative area will appreciate, too, the opportunity to have the kind of Presidential leadership which John F. Kennedy offers in his message of today to the Congress. President Kennedy's devotion to the cause of education has been demonstrated in the other body, and, if further proof of his commitment to the needs of our schools were needed, today's incisive and persuasive message would provide it.

President Kennedy, in his message has correctly stated that "the human mind is our fundamental resource." In conformity with this principle, it is my hope that we can go forward in the 87th Congress, with a program of comprehensive development of our intellectual resources, similar in spirit to the program of comprehensive development of our natural resources, which has been the keynote of our policies in that field.

The principle of comprehensive development, Mr. Speaker, involves the concept that resources, of all kinds, should be utilized in such a way as to make possible their greatest use for the greatest number, and for the widest cross section of our people. Comprehensive development rejects alike the notion that power alone or navigation alone or fishing alone or recreation alone is the sole criterion for development of a great river. Instead we seek to find that plan which will meet as many of the problems as possible, for the benefit of the entire public.

Such a program is necessarily complex. No one bill, no single proposal, no legislation limited to the solution of one problem, will serve our duty of making America's schools equal to the task which history has thrust upon them. Schoolrooms are not enough, teachers' salaries are not enough, college classrooms alone are not the shortage, scholarships alone will not close the education gap which separates our intellectual resources from our Nation's needs.

President Kennedy's package represents a comprehensive approach to the fundamental problems confronting our schools. Some of these bills will go, when introduced, to the Education and Labor Committee. Some of these will, I am given to understand, go to my own Select Subcommittee on Education. I am sure that the majority of the members of the full committee will give early and favorable consideration to these bills, and I can definitely state that the subcommittee, of which I am chairman, will hold hearings on the bills referred to us, before another month is out. With the active support of the President, which has for so many frustrating years, been the vital missing ingredient, it is my expectation that we can have a bill on the House floor—and on the statute books—before the next academic year begins.

The President's proposals, Mr. Speaker, are the cornerstone upon which we can build the kind of educational system that a 20th-century America needs. With these proposals a part of the declared public policy of this Nation, the States, the local governments, the public and private institutions of higher learning can, working together, offer to the young men and women who will be tomorrow's leaders the kind of educational opportunity that a free people must have if they are to remain free.

I do not think I am an alarmist when I state that America's survival as a free nation is at stake in the present struggle for adequate schools.

If we continue to sit idly by while our schools bulge at their seams, while young Americans find no way to use their talents and their energies, because our colleges are overcrowded, then we will soon find a generation of Americans ill equipped to deal with the complex and fundamental questions that a free people must be able to decide.

Our schools hold more than the key to the space race. They are vital to more than our immediate defense needs. They are the one set of institutions upon which tomorrow already rests. It is in our hands to decide whether that foundation is adequate.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special Subcommittee on Labor may sit this afternoon while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take it that generally these requests are limited to the time when the House is engaged in general debate, and I assume in all probability that that is what the arrangement will be this afternoon.

Mr. POWELL. It is the understanding, as I am informed by our majority leader, that there will be no legislation this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]?

There was no objection.

MRS. WILLA B. ESLICK

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it saddens me greatly to inform the Members of the House of the death of a former Member of Congress from my hometown of Pulaski, Tenn.—Mrs. Willa B. Eslick. Mrs. Eslick was elected to fill the unexpired term of her husband, the late Edward E. Eslick, who died on the floor of the House while speaking on behalf of a veterans bonus bill, thus being especially remembered by veterans of World War I.

Having been elected on August 4, 1932, Mrs. Eslick served during the 72d Congress, until March 3, 1933. She represented the district in Tennessee which I now have the privilege of representing; and it gave me great pleasure to have her sit on the platform when I opened my race for Congress in 1954. She maintained an active interest in politics throughout her life; and, only last October, Mrs. Eslick sat on the platform when the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, came to Pulaski to speak in behalf of the Democratic candidates in the past election.

Mrs. Eslick was born in Fayetteville, Lincoln County, Tenn., attended private schools, Dick White College and Milton College, Fayetteville, Tenn., Winthrop Model School and Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn., and Metropolitan College of Music and Synthetic School of Music, New York City, N.Y.; during the

First World War, she served as chairman of the Giles County Council of National Defense; and was a member of the State Democratic Committee.

In the passing of our beloved friend, Willa Eslick, the State of Tennessee has lost one of her most distinguished daughters. I shall miss her particularly, for I valued her counsel and advice and, above all, her warm friendship. Her memory will live on in the highest traditions in the history of her district, State, and Nation—and in the hearts of her many friends.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and service of our late former colleague, Mrs. Willa B. Eslick.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of a former Member, the late Mrs. Willa B. Eslick, of Tennessee.

Mrs. Eslick was the first woman to serve in the House from Tennessee, and she was an outstanding and beloved Congresswoman.

She was a native of Fayetteville, Lincoln County, Tenn., in the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress. She resided in Pulaski, Giles County, Tenn., which formerly was in the district I represented. She was a member of a most distinguished family of my State and was a grand lady of Tennessee and the Southland. She was a fine example of the greatness of a noble woman with ability to endure crises and still carry on nobly.

After the late Honorable Edward E. Eslick, her husband, died on the floor of the House while speaking on behalf of veteran legislation, Mrs. Eslick had the courage, ability, and determination to carry on and was elected to succeed him for his term of office and serve in the finest tradition.

Mrs. Eslick was a most charming and engaging woman, greatly interested in the public affairs of this Nation, and lent her presence to public gatherings and political meetings in our State in the advancement of the Democratic candidates and the philosophy of the Democratic Party. She was considered one of the grand ladies of my State, and I wish to convey an expression of sympathy to the members of her family in Tennessee.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 175) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That EDWARD J. DERWINSKI of Illinois be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Post Office and Civil Service.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the bill approved by the administration, to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain areas of the United States. This is a bill in which many of my colleagues are deeply interested.

It will be known as the Area Redevelopment Act. There are many areas of the country deeply distressed today by reason of persistent and substantial unemployment. In some areas this has existed for years. It is time the Federal Government took some action to help these people who are in such distress. It is not only a condition of supreme importance to the people of these areas but it is also a matter of grave concern to the Nation. We cannot attain full economic growth until these conditions are alleviated. To do so would give us strength at home and add to our prestige abroad.

The bill will be set for hearing at the earliest practicable date. Mr. PATMAN is the chairman of the subcommittee to which the bill will be referred.

UNEMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS IN CONNECTICUT

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party suffers from a strange blindness when human problems are concerned.

An excellent example of this sight difficulty is provided in the current discussion of our economic and employment problems.

Senator DIRKSEN and Representative HALLECK, the congressional leaders, cannot see any economic cloud on the horizon. All is fair and bright. In fact, they prefer not to talk about the jobs and hours of work. They even warn us ominously about the danger of talking ourselves into a recession.

Well, for the information of these gentlemen, we are in a recession right now.

In the three major areas of my district, Torrington, Ansonia-Derby, and Waterbury, the amounts of unemployed of the total working force are, respectively, 12.2, 12.3, and 10.8 percent.

In these same areas, unemployment compensation claims are 2,331, 1,658, and 6,144.

Of course, these figures do not take into consideration reduced hours of work of those who are still technically employed. The average week worked in Connecticut declined from 40 hours to 38 from November through December.

These figures can be matched in many, if not most, areas of the Nation. The least the Republican Party can do is take notice of the problem. It is this lack of interest in the welfare of the average person on the part of its leaders which has caused the Republican Party to become the minority party in the Nation.

Now, I will admit that the question of what to do about the recession is a difficult one. President Kennedy has made certain recommendations to Congress and he has taken certain steps by Executive order to speed up procurement and hasten contract-letting in order to stimulate the economy. On the other hand, a respectable school of economists believes that we are now over the hump and that the economy will revive by its own momentum from this point on.

My own approach is to support the middle-of-the-road course of the President which prescribes short-range stimulation but also adopts a wait-and-see attitude on extreme remedies such as a general tax cut.

It is apparent that Messrs. DIRKSEN and HALLECK are committing the Republican minority in the Senate and the House to a hopeless course. Failing even to admit that a recession exists prevents taking adequate steps to cure it. Of course, the answer is that the Republican leadership is afraid to admit that we are in an economic pause because then people will realize that this recession began under the auspices of the late administration.

Well, the people of this country are too intelligent to be hoodwinked. They know when business is good and jobs are plentiful. And they know the opposite as well.

They also know that leadership—such as that of Messrs. DIRKSEN and HALLECK—which is the accepted and overwhelmingly supported leadership of the Republican Party in Congress will not and should not have the support of the Nation.

WASTE OF MILITARY MANPOWER

Mr. KOWALSKI. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have high hopes that the new Secretary of Defense—an able man with a great record of achievement in both academic and business fields—will move swiftly and effectively to end the colossal waste of our precious treasure of military manpower that has prevailed.

With our armed services needing every available man for defense duties, I am sure that Secretary McNamara will act to reverse the old policies under which men trained at great expense in military specialties have been assigned to nonmilitary duties which are either unnecessary or could better be performed by civilians.

I believe the Secretary of Defense will be as shocked as I was to learn of two recent memorandums issued at Fort Monmouth, N.J.

After the furor over training manuals last year, it would appear that the military might have learned a lesson. But no—one of these memorandums is entitled "Grocery Bagging" and consists of a page of detailed instructions on how to fill bags of groceries in the commissaries.

The other memorandum is a welcome to the men assigned to the commissary. It makes a statement that will startle our millions of unemployed, namely, that the soldiers were assigned there because civilians could not be found to fill the jobs. This, of course, is nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, if there has to be a choice, we can afford a grocery bag lag more than a missile lag.

We need our trained fighting men in units where they can contribute significantly to our national defense. We need them in the jobs for which they entered the service, not as grocery baggers.

And we need a better and greater sense of responsibility in the services than one which not only has so little regard for the proper use of trained military men, but which then compounds its offense by wasting time and money in the issuance of a training manual on how to put groceries properly into a paper bag.

The soldiers who brought these memorandums to my attention told me of their various military skills, of their desire to be on truly military assignment, and also of their disillusionment with a system that relegated them to grocery bagging.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting copies of these two memorandums to the attention of the House. I hope they will be read not only here but in the Pentagon, and that action will follow to end this utterly fantastic waste of men not only at Fort Monmouth but at every post in all the services.

The job of our military services is to defend America, not to fill grocery bags.

Here are the texts of the memorandums:

GROCERY BAGGING

Nothing irks a customer more than a poorly packed bag of groceries. If packed in lopsided fashion, it can become an awful burden. If packed in unbalanced style, it can become an awful mess. If packed in a loose manner, it can become an awful waste. Conversely, packing a customer's grocery bag properly builds good will and increases your service. The bagger, whether bag boy or checker, sells no groceries, just courtesy and efficiency. On this page are a few suggestions for good bagging.

1. Plan the packing: Open the bag fully; a partially opened bag can be easily torn. If more than one bag must be used, pack them with equal weight for easy carrying.

2. Get the right start: Make a solid base by putting the heavy packages and cans at the bottom. They pack solidly.

3. Use extra care: To prevent soaked bags and bag breakage, use waxed bags for wet vegetables, frozen foods, and ice cream (aluminum foil bags are also good for packing ice cream).

4. Watch the perishables: Pack eggs, berries, bread, tomatoes, and other crushable items near the top of the bag. (Inept baggers generally fail in this and cause untold customers' complaints.)

5. Use small items: These, such as candy and cigarettes, should be used to fill up the empty spaces and "holes" in the bag.

6. The finale: Put the cash register receipt in the bag, hand the bag to the customer (making sure she has a firm hold on it), smile, and say pleasantly, "Thank you!"

Thank you for your cooperation and support of the Army team.

———— ————,
Commissary Officer.

To All Details:

Welcome to the commissary, gentlemen, you are detailed here today, and your services are greatly appreciated by the quartermaster and the commanding general. Your work here is necessary because of our inability to secure needed civilian employees.

Commissary privileges are a benefit to you and other eligible military personnel. Please be very courteous to all customers, and above all, do not engage in any argument with them.

Thank you for your cooperation and support of the Army team.

———— ————,
Commissary Officer.

THE INDICTMENT OF EICHMANN BY ISRAEL FOR MASS MURDER

Mr. LANE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Chelsea Zionist District of Massachusetts, held its installation ceremonies at the Shurtleff Street Synagogue in Chelsea, on Sunday, February 12, 1961.

As principal speaker, I took for my subject: "The Eichmann Case." Adolph Eichmann will be tried by the Republic of Israel next month, as one of the major Nazi criminals who were responsible for the murder of over 6 million Jewish civilians, men, women, and children.

All humanity will read the day-to-day reports of this trial which involves a Nazi accused of the appalling crime of genocide; the cruel and methodical attempt to exterminate a whole people. The evidence against Eichmann is overwhelming. The world will wait to see if the rule of law will prevail to establish a precedent that will deter future aggressors from committing similar crimes against innocent peoples.

At the breakfast meeting of the Chelsea Zionist District it was my humble honor to be presented with an engraved citation on a plaque for outstanding service to the Zionist cause and to the welfare of the Jewish people.

The address that I delivered at the installation is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, at the very outset let me applaud the outgoing administration and congratulate the incoming officers for work well done and for confidence well placed. The Chelsea Zionist district has long been active in supporting the cause of Israel and urging its support by others. That its efforts have been rewarded is obvious. That its continued efforts are necessary is certain.

In 1947, on a very grim occasion, I visited this wonderful city of Chelsea. I was your speaker at the high school auditorium. The occasion was a welcome-home and a well-done to a brave Chelsea lad who was wounded by a pistol shot while resisting a boarding party from a British gunboat that intercepted a vessel running displaced Jews into Palestine past the British blockade. His name was William Millman, and he was a member of that gallant crew bringing a precious cargo of human souls to Palestine.

I told you then, in those horrible days, when the land of Israel was barred to the children of Israel, not to be dismayed, there will be a State of Israel. There was.

I told you that President Truman will speedily recognize that state. He did.

I also told you that the State of Israel will be readily admitted to the United Nations. It was.

I did not then, as I do not now, lay any claim to powers of prophecy. My predictions of things to come was based solely on things that went before. I knew then, as I know now, that a people who refused to perish through 2,000 years of travail and exile and the indescribable horrors of Hitler will not perish; that the spirit of faith and devotion to the moral principles of their forefathers, having been so tried, must eventually serve the purpose for which it was being tested.

I can now proudly state that my reasoning was correct. What I anticipated would happen, did happen. I also knew that a State of Israel will be a shining light in the gloomy world that followed World War II, because I knew it would be a democratic government in an area that was ruled by despots, backward and illiterate, and thus bring light where light was badly needed.

I am not disappointed. The State of Israel, founded on those virtues of liberty, equality, and faith, democratic and free, is not only an outpost for democratic institutions but is an example for all new nations, now appearing, to consider and emulate. The State of Israel is the strongest rebuff the reactionary, enslaving, soul-crushing doctrines of communism have so far received. It is no wonder that Russia wants to see Israel obliterated because the forces of darkness must always flee before the power of light.

Let the new nations of the world compare. Compare a new state, founded on democratic principles, the State of Israel, with other states weighted down under the despotism of communism. I ask, where do you find greater freedom of expression, thought, and soul; greater opportunity for spiritual expression, cultural development, and economic progress—in the democratically governed State of Israel or in Communist dominated Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and even Russia itself.

By example alone, the State of Israel has demonstrated the simple and eternal truth that he who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword and that it is not by might and not by strength but by spirit that man endures.

Therefore, when United States marine shipping was barred from the international Suez Canal because of having been used in trade with Israel; when foreign powers dared to dictate to us and classify our citizens and insist on which of our citizens they will allow in their countries and which they will not, and we submitted; when they professed to be peace loving yet refused to sit down and discuss peace terms with Israel, the nation which defeated them; when they asserted a serious refugee problem but did nothing to help their own for admittedly political reasons; when they caused our Navy Department to insert cancellation clauses in all its contracts with its suppliers whose supply ships are blacklisted by the U.A.R.; and, when in the face of all this, the State Department permitted the U.S. executive director of the World Bank to vote for a $56 million loan to the U.A.R. for widening the Suez Canal, I brought this to the attention of Congress on February 4, 1960.

I informed Congress that this affront to the United States, this insult to our people, to our principles, and to our professed sense of morality, was induced only because our Government, at that time, resorted to the use of platitudes and the comfort of temporary expediency for positive action. True facts and moral realities were swept under the rug.

I warned the administration that the pile of sweepings was so great that the administration itself would trip over it. The recent election proved how correct I was. I said that the debris must be cleaned out without delay or else in the eyes of the nations of the world we shall be considered not only weak in arms and technology but also in enforcing moral issues. You who have heard or read the inaugural address of President Kennedy know that you can expect the debris to be cleaned out without much delay.

A few weeks from today, a great and wonderful event will take place in Jerusalem.

Just as thousands of years ago there was brought down from Mount Sinai and given to the children of Israel a new moral code for all men to heed and use as a guide for civilized living (we call it the 10 Commandments), so in a few weeks, in Jerusalem, the State of Israel will open the eyes of the world to the realization that there can be no exceptions to the commandment "Thou shall not kill." I refer to the Eichmann case.

Rarely, since the framing of our Constitution and the writing of the Declaration of Independence has the concept of natural law been raised, as it will be raised in the coming trial of Adolph Eichmann.

As a lawyer, lawmaker, and human being the issues of jurisdiction and venue greatly interest me. We are aware of the accusations against Eichmann, his apprehension, his delivery to the State of Israel, and the diplomatic hauling and pulling that ensued.

There are many pros and cons offered relative to the trial of Eichmann in Israel. The arguments range all the way from those induced by anger to those advanced by thinkers, philosophers, and would-be philosophers and some not worthy of classifying.

During the course of argument the State of Israel will be the target of hatemongers, Communists, and assorted cranks.

There will also be true students of jurisprudence, dispassionate thinkers, and analysts who will dissent from what I am about to say by reason of their sincere beliefs. For such I have sincerest respect because our common purpose is to see justice done. We may merely differ as to the means of accomplishing that purpose.

I make no brief for the State of Israel, it certainly needs none from me. I advance no arguments for the prosecution for it will certainly prove its competence without my assistance. My remarks are intended to let the Israeli Government know that there are non-Jews who can find nothing wrong, morally or legally, in bringing before the bar of justice an accused who, if those who oppose my views were to prevail, would never be brought to trial. Eichmann would never have been brought to trial because no government went to seek him out. In fact there is a question whether or not he was given shelter from apprehension. Except for those who spent 15 years searching for him no individual or private group went to search for him. Now, however, the cry is over the right to try him.

Let us proceed to ask a few questions and offer a few answers.

The crime of murder is reprehensible. The sanctity of human life must never be violated. These are premises and assumptions to which all will agree. Now why do we agree to these simple assertions? Because there is a law on the books? Because the state will punish for such crime? Is that why we agree? Let us look closer. Assume there were no laws against murder or punishment for murder on the books, would the crime be less reprehensible? The answer of course is "No."

Therefore, whence comes this knowledge that murder is wrong, even without a law on the books saying so? It comes from the existence in man of a capacity to know some things with certainty, a God-given endowment. Such origin of law is commonly referred to as natural law and because of it we can assert certain truths such as described in the Declaration of Independence that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

There are some legal philosophers who do not subscribe to that school of thought. They hold that the real source of law springs from reason alone and not from any divine source. Parenthetically, may I ask, whence comes reason?

However, it is not my purpose to give a dissertation on legal philosophy. It is my purpose to state my view, with the concept of natural law always in mind, dealing as we are with a case where there are no precedents, because never have been similar facts and situations.

The question is asked whether the Eichmann trial, held in Israel, will contribute to the growth of international law and justice. The answer is comparatively simple. Where is the international tribunal to try this man? The International Court of Justice has no jurisdiction over the trial of individuals. The Nuremburg tribunal is no longer in existence. At best it was an imperfect court because in the words of Justice Robert H. Jackson "We cannot await a perfect international tribunal or legislature." Down through the years there is still no perfect international tribunal for handling cases such as Eichmann; there are no officers of the law, policemen if you prefer, to ferret out other Eichmanns and bring them before the court. What court is there to handle this case? Another imperfect international tribunal? Eichmann will be safer before an Israeli court which is determined to do impartial justice, and stand forever on its record, rather than before a temporary body convened to dispose of him and then disband.

It is argued that he should be returned to the scene of his crime on the general principle of law that a man is entitled to be tried where his offense is charged to have been committed. The short answer is that the crime charged against Eichmann is murder, not of an individual as an individual, but of individuals as belonging to a common foe, the Jew. Viewed in that light I see no difference in bringing Eichmann to stand trial in the land of the foe than it was to return Ezra Pound to the United States to stand trial in this country for acts of treason committed overseas in Germany, except possibly the fact that Ezra Pound was a U.S. citizen.

It is argued that when a crime is committed it is not against the individual who suffered the wrong, but against the community. To that I agree, and that is why I assert that the community of Jews against whom the crime was committed is now in Israel, and there is where Eichmann should be tried.

It is argued that Eichmann is charged with crimes against the Jewish people. How else should he be charged? In this State a criminal charge is the Commonwealth against defendant; in some States it is the State against defendant; in other States it is people against defendant. This is no great issue, because in law it is always substance and intent that is important rather than form.

It is argued that Eichmann will be tried before a hostile court, or at least a court that will be subject to criticism for lacking impartiality, and that no Israeli lawyer was willing to undertake his defense. I will point out that Israel has already indicated its tendency toward impartial justice. Witness the temperament of a people who would spend 15 years unceasingly scouring the corners of the earth to apprehend an accused charged with such a shocking, revolting crime, and when they found him did not kill him on the spot. The accused is entitled to a lawyer of his own selection. He has that lawyer, and Israel is paying him a much larger sum than our own courts customarily pay appointed counsel. The fact that no Israeli lawyer is defending the accused is good, because then it can never be said that the defense was not whole, complete, and diligent. The full glare of publicity will permit no deviation from fairness both to the defendant and to the people whom he offended.

It is argued that the trial should be held in Germany for the opportunity it would give to enlighten the public and especially the postwar generation. It is also argued in the same breath that he should not be tried in Israel because the trial would be merely a spectacle. Justice Jackson said that he was preparing a record of the Nuremberg trial—a record on which the defendants were being judged and on which history will judge us tomorrow. He made a vast record, volume after volume, depicting and describing the most horrifying activities of depraved men ever known in the annals of a sordid world. The record contains the names of Goering, Goebbels, Hitler, and the rest of that ignoble assembly of humanity's curse. The record is still there—gathering dust—a collector's item, while swastikas are being painted on walls and anti-Semitic outbursts appear from time to time in Germany.

If it is truly enlightenment that is sought for postwar Germany, and for that matter the rest of the world, then the Eichmann trial in Israel will highlight the workings of history and morality. It will cause everyone to wonder how, from the remnants of a defenseless people, who were to be obliterated, arose a free and proud nation; where crime will not go unpunished; where the guilty will not go free; and, where God is still the judge, the father, and the protector. It is His will that must be served, and not the will of the depraved and the powerful.

I must refute the argument that the State of Israel has no jurisdiction in the Eichmann case because it was not a State at the time of the alleged crime. I declare that the State of Israel never ceased being a State from the time its people were exiled by Rome in the year 70 A.D. All through the ages Palestine was merely a possession of different temporary conquerors who held the land, but not the people. The people of Israel never surrendered. They were exiled from it but never surrendered their claim to it, their hope and dream of returning to it. They preserved and studied, and observed wherever possible, its laws, its customs, its traditions, and its history. There was a land that mourned for its people even as its people mourned for it. The land refused to bear fruit, it became waste and dry and desert and nobody could make it bloom. Only upon the return of its people did the desert begin to bloom, and the groves begin to blossom and bear fruit. Never, since and during the exile, has Palestine shone with intellect, sang with freedom, and hummed with industry as it has since the State of Israel once again returned to her bosom, 12 years ago.

The legalist, however, may not care to view it from this historical and sentimental light. He will insist on more proof.

Hitler waged war against Jews not as French Jews, or Dutch Jews, or Polish Jews, or Hungarian Jews, but simply as Jews. Hitler did not recognize them as citizens of the countries he invaded. He recognized

them only as a people separate, distinct, and apart from all other nations and for whom he had a special plan—extinction. Hitler himself laid the ground rules for Eichmann's trial in Israel and as lawyers would say: "This is now the law of the case." He formed and grouped the Jews as a distinct people, and his crimes were committed against the Jewish people and were aimed and intended for the Jewish people wherever they were—including Great Britain and the United States should he have gotten over here.

Still more proof is asked? The Balfour Declaration asserted, long before Hitler, a recognition of Palestine as a homeland for Jews. After World War I, Palestine was mandated to Great Britain to be held in trust by her, and not to be annexed or to make its inhabitants her citizens. The Balfour Declaration was still in effect and force. After World War II the State of Israel received de-jure recognition.

During the time of Eichmann's alleged misdeeds there were governments in exile which we recognized, and who fought beside us. There was the French Government in exile, the Polish Government in exile, and the Dutch Government in exile, to name just a few, and they placed their forces in the field. The Jews of Palestine did likewise. The gallantry of her troops in Italy and north Africa, in Syria and wherever the enemy could be found is a thrilling story of bravery and glory.

Therefore, I conclude with the thought that it is not Eichmann alone who is to stand trial, but all mankind and its juridical system. If nature abhors a vacuum then why should it be in the nature of things that a crime go unpunished; that an accused go untried? If that be so, then we have discovered a vacuum in morality which must be abhorred and eliminated or else mankind perishes.

So I return to my earlier reference to natural law, first conceived by Socrates, elaborated upon by Aristotle, explained by St. Thomas Aquinas, and appearing in our own Declaration of Independence asserting the unalienable rights of man.

Upon that law, if there be no other, I support those who insist that the Eichmann case be tried in Israel. Maybe new law will be written because the old law did not hold, and if new law is to be written based on the principles of natural law then let it be written in Israel because the prophet Isaiah said "From out of Zion shall go forth law," so, from out of Zion shall go forth new law to be an example and a guide for all men, for all nations, for all time.

NATIONAL CLEAN-UP, PAINT-UP, FIX-UP CONTEST

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I take this means to call to the attention of the Congress an extremely worthwhile program that is in progress in this Nation. It is called the national clean-up, paint-up, fix-up contest and is sponsored by the National Clean-Up, Paint-Up, Fix-Up Bureau in Washington, D.C.

My home city of Bedford, Ind., entered into this program last year and to its great credit won recognition as being the second cleanest city in the United States in its class. I am proud of my home city and of the people who live there.

I am grateful to those mentioned in this article appearing in the Bedford Daily Times-Mail on February 16, 1961, for having the interest and for taking the initiative to participate in this program. Their efforts not only won an award for their home city. They also made Bedford one of the two cleanest cities in the Nation. The entire program gave my home city a goal for which to strive and resulted in a spirit of teamwork, cooperation, and togetherness that has meant much to the people and will mean more in the future.

Bedford, Ind., is a wonderful city in which to live and to rear a family. We have many things to offer which are normally limited to cities many times the size of Bedford. Programs such as the clean-up, paint-up, fix-up contest, and the way in which Bedford endorses, supports, and works on such projects, are typical of the friendly atmosphere of self-improvement which characterizes my home city.

The article follows:

OFFICIALS HAVE HIGHEST PRAISE FOR EFFORT; URGE BEDFORD TO TRY FOR FIRST

Bedford has been named the second cleanest city in the United States for its size. Morristown, Tenn., won first place for the sixth straight year, and already plans are underway to take the title away from that city.

For the first time in its history, Bedford was entered in the national clean-up, paint-up, fix-up contest sponsored by the National Clean-Up, Paint-Up, Fix-Up Bureau in Washington, D.C.

"I think it's wonderful Bedford was able to win second place, considering this was the first time the city had ever entered the contest. You can't keep Bedford down," said Joe Beecher, president of the Bedford Chamber of Commerce, which sponsored the project.

"The thing to do now is to go after that No. 1 spot," Beecher said with enthusiasm. He said he understands that during the past 5 years that Morristown has won the award, it has gained approximately 600 new jobs for its people.

Mayor Lee Quackenbush, too, said, "I think we should be proud of winning second."

"We have the debris out of the way now, and the next step is to polish up the city and go for first place," Mayor Quackenbush added.

* * * * * *

Mrs. Agnes McGillvra served as chairman of the City Beautification Subcommittee of the Chamber of Commerec Civic Activities Committee headed by John Fancher.

Mrs. McGillvra was out of the city today, and consequently she could not be reached for a statement.

However, the notice of the contest winners was verified by Anna Gaines, business manager of the Bedford Chamber. Miss Gaines, who served as secretary of the beautification subcommittee, phoned Washington for verification.

RECEIVES TELEGRAM

Mayor Quackenbush, too, received a telegram from the national sponsor saying:

"Congratulations. In the final judging of the 1960 National Cleanest Town Contest, your city has been awarded second place in its population category.

"Please extend this good news to everyone who had a part in your program. Your engraved trophy will soon be shipped."

Bedford was judged in the 10,000 to 25,000 population category.

Other members of the City Beautification Subcommittee who promoted the gigantic cleanup campaign last year were Mrs. A. C. Voris, Sr., Horace Richardson, Jerry Allen, Mary Jo Bolton, Mrs. Paul Chase, Mrs. J. Robert Edwards, Ed Grogan, Mrs. Howard T. Hammel, Wayne Hirscher, Mrs. Edward "Ted" Jones, Mrs. Robert Leahy, Mrs. S. E. Osborne, Mrs. L. C. Smith, Jr., Mayor Quackenbush, Mrs. John D. Walls, Mrs. Darrell E. Zink, Mrs. Horace Richardson, Mrs. Clarence Donovan, Mrs. William E. Jenner, Mrs. J. E. Kenworthy, Mrs. J. B. Wohlfeld, Mrs. Lois Wray, Wayne Hammond, Omar Jewell, Dr. K. T. Edmonds, and Mrs. C. L. Athey.

ALLOCATION OF IMPORTS OF RESIDUAL OIL FOR USE AS FUEL

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include at this point in the RECORD a statement I made today at a public hearing called by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, in connection with a review now underway into the matter of allocating imports of residual oil for use as fuel. This hearing was held in the Department of the Interior Auditorium, in Washington.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS J. LANE, DEMOCRAT, OF MASSACHUSETTS, AT PUBLIC HEARING CALLED BY SECRETARY OF INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL, IN CONNECTION WITH REVIEW NOW UNDERWAY INTO THE MATTER OF ALLOCATING IMPORTS OF RESIDUAL OIL FOR USE AS FUEL—DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AUDITORIUM, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 20, 1961

Mr. Secretary, Members of Congress, and others who have come to this hearing to testify on the issue of mandatory restrictions on the import of residual fuel oil, I congratulate the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, for his understanding of the emergency, and for his realistic action in authorizing an increase of 100,000 barrels daily in the import of residual fuel oil through March 31.

The Secretary's purpose was to protect the consumers. He was right in stating that the increase was needed because severe weather has reduced east coast stocks and users of the fuel might face short supplies and rising prices.

The Government's residual oil import restriction program, in effect for 2 years, has hindered the economic growth of New York and New England. All of our industrial fuel—oil, gas, and coal—must be imported from other States and other countries because we have no commercial deposits of our own. As a result, fuel costs in New England are 50 percent higher than in the country as a whole. These higher costs not only place an unfair burden on the individual consumer, but on industry as well.

In our situation, we must have an adequate supply of fuel from a competitive market, free from outside monopolistic pressures that would force us to pay even higher prices for essential fuel, or turn back the clock to unreliable and uneconomic sources of supply.

Remember that a number of our communities are classified as "distressed areas" or "areas of substantial labor surplus," and have been in this predicament for 7 years. We have not sought a solution to our problems by forcing other sections of

the country, through direct or indirect action by the Federal Government, to maintain our once dominant textile industry. We faced up to the inescapable fact that we could only retain a part of our textile industry, and would have to compensate for the loss, by making the transition to other forms of economic enterprise. That we are doing, but in the process we cannot afford to be handicapped by artificial restrictions designed to give favored treatment to other regions, or other industries.

We from the east coast appear before this hearing not only to ask for a further increase in residual fuel import quotas, but to plead for the elimination of these controls.

We maintain that there was no justification for this program in the first place. It should be noted that domestic refiners have been primarily concerned with crude oil imports and have never considered residual oil imports a real threat because residual oil is what's left after gasoline and other products have been refined from crude oil. Residual is, therefore, not an important domestic product.

A declaration that the national security was endangered by the rising level of oil imports was the basis for prohibiting the free import of residual oil. On the contrary, imports should be encouraged in order to halt the downward trend in domestic reserves and production capacity, so that, in the event of a national emergency, the deficit in domestic petroleum supplies would be minimized.

Domestic production of residual oil is not enough to meet the Nation's needs. It is significant that even those who advocate import restrictions admit that imports are necessary to supplement domestic production.

The entire oil import restrictions program was based on the opinion of the OCDM that these imports threatened the domestic oil industry. But domestic oil has little interest in its "stepchild"—residual oil. Restricting imports of residual might bring minor benefits to the domestic coal industry, but the Government's concern for the coal industry was to protect it from foreign competition. The case for import restrictions on residual is weak. The effort to switch users back to coal would be self-defeating, because most of them, if subjected to this coercion, would turn to natural gas instead.

If the Government continues restrictive policies in order to find additional markets for coal, it would have to impose end-use control on all competitive fuels.

Such Federal controls would replace the normal competition among all fuels used by consumers, and would raise a roadblock in the path of economic growth.

As the residual fuel oil import quotas imposed on the east coast are simply a screen to conceal a step backward, we ask for the elimination of this unworkable policy. It has artificially forced up prices of residual fuel oil for consumers in New York and New England.

As long as it continues to limit the availability of a basic fuel, it will cripple the potentiality of these important industrial areas to participate in the progress of the Nation.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 21 the Geneva nuclear-test ban talks will resume. It is a critical date for the country and for the world. Unless at this juncture when a change in administration makes it possible these talks are put on a realistic basis, it is unlikely that negotiation and agreement as an instrument for reducing international hazards can be employed for several years to come. It is vital that the principle be nailed down that international agreements in which the United States participates shall, in fact, command compliance from the parties. This means negotiating only on controllable subjects and then writing inspection and violations detection machinery into the agreement posing enough risk of cheaters being caught to deter violations.

Specifically in connection with the test-ban talks, this means limiting their scope to atmospheric tests and large yield underground tests. These only are controllable under present circumstances. It also means lifting the self-imposed U.S. moratorium on nuclear weapons tests. Under date of February 16, I recommended these steps to the President in the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1961.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President, the White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am pleased to know you are devoting personal attention to the problem of the Geneva nuclear test ban negotiations scheduled for resumption March 21. This letter is written to urge upon you two basic recommendations relating to these negotiations which, in my mind, are fundamental to the security of the United States and the pursuit of safe and sane arms control in the interests of all humanity.

These recommendations are the following:

First, that you bring to an end the voluntary, self-imposed moratorium on nuclear testing by the United States which was established by your predecessor and has been continued by you. Continuance of the moratorium, as the negotiations have been prolonged, has raised a serious collateral issue regarding its wisdom or unwisdom in terms of U.S. security. This collateral issue has confused the basic issues of the negotiations themselves and has become an impediment to them. It has become a further impediment in that it has established an uncontrolled test ban which may, in fact, be more desired by the U.S.S.R. than a controlled one. Thus it takes away from one side any urgency to complete formal negotiations.

Second, that the scope of negotiations be henceforth limited to the kinds of testing reasonably subject to inspection and control, namely, atmospheric testing and underground testing about 20-kiloton yields. This would exclude from negotiations the following:

1. Testing in space which competent authorities have told the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy cannot be detected.

2. Testing underground of devices yielding less than 20 and more than 5 kilotons, which our best authorities tell us can be picked up by the 21-station long and medium seismic wave detection system agreeable to the U.S.S.R., but which cannot be reliably distinguished from earth tremors.

3. Testing underground of devices yielding less than 5 kilotons which the same authorities declare could not be detected at all by the 21-station network and would require some 200 additional short seismic wave detection stations to which the U.S.S.R. undoubtedly will not agree.

I make these recommendations without reliance on the substantial arguments presented by those who see a basic need for nuclear testing to improve the Nation's security. I urge them without reference to the arguments presented by others who claim there is substantial advantage in banning tests, irrespective of whether the ban can be policed.

For whatever may be the advantages of either course, they are inconsequential compared to the advantage to be gained by quickly establishing the principle that henceforth the scope and terms of international agreements in which the United States participates shall, in fact, command compliance by the parties.

By reopening the test ban negotiations in the manner I am urging, Mr. President, you have the opportunity to establish that principle.

Until it is established, confidence cannot be engendered that agreement will accomplish their intended purposes. Without such confidence, power will continue to control international relationships and the inherent hazards of constantly developing armaments will remain.

If you take that opportunity, a beginning will be made toward substituting for power in the relationships between East and West the process of realistic negotiation and meaningful agreement.

If you reject the opportunity by permitting negotiation toward an all-inclusive "paper agreement" which fails to command compliance with many of its provisions, hopes for enhancement of the world's security from armed conflict by meaningful agreements regarding controllable hazards could be dashed for as long as you occupy the White House.

Your choice will be indicated by whether you act to restore urgency to the negotiations and limit their scope to areas where risk of discovery of noncompliance is reasonably high and, therefore, compliance reasonably commanded, or you permit them also to encompass areas where risk of discovery is small and, therefore, a premium placed on noncompliance.

Your choice will either commit the Nation to a principle offering real promise for further arms control and hazards reduction or embark you and your administration on the slippery course of agreement for agreement's sake. Today's facts of international life being uniquely what they are, should you choose the second course it is unlikely any subsequent opportunity would be presented you to return to the first one.

I am attaching additional material in support of the recommendations I have made and close by again urging them upon you.

Very sincerely,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

The additional material mentioned in the last paragraph of the letter pertained to the problems of arms control relating to the nuclear test ban negotiations and constitutes the subject of my discussion here today.

Arms control involves a multilateral approach to armament policy, including not only the amount and kinds of weapons and forces in being, but also their development, deployment, and utilization in periods of relaxation, tension, or war. It aims at the reduction of international hazards below levels existing without agreement rather than at armaments per se.

Arms control may be accomplished by formal agreement such as that concerning Anarctica or by tacit agreement such as that which limited the scope and intensity of the Korean war. It is to be

distinguished from disarmament which connotes a general reduction of armaments to minimum levels prescribed by some authority.

To be negotiable a specific arms control proposal must offer a reduction of hazards to all the parties involved. It is naive to expect one power to negotiate a proposal reducing the hazards facing another, but which does little to reduce its own.

To be realistic a specific arms control proposal must in fact reduce hazards. If its short- or long-range effect so weakens one side that an inviting opportunity for successful armed aggression is presented to the other, it is defective because it increases rather than reduces hazards.

Basically, armaments are servants of the national purposes, one of which is survival. Minimum armaments necessary for survival are difficult to assess since the word, in this context, means more than just physical survival of individual persons. It also encompasses survival as a nation, survival of standards of living, and survival of the society or civilization of which the Nation is part.

Abstract questions have been raised as to the morality of certain armaments, particularly nuclear weapons. However, from the standpoint of arms control, the question is not so much the morality of particular weapons stocked in defense arsenals to guarantee survival as the immorality either of failing to make the guarantee or using more violence than needed to meet it.

As to national purposes over and above survival, the extent to which particular nations are willing to employ armaments to achieve them is a matter of individual policy. Brief consideration of these particulars is essential in achieving an intelligent military posture and engaging on safe and sane courses of arms control.

Often we regard our own national purposes only in the restricted scope of defense and survival. Actually, and more apparent to others than ourselves, they are wider in scope. The United States was born in revolution against the older orders of tyranny. Always it has stood for the right of all people to national and individual freedom. In this regard the United States today remains as truly a revolutionary force in the world as it was in 1776. As such we pose a steady threat to societies rejecting the principles of freedom. Its significance from the Sino-Soviet bloc's viewpoint is emphasized by De Tocqueville's still valid observation made over a century ago, "The principal instrument of America is freedom, of Russia, servitude."

The American threat is generally regarded as moral, not military, in nature since rather consistently we have reserved the use of arms for defensive security purposes and employed nonmilitary means to implement our external goals. But to the Sino-Soviet bloc this amounts only to a difference in the nature of the threat. It does not diminish its magnitude. To the non-Communist world U.S. armaments in and of themselves are not seriously regarded as threats to world peace. But U.S. goals, laudable though they may be, are regarded by many as possibly dangerous enough in Communist eyes to provoke an attack, to which U.S. armaments, having failed to deter, would respond. That is the fear.

The fear is heightened because the Sino-Soviet bloc consistently has made clear its purpose that the world shall be communized. It views itself locked in total conflict with all that is non-Communist for as long as needed to achieve this end. Further, its philosophers view the conflict extending across the full spectrum of human activity—from the least violent to the most violent actions in which man can indulge. Communist dogma insists that the degree of violence employed at a particular time shall be fixed by historical circumstances. It is that degree which best advances Communist goals. Thus, to the Communists cold war and hot war are but the two sides of the same strategic coin, conflict, to be rotated as needed best to reflect circumstances of the moment.

With the possibility of war above zero, the basic goals of East and West in conflict and mutual distrust high, discussion of arms control may seem academic. It is not because there are hazards and costs of mutual advantage to all to reduce. Accidental war is an example. Spiraling costs of competition in weapons technology is another. However, the difficulties of going about it are immense.

Basically involved is determining what is to be controlled, how to control it, the consequences of violation to innocent parties, and the penalties for violation upon guilty parties. Each is interdependent with the other.

What is agreed to be controlled must be inherently controllable, otherwise means for control cannot be devised. Actual control of even inherently controllable subjects will not be achieved in fact unless the control system confronts a potential violator with more than a nominal risk of getting caught. The consequences of violation must not be so disastrous to one party that noncompliance by another is encouraged. Nor can the penalty facing a would-be violator be too insignificant to create a reasonable deterrent to violation.

It is obviously unwise to negotiate on arms control proposals that fail to meet these criteria. At most only an illusion of hazards reduction can be achieved. At best only time and opportunity for meaningful negotiation are lost. At worst, whole nations could be entrapped and perish.

How to approach arms control proposals to meet these criteria is more difficult to assess than how not to. But at least, risk of entrapment can be lessened and meaningful avenues spotlighted by discussing and eliminating past failures. Amongst these are:

First. Unilateral disarmament: Admitting its patent inadequacies, unilateral disarmament is nevertheless urged by some on the theory that nuclear war would destroy the human race and life, even in slavery, is preferable to extinction. The theory is defective in that as terrible as the consequences of nuclear war may be, and thus vital the need to reduce its possibility, they do not include extinction of the human race and to most people they are preferable to the consequences of surrender to communism.

Independent studies by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and Dr. Herman Kahn of a hypothetical 1,500 megaton surprise nuclear attack on the United States indicated the following:

Genetic effects: An increase in children born seriously defective of about 25 percent from the current level of 4 per 100 of all births to 5 per 100. This is a large penalty since it would have to be paid through 30 to 40 generations. But it is far from annihilation of the human race.

Medical effects: Bone cancer, leukemia, and other life-shortening effects of radiation would amount to 1 to 2 years for lighter exposures and 5 to 10 years for heavier exposures. In any case, life will go on.

Economic effects: Assessing casualties in the 60 million range and semitotal destruction of the 53 standard metropolitan areas, expect full recuperation, that is, restoration of immediate preattack living standards, within 5 to 10 years. This is far from national suicide.

By way of contrast, my own research on the consequences of a hypothetical surrender and Communist takeover of the United States indicates complete destruction of Western society as we know it, reduction of living standards to bare subsistence levels, and the elimination of the United States as a nation. This study also shows that between 60 million and 100 million of the country's 180 million Americans would face extermination if genocide patterns consistently employed following Communist takeovers elsewhere were pursued.

Second. Uncontrolled disarmament: The idea of reducing tensions by progressive arms reduction, eventually to police force levels, was popular in the period between the World Wars. Controls in the nature of self-enforcing mechanisms were not common in the many proposals suggested. However, establishment of some kind of an international security system of mutual guarantees and pledges of assistance were conditions precedent in many of them. Uncontrolled disarmament proved infeasible because even amongst Western nations the problem of treaty violation proved insurmountable. Vis-a-vis the Communists who actively have utilized treaty violation as an instrument of policy, this approach is even more naive.

Third. Supranational authority: Article VIII of the League of Nations Covenant and chapter VII of the United Nations Charter envisioned a supranational authority to spike aggression, otherwise police international friction, and thereby sharply diminish the necessity for large national arms establishments. In both cases implementation foundered upon the troublesome matter of persuading nations to surrender up any of their sovereignty. A more basic weakness of this approach is that should

international amity reach the point where surrender of sovereignty could be negotiated, it would already have passed the point where the less complicated job of negotiating out troubles calling for a supranationed authority could be accomplished.

Fourth. Supranational technology trust: This approach was conceived by the Baruch plan freely offering up the U.S. nuclear technology monopoly to internationalization. Unfortunately this historic magnanimity failed to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons. Even though the United States agreed to destroy its nuclear stockpile, erasing the technology from the minds of our scientists was impossible and the Soviets were unwilling to forgo acquiring it for themselves. Apart from this circumstance, a general handicap to establishing international technology trusts is that weapons develop so swiftly and negotiations proceed so slowly that new systems become entrenched in military strategy before agreement to keep them out can be consummated.

Fifth. Prevention of surprise attack: Exemplified by the Soviet ground observer and Eisenhower "Open Skies" proposals, this approach to hazards reduction proved nonnegotiable because of the large gap between the value assigned to internal privacy by the Communist world's closed society and the free world's open society. Its feasibility is somewhat doubtful anyway due to the indistinguishability of training alert sorties by manned aircraft from a surprise attack sortie; and, the unlikelihood of a missile attack warning arriving before the maximum 30 minutes intercontinental flight time elapses. A unilateral approach to the problem is being taken by the United States in developing its Samos "spy in the sky" orbital surveillance system.

These various approaches having insufficiently satisfied the realistic criteria for hazards reduction in the nuclear era, and the need for it mounting, the United States proceeded to the Geneva test ban negotiations in 1958 with a fresh and promising new idea. It involves writing into formal agreement, along with the promises, so-called self-enforcing mechanisms to make more certain they are kept. Essentially this amounts to inspection and violations detection machinery aimed not at 100 percent efficiency, but posing enough risks of cheating being detected to deter it.

Unfortunately application at Geneva of the self-enforcing mechanisms principle has been clouded by the extension of negotiations into areas where it cannot be applied. This occurred because scientific data available at the beginning of the negotiations was inadequate to assess what testing can, and what testing cannot, be policed, either at all within the limits of present technology, or, within the limits of acceptability of available system to closed societies.

Further confusion has resulted from injection of the legitimate side issue of the wisdom or unwisdom of the United States continuing its self-imposed weapons test moratorium while negotiations drag on. It also undoubtedly has delayed negotiation in good faith since to the Soviets nontesting by the United States without controls on themselves undoubtedly appears preferable to concluding any agreement containing them. This obstacle can and should be removed promptly by ending the moratorium. Ending the moratorium could not result in withdrawal from the talks by the U.S.S.R. unless it has no real self-interest in continuing them. If this is the case, the talks will fail anyway and it is best to ascertain it sooner than later.

Scientific studies since 1958 adequately show that specifically uncontrollable without at least another 5 to 10 years, research are tests in outer space; that specifically uncontrollable are underground tests below 5 kilotons yield without the addition of some 200 short seismic wave detection stations in the U.S.S.R. and this is patently unacceptable to it; and, that only very qestionable control can be achieved by the 21-station medium and long seismic wave detection network acceptable to the U.S.S.R. because nuclear tests underground in the 5- to 20-kiloton range cannot reliably be distinguished from natural earth tremors.

All this means that only tests in the atmosphere and large-yield underground tests can be banned under controllable conditions, that is, either within scientific capabilities in existence or within the acceptable limits of intrusion upon national privacy of closed societies.

It also means that further negotiations at Geneva must be confined to controllable types of testing. If negotiations are continued toward inclusion of uncontrollable bans when the Geneva negotiations resume March 21, it will signal surrender of the one real hope the world now has to achieve a meaningful beginning on reducing its hazards. This is because it will signal abandonment by the United States of the last remaining approach on which safe and sane arms control can be based.

Those who emotionally and altruistically call for a first step at Geneva irrespective of the demands of U.S.S.R. negotiators do a disservice to all who realistically seek to make the world a safer place in which to live. For, unless the first step is toward nailing down the principle that parties to arms control agreement shall, in fact, observe what they promise, it is not a first step at all. It is two steps backward: first, to illusion, and second, to disillusion. Any such weakness would be relentlessly pursued to force our retreat many more steps on a journey of no return.

CIVIL REMEDIES PROVIDED TO PERSONS DAMAGED BY UNFAIR COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce. This bill is similar to one which I introduced in the 86th Congress which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

My bill is designed to introduce order into a body of Federal and State law that is now in confusion. The relief provided for by the act would be in addition to those rights and remedies otherwise available. In other words State jurisdiction over activities wholly intrastate in character will remain as it should, for if State remedies were entirely preempted, the result would be a no man's land, where neither State nor Federal law applied.

The bill I introduced in the 86th Congress was recently the subject of a favorable article in the January 1961 issue of the Yale Law Journal, by Thomas B. Bracken, entitled "Misrepresentation and the Lindsay Bill: A Stab at Uniformity in the Law of Unfair Competition." The article reviews the complex and confused state of the law on this subject and points up the need for reform.

The Lindsay bill is the work product of a distinguished group of lawyer members of the Committee on Trade Regulation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. I have had the pleasure of working with this committee, which has rendered an extremely important public service. The committee has drafted an explanatory statement, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that it be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point. I think it desirable also, Mr. Speaker, to spread the bill out in full length in the RECORD and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD immediately after the explanatory statement.

AN EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The Lindsay bill is designed "to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce." If enacted, it would create a new Federal statute dealing with unfair competition. The text of the bill itself is relatively simple, but the need for such a statute and the reasons for some of its provisions may require explanation.

The fundamental purpose of the bill is to provide a basis for the development of a uniform body of Federal law in the field of unfair competition. In the years prior to 1938, great progress had been made in this direction by the decisions of the Federal courts. Then the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Erie* v. *Tompkins* (304 U.S. 64 (1938)), denied the existence of a Federal common law and required instead that the Federal judiciary apply State law. There is obvious logical justification for this rule, because it prevents the accidental availability of Federal jurisdiction from affecting the law applicable to a given controversy. It is generally agreed, however, that this checkerboard approach is inappropriate for dealing with unfair competition. Modern business activities so frequently are national in scope that there is no serious dissent from the view that uniformity throughout the country in the law of unfair competition would be desirable.

Some commentators believed the problem had been solved by the passage of the Lanham Act in 1946. In particular, section

44 provides protection for foreign nationals against unfair competition, and also provides that citizens of the United States shall have all the benefits conferred by the act upon foreign citizens. It was thought that this would be the basis for Federal jurisdiction over unfair competition causes. The statute has been so construed only in the Ninth Circuit, however, so it is fairly clear that section 44 will not serve as the route to nationwide uniformity.

There is less doubt about the availability of Federal jurisdiction under section 43(a) of the Lanham Act. But that section has proved to have little practical significance. It is invoked only rarely; and, in any event, it is limited by its terms to false descriptions and false representations of origin.

The Lindsay bill attacks the problem directly by creating a new cause of action and giving exclusive jurisdiction over it to the Federal district courts, without regard to the amount in controversy or the diversity or lack of diversity of citizenship of the parties (sec. 8). The availability of this new cause of action does not diminish existing rights to proceed under State or other Federal law; it is specifically provided that relief pursuant to the proposed new statute shall be in addition to those rights and remedies otherwise available (sec. 4).

The heart of the bill is section 2, which lists the "unfair commercial activities" that are made actionable. The expression "unfair commercial activities" was selected deliberately because it was felt that "unfair competition" might be construed as a limitation. As additional assurance of a broad construction, section 3 provides that absence of competition between the parties shall not be a defense to an action brought under the statute.

The list of unfair commercial activities in section 2 represents a carefully chosen compromise between the futility of attempting to define every type of conduct intended to be prohibited, and the equal futility of simply stating that unfair acts shall be deemed unlawful. The former alternative, apart from its practical impossibility, would have created an environment in which defendants constantly could have sought justification for their acts under the expressio unius rule; while the latter would not have been sufficiently precise to serve as a basis for the desired uniformity of decision throughout the Federal judicial system.

There are just four subparagraphs in section 2. Although most of these are self-explanatory, a few comments may be helpful. Section 2(a)(3), in effect, is a Federal anti-dilution statute. Section 2(b) covers false or misleading statements "of fact" in order to avoid prohibiting anyone from stating his opinion. Since section 2(b) applies to statements about the goods or services of "either party," it includes trade libel as well as false advertising and thus removes any doubt about the availability of injunctive relief for this type of defamation. Section 2(c) is a deliberate catchall; in particular, the use of the expression "reasonable standards of commercial ethics" is intended to provide Federal judges with the opportunity to apply the liberal standards of such New York State decisions as *Dior* v. *Milton* and *Miller* v. *Universal*, free from the hampering effect of any archaic rulings in the States where they sit, or in their Federal circuits. The purpose of section 2 is to establish guideposts for the Federal courts that are definite enough to identify the principal types of unlawful activity and yet allow the flexibility that is essential in a field where rapid technological advances in business and communications constantly create new opportunities for exploitation by the unscrupulous few.

Patent and copyright infringement are excluded from the scope of "unfair commercial activities" by section 7. This was done to meet possible criticism that the new statute might otherwise be used to extend the scope or duration of a patent or copyright monopoly. It was not considered feasible or proper to exclude trademark infringement, because many forms of unfair commercial activities affect trademark rights, and also because the objection about extending duration does not apply to trademarks since they may continue in perpetuity.

The right of action against unlawful commercial activities is created by section 1 of the bill. The action is for an injunction; no damages may be recovered. There are several reasons for this. Plaintiffs in most cases of this nature are interested primarily in bringing about the cessation of the unlawful acts rather than collecting damages, which may be difficult to prove even in the best of circumstances. The elimination of any provision for damages should prevent the use of the new cause of action as the basis for strike suits. At the same time, it was felt that a party with a genuine claim should not be deterred from bringing an action because of its expense; accordingly, the bill provides that a judgment for costs, reasonable attorneys' fees and disbursements may be granted to a successful plaintiff in addition to injunctive relief.

Any person damaged or likely to be damaged by unfair commercial activities is entitled to sue under section 1. The phrase "likely to be damaged" is borrowed from section 43(a) of the Lanham Act (similar language will be found in sections 13 and 14, dealing with opposition and cancellation) while the troublesome concept "believes that he is" has not been carried over from the Lanham Act. The words "damaged or" were inserted to avoid any possible argument that the statute applied only where no damage had yet occurred. On the other hand, section 3 makes it clear that actual damage is not required as a prerequisite to suit.

The right of action under section 1 is available against unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce and the term "commerce" is defined in section 9 as "all commerce which may lawfully be regulated by Congress." This makes it clear that the broadest possible scope is intended; specifically, intrastate acts that affect interstate commerce are covered. In addition, section 9 contains a statement of the intent of the statute, which includes the protection of any person engaged in interstate commerce against unfair commercial activities whether used or committed locally or in interstate commerce.

Innocent publishers and broadcasters are protected by section 5, which not only makes the absence of knowledge or intent a defense in an action against a publisher or broadcaster, but provides specifically that the burden of proving knowledge or intent is on the plaintiff. Furthermore, in order to avoid unnecessarily severe economic consequences to media of communication, section 6 provides that relief under the statute shall not be available when the injunction would delay the dissemination of a particular issue of a periodical, broadcast of a radio or television program, or showing of a motion picture after the scheduled time, when the delay would be due to the method by which dissemination is customarily conducted in accordance with sound business practice, as distinguished from a device to evade the statute. A single false advertisement in a magazine, for example, would not hold up distribution of the entire issue even if the publisher did have knowledge; but the use of the same or similar advertisements in future issues could be enjoined.

The active support of this bill by all interested parties is urgently required.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any person damaged or likely to be damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce shall be entitled to an injunction and a judgment for costs, reasonable attorney's fees, and disbursements in a civil action brought by that person against any person who has engaged in such activities.

SEC. 2. Unfair commercial activities under this Act shall be—

(a) the commission of any act or practice or the use of any statement which is likely (1) to cause confusion as to the affiliation, connection, or association of the person charged therewith or (2) to cause confusion as to the origin, source, or sponsorship of the goods or services of such person or (3) to dilute the distinctive quality of a trademark or trade name of another;

(b) the use for purposes of profit of any statement of fact as to the goods or services of either party which is false or misleading by reason either of misstatement or omission of a material fact;

(c) the commission for purposes of profit of any other act or practice which is likely to deceive or which violates reasonable standards of commercial ethics; or

(d) the institution of an action under this Act in bad faith.

SEC. 3. Absence of competition between the parties, of actual damage to the person seeking protection, or of a public interest in such unfair commercial activities shall not be a defense to an action brought under this Act.

SEC. 4. The relief provided for by this Act shall be in addition to those rights and remedies otherwise available.

SEC. 5. Absence of knowledge or intent shall be a defense to any action brought under this Act against a publisher or broadcaster in respect of any contents of any news, literary, educational, advertising, or entertainment medium and the person instituting the action shall have the burden of proving knowledge and intent in any action brought against such a publisher or broadcaster.

SEC. 6. Relief shall not be available under this Act in respect of an issue of a newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical, the broadcast of any radio or television program, or the showing of any motion picture when restraining the appearance or performance of any particular issue of such periodical, program, or picture would delay its dissemination after the regular time therefor, and such delay would be due to the method by which dissemination is customarily conducted in accordance with sound business practice and not to any method or device adopted for the evasion of this Act or to prevent or delay the issuance of an injunction or restraining order.

SEC. 7. This Act shall not apply to patent or copyright infringement.

SEC. 8. The district and Territorial courts of the United States shall have sole original jurisdiction and the circuit courts of appeal of the United States and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall have sole appellate jurisdiction, of all actions whatsoever under this Act without regard to the amount in controversy or to diversity or lack of diversity of the citizenship of the parties. Writs of certiorari may be granted by the Supreme Court of the United States for the review of cases arising under this Act .

SEC. 9. The intent of this Act is to regulate all commerce which may lawfully be regulated by Congress by making actionable solely in a Federal forum all unfair commercial activities set forth herein thereby to protect any person engaged in interstate commerce against such unfair commercial activities

whether used or committed locally or in interstate commerce. In the construction of this Act, unless the contrary is plainly apparent from the context—

1. The term "person" includes any individual, partnership, corporation, association, union, or other organization capable of suing or being sued in a court of law.

2. The term "commerce" means all commerce which may lawfully be regulated by Congress.

3. Words used in the singular include the plural and vice versa.

4. The term "trademark" includes any word, name, symbol, or device or any combination thereof adopted and used by a manufacturer or merchant to identify his goods and distinguish them from those manufactured or sold by others, any mark used in the sale or advertising of services to identify the services of one person and distinguish them from the services of others, including without limitation the marks, names, symbols, titles, designations, slogans, character names, and distinctive features of radio or other advertising used in commerce, any mark used upon or in connection with the products or services of one or more persons other than the owner of the mark to certify regional or other origin, material, mode of manufacture, quality, accuracy, or other characteristics of such goods or services or that the work or labor on the goods or services was performed by members of a union or other organization or any mark used by the members of a cooperative, an association or other collective group or organization, including marks used to indicate membership in a union, an association, or other organization.

5. The term "trade name" includes individual names and surnames, firm names and trade names used by manufacturers, industrialists, merchants, agriculturists, and others to identify their businesses, vocations, or occupations or the names or titles lawfully adopted and used by persons, firms, associations, corporations, companies, unions, and any manufacturing, industrial, commercial, agricultural, or other organizations engaged in trade or commerce and capable of suing and being sued in a court of law.

SEC. 10. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 11. This Act shall be in force and take effect immediately upon its enactment but shall not affect any suit, proceeding or appeal then pending.

SEC. 12. This Act may be cited as the "Unfair Commercial Activities Act".

FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE PROGRESS REPORT

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, during the past 4 years, it has been my great privilege to serve as a member of the Advisory Committee to the Foreign Service Institute. In that capacity I have had opportunity to see heartening progress made toward the goal of improved foreign language and career training for members of the Foreign Service.

As a result of expanded efforts by the Institute over the past 5 years, more than 1,000 officers, mainly class 8, have received both basic career and language training. An additional 600 officers, classes 4, 5, and 6, have had midcareer or specialized language or area training, while upwards of 200 senior officers, classes 1, 2, and 3, have been given special language, war college, or senior seminar training. While some of the benefits of this training will not be fully felt for perhaps another decade or until the junior officers attain higher positions, the training already received is a built-in asset for the Department and the Foreign Service which should prove invaluable in the future.

By providing our Foreign Service officers with the specialized knowledge essential to effective discharge of their varied international responsibilities, the Foreign Service Institute fulfills a vital function. In a report to the Secretary of State last October, the Advisory Committee commented upon the work of the Institute as follows:

While the Institute is comparatively new and is still in the process of building a recognized tradition, substantial progress and improvement are being aggressively sought. This committee expresses the considered view that the Foreign Service Institute is well staffed, operates at a reasonable cost, and effectively performs its work as a professional educational institution serving the special needs of the Government.

Certainly the Director of the Institute, Mr. Harold B. Hoskins, and his dedicated staff are to be commended for their unselfish efforts toward meeting the educational needs of the Foreign Service.

Since 1955, the rate of training for the entire Foreign Service has increased from 47 full-time man-years to an estimated 300.4 in fiscal year 1961. The estimated cost of training for this year is $4.7 million, of which approximately two-thirds is required to meet the salaries, travel, and per diem of the students, leaving approximately one-third for administration and teaching.

So that a clearer picture may be given of the training provided by the Institute, I am attaching two charts: one, a summary of training at the Foreign Service Institute, and two, languages taught under Foreign Service Institute direction in Washington or abroad, fiscal year 1955 through fiscal year 1960. Perhaps most striking about these statistics is the fact that 50 foreign languages are currently being taught under Foreign Service Institute auspices.

As the United States assumes ever greater international responsibilities, the need for properly trained diplomatic representatives will become more and more important. The Foreign Service Institute may be expected to play a key role in preparing members of the Foreign Service for their varied assignments.

Under leave to extend, I include the attached charts together with my remarks:

Foreign Service Institute—Summary of training

	Results, fiscal year 1960	Objectives, fiscal year 1961	Training plans, fiscal year 1962
I. LANGUAGE TRAINING			
A. Full time:			
FSI	327	265	339
Universities	2	2	3
Field schools	119	65	59
Other field locations	15	5	10
Total, full time	463	337	411
B. Part time:			
FSI:			
During working hours	70	70	70
Before working hours	249	249	249
Total, FSI	319	319	319
Oversea posts	2,723	3,210	3,210
Total, part time	3,042	3,529	3,529
Total, language training	3,505	3,866	3,940
II. FUNCTIONAL TRAINING			
A. Full time:			
FSI:			
Career training:			
Basic officers	179	220	264
Midcareer	70	60	80
Senior seminar	11	12	12
Subtotal	260	292	356
A. Full time—Continued			
FSI.—Continued			
Special functional training	388	427	452
Orientation	1,724	1,724	1,724
Seminars	84	102	95
Total, FSI	2,456	2,545	2,627
Universities	54	48	51
Armed services colleges	30	33	33
Rotational training	17	27	34
Total, full time	2,557	2,653	2,745
B. Part time			
FSI:			
Special functional training	100	100	100
Seminars	178	373	373
Correspondence courses	700	700	700
Total, FSI	978	1,173	1,173
Universities:			
Local	192	192	192
Overseas	5	5	5
Correspondence courses	23	23	23
Total, part time	1,198	1,393	1,393
Total, functional training	3,755	4,046	4,138
Grand total	7,260	7,912	8,078

Languages taught under FSI direction in Washington or abroad, fiscal year 1955 through fiscal year 1960

	FSO's with S–2 or above
Afrikaans	7
Amharic	2
Arabic	69
Bengali	1
Bulgarian	8
Burmese	3
Cambodian	3
Chinese	75
Amoy	----
Cantonese	----
Mandarin	----
Creole	1
Czech	29
Danish	51
Dutch	50
Finnish	19
Flemish	----
French	1,784
German	1,091
Greek	42
Hausa	----
Hebrew	13
Hindustani & Urdu	28
Hungarian	21
Icelandic	4
Indonesian	33
Italian	457
Japanese	57
Korean	7
Kurdish	----
Laotian	1
Malayalam	----
Malayan	14
Norwegian	69
Papiamento	----
Persian	19
Polish	43
Portuguese	204
Pushtu	----
Rumanian	11
Russian	166
Serbo-Croatian	45
Singhalese	----
Spanish	1,188
Swahili	2
Swedish	63
Tagalog	----
Tamil	2
Thai	11
Turki	----
Turkish	29
Urdu (see Hindustani)	----
Vietnamese	9
Visayan	----

NOTE.—With the exception of Flemish, Pushtu, and Rumanian, all of the above languages are currently being taught at FSI/Washington or at oversea posts.

DO NOT CUT THE RESERVE COMPONENTS

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, President Kennedy told the Congress and the people of the United States something of what he called "the harsh enormity of the trials through which we must pass in the next 4 years."

In the preparation for exercise of his leadership as Commander in Chief to meet worldwide challenges to our freedom and our way of life, the President said:

I have, therefore, instructed the Secretary of Defense to reappraise our entire strategy—our ability to fulfill our commitments—the effectiveness, vulnerability, and dispersal of our strategic bases, forces, and warning systems—the efficiency and economy of our operation and organization—the elimination of obsolete bases and installations—and the adequacy, modernization, and mobility of our present conventional and nuclear forces and weapons systems in the light of present and future dangers. I have asked for preliminary conclusions by the end of February—and I shall then recommend whatever legislative, budgetary, or executive action is needed in the light of these conclusions.

Two days prior to President Kennedy's address to this body, the then President Eisenhower in his farewell message said:

A vital element in keeping peace is our Military Establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

In his budget message to the Congress, Mr. Eisenhower said further:

To carry out basic military missions, this budget provides for a total strength in our Active Forces of 2,492,900 men and women on June 30, 1962, the same as now estimated for the end of fiscal year 1961 and 4,000 over the yearend strength originally planned for this year. A supplemental appropriation is being requested to provide for this 1961 increase.

Of the Nation's Reserve forces, General Eisenhower said:

If the Reserve components of our Armed Forces are to serve effectively in time of war, their basic organization and objectives must conform to the changing character and missions of the Active Forces. Under modern conditions the quality and combat readiness of the Reserve forces are more important than numbers. The nature of warfare has changed so drastically during the last decade that the whole concept of the roles and the missions of the Reserve forces must be reevaluated.

Accordingly, the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been directed to make a new study of the Reserve missions and requirements. This should be aimed at the objectives of efficiency, economy, and promoting administrative effectiveness. As a first step toward a more fundamental revision, this budget provides for a reduction in the number of Army National Guard and Army Reserve.

I think it is unnecessary to tell this body that this proposed budget cut—the proposal which is now being studied by your Appropriations Committee—was for a flat, across-the-board 10-percent cut. The Congress has had to deal with this proposal for the past several years.

We recognize this for what it is—a bookkeeping cut and not a reduction based upon military estimates. Nor is it consistent with the statements made either by the immediate past Commander in Chief, or our present Commander in Chief.

Both have stated that studies are being made of present requirements. Yet, the Eisenhower budget, even while stating that studies are to be made of the missions and roles of the Reserves, has prejudged this study, and has recommended the answer even before consideration could be given to the question. I hope that the present administration will withdraw this recommendation. As a member of the Military Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with this question, it has been my responsibility during the past several years—and even today with regard to the current budget—to deal with this inconsistency.

The Members of this body know that for the past several years military leaders generally and we in the Congress have considered it unwise to weaken our Reserve Forces, and we have resisted the persistent effort to enforce a dollarwise and defense-foolish policy of applying an across-the-board reduction of our fairly modest Reserve Forces.

It has been my privilege during the past 2 years, as a member of the Army Reserve, to serve as chairman of the legislative advisory committee of the Reserve Officers Association. This organization for 39 years has been devoted to the cause of adequate national defense, and has worked unselfishly in support of the Congress in its efforts to carry out its constitutional obligations to provide for the common defense.

In that role, I have talked with Secretary McNamara and the service Secretaries about this basic concept of Reserve strength. I have urged that the new Defense team cooperate with the Congress in keeping our modest Reserve Forces at the present level. The so-called saving from the 10-percent cut is so relatively insignificant that it cannot affect the Nation's overall economy. It would be my hope that the new administration would recommend a strengthening of the Reserve program, and a substantial increase of the financial support therefor. We know that the Reserve Forces are maintained at a cost of about one-tenth of the cost of the Active Forces.

This country was founded on the principle that the security of the country should be based on a relatively small Regular force and a large citizen force.

Throughout the history of our country both the legislative and executive branches of the Government have carried out this concept.

In the serious time in which we are living, it seems to me that any departure from this principle would be harmful to the security of our Nation.

In 1955 when the Armed Forces Act of 1955 was under consideration, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of each of the services, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Air Force, and the Chief of Naval Operations all testified before the House Armed Services Committee. At that time each and every one of these individuals stated "that as the strength of the Regular service diminishes the strength of the Reserve should be increased."

Approximately 2 years later the Defense Department began enunciating a strange new principle, and that was, "as the strength of the Regular service diminishes the strength of the Reserve should be decreased."

It has been very difficult for me to understand this radical change in thinking and planning within a period of approximately 2 years. We recognize great

changes in weaponry, techniques, and challenges, but the need for manpower is constant.

We have seen develop in this country the philosophy which more or less states, "that inasmuch as the next war will not last a week, and since we could not mobilize our Reserve in that length of time, then why have the Reserve?"

To me, this is a defeatism at its worst. God forbid that another World War should happen, but should it come, and assuming that atomic or hydrogen bombs should be used, we fully realize we would receive some terrific blows. However, I know that the spirit and willpower of our Americans are such that instead of throwing up our hands and quitting, we would respond and fight our way back in spite of all difficulties that must be overcome.

The Army Reserve and our National Guard troops are the only Army military forces that have a built-in dispersion factor. Their distribution in small units all over the United States would insure a large proportion of survival which possibly would not be true of our heavily concentrated Regular Army forces, whose locations may well be known by the enemy in meticulous detail.

If there should be the holocaust of nuclear war, dispersed Reserve units, and even individual reservists, will be of inestimable value in providing leadership, courage, and example to demoralized, frightened, and leaderless civilians.

While recognizing the possibility of a nuclear holocaust, we should, however, also remember that nuclear deterrence can result in a nuclear stalemate. Under such awful prospects the most probable course of military conquest by an enemy so minded would follow strictly conventional methods. Under this premise the availability of our Reserve components could spell the difference between victory or defeat for our country.

The Active Army is now extended in its worldwide commitments to the degree that it would not be effective in a major conventional action without its Reserve. In our system the Army Reserve components are the very key to successful conventional warfare.

The budget now before us again includes a 10 percent cut in the proposed budget for the coming fiscal year for the Army Reserve and National Guard forces. It seems to me that Congress should follow the same procedure it has done for the past 2 years and restore this 10 percent cut for these forces and if necessary include language that will insure that the will of Congress prevails.

In the past the Naval Reserve budget, while extremely austere, has not been the subject of a bald and open cut. This year, however, it too has had its Reserve personnel budget drastically cut.

The Secretary of Defense has authorized a selective Naval Reserve strength of 135,000. This is a rockbottom figure that is necessary for D-day requirements.

The current fiscal year budget provides sufficient funds to keep an average drill pay strength of 127,000. The proposed 1962 Naval Reserve personnel budget will cut the funds so that the average drill pay strength will be 124,330, with an end of 125,105.

It should be borne in mind that the Navy's selected Reserve is a D-day organization. Its members already have their mobilization orders in their hands. They are part of the force in being. The day following D-day they will add jet fighter squadrons, trained antisubmarine aircraft squadrons, 50 antisubmarine-warfare ships of destroyer types to the fleet and also provide the trained personnel to bring fleet ships to their full war complement. The manning level at present is only 81 percent, which precludes sustained combat capability.

Additional funds are needed for those Navy reservists who come in the category D classification. These are reservists who are in the Ready Reserve who are willing to train four times a month without training pay, and for whom a limited number are entitled to receive 15 days' active duty training. Funds for the 15 days' active duty training for these reservists have been radically reduced. In the fiscal year 1960, funds provided for the training of 12,500 Naval Reserve officers. The proposed 1962 budget reduces this number to only 4,700.

For the Navy training program to be maintained on the same status as the current 1961 budget provides will require that the proposed budget for the Navy Reserve of $84,600,000 be increased to the current 1961 budget of $88 million.

Frankly, I think the funds should be provided to permit the Navy to build the authorized strength of 135,000. This would require an additional appropriation of $2 million.

I would also like to point out that under "Operations and maintenance"—O. & M.N.—in the current 1961 budget the amount of money for oil and gasoline for Naval Reserve aircraft was reduced $2 million. This was a $3 million reduction over the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1959.

This money was requested by the Navy but was arbitrarily removed from the defense budget prior to its being presented to Congress.

This will mean a 20-percent reduction for flight training for Naval Air Reserve pilots and plane crews.

We hope that the proposed budget for this item will be increased in order to provide the oil and gasoline to meet all of the training requirements.

The proposed Air Force Reserve personnel budget amounts to a reduction of about $2 million. This is in the face of increased responsibilities given to the Air Force Reserve with the formation of their new base support and recovery units. These units do not replace the flying units that are being maintained in the force. Instead they are an added responsibility. The word "recovery" is the key to their responsibility. They add to the built-in dispersion I discussed before and may be the sole haven for our aircrews returning from an initial strike in an all-out nuclear war.

For this reason, it appears that an increase, rather than a decrease, in Air Force personnel funds is in order.

I understand that in that portion of the Air Force operations and maintenance which provides flying hours for Reserve aircrews, the amount asked this year remains about the same as last year. Under last year's budget our Reserve flying units were so restricted in their flying hours that they could not perform the optimum in training missions.

Now this year a number of these units are having their obsolescent C–119 aircraft replaced by the bigger and longer range C–124's. These aircraft cost twice as much to operate each flying hour. Thus, the moneys asked for flying operations for our Reserves amount to a reduction in what was, at best, a minimal flying program.

If an increase in flying hour funds is not provided for the Air Force Reserve there is grave danger of a serious setback in their training status.

On the 20th of January, President Kennedy, in his inaugural address, said to every citizen in this country:

> Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

The Nation's dedicated reservists are willing and anxious to do what they can. They should be encouraged through recognition by our country of the services they have rendered in the past, the services they are rendering now, and the service they will render should our country once more become involved in an armed conflict.

I think it well to take a look at history and see what happened to some of the great empires in the world. Take Carthage, Greece, and the Roman Empires. When these great empires were at the height of their strength they were leaders in every phase of human endeavor. They had the greatest commerce, the greatest industry in their time, and the greatest educational systems then known. Then their citizens became fat and complacent. They lost sight of the obligation of every citizen to his country, including a military obligation. More and more, these countries placed their security exclusively in professional forces. This may have contributed to the fact that these empires faded, one by one, into oblivion.

Our Reserves today, in addition to being available for any emergency that may require their services in the military force, are unquestionably performing a service that cannot be measured in dollars and cents. Each reservist, when he changes into a military uniform for his drill, is pointing out to the youth of this country that every citizen has a military obligation and that the reservists are carrying out this obligation. He is providing an example in patriotism.

I cannot too strongly urge that the importance of the organized Reserves be emphasized over and over again to our citizens and that Congress do its duty in seeing that sufficient funds are appropriated in order that this concept on which this country was founded is carried out.

I sincerely feel that if this is done, that we in this country will have a powerful additional bulwark of defense. Then truly we need not fear a threat from any Communist power. These dedicated citi-

zens, through their patriotism and their service and by bolstering and strengthening the regular services, can insure that our form of government and our way of life will continue.

A BILL FOR INCREASED PUBLIC PROTECTION AGAINST PRICE FIXING BY PROVIDING FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY CONCERNING IDENTICAL BIDS SUBMITTED TO PUBLIC AGENCIES IN RESPONSE TO INVITATIONS FOR ADVERTISED COMPETITIVE BIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the monstrous conspiracy which the manufacturers of heavy electrical equipment have been operating, and for so many years, has been a shocking thing to many people. Certainly the facts revealed in this case make it clear that the public ought to have increased protection against such price fixing and bid rigging.

Obviously, the possibility, or the probability, of being caught, prosecuted under the Sherman Act, and paying the fines and penalties which might be imposed have not been of a sufficient threat to prevent executives of some of the biggest corporations in the land from doing things that everybody knows to be illegal. The possibility of fines and exposure appear to have been small, in the thinking of these people, as compared to the volume of business—amounting to some $8 billion per year—being done in the products for which prices have been fixed and markets divided.

Accordingly, I have today introduced a bill which I believe will add much to the public protection. The purpose of the bill is simply to provide for public information and publicity every time two or more competitors submit identical bids to a public agency. The effectiveness of the bill would depend solely upon the public's being informed and forewarned—but I am confident that public opinion in such matters can be quite persuasive and will help bring about voluntary compliance with the antitrust laws. To borrow a couple of lines from Alexander Pope—

> Vice is a monster of so frightful mien.
> As to be hated needs but to be seen.

Furthermore, such public reports as would be required by the bill should prove extremely helpful to the directors and top officials of the corporations. There seems to have been some confusion and misunderstanding within the corporations involved in the electrical manufacturers case as to whether some of the big corporations had a policy of violating the antitrust laws or a policy against violating these laws. Some of the company officials who were fined or sent to jail for 30 days made a plea that they were merely cogs in the corporate wheels, carrying out their corporation's policy. On the other hand, some of the heads of these corporations have declared that these violations of the antitrust laws by their vice presidents and junior executives were contrary to the corporation's policy, and, furthermore, that these activities had been concealed from the directors and other top executives of the corporation. Thus a published statement by the General Electric Co., appearing in the New York Times of February 8, says this:

> The improper acts of a few General Electric employees were a deliberate violation of the company's directive policy 20.5, and were carefully hidden from those in the company charged with assuring compliance with the policy.
>
> It should be noted that of the thousands of individual employees invested with management authority and responsibility at General Electric, only a very few acted irresponsibly.

The kind of public reports which the bill would require will bring to the attention of the corporation heads instances of identical bids submitted by their employees and employees of their competitors. These reports will thus help the top corporate executives to know what is going on in their own corporations and give them notice of things which may warrant investigation.

The bill in no way changes the present antitrust laws. And it does not provide for any increased fines or penalties for violating these laws.

In a nutshell, this is what the bill would do:

First, it would require the Federal agencies to make a report to the Attorney General giving all the details each time one of these agencies receives bids in response to advertised invitations for competitive bids for any item, supplies, or services and two or more of the bids are identical as to price.

Second, the bill invites the State and local governments to submit similar information to the Attorney General whenever these governments or their purchasing departments receive such identical bids.

Third, the Attorney General would then be required to make a consolidated report to Congress every 3 months, setting out in some systematic way the pertinent information concerning all these instances of identical bidding. This report would then be published as a House document and thus be available for all interested persons to see.

REPORTS ARE NOW BURIED AWAY IN FILES

What is the background for the bill?

Since 1949 the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act has required the various Federal agencies to make a report to the Attorney General, giving the details of bids received under the advertised competitive bid procedure where in the opinion of the head of the agency there may have been a violation of the Federal antitrust laws. The Armed Forces Procurement Act of 1947 places a similar requirement on the heads of the defense agencies. But, of course, in practice purchases and contracts to purchase made by the defense agencies are made largely on the basis of negotiation, rather than on the basis of advertised competitive bidding.

Leaving the question of reporting or not reporting up to the various agencies, depending upon whether the department head thinks the antitrust laws may have been violated, naturally produces a law with some deficiencies. We may assume, I imagine, that only a fraction of the identical bids being received by the Federal agencies are ever reported to the Attorney General. In fact, I am told that in the first months after the law was passed, the various Federal departments flooded the Department of Justice with reports of identical bids. But as time went on and very little resulted, the departments largely quit making the reports.

Even so, according to a study made by a university professor who is a noted expert in this field, the Department of Justice had received, by mid-1959, a total of no less than 10,000 reports on instances of identical bidding. This information comes from a paper by Prof. Vernon A. Mund of the University of Washington, published in the Journal of Political Economy in April of 1960. I will insert Professor Mund's article at the end of my remarks, because it is most enlightening in several respects.

First, it contains a table No. 1 which provides illustrations of identical bids received by the Federal departments. Second, and what is perhaps more useful, Professor Mund has also provided a table No. 2 which gives similar information on competitive bids which are not identical.

So much has been said in recent times in defense of identical bidding that some of us may have overlooked the point that many business competitors still manage to submit different bids in pursuit of a given piece of business, and give the public agencies an opportunity to purchase needed supplies and equipment at a low cost to the taxpayers.

Finally, Professor Mund's article should prove useful to the public procurement and antitrust enforcement agencies, as well as to the Federal courts. It provides some enlightened guidance on how to tell the difference between prices in a competitive market and prices which are artificially fixed or rigged.

I might add that Professor Mund's article was called to the attention of the Joint Economic Committee last Friday by a representative of the Farmers Union, Mr. Angus McDonald, who is one of the most astute and effective fighters for the American farms it has ever been my pleasure to know.

SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS OF THE BILL

Now let me describe the requirements of the bill more specifically.

First. It requires the Federal agencies to report to the Attorney General all instances of identical bidding—not just those instances where the head of the agency or his subordinate thinks the antitrust laws may have been violated.

Second. The bill would require the Attorney General to institute a procedure whereby it is made known to the State and local governments that they are invited to make similar reports to the Attorney General.

Third. The bill would require the Attorney General to make a consolidated

report of all of these instances of identical bidding, and to submit such report quarterly to the President of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The bill specifies the items of information to be reported.

First. It should be noted that when a public agency receives a batch of bids in which two or more of the bids are identical, it will then make a report giving the pertinent information for all the bids, not just those which are identical. It is well known that in some industries various firms submit bids to public agencies which are habitually and so inevitably identical in all details that the public agencies have set up lottery systems, such as putting the bidders' names in a rotary barrel, or into a hat, and drawing one at random. On the other hand, the competitors in the electric equipment manufacturers' case followed the not unusual practice of rotating the privilege of being low bidder, on a particular bid, while the others all submitted identical bids.

Information which is to be reported includes, among other things, the names of the companies submitting the bids, the kind of equipment or supply for which the bid is submitted, the bid prices, and so on. The bill does not specify any date or any elapsed time within which the agencies must make their reports to the Attorney General. It is expected, of course, that these reports would be made promptly; and should some of the agencies become unreasonably laggard in submitting their reports, this fact will soon be revealed by the public report made by the Attorney General. Among the items to be reported are the date when the bids were opened and the name of the agency or bureau opening the bids.

The bill does not specify the form in which the Attorney General is to present his quarterly report. Rather, it leaves it up to the Attorney General to adopt a form which will present the information in a most orderly and useful way. I would imagine that the information would be arranged in such a way that all of the bids pertaining to a particular industry, or to a particular kind of commodity, would appear together in one section of the report. Further, I would hope that the report would be indexed to contain the names of all of the companies involved in the competitive bidding so that the reader can find from the index each and all of the instances in which a particular company has been involved in an identical bid situation.

Let me emphasize again that the bill does not amend any of the other antitrust laws. It does not provide any penalty for identical bids or make any presumption that such bids are illegal. It merely provides the public with information about the conduct of public business. In fact, the bill will require making public certain details about identical bidding which the public actually has a right to have in the case of all bids submitted to public agencies in pursuit of public business.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASES AMOUNT TO $100 BILLION A YEAR

TRADITIONAL PUBLIC POLICY IS TO PUBLISH BIDS

It is traditional public policy in the United States, at all levels of government, to publish the bids received by public agencies.

Public business is now tremendous business. Government purchases of goods and services amount to well over one-fifth of all the goods and services produced in this country. According to official reports of the Department of Commerce, purchases made by the State and local governments last year were in the neighborhood of $47 billion.

Similarly, purchases by the Federal Government were in the neighborhood of $53 billion, making a total, roughly, of $100 billion of government purchases—Federal, State, and local. I am basing these estimates on the official figures for the first three quarters of 1960, because data for the final quarter of the year are not as yet available.

Officials who make purchases for State, county, and municipal governments over the country would at least be put on guard. By reference to the Attorney General's reports they would be able to tell for what kinds of supplies and equipment they may expect to receive identical bids. Thus, in time, the local governments might hit upon ways of protecting themselves and the taxpayers. They might adopt different practices for dealing with identical bids, such as, for example, making it a practice to give the business each time to the smallest firm making a bid, or to give the business, uniformly, to the bidder whose name stands lowest in the alphabet. Any such practice, if widely adopted, would quickly result in the disappearance of identical bids and, no doubt, in more genuine competition for public business.

True, the point could be made that to expose identical bidding would merely drive some conspirators to other devices for allocating the market, while agreeing to submit a range of bids in each case. Exposure would still be wholesome. At least the conspirators would be driven into fresh overt actions of conspiracy—in which case the business executives would be pointedly conscious of illegal conduct. They would not be able merely to perpetuate practices begun in conspiracy by their predecessors, comfortable in the belief that they themselves are doing nothing illegal.

Furthermore, to carry on a conspiracy to rotate bids in a seemingly random fashion, requires, it seems, more or less continuous meetings, correspondence, or other direct communication between the supposed competitors, and such overt communications are likely to leave tracks. In other words, if frequent meetings and so on are required to keep a system going, these should make detection easier, both by the law enforcement agencies and the top corporate executives who really wish to keep the corporations clean.

Let us keep this point in mind, too. Under the competitive bid procedure, each bidder learns automatically what prices its competitors have bid. The bidders have a right to this information under the law. I can think of no harm that would be done by letting the general public know.

ALSO APPLIES TO SALES OF PUBLIC PROPERTY

I should point out particularly that section 2 of the bill, paragraph (G), requires the Federal agencies to report the method by which the purchase or sale, or the contract to purchase, was actually awarded. In other words, the reporting requirement refers in the first instance to bids received in response to advertised invitations for competitive bids. The supplies or equipment which the Government intended to purchase may, following receipt of identical bids, have been awarded to one particular bidder on the basis of some kind of lottery, such as drawing the name from a hat, an established rotation system, and so on. Where this is the case, the report would specify the method by which the award was made.

On the other hand, after receipt of the bids, the public agency may have refused to accept the bids and thereupon either issued a call for new bids or made the award on the basis of negotiations. In this case, the report would so specify.

Two other points to note:

First, the bill would make a similar amendment to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act to require similar reporting of identical bids received in respect to the sale of surplus Federal property.

Second, information may be withheld from the Attorney General's report when in the opinion of the head of the department or agency public information should be withheld by reason of the national security.

With respect to the practices with which the bill is concerned, the Sherman Act, it seems to me, needs no further clarification. The Sherman Antitrust Act has now been the law of the land for 70 years. I doubt if there is any businessman in the country who does not know that it is illegal for competitors to conspire to fix prices or allocate markets. Yet, in the 70 years the Sherman Act has been on the books, the electrical equipment manufacturers suit marks the first time that any big businessman was ever sent to jail for violating the law. About 2 years ago a Federal judge imposed jail sentences on three small businessmen for violating the law, and if my history is correct, that marked the first time any businessman—big or small—ever went to jail for violating the antitrust laws.

I wish we could believe that these were the only instances of violations deserving such penalties. I wish we could believe that such practices as the electrical equipment manufacturers have engaged in are the rare and exceptional practice, rather than that it is rare and exceptional for such practices to be exposed.

A copy of the bill H.R. 45–70 will appear below, after which I will insert the journal article by Prof. Vernon Mund.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to provide for reports of State, local, and Federal procurement officers to the Attorney General in instances where identical bids are made by competing bidders on contracts for purchases or sales by public agencies, in order to provide public information and publicity concerning such bids.

SEC. 2. Subsection (d) of section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(d)", and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Where two or more bids received after advertising are identical as to price, the head of the agency shall make a report to the Attorney General setting out the following—

"(A) the name and location of the agency and bureau which issued the invitation to bid;

"(B) a description of the item, commodity, or service for which bids were received;

"(C) quantities of such item, commodity, or service for which invitations to bid were issued;

"(D) the date of opening of bids;

"(E) the proposed delivery date of the item, commodity, or service specified in the invitation to bid, or, if more than one date is involved, the beginning date and the completion date;

"(F) the name and location of each bidder who submitted a bid in response to the invitation to bid, and with respect to each bidder the following:

"(i) the unit price bid and the applicable unit of measure;

"(ii) the point to which the item, commodity, or service is to be delivered, and whether or not freight costs are to be at the expense of the seller;

"(iii) whether or not the bid price is freight on board, and if so the point of origin;

"(iv) whether or not the bid price includes delivery cost;

"(v) the terms of discount, if any; and

"(vi) where the bidders are not the manufacturers of the item, commodity, or service, the names of the actual manufacturers; and

"(G) Whether or not the bids were accepted, and—

"(i) if accepted, a reference indicating which bid, or bids, was successful and the method by which the successful bidder, or bidders, was chosen, such as 'low bid', lottery, allocation of orders, rotation of orders, or other method; or

"(ii) if bids were rejected, whether—

"(a) an invitation for new bids was issued; or

"(b) a purchase of, or contract to purchase, the items, commodities, or services in question was made by negotiation; or

"(c) the proposal to purchase the items, commodities, or services in question was abandoned.

"(3) For purposes of paragraph (2), in determining whether two or more bids are identical as to price, the head of the agency shall take into account the net cost to the agency considering discounts and other differences entering into the net cost to the agency."

SEC. 3. Section 203(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (which relates to disposal of surplus property) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(8) The Administrator shall report to the Attorney General all instances of identical bids received by him after public advertising for bids under paragraph (1) of this subsection. Each such report shall contain with respect to bidders the information called for in section 302(d)(2) (except subparagraph (D)(vi)) of this Act."

SEC. 4. The Attorney General shall formulate and put into effect a procedure whereby State and local governments are encouraged to make reports to him corresponding to the reports provided for in section 302(d)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, in instances where identical bids are received by State and local governments.

SEC. 5. The Attorney General shall report each calendar quarter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, on a consolidated basis, with respect to all reports made to him during the preceding calendar quarter pursuant to sections 302(d)(2) and 203(e)(8) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and section 2305(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code, and all similar instances of identical bids made to procurement officers of States and of local governments, where such procurement officers have reported such instances to the Attorney General. No information shall be contained in such quarterly reports, however, which in the opinion of the department or agency head should be withheld from publication for reasons of national security, or which, in the case of information received from State or local governments, would in the opinion of the State or local official providing the information, adversely affect the State or local government. Each report of the Attorney General under this section shall be printed as a House document.

SEC. 6. Subsection (d) of section 2305 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(d)", and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Where two or more bids received after advertising are identical as to price, the head of the agency shall make a report to the Attorney General setting out the information required to be reported to him by section 302(d)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949."

The article by Prof. Vernon A. Mund published in the Journal of Political Economy for April 1960, appears, without footnotes, as follows:

IDENTICAL BID PRICES

(By Vernon A. Mund, University of Washington)

It is frequently stated that, assuming a standardized product, identity of bids and prices among sellers is as consistent with competition as it is with the lack of competition. The antitrust agencies themselves use this generalization as a working rule. In defense briefs, respondents go further and confidently affirm that identical bids and prices inevitably result from competition.

This study will present empirical data on identical bidding and explore the conditions under which it arises. Price relationships in markets generally accepted as being genuinely competitive will also be examined. From these data generalizations will be inferred that appear to hold true with respect to identical bid prices.

DATA ON IDENTICAL BIDDING

There are many sources of data on identical bidding, including the purchasing departments of large industrial firms (such as the aircraft companies), State and local purchasing agencies, and the various purchasing departments of the Federal Government. Inasmuch as public calls for bids are usually open, it is possible to find a rich source of examples in the purchasing activities of State and Federal agencies.

According to section 2(d) of Public Law 413 (Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947) and section 302(d) of Public Law 152 (Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949), identical bids received by a department of the Federal Government which, in the opinion of the head of such department, evidence a possible violation of the antitrust laws, shall be referred to the Attorney General for appropriate action. Since the enactment of this legislation, more than 10,000 references have been recorded with respect to identical bids on Government procurement. Actually, however, the number of such references is but a partial indicator of the extent of identical bidding, for references are submitted to the Attorney General only when a department head believes that a possible violation may exist.

SOME FEATURES OF IDENTICAL BIDDING

Government procurement agencies report that identical bidding usually occurs in the same commodities each year or at successive purchase periods. It is typically a regular, constant, and continuous phenomenon—not sporadic or transitory.

Usually all the bids are identical. However, in some instances—as in the sale of typewriters—only the large producers (i.e, the Big Four) generally submit identical bids. Variations in the degree of identity may reflect independent action by some sellers in not following a pricing formula, mistakes in caculating bid estimates, or deliberate action in staggering, or rotating bids. As a general rule, when competitive bids cannot be received, the contracting agency makes the award by some lottery or drawing procedure.

Procurement agencies usually purchase according to detailed specifications, or by designating a specific product "or its equal." When a specific product is listed—such as a branded microscope—distributors, and sometimes the manufacturer himself may submit identical bids. Typically, the various products are "standardized," and sellers frequently declare that no differences exist in quality or usefulness.

In the case of products produced locally by a number of firms—such as milk or bread—delivery costs per unit are uniform, and no freight formula is involved. In all other cases, some form of basing-point, zone, or freight-equalization system is employed to translate the identical mill, base, zone, catalog, or list prices of geographically scattered producers into identical delivered bids.

SOME EXAMPLES OF REPRESENTATIVE IDENTICAL BIDS

As a basis for considering the various situations in which identical bidding occurs, representative examples of identical bidding are presented in table 1, listing the product, the agency calling for the bids, the delivery point, and the date on which the bids were opened.

SOME EXAMPLES OF COMPETITIVE BIDDING

Calling for bids (or tenders) has long been regarded as sound public policy designed to secure competitive bidding and provide the buyer with a price advantage arising in the more favorable market position of some supplier, or from lower costs, more efficient methods, lower profit markups, or a more urgent need for sales. All bids submitted are sealed, and the buyer takes precautions to insure that suppliers will not learn what any competitor has bid. When there are identical bids, the purchaser is denied any price advantage that would result from genuine competitive bidding. In effect, he is given one bid and one price even though a dozen firms are actively soliciting his order.

In submitting sealed bids, it is possible that bidders may use some focal point, such

as their current price, in making their bid price. But since bids are typically called for opening at some future date and for delivery at or during some future period of time, sellers are faced with considering market trends and supply expectations as well as estimates of what competitors will ask. Under conditions of effective competition these elements typically give rise to a range of valuations in which a buyer can find and secure a price advantage.

Table 2 presents representative examples of competitive bidding and shows a range of sellers' valuations. The products listed in table 2 are as standardized as the products in table 1—if anything, more so. In most cases they are offered in accordance with precise specifications. The procurement agencies may request a delivered or destination price so that the freight is included in the bid price. Variations in delivered costs may reflect not only differing shipping-point prices but also variation in actual freight costs from different shipping points.

TABLE 1.—*Representative examples of identical bidding*

POTENTIAL TRANSFORMER, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, JAN. 16, 1958

Unit price	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$2,695	Coulee Dam, Wash.	Westinghouse Electric Corp., Sharon, Pa.	Net.
2,695		General Electric Corp., Holyoke, Mass.	Do.
2,695		Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh	Do.

ROCK SALT, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, JULY 23, 1954

Unit price (per 100 pounds)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$1.19	Atlanta, Ga.	Carey Salt Co., Atlanta	Net.
1.19		International Salt Co., Atlanta	Do.
1.19		Morton Salt Co., Chicago	Do.
1.19		Pioneer Salt Co., Philadelphia	Do.

ROCK SALT, COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY, PA., AUG. 5, 1958

Unit price (per ton)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$22.40	Allegheny County, Pa.	E. J. Fedigan, Pittsburgh	Net.
22.40		International Salt Co., Pittsburgh	Do.
22.40		Morton Salt Co., Wadsworth, Ohio	Do.

SOIL STERILANT,[1] DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, MAR. 6, 1958

Unit price (per pound)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$3.00	Auburn, Wash.	Associated Sales Supply, St. Louis	2 percent, 20 days.
3.00		Van Waters & Rogers, Seattle	Do.
3.00		Arizona Fertilizers, Phoenix	Do.
3.00		Steve Regan Co., Salt Lake City	Do.
3.00		E. C. Olson Co., Ogden, Utah	Do.

YEAST, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, NOV. 17, 1954

Unit price (per pound)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$0.1450	Richmond, Va.	Anheuser-Busch, St. Louis	Net.
.1450		Standard Brands, Richmond, Va.	Do.
.1450		Red Star Yeast Corp., Milwaukee	Do.
.1450		Federal Yeast Corp., Philadelphia	Do.

MASONRY CEMENT,[2] DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AUG. 1, 1956

Unit price (per sack)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$0.9875	Warehouse, Washington, D.C., or Lorton, Va.	United Clay Products, Washington, D.C.	2 percent, 30 days.
.9875		Cushwa Building Supply, Washington, D.C.	Do.
.9875		Eckington Bldg. Supply, Washington, D.C.	Do.
.9875		Hudson Supply, Washington, D.C.	Do.
.9875		A. P. Woodson Co., Washington, D.C.	Do.
1.025	Any point, Washington, D.C.	United Clay Products, Washington, D.C.	Do.
1.025		Cushwa Building Supply, Washington, D.C.	Do.
1.025		Eckington Bldg., Supply Washington, D.C.	Do.
1.025		Hudson Supply, Washington, D.C.	Do.
1.025		A. P. Woodson Co., Washington, D.C.	Do.

PORTLAND CEMENT, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, OCT. 23, 1957

Unit price (896 barrels)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$3,888.64	Friant, Calif.	Monolight Portland Cement, Los Angeles	Net.
3,888.64		Pacific Cement, San Francisco	Do.
3,888.64		Permanente Cement, Oakland	Do.
3,888.64		California Portland Cement, Los Angeles	Do.
3,888.64		Calaveras Cement, San Francisco	Do.

[1] Telvar W (or equal)—a patented product manufactured by Du Pont.
[2] To be supplied during the period Sept. 1, 1956, to Feb. 28, 1957.

TABLE 1.—*Representative examples of identical bidding*—Continued

TYPEWRITERS (11-INCH STANDARD), COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY, PA., SEPT. 30, 1958

Unit price	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$193.50	Allegheny County, Pa.	Royal-McBee Corp., Pittsburgh	Net.
193.50		Underwood Corp., Pittsburgh	Do.
193.50		Smith-Corona-Marchant, Pittsburgh	Do.
193.50		Remington Rand, Pittsburgh	Do.

CALCIUM CHLORIDE: FLAKES, CITY OF NEW YORK, SEPT. 9, 1958

Unit price (per ton)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$31.00	New York City	Robinson Bros. Chemicals, Barberton, Ohio	Net.
31.00		Allied Chemical Corp., Solvay, N.Y.	Do.
31.00		Thompson Materials Corp., Midland, Mich.	Do.

POTENTIAL TRANSFORMER, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, MAY 2, 1958

Unit price	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$585.00	Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	Standard Transformer Co., Warren, Ohio	Net.
600.60		General Electric Co., Holyoke, Mass.	Do.
600.60		Westinghouse Electric, Sharon, Pa.	Do.
600.00		Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh	Do.

SODIUM FLUORIDE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, SEPT. 24, 1957

Unit price (carload)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$4,290	Grand Rapids, Mich.	Blackson Chemical Co.	Net, 30 days.
4,290		Arthur S. Lapine Co.	Do.
4,290		Allied Chemical Corp.	Do.
4,290		Seebee Paint Chemical Corp.	Do.
4,290		American Agricultural Chemical Corp.	Do.

GRAPHITE,[3] AEC OAK RIDGE OPERATIONS, OCT. 1, 1958

Unit price (per 100 pounds)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$30.25	Oak Ridge, Tenn.	Speer Carbon Co., Niagara Falls, N.Y.	Net, 30 days.
30.25		National Carbon Co., Niagara Falls, N.Y., Columbia, Tenn., Clarksburg, W. Va.	Do.
30.25		Great Lakes Carbon Co., Niagara Falls, N.Y.	Do.

TETRACYCLINE,[4] DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, SEPT. 13, 1958

Unit price (per 100 capsules)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$19.188	Perry Point, Md.	Pfizer	Net.
19.58		Squibb	2 percent, 30 days.
19.58		Upjohn	Do.
19.58		Bristol	Do.
19.58		Lederle	Do.

LIGHTNING ARRESTORS, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, SEPT. 26, 1955

Unit price	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$1,103.64	Yankton, S. Dak.	Graybar Electric, Denver, Colo.	Net.
1,103.64		Ohio Brass Co., Mansfield, Ohio	Do.
1,103.64		Westinghouse Electric, Denver, Colo.	Do.
1,103.64		General Electric, Denver, Colo.	Do.

MAGNESIUM ALLOY SHEETS, DEPARTMENT OF AIR FORCE, MAY 13, 1958

Unit price (per pound)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$1.191	Tinker Air Force Base, Okla.	Continental Metals, Los Angeles	Net.
1.191		Dow Chemical, Midland, Mich.	Do.
1.191		Brooks & Perkins, Detroit	Do.

[3] All bidders agreed to equalize freight.
[4] All prices are identical, discount considered.

TABLE 1.—*Representative examples of identical bidding*—Continued

LIQUID CHLORINE, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, JUNE 19, 1958

Unit price (6,480 pounds)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$810	Boulder City, Colo.	Pacific Engineering Co., Henderson, Nev.	Net.
810		Tops Chemical Co., Duarte, Calif.	Do.
810		Van Waters & Rogers, Los Angeles	Do.
810		McKesson & Robbins, Los Angeles	Do.

CARBON DIOXIDE[4] (DRY ICE), GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, NOV. 29, 1957

Unit price (per pound)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$0.035	Washington, D.C.	Cardox Corp., Chicago	Net.
.035		Liquid Carbonic, Chicago	Do.
.035		Olin Mathieson, Baltimore	2 percent, 30 days.
.035		Pure Carbonic, New York City	Net.

ZINC OXIDE, U.S. NAVY, APR. 29, 1954

Unit price (per pound)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$0.1336	Norfolk, Va.	American Zinc Sales Co., Columbus, Ohio	Net.
.1336		New Jersey Zinc Sales Co., New York City	Do.
.1336		Eagle Picher Sales Co., Philadelphia	Do.

N—155 ALLOY SHEETS,[5] AEC OAK RIDGE OPERATIONS, OCT. 28, 1958

Unit price (per pound)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$2.67	Oak Ridge, Tenn.	Universal Cyclops Steel Corp., Bridgeville, Pa.	2 percent, 10 days; net 30.
2.67		Haynes-Stellite Co. (Division of Union Carbide), Kokomo, Ind.	½ percent, 10 days; net 30.

STRANDED CONDUCTOR PAPER AND LEAF, CITY OF CLEVELAND, SEPT. 18, 1958

Unit price (per 100 feet)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$119.10	Cleveland, Ohio	General Cable Corp., Cleveland	½ percent. 10 days.
119.10		American Steel & Wire Co., Cleveland	Do.
119.10		Okonite Company, Passaic, N.J.	Do.
119.10		Phelps Dodge Copper Products Co., New York City	Do.
119.10		John A. Roebling Son's, Trenton, N.J.	Do.

NETWORK TRANSFORMERS, CITY OF AUSTIN, TEX., MAR. 24, 1958

Unit price	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$7,464	Austin, Tex.	Walter Tips (Westinghouse)[7]	Net.
7,464		Sterett Supply Co. (Kuhlman Electric)[7]	Do.
7,464		Priester Supply Co. (Maloney Electric)[7]	Do.
7,464		General Electric Co. (General Electric)[7]	Do.
7,464		Southern Electric Supply Co. (Allis-Chalmers)[7]	Do.

PAPER CUPS (9 OUNCES), STATE OF VIRGINIA, NOV. 13, 1958

Unit price (per thousand)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
[8] $6.18	Blacksburg, Va.	Consolidated Paper & Box	2 percent, 10 days.
6.18		Hamilton Paper Corp.	Do.
6.18		Frank G. Ennis Paper Co.	Do.
[9] 6.18		Dillard Paper Co.	Do.
6.18		Epes Fitzgerald Paper Co.	Do.
6.18		Hampton Roads Paper Co.	Do.
6.18		Southern Paper Supply	Do.
6.18		Dettor Edwards & Morris	Do.

POLIO VACCINE, CITY OF NEW BRITAIN, CONN., OCT. 6, 1958

Unit price (vial)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$3.9592	New Britain, Conn.	Pitman-Moore Co.	Net.
3.9592		Eli Lilly & Co.	Do.
3.9592		Merck, Sharp & Dohme	Do.
3.9592		Parke, Davis & Co.	Do.
3.9592		Sisson Drug Co.	Do.

[4] The award was made to Olin Mathieson because of the more favorable discount.
[5] This award was made to Universal Cyclops.
[7] Suppliers.
[8] Lilly No. 957.
[9] Dixie No. 185.

BIDDING AND PRICE MAKING IN ORGANIZED MARKETS

In studying prices and price relationships, economists frequently take as a norm or standard the features of bids, offers, and prices in principal central markets, such as the organized commodity exchanges. These markets are not models of "perfect competition." However, they present conditions—price publicity, freedom of entry, independent action in making bids, numerous buyers and sellers, and standardized products—that are practically attainable as features of a price-making mechanism.

Market price in a central market results from a given state of demand and supply. Expectations concerning changes in conditions aside, there are in a market at any given time numerous traders with a range of reserve (latent) valuations. The maximum prices that buyers are willing to bid vary from one buyer to another; the asking prices that sellers have in mind also vary. A central market brings together expressions of opinion from many areas and from diverse trade interests. It is not likely that the bids of various buyers or the offers of various sellers will be identical at any given time. It would be miraculous if they were.

Given stability of expectations, an equilibrium price develops in the making of numerous transactions. Demand and supply become equalized through the making of higher bids or lower offers. After a number of preliminary transactions, there is no continuing competition among buyers to raise the price or among sellers to lower it.

TABLE 2.—*Representative examples of competitive bidding*

BEDSPREADS, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, SEPT. 26, 1958

Unit price	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$4.9994	Bethesda, Md.	Geo. D. Brandt Co., New York City	1 percent, 20 days.
5.33		Kuttnauer Manufacturing Co., Detroit, Mich.	Do.
5.18		Guy Curran & Co., Washington, D.C.	2 percent, 20 days.

HYDROCHLORIC ACID, AEC, OAK RIDGE OPERATIONS, JULY 31, 1958

Unit price (tank-car lots, per ton)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$18.00	Oak Ridge, Tenn.	Tennessee Products & Chemical Corp., Nashville	Net, 30 days.
26.49		Monsanto Chemical, St. Louis	Do.
30.10		Columbia Southern Chemical, Charlotte, N.C.	Do.
26.34		Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.	Do.
26.53		E. I. du Pont de Nemours, Wilmington, Del.	Do.

ARGON GAS, AEC, OAK RIDGE OPERATIONS, AUG. 5, 1958

Unit price (240-cubic-foot cylinders, per 100 cubic feet)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$11.00	Oak Ridge, Tenn.	Alabama Oxygen Co., Birmingham	Net, 30 days.
6.20		Southern Oxygen Co., Kingsport, Tenn.	Do.
6.50		Air Reduction Sales Co., Houston	Do.
5.50		National Cylinder Gas, Knoxville, Tenn.	Do.
6.15		Marks Oxygen Co., Augusta, Ga.	Do.
10.00		Welding Gas Products, Chattanooga	Do.
4.50		Linde Co. (division of Union Carbide & Carbon Co.), Knoxville, Tenn.	Net, 10 days.

ACETONE, AEC, OAK RIDGE OPERATIONS, AUG. 12, 1958

Unit price (tank-car lots; per gallon)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$0.56	Oak Ridge, Tenn.	Enjoy Co., New York City	Net, 10 days.
.559		Octagon Process, Staten Island	Net, 30 days.
.561		C. P. Chemical Solvents, New York City	Do.
.561		Shell Chemical Corp.; New York City	Do.
.50369		Phipps Products Corp., Boston	5 percent, 10 days.
.478		Union Carbide Chemicals Co., New York City	Net, 30 days.
.495		Eastman Chemicals Products, Kingsport, Tenn.	Do.
.477		Allied Chemical Corp., New York City	Do.
.559		Chemical Compounding Corp., Perth Amboy, N.J.	Do.

TRAFFIC CONES, CITY OF AUSTIN, TEX., NOV. 28, 1958

Unit price	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$1.55	Austin, Tex.	Interstate Rubber Co., Los Angeles	2 percent, 10 days.
1.69		Sargent & Ewell, Grand Prairie, Tex.	Do.
1.59		Robbins Tire Co., Tuscumbia, Ala.	Do.
2.29		Rohan Co., Waco, Tex.	Do.

RECORDING WATTMETERS,[1] BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, FEB. 3, 1958

Unit price	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$895.36	Palisades, Idaho	Electro-Technical Equipment Co., New York City	Net.
907.60		Instrument Laboratory, Seattle	Do.
963.00		Esterline-Angus Co., Indianapolis	Do.
972.40		Westinghouse Electric, Denver	Do.
972.40		General Electric, Denver	Do.
1,625.00		Phillips & Edwards, San Francisco	Do.

[1] Frequently, large firms match prices, but there is variation in the extent to which the small firms follow.

TABLE 2.—*Representative examples of competitive bidding*—Continued

BACON, SLAB, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, MAR. 26, 1958

Unit price (per pound)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$0.4972	San Diego, Calif.	Zest Provision Co., Los Angeles	Net.
.61		Oscar Mayer Co., Los Angeles	Do.
.52		George Hormel & Co., Los Angeles	Do.
.4490		Swift & Co., San Diego	Do.

TIRES, NYLON TUBELESS (4-PLY)—CITY OF MIAMI, FLA.—OCT. 15, 1958

Unit price		Delivery point	Bidder	Manufacturer	Terms
Size 750×14	Size 670×15				
$19.24	$17.49	Miami, Fla.	Norton Tire Co., Miami	B. F. Goodrich	Net.
19.24	17.49		General Tire Co., Miami	General Tire	2 percent, 10 days.
19.24	17.49		Aeroland Oil Co., Miami	do	Do.
19.24	16.34		Firestone Stores, Miami	Firestone	Net.
18.86	17.14		Goodyear Service, Miami	Goodyear	2 percent, 10 days.
16.92	15.30		Waldron Tire Co., Miami	Pennsylvania	Do.
16.90	14.90		Tire King, Miami	Vanderbilt or Cooper	Net.
14.59	13.00		Eagle Tire Co., Miami	Mohawk	Do.
13.95	13.95		Major Oil Co., Miami	National	Do.
13.40	12.90		Southeastern Tire Co., Miami	Armstrong	Do.

PADLOCKS,[2] U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, OCT. 9, 1958

Unit price		Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
Without keys	With keys			
$1.775	$1.818	Silver Spring, Md.	Atlantic Hardware & Supply Corp., New York City	2 percent, 30 days.
1.80	1.85		Whitlock Corp., Yonkers, N.Y.	Do.
1.83	1.87		Frederick Trading Co., Frederick, Md.	Do.
2.06	2.11		Wm. H. Cole & Sons, Baltimore, Md.	Do.
1.88	1.93		Rudolph & West, Washington, D.C.	Do.
1.82	1.86		May Hardware Co., Washington, D.C.	Do.
1.856	1.90		W. T. Weaver & Sons, Washington, D.C.	1 percent, 30 days.
1.81	1.855		Fries, Beall & Sharp Co., Washington, D.C.	2 percent, 30 days.
1.78	1.93		Specialty Auto Fabrics Corp., New York City	Net.

[2] Master Lock Co., Milwaukee, Wis., was the common supplier of all bidders.

In an open market at a given moment of time, with competition working effectively in the sale of a standardized product, all buyers tend to pay the same price. This tendency toward uniformity results from publicity on prices and the fact that buyers turn to other sellers when prices appear out of line. This order in price formation is the basis for the doctrine: "There can be but one price in a market."

Since transactions are made openly in a market, no buyer will pay a given seller more than other buyers are paying. A seller, moreover, will have no reason to ask less from one buyer than from another. The price of each seller is thus uniform to all buyers at a given time. A given seller does not sell to various buyers at the same time at different prices net to him. Each seller gets the same net realized price on all transactions currently being made. The "law of one price" applies to the prices net to a given seller.

The concept of a uniform price is applicable to a particular moment or brief period of time. With the passage of time, changes in conditions, opinions, and interpretations occur. These changes operate to raise or lower buyers' or sellers' schedules and to bring about changes in price. Successive transactions may be effected at differing levels so quickly that price uniformity vanishes. It is not likely that the actual prices paid in a series of transactions by a number of buyers to various sellers, from moment to moment, will be identical.

THE INDUSTRY VIEW THAT IDENTICAL BIDDING IS COMPETITIVE

Whenever identical bid prices (and identical delivered prices) are questioned, the industry concerned invariably offers in defense some version of the classical economic law that, "under competitive conditions, the price of a homogeneous product in a market at any one time will be a uniform price; that there cannot be two prices at the same time and place for the same commodity." The basic elements making for identical prices, it is stated, are (1) a homogeneous product and (2) well-informed buyers—a buyer will not pay more for one product than another.

The doctrine that "price uniformity," in the absence of evidence of collusion, is an indicator of effective competition has found its way to the Supreme Court and has been used as a foundation stone in numerous decisions. In the Cement case (1925), for example, the Court declared:

"A great volume of testimony was also given by distinguished economists in support of the thesis that, in the case of a standardized product sold wholesale to fully informed professional buyers, as were the dealers in cement, uniformity of price will inevitably result from active, free, and unrestrained competition."

The view that identical bid and asking prices and identical delivered prices exemplify the "uniformity of price" found in competitive markets involves several basic errors. First, in economic literature the principle of uniformity is made applicable only to prices (actual prices) eventuating out of transactions in a market. It has no application to bids or offers.

Second, there is error in applying the conventional uniform-price theory to delivered prices (mill price plus freight). The doctrine of uniformity is applicable to prices in a market center or at a shipping point without an inclusion of freight to particular destinations. At a given time, there is approximate price uniformity to buyers, and delivered prices to various destinations vary with the actual freight. Sellers at a particular shipping point tend to receive the same f.o.b. prices, even when shipments are being made to widely scattered destinations.

Third, there is error in failing to apply uniform-price theory to prices net to a seller. Usually in identical bidding some system is used which involves phantom freight or freight absorption. In allowing or paying freight, a seller usually receives different prices net to him. This is not consistent with market competition, where a producer or dealer typically sells at the highest net price, not at widely divergent net prices.

Finally, in using competitive-price theory, it may be noted that the doctrine of price uniformity applies to a static equilibrium. True market price is an equilibrium price in a given state of demand and supply. The doctrine of uniformity does not apply to the dynamic process of trial and error in adjustment to changes in market conditions, opinions, and interpretations.

IDENTICAL BIDDING AS A PRODUCT OF COLLUSIVE RESTRAINT

There is substantial evidence showing that when governmental attitudes toward business accept or tolerate concerted action, sellers quote identical bids by deliberate, purposeful agreement, without relying upon the operation of the law of supply and demand. In testifying before a Senate committee in 1936 on steel bids for Government procurement, Mr. Eugene G. Grace, then president of Bethlehem Steel, stated, "During the code period they were identical, as you would expect them to be." Even after the period of antitrust exemption under the NRA, identical bids continued to be made in many industries by agreement because of a lax antitrust policy.

In Canada action taken to provide an effective enforcement of the anticombines laws has provided abundant evidence relating identical bidding to collusion. In a study on wire fencing in Canada, for example, the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission found that identical tenders (bids) on chainlink fencing were made by the common use of uniform list prices and a system of recording all quotations (on amounts of $200 or more) with the trade association secretary, who checked for possible arithmetical errors and for any possible variations from the master copy of the price list. In other instances the Commission found, a trade association secretary received and coordinated tentative bids before they were actually made.

Similarly, a special combines commissioner found that the Canadian producers of electrical wire and cable products submitted identical bids through agreement or arrangement. His report stated:

"The evidence establishes that before submitting tenders the manufacturers have usually advised each other by memorandum or by telephone of the prices they propose to quote. Where differences were found to exist, further discussion by an exchange of memorandums or otherwise has taken place, prices were checked, and differences were reconciled in order to insure that the prices quoted by each manufacturer would be identical."

Further, in 1953 the Combines Commission found that for many years paper distributors in British Columbia had agreed on tenders for use when potential buyers called for competitive bids. The basic policy followed by the association was stated in its records: "The understanding was and the procedure should be that any tenders made ought to be the schedule price unless notified to the contrary. * * *" In implementing this policy, trade members were advised that "it must also be distinctly understood that quotations direct to school boards or municipalities must adhere strictly to list prices."

As a general rule, conspiracies to fix prices center on the quoting of identical bid prices. This is shown clearly by the records in the Cement case (1948), Rigid Steel Conduit case (1948), Malt case (1945), Milk Can case (1946), Crepe Paper case (1946), and related basing-point cases. Hearings conducted in Canada under the Combines Investigation Act (covering many industries) revealed that the primary purpose of concerted action is to obtain uniformity of price. The argument that identical bidding comes about spontaneously as a natural result of competition must find an explanation for the fact that participants in collusive arrangements have set up costly and extraordinary procedures for bringing about this natural and spontaneous result.

In some instances product differentiation makes identical bidding impractical. Some salable products, for example, are installations consisting of many components. Engineers and estimators for different companies may employ numerous variations and alternative combinations of machinery parts. In such situations the evidence indicates that concerted activity centers not on price identity but rather on the use of common unit prices and uniform cost schedules designed to maintain prices at desirable levels.

CIRCULATION OF PRICELISTS AND CATALOGS

Uniform pricelists and price catalogs circulated among trade members frequently form a basis for identical bidding. The prices themselves may be arrived at by agreement, price leadership and price following, or local competitive forces. When list prices and terms are the same and when sellers take the further step of adding identical factors for freight costs and of keeping collateral services, such as standard packaging, the same bids are necessarily identical.

It is sometimes said that it is only natural that identical list prices and bids develop in industries using printed cards or catalogs. However, this view fails to consider that each seller in using a list or card price may, and frequently does, adjust his selling price to competitive conditions by granting current discounts from the list, so that competitive bids can and do develop.

When sellers are few and centrally located, it may be possible for identical pricelists to come into use in a given locality without collusion. Prevailing prices for a small volume of business may be at a level which provides a selling outlet and which reflects an equilibrium of demand and supply. The quantities of products involved in a call for bids, moreover, may not be sufficiently great to tempt sellers to depart from their ordinary pricelists. In such a situation it may be possible for identical bids to occur without agreement.

As a general rule, however, identical bidding is practiced by geographically separate suppliers. In this case, if identical list prices are to result in identical destination bids, it is necessary for sellers to join in the concerted or concurrent use of a basing-point, zone, or freight-equalization system. As will be shown, such methods of pricing are not in harmony with effective market competition.

Studies made by the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission (Canada) of the asphalt- and tar-roofing industry show that uniform list prices in that industry were arrived at by continuous collusion among trade members. In a carefully documented study, the Commission reports that identical list prices quoted by the Barrett Co., Canadian Johns-Manville, and other asphalt-roofing firms had their origin in a master plan developed by the central industry office. In order to translate these identical list prices into identical bid prices at all points of delivery, the industry developed a common basis for transportation charges. By this plan, transportation costs on shipments by a given seller were equalized with those on shipments from any other manufacturing point having a lower freight rate to the destination point. The Commission found, also, that manufacturers of metal culverts quoted identical bids for many years as a result of meetings, discussions, agreements, and the use of uniform list prices made and distributed by a leading producer.

BID COORDINATION AND ROTATION

When the sale of a standardized product involves installation according to plans, specifications, and designs, arrangements to effect identical bids typically involve more than unit-price agreements. In a study of the Canadian flat-glass trade, the Combines Investigation Commisson found that tenders for the supply and installation of flat glass were brought into identity by a price registration system. Under this system a member gave the association details of the specifications, the materials used, and the estimated price of the job. If, later, another member prepared bids using the same plans, he also submitted them to the office, and the various firms consulted and arrived at uniform tenders.

Concert of action on installation and engineering jobs may also take the form of arrangements to allocate tenders among trade members. For example, the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission (Canada) showed that internal office correspondence between two officers of Forano, Ltd., a producer of transmission and conveyor equipment involved systematic rotation of contracts. The examples serve also to show that nonidentity of prices cannot be taken as proof of competition.

"Following your recent suggestion, we submit below a report on a few contracts wherein our competitors were favoured as per agreement passed by you at an association meeting, in Toronto, a few months ago.

"Last September, Jeffrey Manufacturing Co. received priority with regard to a power conveyor requested by James MacLaren Co. Ltd., of Buckingham, when our normal price should have been $12,859.25, while that of Jeffrey was $18,700 and our first quotation was revised to $18,839.25.

"January last, with the same customer involved again, we submitted a price of $32,622 on a conveyor, while Jeffrey's price was $36,300. After an agreement, our price was revised to $39,511.

"In October, a request from the Department of Public Works was received by us for coal conveyor equipment for the Port Arthur Hospital. In order to favour Stephens-Adamson, we did not quote on this equipment.

"Last October, we received a request from Canadian Commercial Corp. for conveyor equipment for the Marine School H.M.C.S. Shearwater, Dartmouth, N.S. Our price was around $68,000 as figured out by Lalonde's department in the Montreal office. After an understanding with United Steel Corp., we quoted a price of $82,340, while the latter company's quotation had been fixed at $80,997.

"We recently quoted on grain elevator equipment to Commonwealth Construction. According to our estimates, the price of this equipment should have been approximately $32,000. At the request of the United Steel Corp., we quoted a $42,000 price in order to favour the latter company."

Likewise, in a report on the retail distribution and sale of coal in Winnipeg (1956), the Commission found that sales of coal to large consumers who called for tenders were allotted among dealers on a quota basis. Upon securing his allotted contract, a dealer computed the price he planned to quote and informed the pool manager. This price was communicated to other dealers, who were then expected either not to tender at all or to tender at higher prices.

Sometimes bids are deliberately staggered by collusive action in order to mislead governmental authorities. In a special study on identical bidding in the electrical wire and cable products industry in Canada for example, correspondence in which an official of the Automatic Electric Co. wrote to an officer in the Phillips Electrical Works is cited:

"It has been suggested by our friends that in view of the fact that the Purchase Board in Ottawa may become too inquisitive in respect to agreed prices being quoted for the Department of National Defense, prices should be staggered. In other words, the business should be allocated. This suggestion is made for quotations valued at $1,000 and over."

PATENT LICENSING AND PRICE CONTROL

In some instances identical bidding may reflect price control based upon patent licensing. The U.S. Navy, for example, received identical bids on January 1, 1958, on "Miltown" tranquilizer tablets (Wallace Laboratories) and on "Equanil" tablets (Wyeth Laboratories). It appears that this product (meprobamate) is manufactured by Wyeth under license from Carter Products Co. (the parent company of Wallace Laboratories), whose patent expires in 1972.

IDENTICAL BIDDING AND THE MAINTENANCE OF RESALE PRICES

Manufacturers who require all outlets to quote the same unit price to all purchasers, including State and Federal agencies, frequently provide a basis for identical bidding. Sales to State and Federal agencies are not subject to or bound by State fair-trade laws. Manufacturers accordingly act

to maintain resale prices either by outright agreement or by some form of refusal to sell.

To maintain resale prices, a manufacturer may join with his distributors in submitting identical bids, or he may consistently refrain from bidding on Government requirements. An example of identical bidding by two manufacturers and their distributors is shown in table 3. American Optical and Bausch & Lomb are the two manufacturers; the other firms are their distributors. An example of identical bidding by the distributors of a single manufacturer is shown in table 4.

IDENTICAL BIDDING AS A NONCOLLUSIVE PRACTICE

In the United States it is exceedingly difficult to secure evidence on overt activities underlying restraints on competition, for conspiracy on price is illegal per se. Antitrust agencies observe identical bidding in many industries—steel and typewriters, for example—but their investigations have not so far developed proof of unlawful agreement. Industry members deny collusion and declare that identical bidding should be permitted (a) because it is not arrived at by collusion or conspiracy and (b) because one cannot draw from it the inference of collusion.

At the present time, neither the Department of Justice nor the Federal Trade Commission appears to be willing to prosecute identical bidding in the absence of actual evidence of agreement (conspiracy). The basis for this position is found in the *Theater Enterprises* case, 346 U.S. 537, 540–41 (1954), in which the Court declared:

"The crucial question is whether respondent's conduct toward petitioner stemmed from independent decision or from an agreement, tacit or express. To be sure, business behavior is admissible circumstantial evidence from which the fact finder may infer agreement (citing cases). But this Court has never held that proof of parallel business behavior conclusively establishes agreement or, phrased differently, that such behavior itself constitutes a Sherman Act offense. Circumstantial evidence of consciously parallel behavior may have made heavy inroads into the traditional judicial attitude toward conspiracy; but 'conscious parallelism' has not yet read conspiracy out of the Sherman Act entirely."

If, in fact, identical bidding and the economic effects of identical bidding flow from business conduct which is not collusive, from what mechanism or rationale do they develop? Is the practice, in fact, a competitive one outside the purview of the law? These questions were faced squarely by the legal staff of the Federal Trade Commission in the Cement and Conduit cases. The complaint in the Cement case was framed in terms of the concerted use and maintenance of basing-point pricing. The staff soon recognized that a cease-and-desist order, if secured, would accordingly have to be limited to one denying the concerted sale of cement at basing-point prices. Such an order would not curb the use of the basing-point system as such in situations in which agreement could not be found.

TABLE 3.—*Example of identical bidding on microscopes, Department of Agriculture, Apr. 29, 1958* [1]

Unit price	Bidder	Address	Terms
$519	Williams, Brown & Earle	Philadelphia	Net.
519	A. S. Aloe Co	Washington, D.C	Do.
519	American Hospital Supply Corp	do	Do.
519	American Optical Co	Buffalo	Do.
519	Bausch & Lomb Optical Co	Rochester	Do.
519	Boder Scientific Co	Pittsburgh	Do.
519	Cardinal Products, Inc	Durham	Do.
519	Chemical Rubber Co	Cleveland	Do.
519	Chicago Apparatus Co	Washington, D.C	Do.
519	Federal Scientific Co	Silver Spring, Md	Do.
519	Fisher Scientific Co	do	Do.
519	Emil Greiner	New York City	Do.
519	Kinsman Optical Co	Washington, D.C	Do.
519	Arthur S. LaPine	do	Do.
519	Macalaster Bicknell Co	Cambridge	Do.
519	New York Lab. Supply, Inc	New York City	Do.
519	Phipps & Bird, Inc	Silver Spring, Md	Do.
519	E. H. Sargent & Co	Washington, D.C	Do.
519	Scientific Glass Appliance Co., Inc	Silver Spring, Md	Do.
519	Standard Scientific Supply	New York City	Do.
519	Arthur H. Thomas Co	Philadelphia	Do.
519	August Waeldin, Inc	New York City	Do.
519	Will Corp. of Maryland	Baltimore	Do.

[1] Delivery point in all instances was Beltsville, Md.

TABLE 4.—*Example of identical bidding on spectrophotometers, city of Miami, Fla., Sept. 4, 1957* [1]

Unit price	Bidder	Address	Terms
$7,975	W. H. Curtin Co	Jacksonville, Fla	Net.
7,975	Will Corp. of Georgia	Atlanta, Ga	Do.
7,975	Dade Reagents	Miami, Fla	Do.
7,975	Fisher Scientific Co	Silver Spring, Md	Do.
7,975	Scientific Products	Chamblee, Ga	Do.

[1] Delivery point in all instances was Miami, Fla.

NOTE.—Beckman Instruments, Fullerton, Calif., was the common supplier.

In the Conduit case (count II) the legal staff therefore sought to attack the concurrent use of the basing-point system as such, on the grounds that its use by individual trade members resulted in denying customers the benefits of price competition. This approach was based on the legal concept of the law against wrongs (torts). At common law it is a tort—a wrong—for one to act when the natural and foreseeable consequences of the action will be to damage others. It is recognized that action which "has a dangerous tendency unduly to hinder competition" is contrary to public policy. Also it is recognized that action having the effect of substantially lessening competition is harmful to the public interest. Therefore it is clear that the taking of action, the results of which are foreseeable—as involving the lessening of competition—adds up to a wrong (a tort) against members of the purchasing public.

The principal industry witness called upon to testify in the Conduit case on bid identity was Mr. H. S. Walker, head of one of the prominent conduit manufacturing firms and president of the Rigid Steel Conduit Association. From the testimony of Mr. Walker it was developed by counsel for the Commission that there are three underlying bases of identical bidding (including "administered prices" and price leadership). First, there invariably is the use of some system or method of behavior by which "uniform prices can be put together." This may consist of a basing-point, zone, or freight-equalization system, or of the outright quotation of another's mill price, with actual freight payable by the buyer. In the Conduit case the method used was the multiple basing-point system, with bases at Pittsburgh and Chicago.

Second, there is the action of each seller in making bids according to the system, knowing that others are doing the same, and knowing also that the natural and foreseeable consequences of this action will be matched bids. Thus, Mr. Walker was asked: "Well, when you use that method and you know that your competitors are using the same kind of method in figuring their prices, even though you and they submit your quotations under seal, you can anticipate what their prices are going to be as submitted in bids, can't you?" He replied, "If they stick to the method which they publish we can tell what the price is going to be because it is all published."

Third, there is the knowledge beforehand, or at least the expectation, that all sellers will follow the given system or method of pricing, so that agreement is not needed to use the system or to get the results of identical bids. Mr. Walker was specifically queried on this point by the trial examiner: "Are you able to continue this method without any express agreements with your competitors?" The witness replied: "If I must answer, I will say 'Yes, of course.' We never had any agreements with them."

So it is that (1) with a given method of pricing, (2) with its concurrent use by industry members, and (3) with the knowledge beforehand of its use by others, sellers can act without agreement to get the foreseeable results of identical bids.

The court of appeals sustained the finding that the concurrent use of the basing-point system in the conduit industry was in violation of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act because it was shown to have been used with trade-restraining results. In affirming the Commission's order in count II, the court declared: "Each conduit seller knows that each of the other sellers is using the basing-point formula; each knows that by using it he will be able to quote identical delivered prices and thus present a condition of matched prices under which purchasers are isolated and deprived of choice among sellers so far as price advantage is concerned."

In a true competitive market sellers act independently in quoting their own shipping-point prices. Each is trying to secure the business of a third party. In order to be able to deal, some offer more favorable terms. No competitor knows, for sure, what others are doing, and no one knows beforehand what all of his competitors will do.

POSSIBLE REMEDIES FOR THE PRACTICE OF IDENTICAL BIDDING

1. Concurrent action that lessens competition: The present-day policy of the antitrust agencies to prosecute identical bidding only when there is evidence of collusive

agreement is exempting a large area from the antitrust laws. Identical bidding, the evidence shows, is not a sporadic or intermittent phenomenon. Rather, in many industries it is a regular, normal procedure which continues over extended periods of time. As we have seen, identical bids on public contracts are arrived at (1) by means of collusive agreements, (2) by the refusal of a manufacturer to sell to distributors who compete on price, and (3) by the uniform use of a certain method of pricing with the knowledge beforehand that others are doing likewise, so that the natural and foreseeable result is a matching of bids.

As a basic first step in curbing the practice of identical bidding, it is suggested that it will be necessary for the antitrust agencies to restudy the economics of the practice. The doctrine that identical bid prices and identical delivered prices may be an indication of either effective competition or collusive restraint is a generalization not in accord with the features of a truly competitive price.

In the case of collusive (concerted) action, the Sherman Act clearly provides an adequate remedy. When specific evidence on collusion is not available, however, it appears that the Federal Trade Commission Act (section 5) can provide a practical remedy for concurrent action that lessens competition. To act in such a way that the natural and foreseeable consequences of the action involve the lessening of competition is the commission of a wrong (a tort), and contrary to public policy. It is clear that the Federal Trade Commission legislation, in particular, was enacted by Congress to enjoin any act or practice which lessens competition regardless of combination, agreement, or conspiracy among sellers.

In the Conduit case, prosecuted under the Federal Trade Commission Act, counsel for the Commission developed a rationale explaining identical bidding not based upon collusion. It was shown in count II that identical bidding is not an innocent, inevitable, competitive practice which defies all human and legal regulation. It is the result of a deliberate, purposeful, mechanism used concurrently by industry members, with the knowledge beforehand that others are doing likewise, so that matched bids arise automatically as a natural result. Upon the basis of the Conduit decision (count II), it would appear that the Federal Trade Commission could bring action against such methods of pricing—and thus identical bidding—on the grounds that they have trade-restraining effects which make them illegal under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

2. The problem of identical bidding effected by refusal to sell: Refusals to sell, and threats of refusal to sell, are also used as a device for achieving resale-price maintenance and identical bidding. Federal courts have condemned refusals to sell to price cutters when there is evidence of some form of agreement. But in many situations refusal to sell or a threat thereof is, and can be, used in subtle ways to maintain prices within the law. Thus in *Adams-Mitchell Co.* v. *Cambridge Distributing Co.* (189 F. (2d) 913 (1950)), a seller of Scotch whiskies demanded that jobbers buying his products must observe stipulated resale prices under threat of refusal to sell. The majority of the court held that this form of price fixing did not violate the antitrust laws.

It is possible that the courts might change their construction of the law on refusal to sell as a mechanism in resale-price maintenance if it can be shown that competitive bidding to public agencies is being restrained. The legislatures and the courts, for example, have so far been unwilling to make fair-trade legislation, with its restraint on price competition, applicable to sales to State or Federal agencies. However, if such a change in judicial construction cannot be made, it will be necessary for the State and Federal Governments to adopt legislation making it illegal (a) to recommend minimum resale prices and (b) to refuse to sell, to withdraw a franchise, or to use related means, to enforce minimum resale price.

3. The problem of patent licensing and price control: The General Electric case (1926), holding that a patent owner may control the price at which his licensee sells patented products, has provided various industry groups over the years with a certain privilege to practice identical bidding with impunity. In subsequent cases, the General Electric decision has been whittled down and held not to exempt price-fixing agreements when made with more than one licensee.

If the use of patents as a basis for identical bidding is to be curbed, it will be necessary for the courts to overrule completely the General Electric decision on the ground that all price-fixing agreements are illegal per se under the Sherman Act.

4. Modifying the first preference to small business rule: In an effort to cope with the problem of identical bidding in military procurement, it has been provided in the Armed Services Procurement Regulations, section 2-406.4 (1958), that in case of tie bids, award shall be made to the small business concern. If there are two or more small business concerns in the tie bidding, it is further provided that the award shall be made by a drawing by lot limited to the small business concerns. A small business concern is considered to be one with 500 or fewer employees.

Investigation shows that in many instances of tie bids there is no bid from a small business firm. In other instances where there are small business concerns selling the product in question, there are several small business bids, in which case the award is made by lottery.

As an alternative procedure, it has been proposed that in the case of tie bids the award should go to the smallest firm bidding, measuring size on the basis of the firm's total assets, without regard to any absolute definition of what is small business. This might mean that in some cases Studebaker-Packard would be the smallest firm. Such a rule, it is evident, would give a quite different result from the rule in the present regulations. It could prove to be something of a boon to small business in the broader sense of the term; it would also operate to break up quickly the practice of making tie bids to governmental agencies on products which those agencies purchase in important quantities.

5. Public discussion, negotiation, and publicity: A somewhat novel, though quite effective, remedy for identical bidding has been developed by Mr. Joseph W. Nicholson, city purchasing agent for Milwaukee, Wis. In an effort to meet this "serious problem," he reports:

"It has been our policy to discuss these situations at open meetings of our purchasing board with bidders present, questioning their representatives as to why bids are identical. We point out the necessity of obtaining sealed competitive bids in order to protect the taxpayer's interest and to obtain the lowest prices possible.

"If time permits, we readvertise for bids after a public discussion of this type. Frequently this results in the receipt of competitive bids and lower prices."

In addition, Milwaukee sends data on the identical bids to the Federal Trade Commission, Department of Justice, and congressional representatives.

As a further technique to break identical bidding, the city of Milwaukee asks when possible for an allowance on used equipment. In one instance the city readvertised for competitive bids on air compressors, also requesting an allowance for some used compressor equipment. The city again received the same identical bids, but received offers on the used equipment ranging from $250 to $2,000 as a trade-in credit. As a last resort, when all other efforts fail, the city uses a public lottery, with drawing confined to local bidders.

SUMMARY

The general doctrine that identical bidding is as consistent with effective competition as it is with monopolistic restraint is without supporting empirical data and should accordingly be set aside. The uniform price theory is applicable only to actual prices—not bids—eventuating out of transactions in a market. Moreover, the prime feature of uniformity in real markets is the uniformity in net realized prices that a given seller receives on all sales made at the same time. In a competitive market a given seller does not sell simultaneously to various buyers at different net prices.

On the basis of empirical evidence and economic analysis, the legal doctrine that identical bidding is consistent with effective competition should be replaced with a working rule making identical bidding a presumption of illegal conduct lessening competition and restraining trade. It should be a presumption which can be rebutted by appropriate evidence. The presumption should also be extended to bids with slight and studied variations in delivered quotations or in terms and to instances where only one or two bids are out of line.

The present policy of antitrust agencies to prosecute identical bidding only when there is proof of collusion means that a considerable area of exemption from the antitrust laws is being granted by administrative action. Conspirators have become exceedingly sophisticated in leaving no record of their activities, and a requirement of proof of conspiracy places an undue limitation upon our antitrust policy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman for any question on this subject; yes, sir.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is rendering a very, very helpful service. Many of us were shocked, we just could not and many cannot now understand how these gentlemen who are otherwise law-abiding and honest, patriotic and doing the right thing, got into this kind of a mess. In the gentleman's bill does he have anything which would help on the other side of the picture, where the labor racketeers join with these employers in conspiracies to shoot prices up? One objective, of course, is increased wages and the other increased profits. But then the consumer pays the whole bill, an exorbitant one.

Mr. PATMAN. If workers are involved they would be covered in this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; but they are expressly exempt from the antitrust laws—that is, labor is.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is talking about something entirely different now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; I am talking about a conspiracy.

Mr. PATMAN. I know, but if they are guilty of what the gentleman says they are guilty of, they are not excluded under this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Labor unions are expressly excluded under our present statutes from antitrust laws. Are they under the gentleman's bill?

Mr. PATMAN. They are not under this bill; no.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then the gentleman includes them?

Mr. PATMAN. If labor unions conspire with management or others to fix prices, allocate markets or otherwise restrain trade, they may be punished under the antitrust laws, just as anybody else. This bill does not change the antitrust laws. And it does not make any presumption as to how identical bills come to be identical. That is for the public to question and for the antitrust enforcement agencies to answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The evil is in this industry-wide bargaining.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will pardon me, his argument is a little farfetched. In any case, it is not related to the subject of this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is all right; I usually am a little confused.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I respect the gentleman. He is a good, forthright Member of this House and a very able Member. But I respectfully suggest that his comments are a little bit off the subject of this particular bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman mean that labor organizations will not be touched by this bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Labor would be touched the same as anybody else, if it is guilty, just the same as the biggest corporation in the land.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What about the exemption given by our present statutes on labor?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is talking about something else now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am talking about conspiracies.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman can have his day in court on that. If he would like to pursue that, he can introduce a bill to change it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to see all of them covered, not just one segment.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is a Member of the House and he can introduce a bill. I am not telling him anything he does not already know.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; but the gentleman has so much more ability——

Mr. PATMAN. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Wait a minute; the gentleman has more knowledge on this subject of antitrust laws than I have. I dropped a bill in this morning to prevent strikes by unions which tie up transportation as do the engineers of the air lines.

Mr. PATMAN. In any event, I assure the gentleman that no one is exempted under the provisions of this bill; everyone is covered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I hope that is true, but I shall wait and see what the Court says.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may discuss another subject?

Mr. PATMAN. I shall be glad to yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House and individuals and groups interested throughout the country to the fact that in the very near future the perennial attempt to put a check on progressive legislation will be made again, to try to prevent the regular standing committees from reporting out important legislation to provide that certain projects can be operated and function through public debt transactions or contract authority or both.

The opponents have created a very sinister slogan, "Back-door appropriations," or "The back-door approach," just as in connection with increasing the membership of the Committee on Rules from 12 to 15 they coined the word "gag," and others.

If that resolution which is pending before the Committee on Rules, and I understand that the hearing will be held next Wednesday, should be reported out and adopted, it would be one of the most serious blows this body could direct against progressive legislation.

For example, if a similar resolution had been in effect at the time the law establishing the Commodity Credit Corporation was enacted, compelling them to come before the Committee on Appropriations at a later date for their appropriations, the very purpose of the Commodity Credit Corporation and its successful functioning would have been sharply impaired if not defeated.

The same thing applies to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and to the Rural Electrification Administration, and many programs of great importance to the farming community of our country. Anyone who votes for this resolution is not voting in the best interest of the farmer. As far as those bills are concerned, they would be voting against the best interest of the farmer.

For example, this resolution changing the rules of the House if adopted would seriously interfere with the Housing Authority, the Home Owners Loan Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which was in existence for so many years, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Savings and Loan Corporation, the Defense Production Act, the Civil Defense Act, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Public Law 480, for example, the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation, the direct loan program of the Veterans Administration, the Defense Material Service, the information media guarantee authority of the USIA, the natural fibers fund of the Department of the Army, the Small Business Administration, the Maritime Service of the Department of Commerce, the public debt borrowing authority in connection with housing, with regard to college loans and public facility loans, and the Highway Act, as well as others.

All of this important, progressive legislation is successful in operation only by reason of the public debt transaction policy and the contract authority being granted.

The opponents of progressive legislation are trying to get the rules amended in order to control the active operation of progressive regulation and to diminish the effect of such progressive legislation.

This resolution, as I understand it, is coming before the Committee on Rules. I expect that it will be on Wednesday at the latest, from information that I have received. I am alerting the Members of the dangers of such a resolution in connection with the programs that I have mentioned and other progressive programs as well. They want to take away the authority from the standing committee, and by doing that to prevent the effective operation of progressive legislation. Not only Members who stand for progressive legislation and for these programs should oppose it, but individuals and groups throughout the country who are also interested in these programs should be advised of the dangerous results that will flow from the reporting out of this resolution by the Committee on Rules and its adoption by the House.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question. Is the distinguished majority leader saying that none of these agencies would have been financed had they gone through the regular appropriations procedures?

Mr. McCORMACK. These programs would have been seriously impeded, if the public debt transaction was not granted to them or the contract authority or both, and the gentleman from Iowa knows that just as well as I do.

Mr. GROSS. No, I do not know that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I respect my friend's views, but I disagree with him. The gentleman from Iowa knows that having to come up for yearly appropriations would impair and prevent the effective operation of these great programs.

Mr. GROSS. No, I do not know that at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Consider the farm loans, for example, to the farmers of the country. I cannot understand how anybody representing a farming community would vote for the resolution to amend the rules that would seriously interfere with the effective and maximum operation of these programs.

Mr. GROSS. Because I am sure that the farmers of the State of Iowa would want the money to be appropriated by going through the regular procedures and being scrutinized by the committee of the Congress that is established to scrutinize appropriations for the purposes for which the gentleman from Massachusetts has enumerated.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the view of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, it is my view.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the view of the gentleman from Iowa, but if those

resolutions are ever adopted, then the farmers of Iowa would realize that the position of the gentleman from Iowa, while in good faith, is not for their best interests.

Mr. GROSS. I do not agree with that at all.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from Iowa has been talking with the majority leader here—do not the farmers out in Iowa and from your district especially know what you have been up to?

Mr. GROSS. I think they have a real sense of financial responsibility.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand that, and I would like to know now while we are on this subject, just how much did you increase your majority the last time they found out what you were up to?

Mr. GROSS. Well, substantially.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well—substantially—I want to know—I have been trying for 2 weeks to get you to tell me, but you have not told me. How much was it?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know that that is important to this issue.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, it is, because the gentleman from Massachusetts thinks that the farmers in Iowa do not know what you have been doing and I think they do, and apparently they approve of it. Now by how much did you increase your majority percentagewise?

Mr. GROSS. It was more than double.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, got that. They know what the gentleman from Iowa has been doing, and they like it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has expired.

A TIME OF TROUBLES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the daring venture on which the new administration has set out has been outlined in bold strokes of the pen for an inquisitive world to view and to speculate upon. In a series of vigorous speeches, beginning with the inaugural address, and continuing with addresses to Congress and with his news conferences, President Kennedy has stated in no uncertain terms what needs to be done in general. He has promised to follow these general proposals up swiftly with the specifics required to put progress into motion. These are proposals, as he says, "symbolizing an end, as well as a beginning—signifying renewal, as well as change."

The negative aspect of his pronouncements has so far received the greater attention. Critics have suggested that the picture he paints is far too gloomy, that the world—the United States—is not really beset by troubles:

> Thick as the leaves that strow
> The brooks of Vallombrosa.
> —*Milton's* "Paradise Lost."

But this is the end of which he speaks, the end of a period of stagnation, indecision, inaction. It is not necessarily a criticism of what is past. Western civilization is staggering under the effects of a half century of titanic wars which few people could foresee, and which none could prevent. At the same time, a maldistribution of the physical wealth which Western societies have learned to produce in such abundance has called into action social forces disruptive of internal peace and order. And now the rest of the underdeveloped world, plagued by centuries of poverty, disease, and ignorance, has plunged into insane revolutions themselves destructive of any attempts to relieve their miseries. This is the negative aspect of the situation. But it is not a condemnation of the efforts of sincere and conscientious men who have expended their best energies to righten wrongs. We have done the best we could, so far as light has been given us to see the right.

But now it is time for us to start anew, for a revival of hope, constructiveness, courage, and determination. For the one negative word, "end," there are three positive words, "beginning," "renewal," "change." These make up the constructive side of the venture on which Mr. Kennedy has embarked, and which a weary world has as yet scarcely started to interpret or to weigh.

The President has also picked up the gauntlet of inaction and answered the call for leadership. He has pledged his body, politically, in testimony of the sincerity of his principles. He has gathered around him a number of lieutenants who, in the opinion of most observers, are of like mind, and of each of whom it might be said, in the words of Matthew Arnold:

> Languor is not in your heart,
> Weakness is not in your word
> Weariness is not on your brow!

The editor of Atlantic characterizes the new phalanx thus:

> Intelligence, energy, enthusiasm are the key qualities with which the new administration begins. Free government cannot exist and prosper on these qualities alone, but

Especially enthusiasm, which by derivation means being filled with the spirit of God. Successful leaders, successful causes, successful societies in all history have been marked by overpowering enthusiasm, and it is the quality which is most conspicuously lacking in our present day outlook.

Three considerations may determine the fate of the new Presidential venture. These are:

First. Has the new administration the innate integrity, the utter dedication to the public good necessary to achieve its goals, and will it retain those qualities unwaveringly through the years?

Second. Has it the intelligence, the resourcefulness, and the vigor to analyze difficulties and to propound appropriate remedies, and push them relentlessly against the opposition of "those that are at ease in Zion" as well as the mountainous mass of inertia which binds our civilization to the wornout habits and customs of the past?

Third. Does it possess that divine spark which alone can kindle the awareness of a somnolent citizenry and inspire them to activity even at the sacrifice of present day advantage?

The consensus of opinion seems to be that the new administration meets the requirements of the first two considerations in quite satisfactory measure. Even in the campaign last summer and fall, the President was described as intelligent, resourceful, tough minded, relentless. It is the last consideration that gives most concern at the present time. Mr. Kennedy himself has reiterated his own concern over that consideration:

> In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than in mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course. * * * Now the trumpet calls us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need; not as a call to battle, though embattled we are; but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation"—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

Arnold Toynbee insists that "growth is the work of creative personalities and minorities; they can not go on moving forward themselves unless they can contrive to carry their fellows with them in their advance. The leader's task is to make his fellows his followers."

The difficulty of enlisting followers for the long twilight struggle is pointed up by the closeness of last fall's election. A vociferous minority which is only a bare minority cautions that the new administration carries "no mandate"—no mandate to do anything. What was good enough for our fathers is good enough for us. The purposes and methods pursued successfully in the past are tried and true. They will ultimately work out for the good of all. This is their position, and on it they will stand until the heavens shall be no more. These are infected with the pessimism and determinism of St. Cyprian, writing some 500 years ago:

> You ought to know that the age is now senile. It has not now the stamina that used to make it upstanding, nor the vigor and robustness that used to make it strong. * * * This is the sentence that has been passed upon the world; this is the law of God; that what has been must die, and what has grown up must grow old.

The Halls of Congress itself are crowded with well-intended Members who cling to this futile philosophy. To them we must say: "The good intentions of democracy have no magic power to perform the miracle of the loaves and fishes." In place of a spirit little suited to the time and its conditions, we must ask them to substitute the thinking of Sir James Jeans:

> Taking a very gloomy view of the future of the human race, let us suppose that it can only expect to survive for 2,000 million years longer, a period about equal to the

past age of the earth. Then, regarded as a being destined to live for three-score years and 10, humanity, although it has been born in a house only 70 years old, is itself only 3 days old. * * * Utterly inexperienced beings, we are standing at the first flush of the dawn of civilization. * * * In time the glory of the morning must fade into the light of common day, and this, in some far distant age, will give place to evening twilight, presaging the final eternal night. But we children of the dawn need give but little thought to the far-off sunset.

And further we must point out, with Toynbee, that—

Certainly, in the movement of all these forces that weave the web of human history, there is an obvious element of recurrence. Yet the shuttle which shoots backward and forward across the loom of Time in a perpetual to-and-fro is all the time bringing into existence a tapestry in which there is a developing design and not simply an endless repetition of the same pattern. * * * This is a message of encouragement for us children of the Western civilization as we drift today alone, with none but stricken civilizations around us. It may be that Death the Leveler will lay his icy hand on our civilization also. But we are not confronted with any stern necessity. The dead civilizations are not dead by fate, or in the course of nature, and therefore our living civilization is not doomed inexorably in advance to join the majority of its species. * * * We are not compelled to submit the riddle of our fate to the blind arbitrament of statistics. The divine spark of creative power is still alive in us, and, if we have the grace to kindle it into flame, then the stars in their courses cannot defeat our efforts to attain the goal of human happiness.

These are words alone, and words are not deeds. But words create ideas, and ideas guide conduct. They set up a sort of pep-rally, which has won many an athletic game in the school and college playground, and which has been equally efficacious in gathering vast forces in favor of religious or economic or social reform. It needs to begin with the conservatives in Congress, and through them spread to industry, to labor, to civic leaders, and to all those who find prestige and favor on their side and who delight to live in a world from which all discordant elements are shut out. For—

A fatuous passivity toward the present springs from an infatuation with the past, and this infatuation is the sin of idolatry. For idolatry may be defined as an intellectually and morally blind worship of the creature instead of the Creator. If it is indeed the truth—

"That men may rise on stepping-stones
Of their dead selves to higher things."

then the idolator who commits the error of treating one dead self not as a stepping-stone but as a pedestal will be alienating himself from life.

It is true that a careless and casual survey of the contemporary scene does not indicate that we are confronted with any stern necessity. Some 66 millions of our fellow Americans are employed at the highest wage in human history. We enjoy the highest standard of living ever known to man—at least, some of us do. Our output of goods and services is measured only by astronomical figures. Our weapons for defensive, or offensive, war exceed in destructive force the lightning bolts of Jove himself. Only two cities in Japan have personal knowledge of just how devastating the smallest of them really is. The urgency of the situation has not come home to most of us yet. There is now no complete collapse of the economic system in the United States, as there was in 1931 and 1932. The tumescence and subsidence of one crisis after another in Europe, in the Near East, and in the Far East, has dulled our senses to the imminence of violent explosion. The chaos in Africa which wrecks any prospects for a peaceful, productive, and orderly life in that continent is far away and hardly comprehensible, or credible. After all, the United States has been uniformly successful over a wide range of activity—political, economic, social, religious, educational, and whatnot. We seem to be perfectly adapted to our environment, and the environment seems favorable. That is the underlying cause of our complaisance, and also the underlying cause of our danger.

A creature which has become perfectly adapted to its environment, an animal whose whole capacity and vital force is concentrated and expended in succeeding here and now, has nothing left over with which to respond to any radical change. Age by age, it becomes more perfectly economical in the way its entire resources meet exactly its current and customary opportunities. In the end it can do all that is necessary to survive without any conscious striving or unadapted movement. It can, therefore, beat all competitors in the special field; but equally, on the other hand, should that field change, it must become extinct.

The condition which is required for the maintenance of growth is a perpetual flexibility and spontaneity.

And this is the condition which the conservatives fail to meet, and which the new administration proposes to change into an actuality. It sees clearly that "whenever the existing institutional structure of a society is challenged by a new social force, three alternative outcomes are possible: either a harmonious adjustment of structure to force, or a revolution—which is a delayed and discordant adjustment—or an enormity. If harmonious adjustments predominate, the society will continue to grow; if revolutions, its growth will become increasingly hazardous; if enormities, we may diagnose a breakdown." Harmonious adjustments are what we seek, both in internal economic structure and in our relations with those peoples which have developed other cultures. To the extent to which we can induce our fellow citizens, both in and out of Congress, to cooperate in making necessary adjustments, we can adapt our society to the changes which can in no wise be fended off, and our society will continue to grow.

This then is the first and vital task of the Kennedy administration, to change an imperceptible political majority into an omnipotent working majority of individuals dedicated to the common good and accepting change as a necessary characteristic of every living organism.

With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

THE ONE-WAY STREET

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the U.S. Congress, last week I started on what some have called a crusade. The crusade is a fight for a principle and one that is necessary because of circumstances surrounding the issue of world trade whereby the people have for too long been fed some truth, half-truths, and absolute untruths.

I called attention to the section 5 in H.R. 5—the so-called depressed area redevelopment bill which will be before us before too long.

I hasten to say publicly that I have supported this legislation in the past and in all probability will again.

However, I would be something less than dishonest legislatively if I did not admit that this bill is the clearest cut confession of the failure of our present reciprocal trades and aid laws.

Never in history have a group of Representatives of the people been called on to spend money to correct a serious economic situation and still leave the door wide open for the reoccurrence of the same trade practices that caused the economic breakdown in the first place.

This depressed area bill calls for the spending of public funds at all levels of government for the industrial redevelopment and rehabilitation of any area that has had and still has serious unemployment.

Top priority is given to those areas which have become depressed because of the adverse effect of imported goods under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act.

This is the plainest admission of the failure of our trades agreements ever put in print.

The claims of injury by those adversely affected by these trades deals have fallen on deaf ears and yet the Congress is called upon to admit the damage by a provision of law setting up a relief program for such injured areas.

I cannot see the logic of helping an area to get well only to become distressed again unless we enact some protective measure against the conditions that made it depressed in the first place.

This reminds me of a story:

They tell of the young colored boy who got a job working in a box factory feeding a machine with narrow strips of wood to be cut to certain lengths.

He accidentally cut off one of his fingers and sued for compensation. In those days a worker had to prove negligence on the part of the employer since the law assumed negligence on the part of the worker in all accident cases.

When the inspector for the insurance company came out he questioned the boy about the use of the saw guard, speed, and so forth.

The boy protested that he had performed the job as always—in fact he said, "I will show you. I always puts my hands and fingers just like this—oops there goes another one."

That is the point I am trying to make on the question of redevelopment of depressed areas. The sponsors of this legislation admit that the cause of depression and the need for redevelopment stems from the loss in employment to the area by the adverse effect of the reciprocal trades.

In their own words, this is what H.R. 5, section 5, page 5, says:

> Any area in which a substantial part of the employment is or most recently was in an industry adversely affected by the reduction of trade barriers under the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, with respect to which the President has reported to the Administrator under subsection (f) of this section, and meeting the standards of unemployment set forth in this section shall be entitled on application to a priority of consideration by the Administrator for designation as a redevelopment area.

Now I ask you if plain commonsense does not dictate that it is the duty of the Congress to protect this area against a recurrence of the same conditions that made the area depressed in the first place.

What would you think of a man who was suffering a severe allergy and went to the clinic to find out what was causing his miseries?

After an extensive and painful period of time he is discharged on the way to complete recovery and is warned against fried mushrooms and lemon pie because that is what caused his trouble.

With the doctor's admonition in his mind and the hospital bill in his pocket, would you consider him smart or stupid if he stopped in a restaurant on his way home and ordered fried mushrooms and lemon pie?

Is that not what we are doing in this section of the depressed-area bill? We are admitting that this depressed area and its economy has an allergy caused by an overdose of imports from cheap-labor countries and, yet, we refuse to protect this community against another attack which in all probability can prove fatal.

Amongst us always there are those who seem to wear blinders and refuse to look at both sides of a question for fear they will not be able to explain why they have changed their course.

Believe me, those of us joined in this crusade are just as disturbed by world poverty as the highest rated humanitarian amongst us. We too feel the need for friends and allies. However, we subscribe to the sound principle that in order to help our needy neighbors we have to be healthy ourselves.

On the 14th of March a group of representatives of the glass industry from my district and elsewhere, including myself, will appear before the Tariff Commission begging for relief under the escape clause for our dying window-glass and plate-glass industry.

Now those of you who have no such problem can join the anvil chorus and shout your condemnation of these men, including me, who feel that this is our duty not alone to our communities, but in fact to all of your communities as well.

Let us take a fast glance at the results of our trade policies on this industry in just one plant.

In my hometown of Jeannette, Pa., we had, not too long ago, the largest window-glass factory in the world. Today, that plant is idle, its fires are out, its thousands of employees unemployed, and some about my age who will never again be able to get a full-time job in industry.

What caused this situation, and what are we doing about it?

It was caused, as any one of the workers knows, by the importation of window glass from overseas.

In a period of less than 10 years the window glass imports jumped from less than 100,000 boxes to over 1 million boxes, or enough windows to build 1,200,000 six-room houses.

It does not take a Harvard graduate to make two and two equal four in this instance.

Now, here is what we are doing about it. We are going to increase unemployment benefits for a period of about 13 weeks, we are going to spend $371 million to rehabilitate this community, dress up its factory sites, widen the streets to make it more attractive to new industry, we are going to keep a heavy personal and business tax program for public works, and other incentives to building up our economy.

These are not new moves, they are just old remedies dusted off for immediate relief like a hypodermic to a person with a broken leg. It will not cure it, but it will ease the pain.

One thing sure—eventually the broken leg, like our broken economy, has to be operated on or the patient will be crippled for life.

I am for these temporary relief shots into the economic body, but by the same token I am not being lulled into a false sense of security.

Revamping our aid and trade programs will not be the full answer, but it certainly has to be done if we are to achieve a full recovery for our ailing economy.

Last week when I said that millions of Americans have lost their jobs because of the adverse effects of our trade agreements, many of my colleagues questioned the figures.

Steel Magazine, in a story published September 5, 1960, had this to say and I quote:

> OUR FIGHT FOR SURVIVAL IN NEW WORLD MARKET
>
> Two million Americans have lost their livelihood since 1956 because of foreign trade changes.
>
> We're losing the fight for survival in the new world market.
>
> Pierre Hans Ubishi is after the excellent job you've held for years. He's smart, ambitious, and gaining momentum.
>
> Volkswagens on the streets and Japanese radios in homes are ample proof the foreign invasion is here. Not so self-evident is the decline in our industrial exports. But it's clear to Americans who have lost their jobs since 1956 directly as a result of drooping shipments abroad. Statistically, here's what the import-export shift is doing to U.S. industry:

[In billions of dollars]

1956 imports	12.6
1959 imports	15.2
Import rise	2.6
1956 exports	17.3
1959 exports	16.3
Export decline	1.0
Total loss to United States	3.6

You get the full impact of the $2.6 billion rise in imports by computing what that amount of business would mean to U.S. firms: It would generate sales of more than $3 billion because our prices average 20 percent higher than those of our foreign competitors. That $3 billion, plus the $1 billion loss in exports, adds up to $4 billion loss in sales to U.S. industry since 1956.

Added to this, we have another serious problem which is tied directly into the adverse picture on foreign trade.

This is the climbing statistic on foreign investment. As of the moment, the investment in foreign production facilities is increasing while investment in this country is decreasing—percentage-wise.

This is even more serious than casual examination might reveal for the simple reason that the oversea investments by Americans is in the area where American exports are the heaviest.

Business Week, September 10, 1960, gives these two lists, one showing our American investments abroad, the other showing our American exports abroad:

> U.S. investment abroad: Primary metals, machinery (including electrical), transportation equipment (including autos), other metalworking; chemicals, paper, rubber, stone, clay, and glass; food and beverages; miscellaneous manufacturing (including textiles); petroleum industry, manufacturing and petroleum.
>
> U.S. exports: Primary metals, machinery, electrical machinery, transportation equipment, including autos; other metalworking, chemicals, paper, rubber; stone, clay, and glass, petroleum, food and beverages; miscellaneous manufacturing, including textiles.

You will note that we are spending our investment dollars in the production lines that make up our heaviest exports. Americans are taking the advice of our Government to compete in the inner-six and outer-seven market by building plants within these areas to escape their tariff and quota restrictions and to use their cheap labor available in abundance.

The experts see no conflict in our program of foreign investment and our efforts to increase exports. I do, very frankly—I cannot see how we can sell to a market overseas after we create production facilities to produce the goods we sell them from home.

For a few more years the demand for equipment and raw materials and food will give us a trade balance but the end must come whether it is tomorrow or the day afterward because, with our know-how, automation, and our investments abroad we will soon be able to supply any given market with any given product.

You will note if you take the time to examine the records that every other

nation immediately increases protective quotas or tariffs when any product from abroad threatens their domestic industries and jobs.

The case of Germany and its coal tariff, Japan and its automobile embargoes, the proposed increase of $300 per auto in Canada, the restrictions in Mexico and the demand that plants be built in Mexico to replace imported products, are examples in point.

These are just samples of worldwide awareness of the simple facts of life.

The history of the watch industry is being repeated in binoculars, cameras, electronics, radios, automobiles, toys—in fact, almost every consumer item is being pushed off of American production lines and the only lines that are growing are the lines of the unemployed.

Next week I hope to again be given the privilege of the House to try to show the advantages to be gained by the exporting nations in curtailing their exports by self-restraint and to increase their imports in order to put Congress to sleep long enough to again reenact the present trades agreements without reevaluation and revision.

All of us have a stake in this world game of trade, but you cannot play unless you have chips, and ours are running out.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter—the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

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

There was no objection.

BILL TO PLACE LABOR UNIONS UNDER ANTITRUST LAW

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would place labor unions under antitrust law. This is the same legislation I introduced in the last Congress in cooperation with other Members of the House.

My bill is not punitive, it is not antilabor. It merely makes unions subject to the same rules which now apply to business and industry, rather than leaving unions and their leaders above and beyond the law, as now is the situation.

As I pointed out 2 years ago, union monopoly power manifests itself in two separate and distinct ways: First, restrictive trade practices such as price fixing, restrictions on use of new processes and technological improvements, exclusion of products for the market, and so forth; and, second, enforcement of wage demands through industrywide and pattern bargaining practices with no regard for the economic problems of individual business firms or the impact upon the industry or area affected. This bill deals directly with both of these aspects of union monopoly power. In limiting the almost dictatorial power of the national labor leaders, the control of union affairs will be returned to the hands of the local unions and workers and their elected officials.

THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF UPSTATE NEW YORK

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, twice in recent days the House of Representatives served as a forum for an attack on a report entitled "The Economic Status of Upstate New York," prepared by the Business Research Center of Syracuse University for the temporary State commission on economic expansion.

The attack did not go unnoticed, nor did the motives for the attack remain unquestioned. A February 11 editorial in the Syracuse Herald-Journal provides some interesting background data and attempts to place the controversy in its proper perspective. I include that editorial at this point:

REASONS IDENTIFIED FOR SPARKING SQUABBLE

Why should Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, whose home base is Schenectady, pick on a study report written by the Syracuse University Business Research Center for the temporary State commission on economic expansion?

He first commented on the report without having read it.

He next asserted he wouldn't change his remarks after reading it * * * although the tenor of his remarks indicated some misplacement of understanding.

Mr. STRATTON is anxious to attract upstate attention for two reasons.

First, he is a Democrat whose district, ordinarily Republican, may be resting on a foundation of sand. New York State faces a loss in representation because of the recent census and Mr. STRATTON'S district might be gerrymandered out of existence.

That is considered a prospect since the task of redistricting is in the hands of a committee named by our Republican-dominated legislature.

Next, Mr. STRATTON has been tantalized, as well, by this newspaper's canvass of Democratic county chairmen. We were wondering if they had been thinking about an opponent for Governor Rockefeller and a few, noting Mr. STRATTON'S success in a normally Republican district, mentioned the Congressman as a third-man prospect.

So, that is what lurks in the background of the current controversy over New York State jobless figures and whether development corporations are worth their community salt.

BILL TO ASSIST REHABILITATION OF BLIND

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I have introduced today is another effort on my part to resolve permanently the perennial Missouri-Pennsylvania problem existing in title X, the aid to the blind title of the Social Security Act.

My bill—and I have introduced other similar bills in previous Congresses—would amend title X of the Social Security Act to provide that, without an increase in Federal participating funds, a State plan for aid to the blind may utilize a more liberal needs test than that presently specified in such act.

Time and time again by its enactments Congress has indicated its belief that our blind citizens should be aided and encouraged in their magnificent struggle to resume normal life, to function as full participants in the normal pursuits of the community.

Time and time again Congress has enacted rehabilitatively oriented legislation in aid to the blind; but repeatedly and consistently it has neglected or refused to solve for all time the constantly recurring Missouri-Pennsylvania problem in aid to the blind.

What is the Missouri-Pennsylvania problem? What has Congress done to solve it?

The States of Missouri and Pennsylvania maintain aid to the blind programs, entirely financed by State funds which are more liberal in their eligibility requirements than those allowable under Federal law and regulation; these same States also maintain aid to the blind programs in accordance with the provisions of title X of the Social Security Act, which are financed jointly from Federal-State funds. These latter programs are operated in compliance with the very stringent eligibility standards set forth in the Federal law and regulations.

For more than 10 years the completely State-financed aid to the blind programs in Missouri and Pennsylvania have been threatened with extinction; for more than 10 years Federal authorities have threatened to withhold Federal participating funds from the Federal-State aid to the blind programs in those States unless they agreed to conform to the eligibility standards required by Federal law and regulations for their blind aid recipients. In other words, these States were expected to maintain Federal standards in programs which did not receive one single Federal dollar to meet operating or program costs.

For more than 10 years the States of Missouri and Pennsylvania have met this challenge, this unreasonable Federal challenge to their right to spend their own funds in a manner determined by themselves, by refusing to abandon their totally State-financed aid to the blind programs. The Congress has abetted these States by enacting stopgap legislation. There have been five such actions, the most recent of which was included in the Social Security Amendments of 1960, extending the cutoff date to June 30, 1964.

Enactment of this stopgap legislation has not solved the Missouri-Pennsylvania problem; it has only postponed a solution to the problem.

It is my hope that this the 87th Congress will cease evading the issue; will enact my bill into law—and will finally and unequivocally solve this prepetual and perplexing Missouri-Pennsylvania problem.

It is my conviction that the more liberal eligibility requirements which prevail in the State-financed aid to the blind programs in Missouri and Pennsylvania have made it possible for many blind men and women to work their way from dependence upon public assistance to economic self-sufficiency; to liberation from a lifetime of dependence upon public assistance.

I believe that these programs, rehabilitatively organized and administered, have served as a bridge across which have traveled many blind persons as they successfully battled to rebuild their lives from the ruins resulting from the loss of sight.

Not only do I believe that these fine aid to the blind programs in Missouri and Pennsylvania should be permanently secured in their right to continue to operate; I also believe that any other State should be granted the right, if it wishes; and with the use of its own funds, to establish and maintain a similar program for the benefit of its blind citizens.

Enactment of my bill would finally resolve the following issues which have been raised—and would continue to be raised—in title X of the Social Security Act:

First. It would secure the States in their right to use their own funds in the establishment and maintenance of improved and enlightened social welfare programs for their blind citizens.

Second. It would protect Missouri and Pennsylvania in their right to continue to maintain permanently their rehabilitatively directed, solely State-financed aid to the blind programs free from further Federal interference and it would allow other States wishing to do so to establish similar programs with the unique features of the Missouri and Pennsylvania State plans for aid to the blind.

Third. The amount of each State's Federal grant for its federally supported aid to the blind programs would continue to be measured by the present Federal standards and on like terms to all States. The means test that is contained in clause (8) of section 1002(a) as amended would apply to all States for the purpose of determining the part of any State's expenditures that would be covered by the Federal grant.

Fourth. No limitation or requirement on the allowance exceptions from the means test in the direction of greater liberality would be imposed upon any State plan in order to retain a title X Federal grant for federally eligible cases.

In order to prevent the States from circumventing the minimum standards of the Federal program by transferring blind aid recipients to a drastically less adequate State program, the States would be permitted to increase but not decrease the extent to which the recipients' earnings, income, or other resources might be excepted from the means test.

Fifth. It would certainly serve to encourage other States to develop their plans of aid to the blind toward the high goal of rehabilitation, rather than the static goal of providing for the barest minimum physical needs of blind persons.

In 1950 Congress incorporated the rehabilitation concept into the provisions of title X of the Social Security Act—by requiring that the first $50 of the monthly earned income of blind aid recipients be exempt from meeting their needs. In the 86th Congress this exemption was increased to $85 plus 50 percent of monthly earned income.

In 1956 Congress proclaimed self-care and self-support to be among the purposes of the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act.

These congressional actions were taken to convert the Federal-State aid to the blind programs into programs which not only gave a person in need minimum food, shelter and clothing; but, and this is of very great importance, it offered those who must apply for help the opportunity gradually to work their way from reliance upon public funds to self-reliance; from demeaning economic dependence to satisfyingly self-achieved economic independence.

Sixth. My bill, if adopted by Congress would restore to the States their right to establish, if they wished to do so, aid to the blind programs with standards more liberal than those allowable under present Federal law and regulations. It would restore to the States their right to spend their own money as they choose in such programs. All this could be done without any cost to the Federal Government. This would be so, since the provisions of my bill specify that the Federal Government would only make available participating funds for those cases which would qualify under the present stringent Federal definition of need.

Not only would the enactment of my bill not cost additional Federal dollars—very much the contrary would happen.

I believe that, by assisting blind persons in need to return to work, to resume economically productive lives, by making aid to the blind programs a means of achieving rehabilitation; by operating such programs in accordance with a philosophy of hope and help—then, I think, and only then—will the many able bodied, employable blind persons be rescued from perpetual dependence upon public support—a drain upon the resources of the Nation; a loss to the economy, to the total life of the Nation.

The experience of the more liberal blind aid programs in my State of Missouri and in the State of Pennsylvania, I believe, fully justifies my conviction and my contention—that when programs providing public assistance to the blind are operated as a force for rehabilitation, then a substantial number of rehabilitated and restored lives results.

I do not believe that men and women who are able to work, who have many years of working life remaining to them should remain upon public assistance for the rest of their lives. Nor do I believe they want to remain there.

My bill, enacted into law would give to these people the opportunity they want, the opportunity they need—and the opportunity they deserve—to regain their lost dignity, their lost independence—for this will come to them only when they again earn their own daily bread, when they can again provide for the needs of their family.

CONFEDERATED SALISH AND KOOTENAI TRIBES OF THE FLATHEAD RESERVATION, MONT.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this day a bill to set aside certain lands in Montana for the Indians of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation.

The same measure was introduced late in the last Congress with the support of the entire Montana delegation—S. 3004 and H.R. 10208, 86th Congress.

This bill will restore to tribal ownership of the Confederated Tribes between 500 and 600 acres of former tribal lands now in Government ownership but not used by or useful to the Federal Government. These lands are needed by the Confederated Tribes for tribal use in the land-use program.

The lands were acquired from the Confederated Tribes under an act of 1904 opening the reservation to settlement which provided payment to the tribes at only the statutory minimum of $1.25 per acre. The lands have fulfilled the purpose for which they were originally taken—which was for Indian administration—and are surplus to the Department's needs.

The fact that such lands could not be integrated into the tribal land-use program became pointedly apparent 2 or 3 years ago when the lack of tribal title to some of the lands hindered and delayed for nearly a year the establishment of a needed Indian clinic at St. Ignatius, Mont. It was this situation which led the Department of the Interior to suggest that the tribes seek legislative restoration. In connection with the proposed clinic it was learned that the tribes did not own the former agency-reserve land or building which the Public Health Service desired to use. Under existing law the Department of the Interior could not promptly make it available to the Public Health Service without payment of its value. Since that situation came up the matter has been solved by means of a permit arrangement.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to convey the beneficial title of lands to the tribes which in the future may be declared surplus to the needs of the Department of the Interior. This provision would avoid the necessity of additional legislation for future conveyances of surplus lands.

When the United States acquired these for agency purpose in the first place, there was no appraisal to determine if the statutory minimum of $1.25 per acre was a fair price, nor were the tribes given any option to accept or reject the statutory remuneration. As a result, the Government paid only some $958.75, according to a Department of the Interior study, for lands

which today are worth nearly 40 times as much. In order that the Government shall not profit at the expense of its wards and in order that lands formerly taken for merely nominal consideration for the benefit of the Indians shall actually inure to their benefit, the bill makes a provision against offsets in any claims against the United States.

The enactment of this bill will materially assist in putting these lands to productive use.

THE ROUSH-CHAMBERS ELECTION CONTEST IN INDIANA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from the minority leader, Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK, along with a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the Indiana General Assembly. The resolution reiterates belief in the principle of "no taxation without representation" and it urges the seating in the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress the duly elected Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of the State of Indiana.

It would appear, however, that Mr. HALLECK inadvertently misinterpreted the resolution passed by the Indiana General Assembly. The resolution asked that the contestant be seated "in accordance with the certificates of election as filed by the Indiana secretary of state." The Indiana secretary of state certified the election of J. Edward Roush by a majority of 2 votes. Mr. HALLECK, in his letter, would lead you to believe that George O. Chambers is the duly elected contestant. So each of my colleagues may personally examine these documents, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

I concur with the request of the House of Representatives of the Indiana General Assembly in Resolution 19, and I join my honorable colleague, Mr. RAY J. MADDEN, in asking this House to take immediate action and seat J. Edward Roush, whose election from the Fifth District of Indiana has been so certified by the secretary of that State.

OFFICE OF THE MINORITY LEADER,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, February 15, 1961.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Enclosed herewith is a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Indiana General Assembly to end taxation without representation in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana by seating George O. Chambers "without prejudice to either contestant in accordance with the certificates of election as filed by the Indiana secretary of state."

Also enclosed is an editorial on this subject from the Anderson (Ind.) Herald, of February 11, 1961.

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. HALLECK.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 19

Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and move its adoption:

"Whereas a resolution has been submitted to permit the residents of the District of Columbia to vote for the President and the Vice President of the United States; and

"Whereas we sincerely do not believe in the principle of taxation without representation whether it be in the District of Columbia or in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana; and

"Whereas the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana has been denied the right of representation in the U.S. Congress: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Indiana General Assembly memorialize the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress to follow established precedent by seating with full representation privileges the Fifth Indiana District Representative without prejudice to either contestant in accordance with the certificates of election as filed by the Indiana secretary of state; and be it further

"Resolved, That support be given to the principle of representation with taxation to the citizens of our Nation's Capital in the expectation that the same privilege be accorded to all of the citizens of Indiana."

Adopted February 9, 1961.

KERMIT O. BURROWS,
Representative.

Attest:

FRANCIS GAYLORD,
Clerk of the House.

SOME FACTS OF THE RECESSION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues are concerned that the administration is going to talk the country into a recession. The facts, gentlemen, speak for themselves.

In California, the jobless total is 517,000—higher than it has been in 10 years. Currently, 8 percent of our work force, compared with 5.9 percent for January 1960, are the victims of this talk.

While employment decreases, there is an increase in the number of shutoff utilities, refinancing, repossession of automobiles, and household furniture. In Los Angeles County foreclosures and bankruptcies are on the rise—90 percent of the bankruptcies are individual wage earners.

The New York Times of February 17, 1961, presented an editorial which favored facing reality when an economy is confronted with a recession. This is hardly an apt recommendation for those who consider unemployment figures are created by talk.

The editorial follows:

IT'S A REAL RECESSION

Few current phenomena are as astonishing as the effort in some quarters to deny that our economy is now passing through a recession. President Kennedy presented the facts simply and convincingly at his Wednesday press conference. Unemployment has now risen to 5,500,000; the steel industry is operating now and has been operating for many months at a level of only about half its capacity; stocks of automobiles are around the million mark and automobile production has been slowed down considerably in consequence. In the face of these and other facts it is incomprehensible how even the most partisan opponent of the administration can deny that the economy has receded substantially from anything approaching full employment of resources.

Much more than semantics is involved in this argument. Those who deny we are in a recession are in effect denying that there is anything about which we need be concerned or that there are any special measures which need to be taken. They fail, consequently, to appraise properly the great costs we are paying during this economic downturn. Domestically we are wasting a significant percentage of our human and material resources which are now idle, with consequent diminution of the flow of wages, profits, and tax revenues. Even more important, in millions of homes where the breadwinner is unemployed an atmosphere of anxiety and worry reigns, creating psychological costs which are not negligible. Abroad the evident facts about our economic ills raise questions about our Nation's future even among our friends, while they give valuable propaganda material for our enemies.

President Kennedy is doing no more than his duty in stating the facts bluntly and in outlining measures needed to improve the situation. The fact that he is moving to increase the flow of purchasing power and to get legislation which will ameliorate hardships resulting from unemployment gives reason to hope that the current downturn will be arrested before it has run its full course. It is the obligation of the leader of a democratic society to tell his people the truth, and this obligation President Kennedy is fulfilling well on this major issue.

CALIFORNIA AREAS HIT BY RECESSION—GOVERNOR BROWN GETS A REPORT—CALLS SITUATION SERIOUS—JOBLESS TOTAL RISES

(By Bill Becker)

LOS ANGELES, February 17.—With more than 500,000 unemployed, California faced conditions comparable, in some counties, to the depression days of the 1930's.

That was the low point of a week by John M. Wedemeyer, director of the State department of social welfare.

Gov. Edmund G. Brown, terming the recession serious, today called a conference in Sacramento for March 13 to combat the problem.

"We don't intend to let anyone starve," the Governor said. The welfare report stated that "there is currently little testimony that people are starving, although there are some indications of some malnutrition." A decided increase was found in the number of calls on public health agencies.

Department investigators found conditions in 13 representative counties checked substantially worse than a year ago. These included such big counties as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Alameda, and smaller counties, both rural and semirural.

The jobless total in January rose to 517,000 statewide, the highest total in 10 years. The unemployment rate of 8 percent compared with 6.9 percent in December and 5.9 percent in January 1960.

In their survey during the week of February 5 to 11, the State social workers found unemployment spreading to skilled laboring groups for the first time in years. Main industries affected were construction, aircraft, steel, and lumber.

The reports showed unemployment benefits were being depleted at a rate that could

bring about a potentially critical condition in several counties in the next 2 or 3 months.

In San Diego County alone, nearly 1,200 workers a month are exhausting benefits. One building trades union reported 500 unemployed of a total membership of 1,500.

Much of the unemployment, investigators found, is among persons under 25 years of age, many of them with families. Negroes and Mexican-Americans have been especially hard hit, the report added.

Increased shutoff of utilities, refinancing of contracts and repossession of cars and furniture were noted. Foreclosures and bankruptcies were reported steadily rising, especially in populous Los Angeles County. Ninety percent of the bankrupt were individual wage earners who overused their credit.

The county's bureau of public assistance went on an emergency 48-hour workweek to cope with mounting relief requests. The bureau handled 10,687 relief applications during January and expected more this month.

The bureau director, Leland C. Carter, said: "It's the heaviest I've seen since I started here in the middle of the depression." Voluntary agencies are helping somewhat, but the State workers found that these groups have limited funds.

Governor Brown, meanwhile, requested President Kennedy to include California in the proposed Federal food stamp plan to help feed the unemployed.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we have been told that Members of the House have been appearing or will appear before the Committee on House Administration in opposition to the request for funds made by the Committee on Un-American Activities. In that connection permit me to call attention to this editorial from this morning's Chicago Tribune. The very distinguished majority leader was one of the first to hold a hearing on the Communist menace in this country. The present committee's request is for funds for continuation of that good work. The editorial reads:

THE RED HERRING'S RETURN

The testimony of William D. Pawley released today by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security has some of the hottest information on the perversities of State Department personalities and method since the exposure of Alger Hiss. Mr. Pawley's statement should be thoroughly examined and discussed in Congress, for, if what he says is correct, the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy didn't know the half of it.

Mr. Pawley's experience with Latin America covers more than half a century, and he had a deep familiarity with the Orient. He was the man who established the Flying Tigers air operation which assisted the Nationalist Government to help defend China before the United States was at war with Japan. He served as President Truman's Ambassador to Peru and Brazil.

Because he insisted that China could be saved from the Communists, and proposed measures toward that end, Pawley testified that he was treated as a leper when he was serving as a special assistant to the Secretary of State Dean Acheson. He related that the Under Secretary, James E. Webb, called him in to notify him that "it has been decided that you are to see no document dealing with the Far East, you are to participate in no conference that is held in the Department of State or anywhere else in Government dealing with this matter, and, as a favor to the Secretary, just don't discuss Far East matters."

Pawley asked, "Am I considered a subversive?"

"No," Webb replied. "Let's say reactionary."

Webb is now President Kennedy's Director of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In Latin America, Pawley testified that ambassadorial appointments and even high assignments within the State Department were virtually dictated by George Michanowsky, a Russian-born naturalized citizen, who ran a committee on Latin affairs for the CIO. When Michanowsky told Pawley to play along and he would go places, Pawley asked what made Michanowsky think the CIO could elevate him to Assistant Secretary or Under Secretary of State.

"We have 8 million votes," was the reply, "and we are quite a power in Government."

"You are a Communist agent," Pawley told his caller, "and I know it."

"Michanowsky," Pawley said, "planted Gustavo Duran, a onetime lieutenant colonel in the Spanish Republican army denounced on the floor of Congress as an agent of the Soviet secret police, on the staff of Spruille Braden, former Ambassador to Argentina and later Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs." Although Braden now is a vocal anti-Communist, Pawley testified that a document exposing Braden's helpfulness to Communists led to his being fired from the State Department, but that, as a sop to Michanowsky and the CIO, President Truman at the same time removed George Messersmith, Ambassador to Argentina, whose loyalty was beyond question.

Pawley testified that the State Department had every reason to know that, long before he grabbed power in Cuba, Fidel Castro was a Communist. When Communists organized riotous demonstrations against the conference of the Organization of American States at Bogotá, Colombia, in 1948, Pawley said he heard Castro broadcast over the Bogotá radio, "This is Fidel Castro from Cuba. This is a Communist revolution. The President has been killed, all of the military establishments in Colombia are now in our hands. The navy has capitulated to us, and this revolution has been a success."

While these events trace back to President Truman's administration, they also stretch into President Kennedy's. Truman dismissed Communist infiltration of his administration as "a red herring." At his press conference last week, Mr. Kennedy said that he had no evidence that anyone in the State Department advanced the Communist foothold in Cuba.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LINDSAY, for 30 minutes, on Thursday next, February 23, 1961.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 1 hour today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 1 hour on Thursday next, February 23, 1961, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 30 minutes on Thursday, February 23, 1961.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TOLL and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER (at the request of Mr. McCormack) and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEVINE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HÉBERT.

Mr. BOLAND and include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 21, 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 Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS—COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES

Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960

Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
England	pounds	82.11.0	$231.14	69.24.0	$196.56	16.19.4	$47.51	20.29.0	$66.06	191.3.4	$535.27
Denmark	kroner	675	97.80	667	96.66	140	20.28	145	20.95	1,627	235.69
Germany	deutsche mark	310.50	73.80	476	113.30	15,954	3,801.00	106.15	25.30	16,856.65	4,013.40
Austria	schillings	2,968	114.20	4,802	184.60	650	24.90	1,514	58.30	7,023	382.00
Switzerland	franc	304	70.62	334	77.59	80	6.27	53	26.71	780	181.19
France	do	427	86.48	787	159.41	157.50	31.88	231.50	46.90	1,603	324.67
Mexico	pesos	2,542.47	203.50	1,676.34	134.17	1,241.09	99.34	336.23	26.91	5,796.13	463.92
Brazil	cruzeiro	44,157	227.61	28,563.94	147.23	492,176.85	2,585.46	1,580.21	38.55	572,378	2,998.85
Argentina	Argentine pesos	20,661.37	249.12	18,960.45	228.63	3,784.80	45.60	2,470.08	29.77	45,876.70	553.12
Chili	Escuda	144.92	137.88	84.59	80.48	3.85	3.65	6.30	6.00	239.64	228.01
Peru	soles	3,397.68	119.07	5,081.67	189.30	1,799.30	67.00	485.96	18.10	10,564.61	393.47
Guatemala [1]			210.40		24.50		16.00		13.00		263.90
El Salvador [1]	colon	375.85	150.34	90	36.00	72.50	29.00	105	42.00	643.35	257.34
Costa Rica [1]	do	234.95	36.95	61.80	9.27		7.00		11.00	296.75	64.22
Panama [1]			123.75		33.00		14.00		21.05		191.80
Nassau [1]			628.05		12.00		87.67		31.25		758.97
Total			2,780.71		1,722.70		6,886.56		475.85		11,845.82

[1] Total foreign currency was converted from Mexican pesos.

BRENT SPENCE, *Chairman.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

577. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 100,000 pounds of subgrade crude quartz crystals now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

578. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission (Commission was established September 2, 1957, and was terminated June 30, 1960); to the Committee on Government Operations.

579. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the pricing of spare parts for J–69 turbojet engines under Department of the Air Force negotiated contracts with Continental Aviation & Engineering Corp., Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on Government Operations.

580. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

581. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

582. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the first comprehensive report concerning activities relating to the production and conservation of coal in the United States, pursuant to section 7 of Publaw Law 86–599; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

583. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, relative to requesting that the bill H.R. 7727 of the 86th Congress, be reintroduced in the present 87th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

584. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of an order granting the application for permanent residence filed by Martino Hroncich, A10255933, pursuant to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

585. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

586. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to improve benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program through increasing the minimum benefits and aged widow's benefits and making additional persons eligible for benefits under the program, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

587. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

588. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report of the affairs of the Library of Congress, including the copyright business, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960; to the Committee on House Administration.

589. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, relative to requesting that the bill H.R. 4850 of the 86th Congress, be reintroduced in the present 87th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 4569. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 4570. A bill to amend section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for public information and publicity concerning instances where competitors submit identical bids to public agencies for the sale or purchase of supplies, equipment, or services; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4571. A bill to improve benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program by increasing the minimum benefits and aged widow's benefits and by making additional persons eligible for benefits under the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 4572. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 4573. A bill to limit and prevent certain concerted activities by labor organizations which interfere with or obstruct or impede the free production of goods for commerce or the free flow thereof in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H.R. 4574. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4575. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 4576. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4577. A bill to extend and increase the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DURNO:

H.R. 4578. A bill to amend the act of August 20, 1954 (68 Stat. 752), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of additional features of the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4579. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require the inclusion of housing designed for middle income groups when rental or cooperative housing

is constructed in the redevelopment of an urban renewal area; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4580. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to provide that, without an increase of Federal participating funds, a State plan for aid to the blind may utilize a more liberal needs test than that presently specified in such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 4581. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to provide that, without an increase of Federal participating funds, a State plan for aid to the blind may utilize a more liberal needs test than that presently specified in such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 4582. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4583. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide medical treatment and outpatient medical services to widows of deceased honorably discharged veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4584. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the same rights to non-service-connected veterans of World War I as are granted to service-connected veterans of such World War I in reference to medical treatment and outpatient medical services; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 4585. A bill to provide a termination date for the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 4586. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H.R. 4587. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, to make it unlawful for any individual employed by a public utility to participate in a strike against that utility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 4588. A bill to amend chapter 135 of title 10, United States Code, so as to further the development and maintenance of an adequate fleet of American jet cargo aircraft, to promote the commerce of the United States, to aid in the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 4589. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 4590. A bill to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 4591. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1962, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 4592. A bill to set aside certain lands in Montana for the Indians of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 4593. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands belonging to the United States to the County of Pima, State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4594. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCRANTON:

H.R. 4595. 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. SLACK:

H.R. 4596. A bill to provide for the encouragement of economic redevelopment in communities depressed by chronic unemployment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4597. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the manufacturers excise tax on business machines in the case of articles purchased for the exclusive use of a church or a convention or association of churches; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 4598. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Mid-State reclamation project, Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 4599. A bill to amend the General Bridge Act of 1946 with respect to the vertical clearance of bridges to be constructed across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 4600. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles and trucks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 4601. A bill to authorize the reimbursement of owners and tenants of land acquired by the Federal Aviation Agency for their moving expenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4602. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more liberal definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability-insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4603. A bill to provide for the acceleration of the land-acquisition program for the migratory bird refuges and waterfowl production areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 4604. A bill to provide for the transfer to Indian tribes of certain tracts of land owned by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4605. A bill to provide for the use of certain moneys deposited in the Treasury to the credit of Indian tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 4606. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and certain provisions of title 28, United States Code, relating to taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 4607. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years; to provide that such annuity for any month shall not be less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 4608. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H.R. 4609. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 469 Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4610. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, to permit Federal savings and loan associations to invest in or lend to business development credit corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 4611. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to widows and children of World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 4612. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a research program in order to determine means of improving the conservation of game and food fish in dam reservoirs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4613. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 4614. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 4615. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 4616. A bill to make available to children who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments the specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 4617. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4618. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the admission of New Mexico to statehood; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4619. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4620. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4621. A bill to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers and directors of professional services of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4622. A bill to provide that no application shall be required for the payment of statutory awards for certain conditions which, prior to August 1, 1952, have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4623. A bill to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to provide an increased statutory rate of compensation for

veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of an eye in combination with the loss or loss of use of a limb; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 4624. A bill to provide for the acceleration of the land acquisition program for the migratory bird refuges and waterfowl production areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 4625. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 4626. A bill relating to documentation and inspection of vessels of the United States; to the Commitee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 4627. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.J. Res. 246. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that Congress shall have power to grant representation in the Congress to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.J. Res. 247. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of certain persons to vote for any candidate for elector of President and Vice President or for a candidate for election as a Senator or Representative in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.J. Res. 248. 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.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.J. Res. 249. 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.

By Mr. McFALL:

H. Con. Res. 166. 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. SCHWENGEL:

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to a program for paying the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. Res. 176. Resolution to provide for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska relative to support of a legislative program to alleviate the critical situation with regard to overproduction of feed grains and decreasing farm income; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRIS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the amendment of the Sugar Act of 1948 in such a manner as to encourage the domestic production of sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact enabling legislation permitting residents of certain Federal and Indian reservations to vote in the event such legislation should become necessary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reassert its constitutional control over our international monetary policies and restore the American dollar to its historic place among the currencies of the world by proceeding at the earliest possible date to enact necessary legislation to take care of the situation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that all moneys paid by the Federal Government to the State of Idaho for the improvement of teachers' salaries, be paid to the Idaho State treasurer and that such funds be deposited for distribution to public schools by using the educational or distribution formula in effect at the time such funds are received; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to representation in the electoral college for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact enabling legislation permitting residents of certain Federal and Indian reservations to vote in the event such legislation should become necessary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 4628. A bill for the relief of Fotios Sakelaropoulos Kaplan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4629. A bill for the relief of Persephoni (Laoutaze) Sekas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 4630. A bill for the relief of Marten Kucukmorel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEERMANN:

H.R. 4631. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Lopinto Arzaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 4632. A bill for the relief of Natividad M. Oblenda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4633. A bill for the relief of Estrellita Tongco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4634. A bill for the relief of Rita Theresa Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4635. A bill for the relief of Hattie and Joseph Patrick, Sr., and for the legal guardian of Betty Ann Smith and the legal guardian of Stanley Smith, and for the legal guardian of James E. Harris, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURNO:

H.R. 4636. A bill for the relief of Ralph B. Cleveland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 4637. A bill for the relief of Pfc. Rodolfo L. Feliciano and his wife, Carmelita M. Feliciano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 4638. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. Vern D. Calloway, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H.R. 4639. A bill for the relief of Rear Adm. Carl H. Cotter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 4640. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles H. Biederman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 4641. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William N. T. Zee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4642. A bill for the relief of Ahmed Soussi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio:

H.R. 4643. A bill for the relief of Chul Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H.R. 4644. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Arnon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 4645. A bill for the relilef of Dr. Hilda Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 4646. A bill to provide for the advancement of Rear Adm. Bartholomew W. Hogan, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy (retired), to the grade of vice admiral on the Navy retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4647. A bill for the relief of Lilian E. Gonzalez (Reyes); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4648. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aliza Shammash Shaby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 4649. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lourdes Ocampo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 4650. A bill for the relief of Matthew Daly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4651. A bill for the relief of Helena R. Teichner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4652. A bill for the relief of Vera and Alfonsina Rosignuolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4653. A bill for the relief of Chao Chiung Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4654. A bill for the relief of Akiva Ziv (also known as Kenneth Finkelman); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 4655. A bill for the relief of Adell Anis Mansour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4656. A bill for the relief of Vito Sproviero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 4657. A bill for the relief of Georges A. Reuter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

63. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the president, Wyoming (Pa.) Borough Council, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to giving approval to and endorsement of the depressed area bill introduced by Congressman WILLIAM W. SCRANTON, and urging that it be passed, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 103d Anniversary Banquet of Clearfield, Pa., Lodge No. 314, Free and Accepted Masons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 18, the Clearfield, Pa., Lodge No. 314, Free and Accepted Masons observed its 103d anniversary with a banquet which was attended by several hundred of its members.

As the speaker of the evening it was my pleasure to deliver the following address:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 103D ANNIVERSARY BANQUET, CLEARFIELD LODGE NO. 314, FREE AND ACCEPTED MASONS, CLEARFIELD, PA., FEBRUARY 18, 1961

In all the fraternal organizations of man since tribal times, probably none has had a greater influence on the progress of the human race as the Masons. This is a proud statement of self-appraisal.

It is good to bear this proud feeling in mind as you celebrate tonight the more-than-century-old record of this Clearfield Lodge No. 314, of the Free and Accepted Masons.

The Masonic influence has been dynamic and it has been benevolent. It is an influence for good that has integrated itself sometimes quietly, sometimes boldly, sometimes through struggle and opposition into the most advanced forms of freedom that invest civilized government in our time.

In matters pertaining to the dignity of man and his rights as an individual it has often been militant and mightily effective.

These are some of the reasons why this honor in addressing you tonight fills me with a certain sense of mission.

My purpose is to make my message to you about our ancient and honorable order bear some relevance to affairs of the present hour that engage and disturb mankind.

I believe that it is the moral groundwork of Masonry as an institution that explains in part its rugged origins—certainly its growth—and most of all, its considerable influence as a body today.

The great men who have made the most striking impression on history have invariably been men of extraordinary moral stature.

I can mention the great religionists.

In our country's history we have the monumental example of Abraham Lincoln.

He was, it seems to me, above all and in the last analysis a great moral teacher for mankind. Without that he might still be a great figure in history as so many others are. But with it—this moral force—he is an immortal among the greatest immortals of all time.

Lincoln was not a Mason, but his philosophy is the very heart of Masonry.

In the long story of human endeavor this moral might is precisely true of the Masons.

Man has a tremendous hunger for comradeship. But there is comradeship among all sorts of people—among gangsters, for instance, and conspirators, fanatics, crackpots, and bigots.

What makes the Masons strong and enduring is the foundation of moral precepts that govern the organization and inspire it and give it its reason for being.

The basis of existing for human rights, for the dignity of man, for the freedom on the individual under law, for tolerance and for charity, this overall sense of responsibility is the bone and the sinew of Masonry.

This moral basis for its origin, its existence, its activities, explain why it has lived and prospered and sometimes endured and surmounted misfortune down through the ages from probably the 10th century.

It is, of course, a remarkable history for a fraternal order conceived in a noble origin and dedicated to high purpose.

This Clearfield lodge constitutes a living fragment of this great tradition.

The Masonic fraternity since its founding has been composed of the rich and the poor, the great and the near great, industrialists and workers—in short, men from all walks of life. In the lodge room they are all equal.

It is recorded that when President Theodore Roosevelt became a Master Mason at Oyster Bay, N.Y., the master of the lodge was Roosevelt's gardener, and "Teddy" was called "Brother Roosevelt" just like the other members of the lodge.

The history of lodge No. 314 is replete with the names of brethren of various occupations many of them prominent in the business—industrial and professional life of Clearfield County—over a span of 103 years.

The membership since 1858 has embraced generations of men of noble character and lofty ideals, from all walks of life, whose dedication to the principles of Freemasonry never faltered or grew lukewarm.

The result has been that under the strong and effective leadership of right worshipful grand masters—your membership has increased in the past 50 years from 164 in 1908 to your present membership of over 500.

The progress achieved merits the warmest commendation—for it reveals the vital force lodge No. 314 is, and has been, in the 21st Masonic district and in the grand jurisdiction.

It is pleasing to be with you on this occasion and share in this 103d anniversary of your founding.

For the history we are now in the process of making in Washington, and the history of the Masons, and the history of your particular order, have an association with each other; a covenant, I would call it, that binds us together, so to speak, in a single force.

As a result Masonry lives in you and in me and in 5 million other Americans because its teachings strike fire in the noblest regions of the human soul.

Of course it is a society with secrets for that is inherent in the nature of a fraternal comradeship.

The Masons, however, are not to be classified as a secret society with all the evil implications that the term implies. Masonry has its own rituals which belong to it as a matter of custom and tradition and may be called secret.

But I can imagine no group—civic or fraternal, patriotic or religious—whose activities and whose quarters, whose doings and festivities are as wide open to the world's sunlight as that of this Clearfield lodge or any other lodge of Masons.

Masonry, as you all know, from its inception proclaimed the dignity of labor. We have since those early Masonic beginnings achieved goals undreamed of by the founders of our order. But they, among others, sowed the seeds of this amazing progress in the life of the workingman.

It is in this same spirit of participation in events, in the life of the Nation, in the problems domestic and international, that beset us that I am pleading for today.

Every American is a link in the chain of America's strength.

If this lodge, this group of men, joined with other groups contribute individually and as a body in advancing our country's progress then by that much our country is stronger.

I suppose it is harping on an old theme to remind you that of the 55 delegates who attended the Convention at Philadelphia in 1787 that created the Constitution of the United States, 20 at some time in their lives became Masons, or were Masons when the Constitution was formed.

I recall with pride that George Washington had been a Mason since 1752 and in the year of his inauguration—1789—was worshipful master of Alexandria lodge in Virginia.

It is good to know that these 20 Masons participated in creating the Constitution of the United States, a document that has been called by Gladstone, the "most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

Who will say how much the ideals and the disciplines of Masonry influenced this the basic law of the land.

It is this influence—benevolent and patriotic, spiritual and moral—that I plead for today in the determination of our destiny.

When we are concerned with the national defense, what should it be that determines decision? Is it our personal interest or the interest of the country?

When we help to make the decision on taxes, what is it that is uppermost in our minds?

Is it the education of our youth or is it some less noble consideration?

When we speak of alleviating conditions in depressed areas, what do we think of as most important?

Is it the diffusion of America's enormous prosperity among all our countrymen or is it the hoarding of the prosperity for the privileged few or a fortunate group or area?

It is to these problems that I would like to see the morals of Masonry applied.

We may differ honestly on the approach to a problem. But if we are dedicated in our basic principles the future of our country will be secure.

If we look upon this Nation and its destiny as that great Mason George Washington looked upon it and the other Masons active in the founding of this Government then we shall build for our posterity as they built for us. George Washington was eminently tolerant and had no use for bigotry. In this, it seems to me, he applied the teachings of Masonry. In his will he freed the slaves of his estate at Mount Vernon.

He was perhaps the foremost American of his time and of all time.

And humbly I ask tonight from you what precisely he asked of his own generation, that we conduct ourselves as good citizens in giving our Government on all occasions our effectual support. This is the burden of my message to you.

It is that we apply the teachings of Masonry to the crises of the hour.

It is not only that we passively remain free ourselves from bigotry and racialism and the little but acute injustices of social insult,

but that we denounce these evils whenever and wherever they raise their ugly heads.

For in this form of division among us is the poison of disunion and the corruption-breeding seeds of national weakness and conflict.

If modern Masonry has not taught us this lesson right out of its heart of hearts, it has taught us nothing and we do not deserve to associate ourselves with Masonry.

We should in that case leave Masonry and find more congenial associations perhaps in any of the many fringe hate organizations that come and go like national aches and pains and the more profound miseries of the human soul.

Masonry has no place for the kind of exclusiveness that destroys the dignity or the character or the standing or the freedoms of any man. That for me is one of the arch stones of our faith as Masons.

For our overall problem today is world-wide.

Indeed, as I speak, more than one-fourth of the earth's surface is controlled by communism. The slavery epidemic is spreading. It is banging with its fist right at our own doors.

It is up to us from within our own country to present a united front against communism. Where the Communists have suppression we offer freedom. Where they force upon a people base servitude we offer freedom to the individual and an opportunity for the human soul to grow and expand and be itself. Where they have goverment by men we have government by law.

We have to ask ourselves how well and how thoroughly and with what flame and conviction and power can we spread these ideas of a free republic and the dignity of the individual? For unless we stand up and fight for what we believe—what hope is there?

When I say fight, I mean fight with our zeal as Masons and as Americans and as patriots. I mean fight as our order fought throughout history.

We face the awful threat of nuclear world suicide. This is the new element in the old crisis of freedom versus slavery.

It is up to the American people to decide how this unbelievable weapon is to be employed from our side of civilization.

We know that the other side will have no compunction about using nuclear warfare if ever it can see great ultimate advantage for itself and near or total destruction for us.

Thus we are obliged to concentrate upon defense in such a pronounced and obvious and formidable and terrible posture as to deter the enemy.

We must in effect frighten him from ever letting loose on this country the desolation which in any conflict we must be able to afflict doubly upon him.

Thus the American idea, the Masonic idea, is not only to speak for peace, but to work for peace where possible without tension.

We must fight for peace through budgets that make our strength a terrifying expression of our military might. For we deal with enemies who today or tomorrow or at some time and some place may be maniacs, as some of them are now neurotics, and we must so pose our strength as to deter and contain and halt even the madmen.

Beneath this outstanding, ever-present and obviously all-powerful military machine we must with equal diligence pursue the paths to peace by negotiation, by publicity, by plans, by honorable concession that exact a just and equally honorable settlement of differences.

We must pursue this peace by taking the initiative and not waiting for the enemy to push us off balance or take us when our guard is down.

We have great veterans organizations of proud and experienced soldiers whose dedication to their country has been proved in tests of fire.

It is a vast strengthening of the strains of our population through these groups and yours and through all our people that the national unity can be achieved upon which our security must rest.

We have just awakened to a moral breakthrough in our country of the first magnitude. This is the election of a Catholic to the Presidency.

It is a moral national experience that attests to our basic unity as a people and that affirms the solidarity we all feel to each other.

But here we have it in a demonstrated form and on a plane of the highest significance.

This is a breakthrough that should be made to do heavy duty for us and for the sincerity of our position as a free republic everywhere in the world including, and particularly, the Soviet Union.

The election of a Catholic President refutes the oft-repeated charge against us that this is a country where all men are equal except Negroes or Catholics or Jews or Mormons.

Politically many of us would have wished the election result otherwise but that does not alter the moral impact of the fact.

Brethren, we are in the midst of one of the great movements of history. This hour is perhaps the greatest and the most crucial of them all since the dawn and the decline of a score or more of great civilizations. For what has never happened before and what is now happening is that this movement and all concerned in it is world-engirdling.

All peoples everywhere are involved.

No nation and no man is any longer an island to himself. All of us, as the poet says, are a part of mankind and any man's death diminishes me.

The role that we have to play is for each of us an individual one. But it is for us, as groups, a role calling for the concerted interplay of our abilities and our talents and energies.

What I see before me in this 103d anniversary of the Clearfield Lodge No. 314 of the Free and Accepted Masons is a potential, however small in itself, of the implementation of those principles of Masonry that give moral and spiritual meaning to the aspirations of mankind.

If the Clearfield Lodge and all other lodges of Masons and other groups and associations of patriotic Americans live up to their respective standards this Nation will have little to fear.

For our greatest strength is our moral strength and once having that we shall not fail to keep ourselves and the free world safe and secure and prosperous and in peace.

Government by Task Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the new President has appointed numerous task forces to delve into matters vitally affecting the Nation. It is well that the President have good and expert counsel in carrying out the duties of his high office. But it must be realized that in the context of the Founding Fathers' notions of representative Government such groups are in no manner responsible to the people. They are not elected; they cannot be impeached. The public has no opportunity to appear before them to state citizen's views and voice desires concerning the manner in which it is to be governed. It has no privilege to evaluate task force recommendations before they are made. In many cases the recommendations may never be communicated directly to those they will govern, nor even the Congress. It is possible that only long after they have, in fact, commenced to govern 180 million supposedly self-governing Americans that they will be discernible. It is possible they may be formulated into rigid Presidential legislative programs coming to Congress nominally as legislative recommendations but actually as Executive demands to which the people's representatives will be expected to accede without exercising the independence of judgment contemplated by the Constitution. If this comes to pass we will hardly enjoy Government by the people about which former President Lincoln spoke so eloquently at Gettysburg. It seems to me the duty of the people's elected representatives to speak out publicly on grave issues facing the Nation notwithstanding creation of semi-anonymous task forces to deal with them behind closed doors and without the enlightenment of public discussion. Only in this manner can the proliferation of Government by task force be blocked effectively.

In closing I invite attention to one such vital issue, the forthcoming resumption of Geneva nuclear test ban talks, which I have discussed during today's proceedings in the House.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 18, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

FEBRUARY 18, 1961.

Abe Lincon's birthday is the occasion for reflection for many over the course of our society, mainly, the role of Government in our lives. Republican Congressmen fan out over the Nation extolling Lincoln's virtues and precepts. Later Democrats do similarly celebrating a Jefferson-Jackson Day. It is wise, no doubt, for men and women thoughtfully to review history's lessons, better to conquer future problems. Surely our best thinking should be brought to bear today on the role that Government plays and should play in our lives.

The individual's place in society was paramount in Lincoln's observations, since he believed that the Government existed only to serve people. While almost everything

he said or wrote carries a lesson, some of his thoughts seem particularly appropriate today:

Freedom—"If there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people to never entrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions."

Individualism—"I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruits of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other men's rights."

Opportunity—"That men who are industrious and sober and honest in the pursuit of their own interests should after a while accumulate property and after that should be allowed to enjoy it in peace is right."

There can be little contest today over the abuse of this philosophy by our ever-growing concept of centralized Federal Government. The welfare state, socialism, or communism—all basically the same economic system—are not compatible with Lincoln's concept of limited government, a constitutional republic in a democracy, which is our traditional constitutional form of government of checks and balances. Today's struggle at home and abroad is between free or private enterprise and government or public enterprise. Stated another way, the argument revolves around the right to own property. Do we have that right, free from government control, or not? Traditionally Americans believed it to be a God-given right which the Declaration of Independence stated would be protected by government. Today the legislative embodiment of the destruction of private property and private ownership can further be seen in the Kennedy program. Taxes, that is, money, which is property, are taken to satisfy a variety of Federal programs adjudged needed by Government planners such as Federal aid to alleged depressed areas, aid for education, aid to the unemployed, wage-setting, and Federal medical care, plus many others.

Contrasted to that is a variety of legislation to stem the tide toward further Federal encroachment, including a forced balanced budget, reduced debt, tax reduction and reform, labor placed under antitrust, and government taken out of business enterprise. Freedom will only be safeguarded when Congress returns the God-given rights to the individuals, local, and State governments, when all legislation is reviewed and evaluated in the light of the 9th and 10th amendments: amendment IX—"The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." Amendment X—"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

How far these are from the Kennedy program that states that school children shall be provided lunch by the Federal Government regardless of their economic need because their nutrition is the proper concern of Federal Government. How far from the Presidential adviser's view (Schlesinger) that a welfare state is needed as a bulwark against communism. The radicals' or liberals' shared characteristics can be summarized by observing that they always propose bigger government and spending, not the contrary. Apparently they distrust the people's judgment. Instead, Federal judgment of both needs and programs to provide the needs are stipulated and all paid for by the individual through taxes. Human happiness as a goal can only result in a society where government lets people be people; that means freedom of choice and as little government as possible, freedom for the millions of personal decisions and actions by millions of people every day, free to come and go, to work, to play, to be sensible or foolish—so long as no one violates another's equal freedom.

Perhaps the limitations on government which foster a society of happy human beings are best summarized in 10 cannots: You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift; you cannot help small men by tearing down big men; you cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong; you cannot lift the wage-earner by pulling down the wage-payer; you cannot help the poor man by destroying the rich; you cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income; you cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred; you cannot establish security on borrowed money; you cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence; you cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

Paul Wooton: A Tribute to a Dedicated Newspaperman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, last Friday on the floor of this House three of my esteemed colleagues spoke out in tribute to Mr. Paul Wooton, Washington correspondent of the Times-Picayune of New Orleans. As you know, Mr. Wooton died Thursday, writing "30" to a distinguished career in journalism at the age of 79.

I rise now to add my own remarks and to join in the deeply sincere tributes paid this dean of the Washington press corps by Members of this body as well as by the press itself. Over the last 3 days I have had time to reflect on the great void that is left in the passing of Mr. Wooton and it is with sadness that I tell of the profound personal loss I feel, for I had the honor and the privilege to be not only an ardent admirer of Paul Wooton but also to be his colleague in journalism.

In July of this year Mr. Wooton would have completed half a century of distinguished reporting for the Times-Picayune and it was less than a decade after he launched his career in 1911 that I had the good fortune to become his colleague on that same newspaper. Thus I came to know Paul Wooton as a fellow newspaperman and this, I think, was the way to know him best.

Many years later I would come to know him in a different capacity but the relationship between a Member of Congress and representative of the press was never to transcend that earlier camaraderie that existed then, as it does now, between members of the working press. Newspapermen, as we all know, are given to confining their eloquence to the typewriter and it would be an unthinkable breach of conduct for one reporter to tell another of his friendship and admiration for that colleague. But death, too, transcends this code of conduct and thus I am freed of that bond when I voice my feelings about this former colleague of mine.

It was his own newspaper that fittingly paid Mr. Wooton the tribute I think he would have liked best when it wrote editorially that he "died covering a story." This, said the Times-Picayune, "is the epitaph fitting and sufficient." I agree as will, I think, most newspapermen past or present.

In reflecting on the many and splendid contributions Mr. Wooton made to his craft, I am not unmindful of the unique role he also played as a sort of ambassador between the fourth estate and the officialdom of the Nation's Capital. For example, the many honors bestowed upon him by grateful foreign governments is, I believe, without precedence for a member of the working press. To know personally every President from Woodrow Wilson to John F. Kennedy, and to know many of them on a first-name basis, is unparalleled as far as I know for a working reporter.

However, it is Mr. Wooton the reporter whom I mourn most. For Mr. Wooton always seemed to me to epitomize the American newspaperman, and I speak now as a former city editor who is painfully aware that the public image of a newspaper reporter is frequently at odds with the true nature of the man. Actually there is little room in journalism for the flamboyant, devil-may-care reporter so cherished in film and fiction. He is, rather, by and large a modest sort of man, who pads between public offices and public officials with pencil and paper in search of often elusive truth. He is aware that his is the work of the day-to-day historian, but because he is essentially a modest man he is not given to public pronouncement of this fact.

The many who came to know Paul Wooton would agree that this was certainly one image of this reporter. And they know, too, that there were other images. He was, for example, a kind man, a man of humility, and a man of charity. He was also a gentleman and he was a fair man and an unselfish one. But I somehow think the eulogy he would most appreciate, as would his colleagues of the working press past and present, would be simply: He was a good reporter.

Civil War Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my remarks and portions of the booklet "Virginia's Opportunity," as an expression of the reasons for and the purpose of the Civil War Centennial.

In my opinion the Civil War Centennial offers us a chance to set before the country the example of men of character

like Robert E. Lee. It is an object lesson to us of the tragedy which results when men seek to use force to solve their problems. In the struggle with international communism in which we are engaged, the American people must be willing to display the same spirit of sacrifice which they showed in the Civil War.

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

On January 8, 1961, the Civil War Centennial officially began. As we enter upon this momentous commemoration of our Nation's most tragic era, it is well that we reflect upon the purposes of this 100th anniversary observance of America's Civil War.

It is all too clear that, improperly handled, the centennial could become a divisive factor in our midst. It is to the credit of the American people that no official agency concerned with the centennial has determined to refight this war. All have seen the centennial as an opportunity to derive inspiration from the deeds of the heroic men and women of both North and South, in order, as President Eisenhower said on July 6, 1959, "to renew our dedication to the task which yet confronts us—the furtherance, together with other free nations of the world, of the freedom and dignity of man and the building of a just and lasting peace."

My State, Virginia, was the scene of perhaps 60 percent of the fighting that took place during the Civil War. Therefore a heavy responsibility developed upon Virginia to plan a centennial program in keeping with the great events that occurred within its borders. I am proud to say that the Virginia Civil War Commission, created by our general assembly, has met that responsibility.

The commission has been active in almost every field. A $500,000 Civil War Centennial Center is building in Richmond, former capitol of the Confederacy, to open next July. Almost every county and city in the Commonwealth has its centennial committees planning its participation. I cordially invite you to come to Virginia during the centennial.

Virginia has given the clearest statement of any State of its aims and purposes in this centennial. On Veterans Day, November 11, 1959, the Virginia Civil War Commission adopted the following "Purposes of the Civil War Centennial in Virginia":

1. To honor the courage and devotion of the unnumbered thousands of men and women who fought so valiantly and endured so bravely during the Civil War.

2. To stimulate interest in this period and to encourage further study of the Civil War, believing that honest research will heal old wounds rather than reopen them.

3. To educate the public concerning the campaigns, the shrines, the personalities, and the human story of the war in Virginia in the faith that knowledge of truth will lead to understanding and not resentment.

4. To preserve the monuments, the graves, the relics, and the ruins of the wartime past to remind this and future generations of their link with history.

5. To proclaim Virginia's true role in the historic struggle emphasizing the following points:

(a) Virginia, through its call for the peace convention in early 1861 and through other efforts at reconciliation, stood for peace;

(b) Virginians believed they fought for freedom as Gen. Robert E. Lee declared, "Soldiers, you tread with no unequal step the road by which your fathers marched through sufferings, privation, and blood to independence."

(c) Virginia rose from the depths of defeat, following again the example of that same leader, who called for an end of bitterness, the restoration of the country, and the reestablishment of peace.

6. To encourage the American people to rededicate themselves to the observance of the highest moral standards and to the service of their country to no less an extent than our fathers dedicated themselves to their causes.

7. To inspire all people to follow the guidance of God in the spiritual crises of life as did some of the greatest heroes of that day.

8. To point out the common heritage and to emphasize the unity of this nation which has developed since the dreadful conflict.

Early in 1960 it published a manual for the use of Virginia's county and city committees and its schoolteachers in planning their observance of the Civil War Centennial. This manual, entitled "Virginia's Opportunity," has served as the basis for similar booklets in a number of other States. The Civil War Centennial was seen in this manual as an opportunity for all Virginians—

To honor our heroes.

To promote Virginia as the place to come during the Civil War Centennial.

To tell the true story of Virginia's people—peacemakers, warriors, restorers, and rebuilders.

To dramatize the great ideas that are the basis of our freedom and tradition—individual responsibility, faith in God, and service to country.

FOREWORD

This manual has been prepared primarily for the use of Civil War Centennial committees in planning their participation in the centennial. It is hoped it will also be useful to teachers who are trying to interpret the meaning of this momentous era to the youth of Virginia. Within the covers of this booklet are practical suggestions for projects and some warnings. There has also been an attempt to afford a glimpse of the meaning and purpose behind the centennial in Virginia.

The commission hopes that through the centennial Virginia's true role in the War Between the States can be made known. The peace convention of 1861 was the most dramatic note in Virginia's efforts to preserve the Union which it had helped create. When war came, most Virginians felt that they fought only to defend their land against invasion. The conduct of many of our people after the war, as they rebuilt a land destroyed, can be an inspiration to us all. These things should be known.

But the centennial is no time for finding fault or placing blame or fighting the issues all over again. Americans from every section produced the division which led to war. These divisions grew out of hate, greed and fear, ignorance and apathy, selfishness and emotionalism—evils from which this generation is not free.

This is the time to recognize these divisive forces; but this is also the time to pay tribute to dedication and devotion, courage and honor, integrity and faith—qualities plentifully demonstrated in the war of 1861 to 1865—and needed for our survival in the years to come.

Virginia hopes to present a positive program based on the lofty principles for which great Virginians and great Americans have lived and died. This is the only method by which we have a chance to capture the attention and imagination of the country.

THE VIRGINIA CIVIL WAR COMMISSION.

THE CENTENNIAL OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR, 1961–65

The national centennial of the American Civil War is scheduled to begin January 8, 1961, with a proclamation from President Eisenhower. All 50 States have been asked to appoint centennial commissions and the Virginia Civil War Commission was created by the General Assembly of Virginia at its 1958 session.

The opening day, Sunday, January 8, 1961, has been designated as an official day of prayer by the National Commission and special services will be encouraged in churches of all faiths in Virginia and throughout the Nation. This places the emphasis during the centennial upon spiritual qualities. Our churches have the opportunity of using the centennial to promote an understanding of the causes of division and disagreement among men and to call for a rededication to the fundamental ideals of a free society.

Virginia plans a commemoration of the peace convention, which was called by the Virginia General Assembly on January 19, 1861, in an effort to restore the Union and prevent the Civil War. This is another occasion for focusing attention on values and ideals.

The official opening date of the centennial in Virginia is April 23, 1961, the anniversary day of the acceptance by Robert E. Lee of the command of the Virginia armed forces.

The proposed reenactment of the Battle of First Manassas, which took place on July 21, 1861, has attracted interest and attention across the country and will be followed by many other events and spectacles. After the commemoration of the Appomattox surrender, it is hoped that a way will be found to emphasize the recovery of the State from defeat and Reconstruction and its emergence to its present position of prosperity and influence. The duties and responsibilities of the Virginia Civil War Commission will cease on December 31, 1965.

WHY COMMEMORATE THE CIVIL WAR?

The Civil War, like any other war, was a tragedy. Therefore its 100th anniversary, the Civil War Centennial, is not a celebration. It is a commemoration.

The chief purpose of the centennial is to strengthen the unity of the country through mutual understanding—an understanding derived from the realization that there was dedication and devotion on both sides. North and South, there were those who gave all they had in support of what they sincerely believed was right.

In the centennial the spotlight will be on character in men—for war is the ultimate test of character. The stories of the Civil War are full of lessons for present-day living. By these examples we can teach children and adults the moral values so needed in America today.

The centennial, of course, is not a commercial venture; but it is an opportunity to sell Virginia and Virginia's story to our countrymen.

The Centennial of the American Civil War is a turning back to the past in which we hope to clarify for ourselves the concepts upon which our democratic freedom depends for its existence—individual responsibility based on faith in God and service to country.

THE CENTENNIAL PROGRAM IN THE SCHOOLS

This is the greatest opportunity of the centennial—a chance to channel the natural interest of the young in the Civil War into an understanding of the philosophy and ideas of American democracy. The key to the centennial program in the schools is the history teacher. It may be appropriate for the local centennial committee to contact all of the American history teachers in the locality and put them on a subcommittee or advisory group, along with other persons interested in interpreting the Civil War to the young people of the community.

It is hoped that a certain amount of information on the Civil War Centennial program in the schools and material for classroom use can be furnished to these teachers during the centennial by the department of education and the Virginia Civil War Com-

mission, but there is an opportunity for the local committees to provide much necessary material.

The local committees, the professors at our colleges, and the teachers in our schools can work together to see that the centennial story reaches our schoolchildren and college students.

WHAT IS IT THAT WE WANT TO PUT ACROSS TO OUR STUDENTS DURING THE CENTENNIAL?

These are some of the things that our young people can be taught, through their study of the Civil War, to value and appreciate:

1. The importance, the fascination, and the drama of history. The students do not want a drybones recital of dates and events. They want to know the human story of the war. They want to feel what the solder on the battlefield experienced. They want to know why people acted the way they did; what choices they had. Our goal is to present history as exciting, moving, and relevant.

2. The qualities of life that are needed for a worthwhile and meaningful existence and the preservation of our society. These qualities are especially dramatized against the background of war. Examples of bravery, of course, are myriad. There is Dick Kirkland, Confederate soldier, known to history as the "Angel of Marye's Heights" who ventured into a hail of bullets at Fredericksburg to care for the Federal wounded. In addition to spectacular bravery, there are stories of the quiet courage of those who did the unrewarded or the unpopular thing. There is General Lee, who prayed for his enemies and whose example led the South to bury much of its resentment and to train a new generation of leaders to do their duty.

3. Heroes and patriotism. There is an opportunity in the centennial for our young people to learn the respect for patriotism and great men which used to be such a large part of the fabric of American life. To do this we must make our heroes understandable and present their lives and principles in present day terms. Lee's words should have as much meaning to Virginianse today as they did in Reconstruction times—"You can work for Virginia, to build her up again, to make her great again. You can teach your children to love and cherish her."

4. Understanding. The student can be led to see that dissensions between people are caused by ordinary human emotions and desires, by selfishness, hate, and pride, that the divisions that led to this awful war were created by people in all parts of the country and that the diseases of mistrust, hatred and war can be cured only by uniting behind a bigger idea or a bigger goal than the ones that divide us.

5. Mission and destiny. The teacher of Civil War history can highlight those instances where a few men turned the tide of history (for good or ill); for example, the single vote that killed the Crittenden compromise and the minority of states that prevented the success of the peace convention, the iron will of "Stonewall" Jackson that made supermen of ordinary mortals, the devotion engendered by the character of Lee, the dramatic arrival of Sheridan to rally his forces at Cedar Creek. By comparing these situations to present day problems, the teacher can get across to the student the importance of his own life and its possible effect on the history books his children may read.

CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL REDEDICATION DAY AND OTHER SPECIAL EVENTS

(The purpose of rededication day—Rededication to our fundamental ideals—to the faith that built America)

Rededication means that we find again the faith in God our fathers knew and that we recognize that our homes, schools, farms, and businesses must be centers of strength and learning and that our lives must be based on the concepts of unity, integrity, and service.

The Confederate monument. Most of the counties or cities in the Commonwealth have a monument to their Confederate soldiers and sailors. If you have such a monument the commission hopes that it will be rededicated during the centennial.

Suggestions:

1. Find out when the monument was originally dedicated and, if possible, collect newspaper stories, pictures, programs, and reminiscences concerning the original dedication. These items could be the basis of a good newspaper story and would be an interesting feature of a centennial exhibit.

2. Choose a date for the rededication of the monument now. The anniversary date of the original dedication is suggested, if this falls on a suitable date. Memorial services in the local churches or a special religious program might logically follow on Sunday.

3. Begin making plans now for this occasion. It is an opportunity to bring the people of the locality together and to set the unifying tone for the observance of the centennial in your area.

4. Try to get the widest type of participation and the most extensive publicity possible—so that the ceremony will have meaning for the whole community.

5. There follows a sample program for Rededication Day. Each county or city committee will, however, design its own program as suits its best judgment.

6. It is suggested that a copy of this manual be furnished in advance to the speakers who will appear on the program.

Caution:

1. The entire program must be dignified. We must avoid any display of bad taste or any actions that will cheapen the National flag or the Confederate flag or the purpose of the observance.

2. One of the reasons behind the centennial is a desire for a unity based on mutual understanding. Everyone in the community should be invited as the observance is intended to bring all the people closer together.

3. The positive aims of the ceremony are to encourage a greater appreciation of courage and a firmer dedication to high ideals, to remind ourselves of the mutual sacrifices made all over the Nation, and to bring a deeper understanding of the causes of division and war.

Therese M. Loeb Memorial Lecture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the city of St. Louis was honored last week to have the very able and distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] deliver the Therese M. Loeb Memorial Lecture at Washington University.

The lecture is sponsored by the St. Louis League of Women Voters to honor the memory of one of the truly outstanding citizens of St. Louis, Therese M. Loeb. Mrs. Loeb, who died in 1959, was a leader in the civic, cultural, and political affairs of her city. Her efforts helped to make her city and State a better place to live, and she is sorely missed by her countless friends.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the thoughtful address of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], "Political Lag—Enemy of Freedom," delivered at the Therese M. Loeb Memorial Lecture at Graham Chapel, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., on February 15, 1961, be printed in the RECORD.

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

POLITICAL LAG—ENEMY OF FREEDOM

(Speech delivered at Therese M. Loeb Memorial Lecture, Wednesday, February 15, 1961, Graham Chapel, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania)

I

When President Kennedy stood for the first time before the Congress of the United States, he said: "I speak today in an hour of national peril and national opportunity. Before my term has ended, we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed such as ours can endure. The outcome is by no means certain. The answers are by no means clear. All of us together—this administration, this Congress, this Nation—must forge those answers."

This is the same test which Abraham Lincoln enunciated almost a century ago at Gettysburg: Whether a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal can long endure—whether government of the people, by the people, for the people shall perish from the earth.

In Lincoln's day the peril was obvious. In our time the peril is no less real, but it is more subtle, less visible. And because many people either cannot see it or will not admit that it exists, it is therefore more difficult to counter.

Today I would like to discuss with you some of the obstacles we have placed in our own way, obstacles which make it difficult to forge satisfactory answers to the problems of 1961.

One of the traits of the American character has been a streak of easy optimism—a confidence that the future is bound to be better than the past and that what is right will inevitably triumph in the end.

Our optimism has been a source of inspiration. The men and women who settled our shores, crossed the continent, conquered the wilderness, and created the greatest and most powerful Nation in the world, had to believe in the future. Otherwise, they could not have endured the hardships which confronted them and still pressed forward to success. And we must believe in the future, too. For if we lose faith in America, and indeed in the world, we will assuredly let fall the torch they lighted.

Yet optimism can be fatuous as well as inspiring; and I fear that during much of our history Americans took far too much for granted their country's happy future.

Consider the national temper of a generation ago. In the 1920's most of us assumed as a matter of course that the more abundant life was just around the corner, that equal justice under law would soon become a reality for all, that freedom arrived at through, and protected by, democracy, was on its inevitable way to sweep the world. God, having inspired the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, could be relied upon to preserve them both. All we had to do was to let things alone and the future would take care of itself.

But the events of our lifetime have given our national psyche a permanent shock.

The great depression, Hitler, Stalin, World War II, nuclear weapons, Khrushchev, the sputnik, inflation, recession, Lumumba, Castro, the rise of Communist China, the unexpected strength of the Russian economy, the uncertain future of the United Nations, have changed the world and—I believe—the way in which Americans see the world and our place in it.

The old comforting philosophy of easy optimism has disappeared. All but the last few political practitioners of that happy creed have retired to private life.

And what is the new philosophy that has risen in its place? I submit it is the conviction that we must rely, for our salvation, not on our manifest destiny but on the minds and souls of men. This, I suggest, is a definition of the political creed that today is loosely referred to as liberalism.

It is the belief that change and progress are not necessarily synonomous—that change can enrich our civilization or destroy it, and which it will do depends on us. We must understand the forces of change, guide them, influence them, master them. And to do so will require the mobilization of human intelligence and human compassion on a scale never before attempted.

Thus I come to my thesis, which is this: Our forms of government and our governmental procedures—local, State, National, and international—have built-in rigidities which stand in the way of the systematic application of human intelligence and human compassion to the problems which we must solve to survive in freedom and well-being. We must make far-reaching changes if we are to so survive. We must provide, seek out, and follow leadership which is prepared to act. We must recognize that the principal instrument at our disposal is government—and, once and for all, realize that that government does not govern best which governs least.

It is a law of biology that a species must adapt or die. So it is with nations and their political systems. Our problem is to adapt the American forms of government at all levels to the strains which are being put upon them in the last half of the 20th century. The lethargy with which we have regarded this imperative task I call political lag.

This is surely what President Kennedy meant when he said we would be tested anew. This is why the outcome is far from certain, the answers by no means clear. As a nation we are far from prepared to overcome the lag between what we have and what we need, between where we are and where we should be.

II

Consider first the city and ask the question: Does the governmental structure in our urban areas facilitate or hinder the mobilization of human intelligence and human compassion for the solution of urban problems?

In medieval times the city was a community within a wall. Today, in America and abroad, few can tell where it begins and where it ends. The metropolitan area of which it is a part may spread over many counties and several States. Area problems of shelter, industrial and commercial redevelopment, transportation of goods and people, water supply, sewage disposal, education, police and fire protection, recreational facilities, public health, the administration of justice, delinquency, and racial tensions have overwhelmed outmoded local and municipal units of government created centuries ago.

In some of the larger cities strong mayors, and in the smaller cities city managers, have succeeded in recent years in modernizing city government. But the incredibly inefficient commission form of local government lingers on in many a city and almost all counties. And in many large cities, of which New York is a conspicuous example, obsolete charters are an impediment to successful self-government.

There is hardly a major metropolitan area in the country which has not had a comprehensive metropolitan study. But only Miami and Atlanta have done anything significant about it. The reports on the other areas form a library of frustration. You in St. Louis tried to do something constructive a few years ago and failed. So did Pittsburgh. We in Philadelphia brought our city government up to date in 1951 with a new charter, but Mayor Dilworth today is still struggling to persuade unwilling and uncoordinated units of suburban government located in eight counties and three States that their economic, social, and political future is tied to the core city from which they spring—so far with little success.

Our local governmental structures, survivals of the 18th century, are just not suited for the decisionmaking processes involved in solving metropolitan area difficulties in the 20th century. The structure of local government in America tends to inhibit rather than facilitate the application of intelligence to the solution of human problems. And yet, not enough people are prepared for the drastic changes that are needed. This is political lag, in opinion and in organization, and it must be eliminated before we can succeed.

In my judgment, strong political executive leadership at the municipal and Federal levels is the indispensable element in a successful approach. Planners, civic groups, political parties, local legislative bodies, or county commissioners, organizations representing business and labor can all help. But it takes a strong mayor to rally them behind an action program. And an action program will have to attack at once or very soon the structure of metropolitan area government. A Federal Department of Metropolitan Affairs with Cabinet status can assist enormously in providing guidance, coordination, and research. But in the end, the decisions will have to be made at the local level in response to local leadership that is ready to tear down the political walls that fragment our metropolitan communities.

III

Consider next the States and ask the same question: Are our States, at present, efficient instrumentalities for the application of human intelligence and compassion to human problems? The answer is that they are not. For this there are many reasons.

The first is boundaries. Except for Hawaii, Alaska, and California, there is hardly a State whose political boundaries coincide with natural economic, social, and cultural areas. And even California might do better if it were chopped in half to end the continuous struggle between Los Angeles and San Francisco.

The Founding Fathers could not foresee that New York City would become a metropolitan complex of some 15 million people, spilling over into New Jersey and Connecticut, while the Delaware Valley comprising parts of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and New York would become, for many purposes, a unified economic region.

In Missouri, you know the problems which arise from river boundaries which slice through the hearts of metropolitan communities and disrupt the geographical unity of two great river basins.

Next, in economic matters, our modern industrial Nation has become economically one community with whose problems 50 federated States cannot deal effectively. Competition among States for industry tends to defeat the adoption of desirable social legislation, penalizing progressive States and rewarding backward ones.

Compounding the problems arising from geography and economics, political lag has come close to reducing State governments to impotency. Most State constitutions are obsolete, their tax systems are narrow and regressive. Many States are still cursed with the spoils system, few can recruit really competent personnel. Governors who understand these problems are thwarted by State legislators who do not.

Last and perhaps most important is the failure to reapportion State legislatures—most important because this failure prevents the correction of other aspects of political lag. Malapportionment is a denial of democracy and the right of self-government. Rural communities whose population is declining and whose problems are relatively simple control the destinies of huge metropolitan areas whose problems are complex and growing.

In short, the structure of State government is such that the intelligence and compassion which exist in metropolitan areas can be applied neither to eliminate the misery nor to develop adequately the area of which they are a part.

One result has been the transfer of metropolitan area problems from State capitols to Washington. This trend, so vigorous in the 1930's, still continues. Direct relationships have been established between the cities and the National Government, bypassing the States. Housing and urban renewal are perhaps the most conspicuous examples.

But the nostalgia for States rights, fostered by those who hope that if a governmental service which might cost them money is kept at the State level it won't be rendered at all, severely limits what, from the standpoint of political feasibility, can be brought to Washington. And the problem of workload alone puts a limit on what, from the standpoint of efficiency, should be brought there.

We are going to have to make drastic changes in the structure and programs of State governments if they are to carry their share of the burden of building a prosperous America. They are not presently effective tools for the application of human intelligence and human compassion to human problems.

IV

We come now to the National Government. Under our system of checks and balances, power at the national level is divided among executive, legislative, and judicial branches. Many believe this cumbersome scheme is less effective than the unity of power in parliamentary government as practiced in Great Britain. But this argument is largely academic, for there is not the slightest possibility that within the foreseeable future we are going to rewrite the Constitution of the United States.

Moreover, it is not necessary. The institution of the Presidency is well organized to apply intelligence and compassion to the solution of human problems. Whatever political lag exists in the executive branch—and there is some—comes from the varying philosophies and administrative abilities of those we elect to the Presidency. The tools to eliminate the lag lie at hand ready for use. I hope you will not think me unduly partisan if I give it as my opinion that rarely in our history have we seen a President as superbly equipped to use those tools as the present occupant of the White House.

The same comment applies to the present Supreme Court of the United States. It was not so long ago that the so-called "nine old men," unconscious of their times, were digging in their heels to preserve an outworn and rigid view of our essentially flexible Constitution. But that time has passed. Today nine extremely able Justices, coming fortunately from varying backgrounds and representing, again fortunately, varying legal philosophies are each day applying a high level of human intelligence to the solution of a wide variety of difficult human

problems. If they disagree, it is because the problems are tough—not because the Justices are either uninformed or perverse.

It is when we turn to the Congress that we find ourselves once more confronted with entrenched and powerful political lag.

Congress, like the State legislatures, is not truly representative of its constituents. Only the politics of 1787 can explain why in 1961 a citizen of Wilmington, Del., has 25 times as much voting representation in the U.S. Senate as his neighbor in Chester, Pa., a few miles up the Delaware River. Pennsylvania has 2 Senators for its 11 million people and Delaware 2 for its less than half a million. When we move west across the Dakotas and the Mountain States the inequities are even worse, though the historical justification no longer exists. California has more population than all the 12 other Western States plus the two Dakotas and Nebraska put together, but has only 2 Senators against 30 for the same number of people in the other States.

In the House of Representatives, despite the requirement for decennial reapportionment according to population, there is sometimes a lag of as much as 50 years between the growth of a metropolitan area and fair recognition in its congressional representation. It all depends on how much the rural-dominated State legislature in any particular State is willing to cheat.

Both Houses of Congress are plagued with ancient rules, practices, and traditions which enshrine age rather than wisdom in seats of power and, therefore, frequently, though not always, the social and economic views of the past generation rather than the present one.

The scandal of the House Rules Committee has recently been terminated by a vote of 217 to 212. But the equally scandalous Senate filibuster was at least tentatively given a new lease on life by a vote of 50 to 46 last month.

It would be difficult to deny that Congress and particularly the committee structure of both Houses, is the seat of substantial political lag which makes it difficult to apply human intelligence and compassion, objectively and fairly, to the solution of human problems.

V

Finally, in our consideration of political institutions and political lag, let us turn to the international scene.

It is now 20 years since Wendell Wilkie wrote, "One World." Yet despite the earnest efforts of countless men of good will, we still live in a condition of international chaos. Great hopes were held for the United Nations. It has justified many of those hopes. Yet its most ardent defender would have to admit that the United States from 1783–87 under the Articles of Confederation was a strong Central Government compared to the United Nations today.

If there was ever a need to eliminate political lag, to create a mechanism whereby the best brains of the world can be set free to prevent the destruction of the human race, it is in the U.N. today.

The men who framed the U.N. Charter in the preatomic age labored hard and well. They believed the people of the world were not ready for that surrender of sovereignty in the limited field of disarmament and world law which is essential to the maintenance of peace. And they were right.

But now engines of destruction succeed each other in geometrical progression of lethal effect—as the hydrogen bomb, the intercontinental ballistic missile, the Polaris submarine, earth, moon, solar, and planetary satellites follow each other in frightening array. A score and more of newly independent nations with little experience in Government of any sort are accepted as United Nations members. A menacing Communist China of 600 million people rears itself outside the doors of civilized international institutions. Surely, human intelligence has never faced so perilous a challenge since history began.

Yet who is there among us who can confidently predict that international institutions which will make possible the successful application of human intelligence to the solution of the problem of survival can be created in time to prevent the destruction of the human race?

The political lag in metropolitan affairs may be inconvenient. But the political lag in world affairs menaces the very survival of our species.

VI

There is, to summarize, an alarming political lag at all levels of government, local, State, National, and international—a lag between what needs to be done to assure freedom, peace, and well-being and what we seem presently capable of doing.

This lag between our needs and our apparent capabilities arises from two sources: first, the failure of our leadership to bring to our people and, indeed, to the people of the world the need for drastic action; and second, the obsolesence of our political institutions and procedures. There is nothing fundamentally wrong with our political institutions. But they badly need renovating and updating.

My plea to you today is therefore twofold. First, respond to the leadership you are getting right now from the White House in national and international affairs. Do not accept it slavishly and without critical analysis; but approach it with recognition that it embodies the one indispensable element of leadership in 1961—a determination to bring to bear upon our human problems the best of human intelligence and the warmest of human compassion.

Seek out similar leadership at the local and State level and give it your support on the same basis.

Second, concern yourself with the forms and procedures of our Government at all levels, to eliminate rigidities, to root out the stubborn ancient ways of doing things where these ways frustrate the application of our best brains and hearts to our most serious problems.

We have been from the beginning a very fortunate people. We were given more time, more opportunity, and more space in which to make mistakes than any other nation. We had a fresh start and a new world. But time has run out on us. We can no longer rely on our luck, on our manifest destiny, on the chance that a great national leader will emerge every generation or so who will make up for the wasted decades, the lost opportunities. God helps those who help themselves, and we will either help ourselves now or perish. With us would perish not just the American dream, but the last possibility of proving that men can rule themselves as well as the world. I am not at all sure that we can; but I am certain that we must try.

Higher Education Is a National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I was pleased to note in the current issue of the Saturday Review a particularly timely article by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] entitled "Higher Education Is a National Problem."

With his customarily trenchant logic Senator CLARK has indicated quite clearly the need for Federal aid to higher education, and he has indicated with equal clarity that the only alternative is to suffer a less than adequate program of advanced learning in America.

Senator CLARK's article, however, raises more questions than it answers—as was his intention. I believe it is especially important—at this time when the Senate has just been presented with the administration proposals for aid to education—that we attend to the questions raised by Senator CLARK.

Without having had, as yet, the opportunity to study the President's suggestions in this field, I would hazard a guess that Senator CLARK's thinking is somewhat in advance of that which the administration at this time will propose. But we all know that this Congress will not, in this session nor in the next, find all the answer to the complex and proliferating problems of education that are confronting us. Therefore, I think that Senator CLARK's article serves a most valuable function in drawing our attention to further issues that must be faced—if not in the present session, then in the near future.

I believe Senator CLARK would concur with the dictum of Alfred North Whitehead that "the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgement which will then be pronounced on the uneducated." If not with these words in mind, it was certainly in the spirit of Professor Whitehead that Senator CLARK addressed himself most cogently to the problem of Federal aid to higher education. Therefore, I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

HIGHER EDUCATION IS A NATIONAL PROBLEM

(By JOSEPH S. CLARK)

(In this article, U.S. Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, states the case for increased Federal aid to higher education.)

Reasonable men cannot study American higher education in any depth without concluding that drastic steps must be taken immediately to improve our colleges and universities. These steps must include provision for a much larger and better-trained corps of professors and instructors, a very large expansion of physical facilities, and provision for the admission into college and the retention through graduate school of all high school graduates who have the intellectual capacity and the character necessary to assimilate college and graduate work.

While money alone will not solve these problems it is obvious that they are not going to be solved without a lot more money than is now available. Where is the money to come from? Some will come from the annual gifts of graduates and friends of the colleges, some from bequests of the wealthy, some from tuition paid by students, some from corporate giving, some from private

foundations, and some from State taxation. But in a decade in which college enrollments will double, all this will not be nearly enough. So what have we left? Only the Federal Government.

Government is the agency which, Lincoln said, exists to do for people that which they cannot do or do as well for themselves. The national government is the usual means by which a free people tackle a problem which is public in its character and national in its scope. We use our Federal Government to wage war, to conduct diplomacy, to guide the national economy in a score of areas. We use it to operate a nationwide system of social security, to construct great public works, and to support our industry and commerce in many different fields. It operates our post offices and our national parks. It helps build houses and clear slums. It helps build hospitals and engages in extensive welfare operations. Without it, most of the progress we have made in this country during the twentieth century would have been quite impossible.

Yet whenever the suggestion arises that we use our Federal Government to tackle a new problem—any new problem—a cry of horror arises. When Federal action is proposed to help solve the crisis in higher education, the outcry comes from many sides, including such strange allies as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and certain of the more lush groves of academe.

This stereotyped reaction deserves some basic attention. Why are we Americans, perhaps alone among the civilized peoples of the earth, so reluctant to use this great instrument which we control and which lies at our disposal?

Surely democratic government is a tool to be used by the people to solve their collective problems and to improve their collective lot. Yet a multitude of influential Americans regard their national Government with suspicion and hostility. One would think, to hear the talk, that to turn to Washington in a time of need would be more like surrendering to a foreign power than utilizing one's own resources. The "conventional wisdom" in America still agrees with Jefferson that "that government is best which governs least." If chaos results and problems are swept under the rug, never mind; we are the same free people who drove the minions of George III into the Atlantic.

This inbred and deep-seated distrust of government may have had sound historical roots in the eighteenth century, but it is dangerous indeed in the twentieth. For it is only our National Government that can mobilize and direct the resources of our society when they must be mobilized. And we should all ponder whether the United States as an unmobilized society can long compete with the determined, mobilized, aggressive society that confronts us today from the other side of the iron curtain.

This distrust of government, which has always been present in American thought, goes back to our unfortunate experiences with King George III. It was strengthened by the physical distance between the frontier and Washington, D.C. But the distrust did not break out into open warfare until the days of Franklin Roosevelt. Being unable to prevent the enactment, or later to repeal, many of the specific provisions of the New Deal, its powerful opponents set out to discredit government itself. In the publications they controlled, the fine old term "public servant" disappeared from the lexicon and the derogatory word "bureaucrat" took its place. "Citizens" became "taxpayers"—usually depicted by cartoonists as clad only in a barrel. The word "taxes" was rarely seen without the prefixed adjective "confiscatory" or "crippling" or the synonym "burden." Public spending was referred to always as a "cost," never as a benefit, and normally with the prefix "wasteful."

We have recovered a bit from the worst of the antigovernment crusade. Today thoughtful and sensitive men, such as Walter Lippmann and Adlai Stevenson and Senator Fulbright, suggest that the fiscal starvation of public services such as education is a matter for national shame rather than national pride. Yet the conventional wisdom has not been greatly modified. I speak with assurance because the propaganda output flows across a Senator's desk by the ream.

To support the thesis that the Federal Government is essentially evil and should be dismantled, a whole school of economics has grown up. We are told that the oppressive weight of Federal taxation is destroying enterprise and stifling investment, that the Federal debt is climbing out of control, and that the soundness of the dollar is threatened. We are told that the Federal Government is costly and inefficient and therefore the States should do the job—when every objective test shows that Federal employees are better selected, better trained, and better supervised on the average than State employees, and that the Federal tax system is more equitable and more efficient than State tax systems.

Since the facts lead us toward the Federal Government, let us be calm. Let us keep our heads and repeat together: "The Federal Government is not our enemy, it is our friend. It is not an alien power, it is the creature of the American people. It will do what they want it to. It is not a monster that can ignore their will."

I will not dwell at length on the objection that Federal aid will lead to Federal control of the colleges and universities. I will say only that, in my opinion, it is a myth. Surely we are wise enough to legislate and to administer so as to prevent a result we don't desire. To those who oppose Federal assistance I ask: What is your alternative? Is it not clear that the only real alternative is a second-class system of higher education?

Let us turn to the question of how Federal aid can best be provided for higher education. The absence of any widely accepted plan, up to this very moment, is to a great extent the fault of those engaged in higher education. They have made the mistake of leaving legislating to the legislators. But Government programs do not ordinarily spring full grown from the brows of Senators or Congressmen. A public need must be established. So must public awareness of that need and public support for its satisfaction. Leadership must come from people who are determined and informed. Politicians should be out in front of the people, I agree. We have a duty of leadership, but we cannot afford to get too far ahead of the people we lead, for, if we do, there is a great risk we shall be shot down from behind on election day.

I wonder whether existing organizations in the field of higher education are set up to do the needed job of working out a proper plan for Federal aid—in concert with the new administration—and then lobbying vigorously for it? In the past, they have been immobilized to some extent by internal divisions on the basic questions, first, of whether Federal aid in any form is desirable and, second, of who, if it is desirable, should get it.

Let us remember that most educators are not monks who take a vow of poverty, both for themselves and for the institutions they serve. They, too, are American citizens with the right, indeed the duty, to petition for redress of grievances and to indicate to their elected representatives how they would like those grievances redressed.

Perhaps the leadership of a new administration, committed to lifting a nation's head out of the sand, will make the difference. Surely Abraham Ribicoff, the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, will give higher education priority attention.

To those who finally tackle this problem in earnest, I offer a few timid suggestions:

First, the proposal for a semiautonomous "educational foundation" patterned after that in Great Britain, with wide latitude for distributing Federal money, deserves careful and detailed exploration. So does the view that allocations by such a foundation should include both operating and facilities moneys paid directly to recipient institutions. Faculty salaries should, in my judgment, have the highest priority, academic facilities the next. When these problems are reasonably well solved it will be time to turn our attention to further scholarships and loans to students. There isn't much to be gained in substituting a slightly brighter boy or girl for one who now wins admission to college if, when the bright student arrives on the campus, there is no place for him to sit or lie down, no books or laboratories available, and not enough professors really qualified to teach him what he needs to know.

Secondly, the hardest thinking must be done in the field of who gets how much aid. The situation in Pennsylvania is a good illustration of the difficulty.

My State has 109 different institutions of higher education, but those 109 include no public community college, no public liberal arts college, and only one State university—Penn State. State aid goes principally to Penn State, which is also a land-grant college receiving Federal aid, and to three private universities, Temple, the University of Pittsburgh, and the University of Pennsylvania, which is a reasonably well-endowed Ivy League institution with Federal Government research contracts in substantial amounts.

The 14 teachers colleges, however, are supported entirely by the State. Tuitions and faculty salaries are low, curriculum necessarily limited. Between these extremes are 91 private institutions that defy classification. Some are rich; most are poor. Some are widely renowned; others are so small that they cannot support a strong faculty or a broad curriculum. They are Baptist, Methodist, Lutheran, Catholic, Quaker, and nonsectarian.

Frankly, I haven't the faintest idea how public aid should be distributed among such a complex variety of institutions, although I am presently serving on a Governor's commission charged with the duty of finding out. All I know is that if Pennsylvania does not substantially increase its State aid to higher education and get substantial additional help from the Federal Government, we are headed straight for trouble.

Third, Federal aid should not be limited to special projects or research, or science, or defense-related subjects. It should be across the board. It should go to the heart of the university, not just to the periphery. In the civilization of the future the natural sciences may well predominate pragmatically, as C. P. Snow has recently suggested, but the social sciences and the humanities are of equal importance, remote though the latter are sometimes thought to be from practical applications to the modern world. Assuredly, man does not live by bread alone.

We have not yet solved the problem of the Federal Government and higher education but I hope we have at least answered one question: Is Federal aid to higher education necessary? For the clear answer is: "Yes."

There are other urgent questions ahead. They are the question of how much, how, to whom, and what for. I am confident

that they too can be answered. In fact, we must answer them, for the purpose of higher education in America is the staffing of freedom. If we cannot staff freedom adequately, history will again take note before the end of this century, as it has before, that an unmobilized society cannot compete successfully with one that is fully mobilized. This is a conclusion which no free American, living in the richest country the world has ever known, in a society founded on Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States, can willingly accept.

A Study of the Fuels and the Need of a National Fuels Policy Are Imperative in the Interest of Our Economy in Peace or in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the sponsors and supporters of a fuels study by a joint congressional committee have been criticized by spokesmen of the oil and gas industries for not having spelled out more clearly what will be accomplished by such a fuels study.

It has been repeatedly said by such opponents that this Nation has a national fuels policy, and therefore such a fuels study is unnecessary.

This statement is not in keeping with the facts for the Paley Commission in its report to President Eisenhower said:

> But on one point, the Commission is very clear; the hydra heads of energy policy must be reined together.
>
> This can be accomplished only if all parties concerned—the President and the Congress, the State and Federal agencies, and the energy industries—work for a common base of understanding of the total energy outlook, the interrelations within the energy field and of the relations between energy and the rest of the economy.

Further a member of the Federal Power Commission said in 1959:

> The need for a national energy policy seems so patently obvious that I am simply unable to understand how thoughtful people concerned with this business can overlook it.

There are so many facets of the fuels industry that should be studied that it is important everyone concerned be in complete accord as to such a study by a joint congressional committee.

To charge that such a study looking toward recommendations to the appropriate committees of the Congress would lead to bureaucratic control of the fuels industry is entirely erroneous.

What has any of the fossil fuels to fear from such a study? This Congress must develop a positive approach to this important problem.

Making a study of the fuels and the need of a national fuels policy is quite different from specifically calling for a national fuels policy itself.

It is now necessary to relate the supply to the fuel requirements in the foreseeable future, and in terms of kinds of geographical origin to determine the nature and the extent of supply problems to be encountered.

The various fuel and energy segments with transportation and manpower requirements must be studied to give rational direction to the Government and to industry in order to give them the information so vital to the very existence of our Nation.

Such a fuels study will make available the analytical tools necessary to anticipate longer range problems. It will also insure that the facilities and resources needed in our economy are available in peace or in war.

A More Vigorous Space Age Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Congressman EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of Connecticut, delivered this speech at the Aircraft Luncheon Club meeting in Washington on February 14. I think it deserves the attention of the House:

A MORE VIGOROUS SPACE AGE PROGRAM

(Speech by Hon. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, First District, Connecticut, at the Aircraft Luncheon Club meeting, Hotel Burlington, Washington, D.C., February 14, 1961)

On this anniversary of St. Valentine's Day, it is appropriate that we take note of the Soviet Union's interest in Venus. The remarkable launching of a second heavy satellite within several days, the subsequent launching of a rocket from that satellite toward a point in space where it will impact on a distant planet—give or take a probable error of 6,000 miles in the location of the target—is a substantial reminder of the capabilities of the Soviet Union.

I need not linger on the military implications of the ability to launch a rocket and then separate a payload aimed at a distant point. Nor will I review again, as many of my colleagues will hasten to do, the cold statistics of how many American vehicles are successfully in space compared to the Russian total. I do want to look at the state of the American space effort at the present time, some of the things we ought to be doing, and some that we will be doing.

It has always been my conviction that the major problem is the absence of a sense of urgency. When I first examined the 10-year program of goals outlined by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to our committee last year, I did not believe it reflected the critical urgency of our needs. Yet since that time, the NASA Administrator has revised his estimates downward. Five major programs have been rescheduled, including the 1962 Venus reconnaissance mission, now put off until 1964.

It does us little good to speak of the technological sophistication of American satellites, compared with those of the Soviet Union. Granted, we may be launching highly effective small packages. But when it comes to the eventual dispatch of man into space, so that the human brain may be applied to the problems we encounter there, it cannot be part of our program to design it entirely for 26-pound men.

We need a new sense of dedication to the goal of being first in space. It was no secret that January 13, 1961, would be a favorable time to try to hit Venus, nor that the shot was feasible with only a slight penalty in extra speed demanded within a month either way. I refer you to the Space Handbook issued by the predecessor of my committee on December 29, 1958. On page 170 of that handbook, you will find the most favorable launching dates for missions from Earth to Mars or Earth to Venus. Not since June 8, 1959, was there an occasion so favorable to a Venus probe as January 13 of this year, and not until August 16, 1962, will there be another occasion on which the two planets are in such a relationship.

The question then is where we stand with respect to such probes. Obviously we need bigger and strong boosters as soon as possible, if we are to push aggressively out into space. Yet here, too, at least one target date has been moved backward—the qualifying tests of the Rocketdyne F–1, 1,500,000-pound thrust liquid rocket have been put off from 1963 to 1965. I was glad to see certain static tests being carried out in recent days, but unless we move along on boosters, we will continue to make progress only at a slow pace.

The truth is that we have been painfully slow in decision-making on the national booster program. Almost 2 years have passed since my committee first held hearings on space propulsion. Many of the basic decisions needed to give this program impetus and direction have yet to be made. Both NASA and the Department of Defense have booster development programs that can contribute to each other without being competitive in terms of industrial and scientific facilities.

President Kennedy has indicated that he wants Vice President JOHNSON to take a personal hand in the direction of the space program. As you know, the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 places personal direction of the space effort in the President and gives him a space council to advise him in that effort. President Eisenhower did not make use of this machinery, but rather left it largely to the head of the Space Administration. This has contributed, I believe, to some of the unhealthy competition and maneuvering among agencies which in itself is a severe drag on progress.

When I first analyzed the President's suggestion that Mr. JOHNSON take control of the space program, it seemed to me an excellent choice. We in Washington know LYNDON JOHNSON as a man who gets things done. We know his familiarity with our national military potential and with the space program. I, therefore, introduced legislation which I believed necessary to amend the Space Act and permit Mr. JOHNSON to assume command.

Since that time, I have been in touch with the White House regarding this legislation, and I have been advised that a full-scale review of necessary legislation is underway. The Administrator of NASA has been asked to submit a program. I believe we should act speedily to coordinate the direction of this program as the new Executive wishes, and at the same time I believe Congress was wise and will be wise to insist on major responsibility at the top.

I cannot argue with the administration's first concern about people at home—with its moves to alleviate economic distress. But I am in hopes that we will soon see the gantries being rolled away from a new and reinvigorated space effort.

I do not think we can afford to greet each new Russian effort with a quiet hope that they will share what they learn. I was amazed when I heard Dr. Dryden, who has been the acting administrator, say that we had known of their capability for the Venus probe for some time, that the technique of launching from a parking orbit has often been discussed, and that he hoped the scientific data obtained will be made available promptly to the scientific community. I do not think we can count on the charitable benevolence of Soviet scientists. Perhaps some day a unified effort will be achieved, but it is scarcely likely to happen tomorrow. The Russians, I suspect, will not be quick to share their knowledge of propulsion.

How, then, can we improve our own efforts? We must look, I think, at the way in which we have organized our space program. Are we making the full use of our technological skills and know-how? Are we putting the full energy of our industrial capacity into this effort? Can we do better? I doubt if anyone in this room thinks we can't make better use of our potential than we are now doing.

Our Nation has excelled over all other nations in this industrial age because we have been able, through our vast industrial energies and resources, to produce results faster and better than any other people. The concentrated, vigorous application of our national talents and abilities can not only overcome the Russian space lead, but can also surpass it. We have accomplished this fusion of effort readily in wartime. Industry has been asked, and has always complied, in time of emergency, to coodinate its activities closely in the Nation's interests. This is one of those times when we must take steps to enlist the coordinated abilities of the best of our talent.

We know that a major effort will be expensive. Consider the problem of Saturn and Centaur. Right now Saturn is a research and development project only, with a goal of developing a space booster vehicle of large payload capability. Some figures developed by the staff of the Committee on Science and Astronautics show each Saturn we fire will cost the Nation $17,300,000—exclusive of the research and development involved. The first flight test of a Saturn vehicle is scheduled for this year, but the date could slip into 1962.

Centaur, which is the second generation upper stage vehicle, is estimated to have a lower cost per launch—$9,100,000—although increased costs in development. Whatever the actual figures may turn out to be, it is apparent that this is an expensive business, and it demands the best efforts of all of us to keep the costs down.

Let me suggest one approach that might help in this effort. I have been disturbed, as I know many of you have, by the increasing costs of proposals. Each represents considerable skill and know-how, as well as management ability. But the increasing demands on contractors seeking to put their abilities to work for the Government is having an opposite effect from that we all desire—it is discouraging concerns from entering in competitive bidding where preparation of a proposal is inordinately expensive.

Thus while it may be said that the only thing worse than having a Government contract is not having one, I think we should review the cumbersome procedures that require a massive and expensive effort to convince the Government where it can buy the best product. The work necessary to establish a proper bid becomes as expensive as production itself, and they spur competition that needs to be subjected to close scrutiny. If these competitions result in fruitful savings to the taxpayer, if they produce a far better product, then they can certainly be justified. But if they only harass experienced and qualified industrial teams, and if they forestall the use of ideas, imagination, and initiative, then they may be a needless waste of national resources. Proposals, procurement of contracts, negotiations, renegotiation—the whole machinery of Government-industry relations has grown cumbersome and needs to be adjusted.

The administration has chosen a proven Administrator to head the national Aeronautics and Space Administration in the years ahead. Perhaps Mr. Webb can bring some desirable changes in this system, out of the years of his own experience in Government, and a proven record of imaginative public service.

I have talked on a number of other occasions about some specific measures I think we need to help spur this effort. I think we need a revision of the patent provision of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, along the lines of that which a subcommittee of the House Science and Astronautics Committee recommended and the House approved last year. We can't continue to move toward a broad patent policy inimical to the American free enterprise system without slowing down the force and drive of that system—upon which we depend more than ever today for help in assuring our national survival.

Any such revision should encourage wider participation in the space effort. We ought to reinforce the patent system that has worked well for 160 years, and has provided jobs and whole new industries to this country.

I think we need a new attention to duplication of effort in the space program. I would call your attention to a statement issued by our chairman, Congressman Overton Brooks, earlier this year, in which he warned that the large booster program, by its very nature, invited waste in expenditures unless it was carefully planned and programed. He was especially concerned by the assignment of clear-cut responsibilities in the civilian and military areas. It is not difficult to see that the planning and management of large scale facilities for development and testing offer another problem area.

I myself have been looking into another phase of our space effort which has troubled me. I refer to the development of a capacity for biomedical research by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. A year ago, NASA outlined its plans to set up a fifth functional division of its management structure to monitor and coordinate the work it believes necessary in space medicine in conjunction with the man-in-space program. We were assured that this was not intended to duplicate work already being done, and that it would cover a biomedicine gap which the military services could not fill.

Subsequently I had a chance to look further at existing work being done in the military services in this area. This has aroused new questions in my mind, and I expect to ask them. I am now completing a report to the House committee in which I examine aspects of the problem. Unless we insure that we can justify the work in the space program that must be done, we run the risk of having it all classed as unnecessary.

Nuclear propulsion for space travel has also reached a point where NASA and the AEC are ready to move into more intensive research. A study is currently underway regarding necessary facilities. Here, too, there are existing facilities which can be used or which may be available for this work. Again it is necessary to plan carefully to avoid duplication, as these programs expand.

If we are to have a more vigorous space age program, therefore, the place to start is at the top, with the direction and management. Washington has complained for many years about the lag in decisionmaking in all areas of government; let NASA, as the proponent of our future in space, move to cut out its own lag in decisionmaking. Let it review its goals, reevaluate the national objectives, and move toward greater urgency in bringing our program abreast and ahead of the Russians.

One place to start would be the plans for lunar probes and a manned landing on the moon. NASA's original timetable indicated that we would not be looking forward to a manned landing on the moon until the 1970's.

It is my opinion that this timetable is much too slow. Even if there were no slippage, we would be missing an obvious bet. For that same space guide I mentioned before, issued in 1959, made this statement in unequivocal terms: "The moon will be at its best inclination in 1969."

This is an optimum for a shoot at the moon—but the Russian thrust capability permits them to pick their own time. In 1967, it will be the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution. Here they have a clear choice between a calm, scientific appraisal of the best time, and the practical prospect of pragmatic propaganda. They have already said they'll be shooting for the earlier date.

I see no reason for us to wait upon events. I will continue to analyze our national program and to make every attempt to convey my own sense of urgency in seeking to develop a national sense of urgency that will push the American timetable ahead.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Concerning Economic Problems

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the economic problems confronting the country require consideration and action by Congress.

We face the task not only of finding a quick answer to our immediate dilemma, but also of finding more effective machinery to minimize the up-and-down fluctuations—particularly the "down"—of the economic cycles.

Recently, I was privileged to comment on some aspects of these problems in a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the Record.

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

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY OVER WISCONSIN RADIO STATIONS ON EXCESSIVE SPEND-AND-TAX PROGRAMS

Currently, the Nation is deeply preoccupied with finding a solution to our economic difficulties. Looking briefly at the national economic picture, the facts are as follows:

We have a gross national product of $503 billion;

A national income of $418 billion;

According to the latest figures available, employment is between 64 and 65 million;

Unemployment, regrettably, is up to about 5½ million; this includes—according to latest figures available—about 80,000 unemployed in Wisconsin.

By experience, we have learned that spend-and-tax programs, alone, are not successful, long-range solutions to unemployment and economic setbacks.

However, federally sponsored efforts to strengthen the economy can be of some immediate stimulus to the economy.

Recently, the administration made a series of proposals in the following fields:

Providing Federal aid for chronically depressed areas;

Stepping up Government procurement;

Extending time in which the unemployed are eligible for compensation;

Stimulating homebuilding, urban renewal and highway construction;

Expedite Federal building projects of various kinds;

Although this is still being held in abeyance, the possibility of tax revision also may ultimately be considered to stimulate the economy—if other measures are not adopted successfully.

Other recommendations—relating not just to the economy but to other interests of our citizens, include:

Liberalizing social security;

Improving health aid programs for the aging;

Increasing the minimum wage and extending coverage to more workers;

Expanding Federal aid to education;

Expanding the distribution of surplus foods to needy folks, including families of the unemployed.

We recognize, of course, that in attempting to spur recovery, we must be careful not to encourage greater inflation.

In dealing with economic difficulties, also, we must not become so preoccupied with our internal problems to forget that—in the world at large—we are in a struggle for survival. Whatever our problems at home, we must remember that the Communists are working on a 24-hour day, 365-days-a-year basis to conquer the world. The long, Red tentacles reach out for the jugular vein of every people and country. At the Reds' command, are almost a billion people, vast natural resources, mighty and powerful military establishments, and a growing skill and dexterity in science and technology.

A strong defense—supported by a forward-moving economy—of course, is fundamental to our success in meeting the challenge of communism.

Our task, then, is to pursue a two-course road: (1) toward further strengthening the economy and meeting the peacetime needs of our citizens; and (2) toward successfully resisting the Communist effort to conquer the world; and alternatively, to establish peace.

Now, let's look closely at some of the major challenges. First the Federal budget:

BALANCING THE BUDGET

The Kennedy administration has made relatively little change in the $80.9 billion budget proposed by the previous Eisenhower administration—drawn up with an anticipated $1.5 billion surplus to help promote economic growth without spurring inflation.

However, proposed expenditures, if approved, as well as diminished revenue resulting from lags in the economy—may well upset the budgetary applecart.

MAINTAINING A STRONG DEFENSE

What about defense? The United States has a strong—and growing—jet-missile-nuclear-space defense. Over $47 billion are earmarked in the 1962 budget for national security. As of now, our Armed Forces—together with those of our allies—are serving as an effective deterrent to massive military attack by the Communists.

Interestingly, preelection estimates of Soviet superiority in missiles are now being modified. After a more realistic look at the strategic facts of life, it appears that the United States, after all, may not be a second-class world power—an allegation which many of us have consistently refuted.

For the future, however, defense will require further strengthening of our air, sea, land, space forces on a balanced front, to deal with either brushfire or large-scale attacks by the enemies of freedom.

PROGRESS IN SPACE

Our progress in space, too, is of paramount significance—domestically and internationally.

Defensewise, space offers new opportunities and dangers. Domestically, space promises advances in communications, transportation, weather reporting; and other areas. Internationally, the space race—whether we like it or not—continues to symoblize the scientific advancement of a Nation.

Now, what about the comparative progress of the United States and the Soviet Union—the two major contenders in the race for space? A comparative evaluation boils down to this: The Reds have developed greater rocket power; the U.S. program, however, is far more advanced and polished technically and scientifically. Today, we have many more satellites in orbit, and the cumulative value of scientific knowledge obtained from space exploration far exceeds that of the Soviet Union.

NEED FOR TAX REFORM

As I mentioned, tax reform may often be considered—as an extreme alternative—if the economy fails to recover quickly and rapidly enough.

Frankly, I feel that the reform of our tax system has long been overdue. Recently, I proposed a Hoover-type Commission to carry out such a job. The current economic difficulties, too, require that we take another look at the tax structure to determine (a) that it is not unduly stunting the economy; and (b) that loopholes be plugged to assure more equitable distribution of the tax burden. A new look would, in all likelihood, include:

The 27½-percent depreciation allowance on oil, gas, and other minerals;

Tightening up on expense accounts;

Simplifying the tax system of reporting and payment;

Excise taxes;

Relative rates of income and corporate taxes;

Depreciation allowances for private enterprises.

Current Proposals for Federal Conflict of Interest Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia chapter of the Federal Bar Association held its monthly luncheon meeting on Friday, February 17, 1961, at the Adelphia Hotel. At that time it was my privilege, as president of the chapter, to introduce the distinguished guest speaker of the day, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary. Mr. CELLER spoke on "Current Proposals for Federal Conflict of Interest Legislation." His talk was so timely and so enthusiastically received by the members and guests, that I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of others interested in this important subject:

CURRENT PROPOSALS FOR FEDERAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST LEGISLATION

(Remarks of Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, before the Federal Bar Association, Philadelphia chapter, Adelphia Hotel, February 17, 1961)

Your distinguished president—my good friend and colleague, HERMAN TOLL—has suggested that I spend a few minutes with you today in discussing the problems of conflict of interest in Federal employment—a subject that has become increasingly elusive and troublesome over the years. What is more, it is a subject that vitally affects lawyers. In their private practice, they must be in a position to advise clients of the pitfalls in sharp dealing with the Government. As practitioners before the agencies, they need to know their duties and obligations and have a direct interest in seeing that those duties and obligations are impartially imposed also on their adversaries. Should they enter Federal employment, they are directly subject to the conflict of interest statutes and rules, and when they resign, those statutes and rules affect their right to practice before the Government. Should they be called to advise the Government on a part-time basis, they must weigh the consequences for their other Government business and that of their partners and associates. Finally, the subject deserves the attention of lawyers working through bar associations such as yours to improve the quality of government.

During last year's presidential campaign, Senator John F. Kennedy declared: "The essence of any government that belongs to the people must lie in the Biblical injunction: 'No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate one and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other.' All America seeks a government where no man holds to his own interest and despises the public interest—and where all men serve only the public—and love that master well."

In these apt words, the new President has summarized the aspirations of legislators, political scientists, lawyers, and citizens generally, with respect to the problem of conflict of interest in Government employment. Just what do we mean by the term "conflict of interest?" I should say we mean those activities and interests of Government employees, falling short of outright bribery and graft, that are simply inconsistent with holding a Government job. They are inconsistent because they tend to impair the integrity of the service and to deprive the Government of the full performance for which it has bargained. These include adversaries of the Government in matters in which the employee performs Government service; representing the Government in transactions in which the employee has a private adverse interest; and taking advantage of information, prestige, or influence which he holds in trust. They include switching sides, that is, representing the Government in a matter one day and then resigning from Government and representing a private person against the Government the next day in the same matter. In addition, most would agree, the importance of public confidence in the Federal service requires the Government employee to avoid the appearance of evil, as well as evil itself.

To effectuate these principles, Congress, over the past century has enacted, piecemeal, a number of criminal prohibitions. These

laws, however, have been repeatedly criticized in recent years as confused and inadequate—as unequal in application and sometimes contradictory. Many Federal agencies also, have issued diverse regulations on conflicts of interest for guidance of their own employees—but these, too, often fall short of comprehensive treatment of this vital subject. With respect to Government attorneys, it should also be noted, a further source of law is provided by the Canons of Ethics of the American Bar Association, which have been incorporated in the rules of a number of Federal district courts.

Testimony taken during the 84th Congress by Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am chairman, indicated an urgent need for a reappraisal of existing Federal legislation prohibiting conflicts of interest. I therefore requested the staff of the subcommittee to prepare a report on such legislation. When that report had been received, I introduced two bills in Congress in the hope that their introduction would stimulate study leading to more effective prevention of unethical practices without impairing the attractiveness of Government service to competent men and women. The first bill (H.R. 12547, 85th Cong., reintroduced as H.R. 2156, 86th Cong.) would strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft and conflict of interest by revising, coordinating and simplifying them. The second bill (H.R. 2157, 86th Cong.) would implement those laws with a comprehensive code of ethical conduct for Government employment.

During 1960, Subcommittee No. 5 held 10 days of hearings on H.R. 2156 and H.R. 2157, as well as a number of related measures which had been assigned to the subcommittee. Testimony addressed to the shortcomings of existing law and to proposed amendments was received from Members of Congress and from representatives of 13 Government agencies and four bar associations, including your own.

At the hearings, a substantial number of witnesses opposed the enactment of a code of ethics with primary resort to administrative sanctions such as was proposed by H.R. 2157. On the other hand, H.R. 10575, 86th Congress, reintroduced in the 87th Congress as H.R. 3050, one of the measures under consideration by the subcommittee, proposed to place summary emphasis upon an administrative approach and much less emphasis than at present upon criminal sanctions. H.R. 10575 was introduced by Representative JOHN LINDSAY, of New York. It is the product of several years of study by a special committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, of which Mr. LINDSAY is a member. Testimony concerning this bill focused attention on two major questions of policy. The first involves the degree to which Congress ought to spell out the details of the program seeking to eliminate conflicts of interest or ought, instead, to place primary responsibility in this area upon the Chief Executive. H.R. 10575 selects the latter approach. It resorts to criminal sanctions only in cases of willful violations, relying heavily on Executive regulation to fill out and define the bounds of its prohibitions.

In evaluating this approach, it should be borne in mind that for the past several years the administration and the Department of Justice have not taken the initiative to improve existing conflict-of-interest laws. Indeed, the Justice Department witness before the subcommittee conceded that although the Budget Director had in 1955 requested the Department to prepare a general consolidation and revision of the conflict-of-interest statutes, it has failed to do so.

The other policy question highlighted by the subcommittee's consideration of H.R. 10575 involves the treatment of so-called intermittent, as distinguished from regular Government employees. The tendency of existing law and of my bills, H.R. 2156 and H.R. 2157, is to treat the two groups identically, with legislative exemption being created on an ad hoc basis where deemed appropriate. The bar association's bill, H.R. 10575, however, treats the two groups very differently. Enactment of this bill would mean substantially more rigid regulation than at present for career employees and substantially less rigid regulation of persons classed as "intermittent." The Justice Department witness told the subcommittee that the Department is very much concerned over the proposed double standard of H.R. 10575 for dealing with intermittent and regular employees of the Government, stating that its adoption would represent "quite a drastic and radical departure from existing standards."

The 86th Congress expired before the subcommittee could complete its study, and the task of revising the conflict of interest laws remains to be completed. To that end, last month, Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, ranking Republican member of the committee and the subcommittee, and I, introduced identical bills (H.R. 3412 and H.R. 3411, 87th Cong.), representing our best present thinking as the result of nearly 4 years of study by the subcommittee and its staff. Principal provisions of these twin measures include: (1) A lifetime prohibition of breaches of confidence in matters formerly worked on by employees who leave the Government; (2) prohibition of payments to (as well as receipts by) Government officials of compensation for services rendered before Federal agencies; (3) uniform provisions prohibiting bribery of officials, and extension of bribery provisions to witnesses before committees of Congress and before Federal agencies; and (4) cancellation of Government contracts, licenses, and grants consummated in violation of the conflict of interest and bribery laws.

Representative MCCULLOCH and I are not committed to any particular language. Indeed, many sections of our bill reflect drafting suggestions made by witnesses, including language found in last year's H.R. 10575. We are, however, committed to getting this important job done.

One significant development will facilitate this task. The new President has spoken out. In his address at Wittenberg College last October, Mr. Kennedy stated that it would be his intention "at the earliest opportunity, to submit to the Congress a single, comprehensive code on conflicts of interest—aimed at eliminating duplications, inadvertencies and gaps—at drawing a clearer line between propriety and impropriety—at protecting the public against unethical behavior without making it impossible for able and conscientious citizens to accept public service."

Further, Mr. Kennedy declared as one of the basic principles which he intended to use as guidelines in appointments, that "Preference in appointments will be given to those willing to commit themselves to stay on the job long enough to apply what they learn. The goal is a full-time effort for the full tenure of the Presidential term, without regard to any prior affiliation or prospective employment."

In light of the new administration's declared policy, proposals to establish one set of ethical standards for intermittent employees and another for regulars may well become academic. Certainly, the need for accommodating the rigor of ethical imperatives in Government employment to the needs of part-time participants in Government will decline if the emphasis in recruiting is laid on securing more full-time careerists.

Promptly after taking office, the Chief Executive appointed a committee of experts on conflicts of interest which is due to report its recommendations by March 15. A thorough overhauling of existing conflict of interest laws and regulations is long overdue, and the subcommittee will note with interest the new administration's legislative proposals in this important area.

Armed Services Medical Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, for some 12 years I have been sowing the seed in what I hoped would be a fertile soil for the growth of an Armed Services Medical Academy.

The time now appears to be ripe for full examination of the entire field.

It is most encouraging to note that the need of such an academy has been recognized by some of our distinguished colleagues.

Early this year the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, FRANCIS E. WALTER, who has introduced so much constructive legislation during his years in Congress, introduced legislation providing for such an academy. His recognition of this problem and his action in introducing legislation provides one of the strongest voices in the Congress in support of such action.

Recently another colleague of mine on the Armed Services Committee again introduced a similar bill. This one is sponsored by CHARLES E. BENNETT of Florida, who for the past several Congresses has introduced such legislation.

After my years of study of this situation which began with the introduction of the first bill authorizing extra pay for doctors in the service, I decided it was time for me to finally introduce a similar bill which I did several weeks ago.

Before introducing my bill I conferred with my old friend and benefactor, CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

This illustrious and respected Member of the House unhesitatingly promised his full support and cooperation. His support is most welcomed and most needed for such an ambitious program of so great a magnitude.

The national response to the proposal has been greater than I ever anticipated. I have received editorials from newspapers throughout the Nation. From these I have selected an editorial from my own New Orleans newspaper, the States-Item, which I refer to you, as well as an editorial which appeared in all the Scripps-Howard newspapers in the Nation.

The record of hearings before the Armed Services Committees in other years, will reveal that I have already on record the advisability of examining such a proposal from former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, when he was Chief of Staff of the Army, James For-

restal, when he was Secretary of the Navy, and Judge Robert Patterson, when he was Secretary of War. Throughout the years I have been careful to build up the record before stepping into the legislative water.

We must now sell the American public on the idea of the necessity of such an academy, which should also merit the support of the doctors and the dentists in this country. This is neither socialized, nor federalized medicine, to which I am unalterably opposed. It is a plan which will relieve the draft of civilian doctors and dentists, and which will provide more of both.

There is a shortage of doctors in the country today. There is only one way in which to supply more doctors and that is to educate more. Private schools now in existence cannot do the job unless facilities are enlarged. An armed services medical school would provide at least 1 of the 22 new medical schools which President Kennedy says are needed if we are to accept the challenge of supplying more doctors for the exploding population which we face tomorrow.

Those of us in the House who believe in such action can accomplish our objective through united effort and cooperation.

I propose that this Armed Services Medical Academy be built in the Washington area where it is possible to draw on Walter Reed General Hospital, Bethesda Medical Center, and the National Health Institutes for clinical services.

I also propose that the academy should be staffed by competent civilian professors, thus eliminating any objection to so-called inbreeding by the military.

This is a large and broad subject. It is a great problem. This proposed Armed Services Medical Academy is not the complete answer, but it is a step in the right direction.

The language of the present bills introduced by my distinguished colleagues and myself will not be the final language of the legislation. The final bill will be written only after the entire subject matter has been thoroughly explored and ventilated.

In the meantime I submit these two editorials to which I referred and which give you an insight as to how this proposal is being accepted in the Nation at large.

[From the New Orleans States-Item]

MEDICAL ACADEMY

U.S. armed services in peacetime have always had trouble filling their medical and dental personnel billets.

Toward alleviating the shortage of such professionals in the Army, Navy, and Air Corps, Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT proposes establishment of an Armed Forces Medical Academy in the Washington, D.C., area.

This bill, which has been referred to the House Armed Services Committee, of which he is a ranking member, calls for an initial appropriation of $50 million.

The academy would accommodate up to 500 medical students and 250 students of dentistry. Upon graduation, they would serve under direction of the Secretary of Defense for a minimum of 7 years.

We believe Representative HÉBERT's bill is worthy of serious consideration.

Anticipated need for the training by 1975 of 50 percent more physicians to serve the civilian population will only aggravate the armed services' medical personnel problems.

[From the Washington News and allied Scripps-Howard newspapers]

MEDICAL ACADEMY

The plan for an Armed Forces Medical Academy as advanced by Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT of Louisiana, deserves serious attention.

It would serve two important purposes: ending the need to draft doctors and dentists and adding to the scant supply of medical practitioners. It is preferable to straight scholarship grants in that it would provide new training facilities and give students a chance to repay the Government. This they would do by agreeing to serve at least 7 years, after graduation, in the military services, the Public Health Service, or the Veterans' Administration.

Representative HÉBERT specifies the new academy should be in the neighborhood of Washington, so that it could use Army and Navy hospitals and the National Institutes of Health, both for facilities and for faculty.

Since this plan involves no socialized medicine it seems to us something that the American Medical Association could support, or at least investigate carefully. In Congress it should have prompt committee hearings.

Hope Increases for Cape Cod National Seashore Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as one who, back in the 85th Congress, introduced one of the first bills to authorize a national seashore park on Cape Cod, I wish to express my gratitude to my colleagues in this 87th Congress, and particularly to the members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for the sense of urgency as well as the earnestness with which they are considering this nationally important conservation measure.

The National Parks Subcommittee last week held hearings on the Cape Cod National Seashore legislation, which has the full support of President Kennedy. It is clear that we all agree with the President, with Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, with other sponsors of this legislation and with the committee members who have heard testimony in the past, that Cape Cod has top priority among conservation measures now before the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, when I introduced my first Cape Cod National Seashore bill in 1958, basing it upon the findings of the National Park Service studies of the cape and of the Atlantic coast, I was deeply impressed by two things. One was the truly terrifying speed at which our superb natural shorelines were being preempted for developments of all kinds which would destroy their beauty and remove forever the opportunities which future generations might have to know and enjoy this aspect of their national heritage. Within the past 20 years whole stretches of natural seashore have vanished completely under developments or have become priced out of the reach even of Government.

But an equally impressive fact, and one which fills us all with a great hope, is that one of the finest seashore areas of the entire Atlantic seaboard yet remains largely unspoiled and constitutes a major conservation opportunity.

This is Cape Cod, an area so close to the country's largest centers of population that one marvels at how its unspoiled character has survived for so long. Here is not only a spectacular shoreline, beloved and written about for generations, but also inland areas of surpassing charm, scientific values of extraordinary significance, and evidences and traditions of an inspiring history.

Since establishment of a Cape Cod National Seashore Park will affect the lives and interests of many private citizens and their town and State governments, it is evident that great care must be taken to reconcile national and local interest in this conservation legislation. The recommendations of the National Park Service already had done much in this direction. However, more was needed, and we of the Massachusetts delegation in Congress are proud to sponsor legislation, unique and unprecedented in its scope and purpose, which we believe will be successful in protecting individual rights and interests within the larger framework of the national purpose.

But working out such complex protective and reconciling provisions, based on further studies of the economic and other consequences of park establishment on the cape, have taken time, and time is running out. Since I introduced my first Cape Cod Park bill, new roads have been cleared, new subdivisions staked out, and the blight of honky-tonk development has crept further up the peninsula.

And the delay is costly in dollars as well as beauty. Seashore land prices have in some places risen as much as a thousand percent in the last 20 years. Each passing year sees conservation of Cape Cod growing more costly, with less and less to conserve.

I recommend to the Congress that prompt and effective action in conservation matters carry through all the legislative process, reconciling remaining differences with dispatch so that a nationally significant Cape Cod National Seashore can become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I include with my remarks an editorial from the Springfield, Mass., Union of March 11, 1961, concerning the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park:

HOPE INCREASES FOR CAPE COD PARK

Chairman ALAN BIBLE of the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee, said Thursday that he sensed an atmosphere of give and take between Cape Cod town officials and the National Park Service on the reduction of boundaries in the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore. The chief stumbling block to establishment of the great park is the reluctance of towns in the area to relinquish taxable property for the project in

the face of the National Park Service's decision that it can reduce the acreage no further.

The Park Service already has substantially cut its original request for land in order to placate local objectors. But the objections still continue, though an adjustment at last appears hopeful. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL holds that Cape Cod officials are unduly upset over the boundary problem and that they serve "only to frustrate both national and local interests in an irresponsible manner."

They also appear to be using their piecemeal demands for excluding more land from the park to mask their aim of killing the whole idea. Great areas of the proposed park have lain undeveloped through all the years of Massachusetts history and have produced little tax revenue for the towns in which they are located. The fact that the developers now have their eyes on these areas and, in fact, are eating away at them, accounts for the immediate crisis. Underlying the whole plan for the park is the desire to conserve the tract in its natural state for posterity and to stem the tide of commercial development before it engulfs the land. In view of the park's importance as a magnificent tourist attraction and an asset to the whole State, the objectors appear woefully shortsighted in their efforts to discourage the plan and, in effect, kill it by shrinking the land available for it to an acreage so small as to force the National Park Service to abandon the project.

Secretary of the Interior Udall, whose appearances at the hearing he admits indicate President Kennedy's deep interest in the proposal, tersely and accurately analyzed the issue recently when he said:

"Unless action is taken in the near or immediate future to acquire and preserve lands at Cape Cod for public enjoyment, it seems quite evident that the Cape's traditional atmosphere and character will vanish under construction activity now under way there."

Statement by Hon. Robert C. Byrd, of West Virginia, at Public Hearing on Residual Fuel Oil, Department of the Interior Auditorium, Monday, February 20, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement I made this morning at the public hearing on residual fuel oil conducted by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. Secretary, the mining of coal in my State of West Virginia is an industry which has invested billions of dollars in plants and facilities to mine and market coal. It is an industry which in the last few years has been buffeted and battered by unfair marketing prices from competing oils—principally imports of foreign residual fuel oil at dump prices. Such imports, which began to swell soon after World War II, primarily from the Caribbean area, zoomed from 53 million barrels in 1948 to 129 million barrels in 1954.

In February 1955, there was issued a report on energy supplies and resources policy. The report was prepared by an Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy, established by the President on July 30, 1954. In part, the report contained the following:

"An expanding domestic oil industry, plus a healthy oil industry in free countries which help to supply the U.S. market, constitute basically important elements in the kind of industrial strength which contributes most to a strong national defense. Other energy industries, especially coal, must also maintain a level of operation which will make possible rapid expansion in output should that become necessary."

In that year, residual imports amounted to 152 million barrels.

In October 1956, the Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy reaffirmed its earlier finding. In that year residual oil imports amounted to 163 million barrels.

In April 1957, Mr. Gordon Gray, Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, made a finding to the effect that crude oil was being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security. The special committee's findings in July 1957 supported Mr. Gray's certification and indicated that a limitation on imports was required. The committee recommended a voluntary import limitation plan, which did not include residual, and it was put into effect. In 1957, a total of 173 million barrels of residual oil were imported.

The voluntary control program was only partially successful, as was indicated by a letter from Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, issued on September 7, 1956, to the oil importing companies. He called attention to previous letters he had written asking for voluntary compliance with such reduction of the level of oil imports, and in referring to the cooperation received, he commented, "I would be less than frank if I did not say that this is a disappointing result."

In 1958, residual oil imports rose to 182 million barrels, and it was not until March of 1959, that mandatory controls were finally imposed. In imposing the mandatory residual import controls, the Government selected 1957 as its base year. In that year, residual imports totaled 173 million barrels. The proclamation by the President of the United States stated, with reference to residual oil, as follows:

"In districts I to IV, the imports of residual fuel oil to be used as fuel shall not exceed the level of imports of that product into these districts during the calendar year 1957."

But the import quotas which the Government piously placed on foreign residual fuel oil proved to be only theoretical in nature, for by 1960, even under mandatory import controls, residual oil imports amounted to 230 million barrels—57 million barrels above the 1957 levels, or the equivalent of approximately 14 million tons of coal. The 1960 imports of residual oil—230 million barrels—were the equivalent of approximately 55 million tons of bituminous coal.

About 75 percent of the oil which is imported is competitive with coal. Therefore, this competitive element displaced 41,250,000 tons of coal.

The average value per ton of bituminous coal, f.o.b. mines, in 1958 was $4.86. This is the last date for which I have figures. Using this figure, the loss of a market for 41¼ million tons of coal meant a loss of $200,475,000 in gross revenue for coal producers.

I am advised that wages constitute from 50 to 60 percent, depending upon whether or not vacation pay, welfare fund contributions, social security payments, unemployment compensation tax, and other factors are included, of the price per ton of coal, f.o.b. mines. Taking a conservative figure of 50 percent, one can readily see that there was a loss of $100 million in miners' wages, or a year's work for 18,500 men, plus a loss of $100 million in new equipment, taxes, development of new mines, and return on investment. The loss of 41¼ million tons of coal freight meant well over $100 million in lost freight revenue for the railroads, to say nothing of the wages lost to railroad workers.

Mr. Secretary, this is but a portion of the loss. One could cite the loss in taxes to Federal, State, and local governments. One could also cite the multiplier effect upon the economy of service jobs lost when industrial employment drops.

What has been the trend in coal production while residual imports have been mounting? Coal production in 1947 amounted to 631 million tons. Last year it totaled only 413 million tons. What are some of the resultant effects upon the coal industry? Coal mines cannot be put in mothballs. When they are not in operation, they soon become flooded with water. The roofs fall. The machinery deteriorates. Unemployed miners walk the streets, and their families exist on meager surplus commodities. (There are 300,000 such recipients in West Virginia eligible for commodities today.) Further exploration for new coal reserves is discouraged.

With reduced coal freight tonnage, the railroads feel the pinch and their profits are siphoned away. I was in Baltimore on Saturday, where I talked with a high official of the B. & O. Railroad. He told me that 20,000 units, or 25 percent of the rolling stock, are presently in need of repairs. One hundred B. & O. freight cars constitute a train one mile in length. Consequently, 20,000 units represent, for the B. & O. 200 miles of inoperable railroad cars and locomotives. The situation is equally bad with other railroads.

On January 1, 1959, there were stored in class I railroad yards 54,494 hoppers which required major and extensive repair work. This compared with a total of 19,150 bad order hoppers in existence on January 1, 1957. In 1955, the average open top hopper cars had an age of 20 years. Twenty-nine percent of the open top hoppers were more than 30 years old. It is easy to see, therefore, how depressed economic conditions in the coal industry make themselves felt on the railroads' economy.

A March 16, 1959, article in the Wall Street Journal stated, in referring to the freight-car pinch: "Part of the decline in the car fleet has occurred because railroads are not buying new cars as fast as old ones are headed for the scrap heap."

In 1958 the carriers ordered only 17,546 new cars—just a fraction of the record 162,352 ordered in 1955—while at the same time some 41,000 cars were being retired.

The opponents of the mandatory oil import program contended that it was discriminatory to a populous region of the United States. I maintain that the Government discriminates against the depressed coal-producing areas if quotas are upwardly revised.

The opponents contended that such quotas constituted a major contribution to inflation. Yet coal prices, f.o.b. mines, in 1958 averaged for the entire country $4.86, whereas 10 years before, in 1948, coal sold at $4.99 per ton. The average price of coal at the mine today is actually less than it was 10 years earlier despite rising costs and a $10 per day increase in wages.

The opponents contended that import quotas produce unemployment. Yet, residual oil imported from foreign countries con-

tributes only insignificantly to employment in the consuming areas. However, it throws thousands of coal miners and railroad workers out of their jobs.

The opponents feared that import controls would weaken our national security, saying that they would tend to exhaust the American oil supply at a faster rate. Nothing could be further from the truth. Our domestic oil industry has suffered as a result of increased foreign imports because domestic exploration and production are discouraged.

The opponents contended that quotas on residual imports would precipitate price and wage controls for everyone. The prophesied results have not materialized.

More recently, opponents of the program have contended that import quotas on residual fuel oil have forced up the price of the oil and are costing New England consumers anywhere from $10 to $20 million a year. It is not clear on just what they base such a claim. If they contend that it results from a 15-cents-per-barrel increase in the cargo price of residual last July, they conveniently ignore the fact that the price of residual had been decreased 15 cents a barrel the previous January, and that it is now selling for considerably less than in the base year of 1957.

I understand that they also claim that higher residual oil prices have cost homeowners money by forcing up electric rates. However, the Federal Power Commission reports that there have been no increases in New England electric utility rates since last summer and, if anything, they tend to be lower.

Mr. Secretary, aside from the economic problems created by increasing residual imports, we cannot hide our heads in the sand and refuse to admit the accompanying danger to our national security. In the event of another national emergency, the coal industry will again be called upon to supply the fuel needs and power requirements of our country. Can this economically unhealthy industry respond as it must?

The continuing trend toward greater mechanization, together with the rising price level of mining machinery, has greatly increased the capital investment required for profitable coal mining operation. Coal operators cannot be expected to purchase high priced equipment for use in a highly competitive fuels field and maintain the cost upkeep of machinery and operative mines ready to expand production in a moment of emergency.

Moreover, with the coming of an emergency, wornout mining machinery would become difficult to replace with new equipment. A modern deep mine may take an investment of $6 to $10 per ton of annual capacity. The development of new mines in the older mining regions now requires about 2 years. Development of new mines in new areas requires an estimated 4 years. Expensive machinery requires materials which may not be available in time of war. The average life of plant and equipment is calculated to be 10 to 12 years.

Can an ailing coal industry afford new equipment and the costs of new exploration? If anyone questions the precarious financial position of the coal industry, he need only take a look at page 33 of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, House Report No. 1263, 85th Congress, 1st session. The Special Subcommittee on Coal Research noted that from 1925 to 1953, inclusive,

"The bituminous coal mining industry experienced a net loss in 13 of the 27 years for which data are available and in only 2 of the 27 years were fairly good profits obtained. It also is noted that the 1,572 corporations engaged in bituminous coal mining in 1953 earned an average profit after Federal taxes of a little less than 3¾ cents per ton on the 350 million tons of coal which they produced. Viewing industry's earnings from another angle, it is found that the value, f.o.b., mines, of the total production of bituminous coal in 1953 was on the order of $2,247 million, from which the incorporated producers, who accounted for 80 percent of the production realized a profit after Federal taxes of less than $13 million—or a calculated net profit of less than three-quarters of 1 percent on the gross value of the coal produced."

The subcommittee went on to state: "It is doubtful that any other major industry vital to the economy of the Nation has experienced anything approaching the depressed financial condition of the coal mining industry over the past 20 years."

Moreover, Mr. Secretary, an industry plagued by declining employment for a generation cannot raise a new generation of skilled and experienced coal miners in a day of peril. As the number of personnel regularly employed in the mines has been sharply reduced, there has been a steady reduction in the relative number of younger men employed in the coal industry. In 1951, the percentage of miners under 30 years of age was 18.6. In 1957, it had fallen to 6.5 percent. This alarming trend emphasizes the importance of retaining young workers in the bituminous coal industry in order to assure an adequate supply of experienced and skilled workers in the years ahead.

In its report in February 1955, the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources stated its belief that "If the imports of crude and residual oils should exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports of oil bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuel situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial strength which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense."

Mr. Secretary, as I have already shown, the domestic fuel situation, particularly with reference to coal, is becoming seriously impaired to the point that it could not cope with the sudden and stepped up needs of a grave national emergency.

We are playing with fire if we permit the important east coast segment of our whole industrial complex to become increasingly dependent upon a source of foreign fuel oil which may be entirely cut off in a national emergency. It may be noted that the foreign sources, which supplied but 26 percent of the east coast residual oil requirements in 1940, now account for something in excess of 70 percent of the residual oil requirements of the same area.

A depressed coal industry could not possibly respond to the accelerated needs of war. Coal mining is increasingly becoming a highly skilled operation. Whereas in 1934, the year of my graduation from high school, only 12 percent of the coal was loaded by machinery, almost 86 percent of the coal produced in 1959 was machine loaded. It is apparent, therefore, that skilled personnel could not be secured overnight. Whereas in that same year of 1934 there were 458,000 miners in the United States, there were only 174,100 in 1959. Just as "the wine of life is oozing drop by drop," employment in the coal mines is dropping one by one.

The coal industry's expansibility declines as its rate of production decreases. This is true because its excess capacity is but a percentage of its current production. The common measure of annual mining capacity is the average number of employees times output per man-day times the number of working days per year. Using our pencil, therefore, 174,100 miners producing the current national average of 12 tons per day would produce 2,089,200 tons daily. Two hundred and sixty working days is about the maximum that can be worked per year in the deep mines. Taking the most liberal figure of working days per year in World War II—278 days in 1948—and proceeding with our process of multiplication, we find that the capacity production that could be reached would be 580,797,600 tons—a figure that falls below the tonnage produced in the World War II years of 1942, 1943, and 1944.

Mr. Secretary, if there is any doubt that foreign sources of residual are vulnerable to interruptions by enemy action, that doubt can be readily removed by reading pages 87–88 of the Interior Department's "History of the Petroleum Administration for War, 1941–1945." Referring to the sinking of 50 tankers along the east coast in 1942 and the resulting fuel supply situation, the document has this to say:

"Although the boats had to keep running to supply military requirements, no one could doubt the decline of tanker shipments for civilian needs in the face of these 50 sinkings. From then on, until the last year of the war, tanker deliveries were an insignificant factor in supplying the oil needs of the east coast.

"Tanker deliveries to the east coast reacted quickly to the submarine blockade. Shipments started to dive in February 1942, and by May they amounted to only 173,000 barrels daily, or about 18 percent of the December 1941 total. The low point of the war was reached in April and May 1943—63,000 barrels a day. From May 1942 to the end of 1943, east coast tanker deliveries averaged only a little more than 121,000 barrels daily.

"Even this small movement was on an uncertain, sporadic, undependable basis.

"One of the most crippling effects of the transportation shortage was the decline, below safe levels, of petroleum inventories on the east coast for the duration of the war. Never, throughout the war, was it possible to rebuild stocks on the east coast to safe operating levels, even after the transportation bottleneck was broken, although strenuous efforts were made to do so. This shrinkage of inventory was the major cause of one of the worst headaches of the war—the spot shortages which would result from failure of a scheduled shipment to arrive when storage tanks were empty."

Mr. Secretary, I am not like the lad in the fable who yelled "Wolf, wolf!" to the shepherds in a nearby field when there was no wolf. We are confronted with a real wolf, and I have a sample of it here. This is the thick, tarry substance known as residual oil, and it is not to be confused with home heating oils. There has been a lot of misrepresentation on this point. The ordinary house does not use residual oil at all, because special equipment is required for preheating purposes, and most of it goes to industry. Some residual is used for apartment buildings, hospitals, hotels, and so forth, where there are central heating units.

Residual is a derivative and product of crude oil and is left as a residuum in the distillation of petroleum products. While U.S. refineries are very advanced and efficient, the residual fuel oil yield in South American refineries may be as high as 60 percent. In order to dispose of residual oil, the oil companies are willing to sell it at almost any price, and it is dumped on utility and large steam plants that have multiple burning equipment. They provide the focal point for the residual-coal competition when there are excess supplies of residual oil caused by imports.

Residual has but limited storage and it has to be forced into the coal markets once the storage tanks begin to bulge. Consequently, there is no stability of price, and the objective is to undersell coal at any price.

To illustrate the fluctuation in price of this "dump" product, one has only to look

at the year 1958 when residual stocks continued to mount as imports increased. Residual went from $2.95 per barrel in January to $2.37 by late summer—a drop of 58 cents, equivalent to $2.44 per ton in terms of coal. Actually, a great deal of residual was sold under the list—as low or even lower than $2 per barrel ($8.40 coal equivalent).

I am informed that users of coal are often lured into converting to residual oil by cutthroat prices which will offset the cost of conversion, and I am also advised that the oil companies will not enter into contracts to deliver oil at a definite and stable price but, instead, promise to meet and undersell the price of coal. This type of competition is unconscionable and it simply cannot be met.

Mr. Secretary, I do not ask for complete elimination of residual fuel oil imports. I do ask for a substantial reduction. I maintain that the quotas on residual oil imports should be so designed to permit the coal industry, the domestic oil industry, and the transportation industry to meet the needs of exploration and research, repair and replace damaged and obsolete equipment, recoup employment losses, and maintain a capability to meet the expanded needs of a national emergency. I ask nothing more. One could expect nothing less.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 133: 1: *Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.*

O Thou, who art the God and Father of us all, grant that in this Brotherhood Week men and nations may be lifted, by the mighty tide of Thy grace and love, into a more fraternal relationship.

We pray that we may never harbor within our minds and hearts those thoughts and feelings which were alien to the Master's spirit of compassion and consideration, of patience and kindness.

Inspire us with a clearer vision of the many noble and helpful things which we are daily privileged to do together for the health and happiness of mankind everywhere.

Show us how we may release the hidden splendor of humanity and bring to a joyous and victorious fulfillment those capacities and lofty aspirations with which Thou didst endow the soul of man, created in Thine own image and for Thy glory.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 610. An act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board;

S. 707. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; and

S. 804. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1426), relating to the length of time by which the Federal Maritime Board may suspend tariff schedules.

The message also announced that the Secretary had been directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 681) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology."

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 38, 75th Congress, the Senator from Alaska, Mr. BARTLETT, and the Senator from Kansas, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, were appointed members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 301, 78th Congress, the Senator from California, Mr. ENGLE, and the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. CASE, were appointed members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. LONG; the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD; the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. JORDAN; the Senator from Montana, Mr. METCALF; the Senator from Indiana, Mr. HARTKE; the Senator from Texas, Mr. YARBOROUGH; the Senator from Indiana, Mr. CAPEHART; the Senator from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN; the Senator from Colorado, Mr. ALLOTT; the Senator from Idaho, Mr. DWORSHAK; the Senator from Delaware, Mr. BOGGS; and the Senator from Maine, Mrs. SMITH, to attend the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group meeting to be held in Ottawa February 22 to 25, inclusive.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AGAINST HARVEY O'CONNOR

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been served with a subpena duces tecum which directs me to appear before the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey to testify in the case of the United States of America against Harvey O'Connor.

Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved.

I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY—UNITED STATES *v.* HARVEY O'CONNOR, No. 232–59

TO FRANCIS E. WALTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey at Federal courthouse in the city of Newark on the 31st day of May 1960, at 10 o'clock a.m., to testify in the case of *United States* v. *Harvey O'Connor* and bring with you the documents and objects listed in the schedule attached hereto and made a part hereof.

This subpena is issued upon application of the defendant.

MICHAEL KELLER, Jr.,
Clerk.
By MARY BRADBURY,
Deputy Clerk.

John O. Bigelow, Leonard B. Boudin, and Morton Stavis, attorneys for defendant.

MAY 19, 1960.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* HARVEY O'CONNOR, No. 232–59.

SCHEDULE—TO SUBPENA TO PRODUCE DOCUMENT OR OBJECT

(a) The original minute book of the House Un-American Activities Committee and of the subcommittee of the Un-American Activities Committee, which held hearings in Newark in 1958, and if there be no original minute book, the minutes of all meetings of the Un-American Activities Committee or the said subcommittee authorizing the 1958 Newark hearings, authorizing the issuance of subpenas in connection therewith, and recommending proceedings by contempt against Harvey O'Connor.

(b) All material in the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee relating to Harvey O'Connor, including but not limited to staff memoranda, reports of other Government agencies in the committee's files, reports of interviews, statements, affidavits, recordings, correspondence, press releases, and proposed lists of questions or memoranda to be used by counsel or the committee in the questioning of Harvey O'Connor.

(c) All material in the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee relating to the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, including but not limited to staff memoranda, reports of other Government agencies in the committee's files, reports of interviews, statements, affidavits, recordings, correspondence, press releases, and proposed lists of questions or memoranda to be used by counsel or the committee during the questioning of any witness in Newark, N.J., in 1958 in relation to the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

(d) All records and logbooks kept by the House Un-American Activities Committee in respect to the issuance of subpenas in June, July, August, and September 1958 and the carbon copies of all subpenas issued in that period in respect to hearings relating to the Newark area.

(e) All memoranda of the staff of the House Un-American Activities Committee, minutes of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, reports by the committee staff or reports of any other Government agency in the files of the committee, summaries of interviews, affidavits, statements, recordings, correspondence, press releases, proposed lists of questions or memoranda to be used by counsel or the committee during the questioning of any witness, or any other material prepared for or used (relating to