project to the Kennedy-Day administration. I have been advised that this is the case even in instances of post offices which were completed and placed in operation prior to January 20, 1961.

Will you please advise me as to whether there is any basis for such reports, if so the exact wording of such plaque or sign, and on what grounds claims of credit for the new post office are made by the new administration.

6. Finally, I am advised that the Department is giving consideration to a change by administrative order of the procedures under which letter carriers are to receive the $100 per year uniform allowance.

It is my understanding that the proposed new procedure contemplates payment of the $100 a year allowance in cash, rather than the letter carrier receiving an authorization for purchase of such uniforms with the Post Office Department billed by the vendor for the uniforms.

I would appreciate being advised as to the facts in this matter if the reported change is indeed contemplated, the basis for the proposed change.

Respectfully yours,

AUGUST E. JOHANSEN.

The Late Herman A. Lowe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1961

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I express the shock and deep regret of many Members of Congress who knew him as a newspaperman upon learning of the death in Philadelphia of Herman A. Lowe, director of development and public relations for the Albert Einstein Memorial Medical Center in Philadelphia. Mr. Lowe was only 55 when he died Sunday of a heart attack, just as he was preparing to expand his activities by opening a public relations office here in Washington.

As a long-time friend of Mr. Lowe, and of his very fine and capable wife, Florence, I find it almost impossible to realize that Herman has been taken from us in the prime of an active and useful life. My deepest sympathy goes to Mrs. Lowe and to their son and daughter, Roger and Mrs. Fred Israel.

Mr. Lowe spent many years as a newspaperman in Philadelphia before joining the Washington Bureau of the Philadelphia Inquirer in 1942. Several years later, he opened his own news bureau here, the Penn-Federal News Bureau, writing for a number of Pennsylvania papers and serving also, in partnership with Mrs. Lowe, in covering Washington for Variety, the entertainment industry's trade journal. He closed his Washington office 3 years ago to join the staff of the world-famous Einstein Medical Center.

Long associated in various capacities with the Republican Party in Pennsylvania, Mr. Lowe never allowed partisanship to interfere with his objectivity in covering news stories involving me, or my husband before me. We were personal friends regardless of politics.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 1961

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

Monsignor Béla Varga, chairman of the Hungarian Committee, New York, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Almighty Father, in Thy year of 1848, on this day of the Ides of March, the Hungarian nation rose in revolution to establish freedom in their land; but Russian intervention trampled down their newly won liberties. Thou hast willed so, O Lord, and Thy ways are unfathomable. Seventy years later, in these Halls, a great President of this Republic made a memorable announcement of 14 points and proclaimed to the world the principle of self-determination and an international government under law and justice. Thy ways are merciful, O Eternal Father in heaven, for a great fire was lit by that pronouncement, in the light of which all the oppressed could look up to Thee and praise Thy wisdom in hopeful prayer.

A new colonial system has been forced upon the people behind the Iron Curtain, ruthlessly exploiting defenseless millions, forbidding them to seek solace in Thy benevolence, blaspheming Thy holy name and defiling the Sabbath.

Hallowed are these walls which have so often echoed stirring words spoken in behalf of freedom. I entreat Thee, O Lord, to give Thy blessing to the deliberations in this Chamber. Let these walls echo and reecho freedom's praise; let freedom's clarion calls sally forth from this rostrum again and again until all the fortresses of oppression and tyranny will crumble like the walls of Jericho.

And then let there be a general resurrection of freedom, O Lord of all hosts, and let the millions who will have risen sing the hosanna of Thy praise. Let there be an Eastertide for all the peoples of the world, when darkness at noon will forever be banished by the daylight of Thy will. Grant, O Lord, to Thy humble servant the hope that the Hungarian people will be among the joyous millions who will celebrate the resurrection of freedom. That is the last hope they nurture in their breasts when they lay flowers on the graves of their fallen heroes.

I implore Thee, O Lord, from this rostrum which Thou hast made the most powerful symbol of freedom: Keep it strong, that it remain the hope of all the oppressed, of all the millions who are ready to give their lives, as my people were, in Thy service, for only in the truth of Thy eternal wisdom may we forever be free. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 14, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations 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, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1163. An act to amend section 510 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to extend for 15 months the loan guaranty authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission; and

H.R. 3980. An act to amend the transitional provisions of the act approved September 6, 1958, entitled "An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety," and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1173) to authorize the appointment of Dwight David Eisenhower to the active list of the Regular Army, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1163. An act to amend section 510 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to extend for 15 months the loan guaranty authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3980. An act to amend the transitional provisions of the act approved September 6, 1958, entitled "An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the calendar.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of John H. Winchell, of Colorado, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

Herschel C. Loveless, of Iowa, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Charles S. Murphy, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture; and

James T. Ralph, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Paul Rand Dixon, of Tennessee, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner.

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

James P. O'Brien, of Illinois, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Illinois.

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

Lawrence Gubow, of Michigan, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Michigan.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The following favorable report of a treaty was submitted:

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

Executive C, 87th Congress, 1st session. A treaty between the United States of America and Canada relating to cooperative development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin, signed at Washington on January 17, 1961 (Ex. Rept. No. 2).

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Neville Miller, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I understand that this confirmation is not one of which the President is notified. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

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

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward R. Murrow, of New York, to be Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a biographical statement in regard to the confirmation of the nomination of Edward R. Murrow. Yesterday I appeared in respect to this nomination before the Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. Murrow is a very distinguished New Yorker, and is one of the outstanding commentators and producers on radio and television. Therefore, I wish to have printed in the RECORD an appropriate statement in respect to the confirmation of his nomination.

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

EDWARD R. MURROW

Born April 25, 1908, near Greensboro, N.C.

Education: Normal, primary, and secondary education in western Washington. Graduated Washington State College, 1930.

Marital status: Married.

Experience: 1930–32, president, National Student Federation (an organization of student body presidents), traveled abroad during this period; 1932–33, assistant director, Institute of International Education, in charge of foreign offices, arranging student exchanges, publication of various pamphlets dealing with exchange professorships and equivalents of degrees between American and foreign universities; 1933–34, assistant secretary, Emergency Committee for Displaced German Scholars, an organization engaged in bringing German professors, dismissed by Hitler, to this country; 1935–37, director of talks and education, Columbia Broadcasting System; 1937–46, European director, CBS, London, recruited and directed CBS news staff in Europe; 1946–48, returned to New York as vice president in charge of news and public affairs; 1948, reporter, director, and producer, CBS. From that time until the present, engaged in production of radio and television news programs and documentaries, historical record albums and the editing of two books.

Honorary degrees: Brandeis University; Colby College; Grinnell College; Hamilton College; Mount Holyoke College; Muhlenburg College; University of North Carolina; Oberlin College; University of Rochester; Rollins College; Temple University; Washington State College.

Memberships: Board of trustees, Institute of International Education; Phi Beta Kappa; Kappa Sigma; Council on Foreign Relations.

Has farm at Pawling, N.Y.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Donald M. Wilson, of New Jersey, to be Deputy Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and without objection, they are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Avery F. Peterson, of Idaho, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 17th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. 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.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

ENLARGEMENT OF SITE OF PROPOSED NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

A communication from the President of the United States, urging the enactment of legislation to enlarge the site of the proposed National Cultural Center in Washington; to the Committee on Public Works.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, EXECUTIVE BRANCH (S. Doc. No. 19)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, for the consideration of the Congress, proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1961 in the amount of $3,977,955,000, for several agencies of the executive branch (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON AUDITS OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on audits of Government Services, Inc., and of Government Services, Inc.'s employee retirement and benefit trust fund and supplemental pension plan, for the year ended December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT AT MUIR WOODS NATIONAL MONUMENT, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit at Muir Woods National Monument, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by a mass meeting of Lithuanians at Kenosha, Wis., relating to Lithuanian independence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE LEGISLATURE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and myself, I ask unanimous consent that a concurrent resolution, passed by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

This measure focuses the spotlight once again on the serious difficulties encountered by the domestic textile industry as a result of the ever-increasing flow of imported textiles from low-wage foreign countries.

I am sure that the Members of this body need not be reminded of the great concern which both New Hampshire Senators have regarding the problems of the textile industry, but I feel it is important to note the sentiments expressed by our State legislature in this regard. The significance of this problem cannot be overamplified and I commend this concurrent resolution to the attention of all the Senators.

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 the textile industry is an important part in the economic life of New Hampshire; and

Whereas foreign competition is one of the factors adversely affecting this industry and the economy of this State; and

Whereas the U.S. Senate textile subcommittee has recently been holding hearings relative to this question; and

Whereas the Governor of New Hampshire, as chairman of the New England Governors' conference, and all other New England Governors have been diligent in the effort to find a solution to this vital problem: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the general court of the State of New Hampshire requests its congressional delegation to support and work for all possible and necessary legislation and regulations to control textile imports which are adversely affecting the textile industry in this country; and, be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit copies of this concurrent resolution to the President of the United States, Senators STYLES BRIDGES and NORRIS COTTON, of the Senate of the United States, and the Honorable PERKINS BASS and the Honorable CHESTER MERROW.

STEWART LAMPREY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
SAMUEL GREEN,
President of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 1116. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of certain calcines and matte proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (Rept. No. 70).

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

H.R. 5075. An act to provide temporary extended railroad unemployment insurance benefits, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 72).

REPORT ON PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION FOR MUTUAL DEFENSE PURPOSES WITH ITALY (S. REPT. NO. 71)

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I submit a favorable report on the proposed agreement for cooperation for mutual defense purposes between the Government of the United States and the Government of Italy, and I ask that the report be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Rhode Island.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of January 1961. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, 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 PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, JANUARY 1961 AND DECEMBER 1960, AND PAY, DECEMBER 1960 AND NOVEMBER 1960

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for January 1961 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In January numbered—	In December numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In December was—	In November was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,352,799	2,356,737	−3,938	$1,207,079	$1,135,908	+$71,171
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,319,894	1,324,603	−4,709	706,192	632,432	+73,760
Department of Defense	1,032,905	1,032,134	+771	500,887	503,476	−2,589
Inside the United States	2,192,071	2,197,058	−4,987			
Outside the United States	160,728	159,679	+1,049			
Industrial employment	562,038	561,786	+252			
Foreign nations	172,849	174,287	−1,438	23,661	23,720	−59

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1961, and comparison with December 1960, and pay for December 1960, and comparison with November 1960*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	January	December	Increase	Decrease	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	86,716	87,887		1,171	$42,184	$43,101		$917
Commerce [1]	30,640	31,372		732	16,973	16,890	$83	
Health, Education, and Welfare	65,433	64,847	586		33,057	32,519	538	
Interior	50,909	50,975		66	27,712	27,385	327	
Justice	30,632	30,842		210	18,951	19,161		210
Labor	6,927	6,957		30	4,035	4,031	4	
Post Office	568,146	573,160		5,014	[2] 326,028	251,962	74,066	
State [3]	37,782	37,826		44	18,249	17,875	374	
Treasury	77,027	76,736	291		42,231	42,433		202
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	395	416		21	266	254	12	
Bureau of the Budget	453	439	14		372	376		4
Council of Economic Advisers	32	32			24	27		3
Executive Mansion and Grounds	68	70		2	38	33	5	
National Security Council	63	63			50	50		
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,796	1,793	3		1,237	1,232	5	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization [4]		1		1	(5)	1		1
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	5	5			3	3		
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	15	12	3		8	6	2	
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	3	3			2	2		
American Battle Monuments Commission	425	444		19	80	80		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,833	6,824	9		4,698	4,713		15
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	590	598		8	377	374	3	
Civil Aeronautics Board	749	755		6	529	530		1
Civil Service Commission	3,614	3,605	9		2,136	2,147		11
Civil War Centennial Commission	7	7			5	4	1	
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6			4	4		
Commission on Civil Rights	70	78		8	48	50		2
Development Loan Fund	148	145	3		107	111		4
Export-Import Bank of Washington	233	234		1	162	167		5
Farm Credit Administration	238	241		3	166	165	1	
Federal Aviation Agency	40,038	39,722	316		24,611	24,442	169	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,361	1,360	1		875	869	6	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,243	1,234	9		769	805		36
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,066	1,053	13		654	653	1	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	340	339	1		288	291		3
Federal Power Commission	864	853	11		565	560	5	
Federal Trade Commission	813	801	12		566	558	8	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	47	49		2	38	37	1	
General Accounting Office	4,865	4,885		20	2,937	2,974		37
General Services Administration	29,233	29,195	38		13,303	13,350		47
Government Contract Committee	27	26	1		17	18		1
Government Printing Office	6,587	6,573	14		3,285	3,219	66	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,177	11,244		67	6,656	6,648	8	
Indian Claims Commission	14	17		3	16	16		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,370	[6] 2,374		4	1,506	1,506		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	16,212	16,042	170		10,477	10,817		340
National Capital Housing Authority	340	338	2		151	135	16	
National Capital Planning Commission	46	45	1		32	31	1	
National Capital Transportation Agency	11	10	1		5	4	1	
National Gallery of Art	316	314	2		132	132		
National Labor Relations Board	1,779	1,774	5		1,153	1,142	11	
National Mediation Board	117	115	2		100	104		4
National Science Foundation	666	687		21	404	369	35	
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	39	50		11	32	27	5	
Panama Canal	14,725	14,333	392		4,541	4,740		199
Railroad Retirement Board	2,204	2,177	27		1,132	1,128	4	
Renegotiation Board	276	279		3	216	221		5
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	157	162		5	94	104		10
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,039	1,031	8		673	667	6	
Selective Service System	6,482	6,460	22		1,999	1,975	24	
Small Business Administration	2,332	2,325	7		1,426	1,424	2	
Smithsonian Institution	1,096	1,106		10	523	526		3
Soldiers' Home	1,027	1,025	2		330	327	3	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	48	48			35	35		
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	27			23	23		
Tariff Commission	268	267	1		184	184		
Tax Court of the United States	150	150			112	112		
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,831	14,855		24	8,309	8,315		6
Texas Water Study Commission	[7] 49	49			34	34		
U.S. Information Agency	10,810	10,807	3		4,258	4,361		103
Veterans' Administration	173,786	173,475	311		73,888	73,764	124	
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,054	547	507		107	95	12	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,319,894	1,324,603	2,797	7,506	706,192	632,432	75,929	2,169
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			4,709				73,760	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,888	1,856	32		1,382	1,377	5	
Department of the Army	381,311	380,681	630		178,633	179,764		1,131
Department of the Navy	343,342	342,980	362		174,799	175,289		490
Department of the Air Force	306,364	306,617		253	146,073	147,046		973
Total, Department of Defense	1,032,905	1,032,134	1,024	253	500,887	503,476	5	2,594
Net change, Department of Defense			771				2,589	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [8]	2,352,799	2,356,737	3,821	7,759	1,207,079	1,135,908	75,934	4,763
Net change, inclu ing Department of Defense			3,938				71,171	

[1] January figure includes 213 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.
[2] Includes pay for temporary Christmas employees.
[3] January figure includes 14,436 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 14,406 in December and their pay. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The January figure includes 3,892 of these trust fund employees and the December figure includes 3,881.
[4] Abolished by Executive Order No. 10917, dated Feb. 10, 1961.
[5] Less than $500.
[6] Revised on basis of later information.
[7] Subject to revision.
[8] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1961, and comparison with December 1960*

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	85,689	86,862		1,173
Commerce [1]	30,068	30,781		713
Health, Education, and Welfare	64,968	64,389	579	
Interior	50,442	50,519		77
Justice	30,306	30,515		209
Labor	6,837	6,881		44
Post Office	566,871	571,921		5,050
State [2]	9,192	9,107	85	
Treasury	76,460	76,169	291	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	395	416		21
Bureau of the Budget	453	439	14	
Council of Economic Advisers	32	32		
Executive Mansion and Grounds	68	70		2
National Security Council	63	63		
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,796	1,793	3	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization [3]		1		1
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service		5		
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission of Intergovernmental Relations	15	12	3	
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	3	3		
American Battle Monuments Commission	12	12		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,791	6,784	7	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	590	598		8
Civil Aeronautics Board	749	755		6
Civil Service Commission	3,612	3,602	10	
Civil War Centennial Commission	7	7		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	70	78		8
Development Loan Fund	148	145	3	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	233	234		1
Farm Credit Administration	238	241		3
Federal Aviation Agency	39,128	38,815	313	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,359	1,358	1	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,241	1,232	9	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,066	1,053	13	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	340	339	1	
Federal Power Commission	864	853	11	
Federal Trade Commission	813	801	12	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	47	49		2
General Accounting Office	4,793	4,812		19
General Services Administration	29,233	29,193	40	
Government Contract Committee	27	26	1	
Government Printing Office	6,587	6,573	14	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,033	11,099		66
Indian Claims Commission	14	17		3
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,370	[4] 2,374		4
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	16,204	16,036	168	
National Capital Housing Authority	340	338	2	
National Capital Planning Commission	46	45	1	
National Capital Transportation Agency	11	10	1	
National Gallery of Art	316	314	2	
National Labor Relations Board	1,751	1,746	5	
National Mediation Board	117	115	2	
National Science Foundation	661	682		21
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	39	50		11
Panama Canal	399	389	10	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,204	2,177	27	
Renegotiation Board	276	279		3
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	157	162		5
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,039	1,031	8	
Selective Service System	6,327	6,306	21	
Small Business Administration	2,303	2,300	3	
Smithsonian Institution	1,088	1,097		9
Soldiers' Home	1,027	1,025	2	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	48	48		
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	27		
Tariff Commission	268	267	1	
Tax Court of the United States	150	150		
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,829	14,853		24
Texas Water Study Commission	[5] 49	49		
U.S. Information Agency	2,780	2,783		3
Veterans' Administration	172,723	172,398	325	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,260,220	1,265,718	1,988	7,486
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			5,498	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,850	1,818	32	
Department of the Army	330,732	330,242	490	
Department of the Navy	321,300	320,926	374	
Department of the Air Force	277,969	278,354		385
Total, Department of Defense	931,851	931,340	896	385
Net increase, Department of Defense			511	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,192,071	2,197,058	2,884	7,871
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			4,987	

[1] January figure includes 213 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] January figure includes 1,947 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 1,942 in December.
[3] Abolished by Executive Order No. 10917, dated Feb. 10, 1961.
[4] Revised on basis of later information.
[5] Subject to revision.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1961, and comparison with December 1960*

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,027	1,025	2	
Commerce	572	591		19
Health, Education, and Welfare	465	458	7	
Interior	467	456	11	
Justice	326	327		1
Labor	90	76	14	
Post Office	1,275	1,239	36	
State [1]	28,590	28,719		129
Treasury	567	567		
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	413	432		19
Atomic Energy Commission	42	40	2	
Civil Service Commission	2	3		1
Federal Aviation Agency	910	907	3	
Federal Communications Commission	2	2		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
General Accounting Office	72	73		2
General Services Administration		2		1
Housing and Home Finance Agency	144	145		1
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	8	6	2	
National Labor Relations Board	28	28		
National Science Foundation	5	5		
Panama Canal	14,326	13,944	382	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Selective Service System	155	154	1	
Small Business Administration	29	25	4	
Smithsonian Institution	8	9		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	2		
U.S. Information Agency	8,030	8,024	6	
Veterans' Administration	1,063	1,077		14
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,054	547	507	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	59,674	58,885	977	188
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			789	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	38	38		
Department of the Army	50,579	50,439	140	
Department of the Navy	22,042	22,054		12
Department of the Air Force	28,395	28,263	132	
Total, Department of Defense	101,054	100,794	272	12
Net increase, Department of Defense			260	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	160,728	159,679	1,249	200
Net increase, including Department of Defense			1,049	

[1] January figure includes 12,489 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 12,464 in December. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The January figure includes 3,892 of these trust fund employees and the December figure includes 3,881.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1961, and comparison with December 1960*

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,455	3,427	28	
Commerce	5,668	5,662	6	
Interior	7,783	7,798		15
Post Office	236	236		
Treasury	5,064	5,048	16	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	227	228		1
Federal Aviation Agency	1,733	1,695	38	
General Services Administration	1,367	1,360	7	
Government Printing Office	6,587	6,573	14	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	16,212	16,042	170	
Panama Canal	7,716	7,372	344	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	126	126		
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,015	12,061		46
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,054	547	507	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	69,243	68,175	1,130	62
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			1,068	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 135,000	[2] 134,881	119	
Outside the United States	[1] 4,600	[2] 4,590	10	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	198,598	199,235		637
Outside the United States	479	483		4
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	152,571	152,707		136
Outside the United States	1,547	1,715		168
Total, Department of Defense	492,795	493,611	129	945
Net decrease, Department of Defense			816	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	562,038	561,786	1,259	1,007
Net increase, including Department of Defense			252	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of January 1961 and comparison with December 1960*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force		National Aeronautics and Space Administration	
	January	December	January	December	January	December	January	December	January	December
Australia	1	1							1	1
Canada	32	31					32	31		
Crete	46	46					46	46		
England	3,322	3,336			18	16	3,304	3,320		
France	21,942	22,147	17,922	17,985	6	[1] 6	4,014	4,156		
Germany	80,746	80,863	67,737	67,746	54	[1] 54	12,955	13,063		
Greece	275	272					275	272		
Japan	56,540	57,677	19,880	20,051	15,178	[1] 15,505	21,482	22,121		
Korea	6,270	6,226	6,270	6,226						
Morocco	2,959	2,998			848	857	2,111	2,141		
Netherlands	41	42					41	42		
Norway	24	24					24	24		
Saudi Arabia	5	2					5	2		
Trinidad	646	622			646	622				
Total	172,849	174,287	111,809	112,008	16,750	17,060	44,289	45,218	1	1

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of January totaling 2,352,799. This was a net decrease of 3,938 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of December.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1961, which began July 1, 1960, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
1960			
July	2,382,549		125
August	2,384,933	2,384	
September	2,364,636		20,297
October	2,360,534		4,102
November	2,360,667	133	
December	2,356,737		3,930
1961			
January	2,352,799		3,938

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of January was 1,319,894, a decrease of 4,709 as compared with the December total of 1,324,603. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in January was 1,032,905, an increase of 771 as compared with 1,032,134 in December.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger decreases were Post Office Department with 5,014, Agriculture Department with 1,171, and Commerce Department with 732. The largest increases were reported by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with 586, and the Virgin Islands Corporation with 507.

In the Department of Defense, increases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Army with 630, and the Department of the Navy with 362. The Department of the Air Force reported a decrease of 253.

Inside the United States civilian employment decreased 4,987, and outside the United States civilian employment increased 1,049. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in January totaled 562,038, an increase of 252.

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

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,352,799 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 172,849 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during January who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in December was 174,287. A breakdown of this employment for January follows.

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Australia	1				1
Canada	32			32	
Crete	46			46	
England	3,322		18	3,304	
France	21,942	17,922	6	4,014	
Germany	80,746	67,737	54	12,955	
Greece	275			275	
Japan	56,540	19,880	15,178	21,482	
Korea	6,270	6,270			
Morocco	2,959		848	2,111	
Netherlands	41			41	
Norway	24			24	
Saudi Arabia	5			5	
Trinidad	646		646		
Total	172,849	111,809	16,750	44,289	1

FEDERAL PAYROLL

(There is a lag of a month between Federal employment figures and Federal expenditure figures for personal service in order that actual expenditures may be reported. Payroll expenditure figures in the committee report this month are for December.)

Payroll expenditure figures in the executive branch during the first 6 months of the current fiscal year 1961 totaled $6.8 billion. These payroll expenditures for the first half of the fiscal year, July-December 1960, exclusive of pay for foreign nationals not on the regular rolls, follow:

Month:	Payroll (in millions)
July	$1,063
August	1,182
September	1,136
October	1,092
November	1,136
December	1,207
Total	6,816

U.S. pay for foreign nationals not on the regular rolls during the first 6 months of the fiscal year totaled $140 million.

REPORTS ON FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS UTILIZED BY COMMITTEES DURING 1960 IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by the committees in 1960 in connection with foreign travel.

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

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate

[Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960]

Name and 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
Senator J. W. Fulbright:											
United States, France, Italy, United Arab Republic, Jordan, Israel.	U.S. dollar						7.50		36.00		43.50
Italy	lira					921,812	1,484.40			921,812	[1] 1,484.40
United Arab Republic	U.S. dollar		48.00								48.00
Jordan	do		28.00								28.00
Total			76.00				1,491.90		36.00		1,603.90
Senator John Sparkman:											
United States, Japan, United Arab Republic, Italy, Israel, Jordan.	U.S. dollar						2,194.06		787.83		2,981.89
Japan	yen	33,339	92.60	4,250	11.80			5,752	15.98	43,341	120.38
Do	U.S. dollar								33.85		33.85
Republic of China	new Taiwan dollar.	2,000	50.00	375	9.30					2,375	59.30
Israel	pound	81.180	38.97	16.250	7.80					97.430	46.77
Jordan	dinar	4.230	11.84	2.150	6.02					6.380	17.86
United Arab Republic	pound	67.640	140.04	11.400	23.55			3.000	6.21	81.040	169.80
Italy	lira	128,660	206.19	43,986	70.82	33,478	53.90	37,880	60.11	244,004	391.02
Germany	deutsche mark					3,592.68	855.40				855.40
Total			539.64		129.29		3,103.36		903.98		4,676.27
Senator Frank Church:											
United States, Spain, Morocco, Libya, United Arab Republic, Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanganyika, Southern Rhodesia, Congo, Togo, Nigeria, Ghana, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Mali, Guinea, and Senegal.	U.S. dollar		107.80		282.18		63.13		115.09		568.20
Spain	piaster	2,690	44.83	3,532	57.06	470	7.83	380	6.46	7,072	116.18
Morocco	franc	11,000	22.00	6,500	13.00	8,600	17.05	2,000	4.00	28,100	56.05
Do	do	8,000	16.00	8,412	16.82	700	1.40	700	1.40	17,812	35.62
Libya	pound	3,020	8.52	1,065	3.00			440	1.28	4,525	12.80
United Arab Republic	do	36.080	81.18	15.830	35.62	1.725	3.85	1.400	3.15	55.035	123.80
Ethiopia	dollar	112.10	44.84	34.00	13.62	1.67	.67	43.40	17.38	191.17	76.51
Kenya	shilling	132.30	18.35	40.00	5.72	325.30	45.82	30.00	4.28	527.60	74.17
Tanganyika	do	240.00	33.80	118.00	16.64	173.00	24.37	89.00	7.51	620.00	82.32
Congo	franc	1,633	32.66	3,092	61.86	180	3.62	165	3.30	5,070	101.74
Nigeria	pound	24.7	68.18	11.16	32.54	13.7	37.34	1.4	3.35	50.14	141.41
Ghana	do	15.18	44.66	2.0	5.60	9.0	25.24	8.15	24.27	35.14	99.47
Mali	franc	2,500	10.40	11,776	49.26	740	3.07	292	1.24	15,308	63.97
Senegal						333	1.38	175	.73	508	2.11
Total			533.22		592.92		234.77		193.44		1,554.35
Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper:											
United States, Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Panama, and Venezuela.	U.S. dollar		154.24		140.78		110.23		27.73		432.98
Colombia	peso	1102.50	159.32	99.40	14.36	46.00	6.65	2.10	.30	1250.00	180.63
Brazil	cruzeiro	26,959	135.14	15,427	77.34	75,811	416.11	4,811	24.12	123,008	652.71
Ecuador	sucre	60.00	3.37					3.40	.19	63.40	3.56
Peru	sol	4,021.50	149.55	729.55	26.94	3,732.94	138.80	124.80	4.42	8,584.29	319.71
Chile	escudo	24.37	23.19	6.10	5.80	1.67	1.59	1.97	1.87	34.11	32.45
Bolivia	boliviano	250,350	20.78	120,000	9.96	20,500	1.70			390,850	32.44

[1] $427.80 of this sum rebated to State Department by airline at Washington, D.C.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate—Continued

[Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960]

Name and 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
Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper—Con.											
Argentina	peso	500	6.04			700	8.45			1,200	14.49
Uruguay	do	604.80	54.98	130.38	11.85	5.00	.45	39.88	3.63	780.06	70.91
Germany	deutsche mark					3,402	810.00			3,402	[2] 810.00
Total			706.61		287.03		1,493.98		62.26		2,549.88
Senator Wayne Morse:											
United States, etc	U.S. dollar								18.00		18.00
Brazil	cruzeiro					40,931.80	224.90			40,931.80	224.90
Colombia	peso	1,816.50	262.50	982.45	141.97	132.00	19.08	310.45	44.86	3,241.40	468.41
Total			262.50		141.97		243.98		62.86		711.31
Senator Frank Carlson:											
United States, Belgium, Netherlands, France, and Italy	U.S. dollar						12.00		40.75		52.75
Belgium	franc	1,375	27.50	1,140	22.80			285	5.70	2,800	56.00
Netherlands	guilder	40.40	10.63	5.19	1.37			4.00	1.05	49.59	13.05
Germany	deutsche mark	56.20	13.38	64.70	15.40	4,795.68	1,144.72	14.00	3.33	4,942.46	1,176.77
France	new franc	200	40.82	133.30	27.20	159.50	32.55	63	12.86	555.80	113.43
Italy	lira	12,334	19.86	16,200	26.09	1,000	1.61	2,130	3.43	31,664	50.99
Total			112.19		92.86		1,190.82		67.12		1,462.99
Carl Marcy:											
France, Italy, United Arab Republic, Jordan, Israel, and United Kingdom.	U.S. dollar						7.50		36.00		43.50
Italy	lira					921,812	1,484.40			921,812	[2] 1,484.40
France	new franc							1,446.00	295.10	1,446.00	295.10
United Arab Republic	U.S. dollar		48.00								48.00
Jordan	do		28.00								28.00
Israel	pound							227.000	105.09	227.000	105.09
United Kingdom	do							100.0.0	280.00	100.0.0	280.00
Total			76.00				1,491.90		716.19		2,284.09
Pat Holt:											
United States, Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Panama, and Venezuela.	U.S. dollar		82.84		173.44		71.67		74.93		402.88
Colombia	peso	660.00	95.38	1,027.90	148.54	543.28	78.51	772.22	109.32	3,003.40	431.75
Brazil	cruzeiro	22,788	114.24	18,518	92.84	42,834.80	234.44	12,166	60.98	96,306.80	502.50
Ecuador	sucre	60.00	3.37	18.80	1.06			207.80	11.67	286.60	16.10
Peru	sol	1,554.95	57.94	1,200.75	44.75	3,916.04	145.87	679.47	25.33	7,354.01	273.89
Chile	escudo	11.66	11.10	4.92	4.68	1.67	1.59	3.84	3.65	22.09	21.02
Bolivia	boliviano	178,700	14.83	88,950	7.38	20,500	1.70			288,150	23.91
Argentina	peso	500	6.04	13	.16	700	8.45	10	.12	1,223	14.77
Uruguay	do	322.56	29.31	205.78	18.71	5.00	.45	66.60	6.05	599.94	54.52
Germany	deutsche mark					3,402	810.00			3,402	[2] 810.00
Total			415.05		491.56		1,352.68		292.05		2,551.34
Donald G. Henderson:											
United States, Belgium, Netherlands, Germany, France, and Italy.	U.S. dollar						23.52		44.00		67.52
Belgium	franc	1,212	24.24	430	8.60			408	8.16	2,050	41.00
Netherlands	guilder	40.40	10.63	9.60	2.53			10.41	2.71	60.41	15.87
Germany	deutsche mark	51.70	12.31	51.40	12.24	4,795.56	1,141.80	22.00	5.24	4,920.66	1,171.59
France	new franc	200.00	40.82	119.70	24.33	403.75	82.40	63.00	12.86	786.45	160.51
Italy	lira	19,500	31.55	19,800	31.88	2,500	4.03	5,946	9.57	47,836	77.03
United States, Spain, Morocco, Libya, United Arab Republic, Ethiopia, Kenya, Ghana, Tanganyika, Southern Rhodesia, Congo, Nigeria, Togo, Mali, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Guinea, and Senegal.	U.S. dollar		73.75		139.42		62.88		130.58		406.63
Spain	piaster	1,560	26.00	1,886	31.38	470	7.83	230	3.96	4,146	69.17
Morocco	franc	11,500	23.00	8,706	17.40	9,300	18.45	2,200	4.40	31,706	63.25
Libya	pound	3.140	8.85	1.065	3.00			.440	1.28	4.625	13.13
United Arab Republic	do	27.450	60.76	11.420	25.88	1.725	3.85	18.500	41.63	59.095	132.12
Ethiopia	dollar	66.90	26.76	17.00	6.81	1.67	.67	5.40	2.18	90.97	36.42
Kenya	shilling	132.30	18,65	40.00	5.72	325.30	45.82	30.00	4.28	527.60	74.47
Tanganyika	do	80.00	11.30	59.00	8.32	173.00	24.37	36.00	5.11	34.80	49.10
Congo	franc	1,628	32.56	1,546	30.93	180	3.62	165	3.30	3,520	70.41
Nigeria	pound	16.12	47.04	5.18	16.26	13.7	37.34	1.4	3.35	37.1	103.99
Ghana	do	10.8.7	29.08	1.0.0	2.80	9.0.0	25.24			20.8.7	57.12
Mali	franc	2,100	9.00	5,888	24.63	740	3.07	292	1.24	9,020	37.94
Senegal	do			4,320	17.98	333	1.38	175	.73	4,828	20.09
Total			483.30		410.21		1,486.27		284.58		2,667.36
John Newhouse:											
United States, Japan, the Philippines, India, Greece, Israel, Jordan, United Arab Republic, and Italy.	U.S. dollar						26.85		208.96		235.81
Japan	yen	43,650	121.25	19,730	54.94			19,320	53.66	82,700	[3] 229.85
Republic of China	new Taiwan dollar.	2,213	55.33	460	11.50					2,673	66.83
The Philippines	peso							57.80	18.06	57.80	18.06
Hong Kong	dollar	202.20	36.11	112.10	20.01	98.	17.40	107.	19.11	519.30	92.63
India	rupee	330.77	69.49	91.06	19.13	28.	5.68			449.83	94.30
Iran	rial	2,660	35.00	1,140	14.99					3,800	50.00
Greece	drachma	752	25.07	1,112	37.07	867	28.90	1,069	35.63	3,800	126.67
Israel	pound	88.800	42.62	14.270	6.85			4.000	1.92	107.070	51.39

[2] $4.20 of this sum rebated to State Department by airline at Washington, D.C.

[3] $11.44 of this sum reimbursed U.S. Embassy, Tokyo, for personal expenses.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate—Continued

[Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960]

Name and 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
John Newhouse—Continued											
Jordan	dinar	6.100	17.08	.720	2.02					6.820	19.10
United Arab Republic	pound	49.065	101.56	19.788	40.96	4.000	8.28	3.000	6.21	75.853	157.01
Germany	deutsche mark					10,229	2,435.50			10,229	2,435.50
Italy	lira	54,755	88.17	54,788	88.23	64,537	103.93	48,840	78.65	222,920	358.98
Total			591.69		295.70		2,626.54		422.20		3,936.13

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$18,625.63
Appropriated funds:	
S. Res. 250 (86th Cong.)	4,622.84
Government Department: Department of Defense	749.15
Total	23,997.62

MARCH 13, 1961.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on foreign currencies and U.S. dollar equivalents utilized by Committee on Appropriations for the period Jan. 1 to May 13, 1960 (as provided by sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended)

Country	Kind of currency	Transportation		Lodging		Meals		Other		Total	
		Foreign currency	Dollar equivalent	Foreign currency	Dollar equivalent	Foreign currency	Dollar equivalent	Foreign currency	Dollar equivalent	Foreign currency	Dollar equivalent
Japan	yen (360 to $1)			90,878	252.44	25,740	71.50	19,588	54.41	136,200	378.35
Okinawa	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Philippine Islands	peso (2 to $1)	72	36.00	144.40	72.20	77.30	38.65	60.30	30.15	354	177.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollars (5.80 to $1)			233.80	40.31	335.24	57.80	109.56	18.89	680	117.00
Thailand	baht (21 to $1)			1,172.60	55.84	1,620.40	76.97	995.00	47.26	3,791	180.07
Ceylon	rupee (1 equals 21 cents)			262.65	55.16	157.74	33.00	35.22	7.39	455	95.55
India	do			566.88	119.04	395	82.95	178.12	37.41	1,140	239.40
Iran	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Lebanon	Lebanon pound ($1=£3.15)			153.50	48.73	231.52	73.50	146.32	46.45	528.20	168.68
Egypt	pound (1=$3.20)			35.47	113.50	19.37	62.00	13.16	42.10	68	217.60
Greece	drachma (30=$1)			1,100	36.67	155	5.16	245	8.17	1,500	50.00
Italy	lira (625 to $1)			47,692	76.30	81,550	130.50	38,750	62.00	168,000	268.80
Austria	schilling (26 to $1)			1,986	76.36	430	16.55	124	4.78	2,540	97.69
Germany	deutsche mark (4 to $1)					20	5.00	20	5.00	40	10.00
England	pound (1 equals $2.80)			69.2.5	193.55	30	84.00	16.17.5	47.25	116	324.80
Morocco	franc (550 to $1)			40,500	73.64	20,350	37.00	12,750	23.18	73,600	133.82
Portugal	escudo (28.40 to $1)			966.40	34.00	318.40	11.21	145.20	5.11	1,430	50.32
Liberia	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Total			36.00		1,247.74		785.79		439.55		2,509.08
PAA ticket purchased by GTR LO, 781,262.	German deutsche mark	10,048.50	2,392.50								2,392.50
PAA ticket purchased by GTR LO,781,263.	do	10,048.50	2,392.50								2,392.50
Total dollar equivalent			4,821.00		1,247.74		785.79		439.55		7,294.08

[1] No counterpart funds.

CARL HAYDEN, *Chairman.*

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate

[Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960]

Name and 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
Senator Dennis Chavez, Great Britain	pound	26	72.80	8	22.40	7	19.60	5	14.00	46	128.80
Senator Allen J. Ellender:											
1st trip: [1]											
Denmark	krone							27.55	4.00	27.55	4.00
Poland	zloty							2,280.00	41.45	2,280.00	41.45
Hungary	forint							1,237.00	25.77	1,237.00	25.77
Italy	lira							65,000	104.00	65,000	104.00
West Berlin	West German deutsche mark.							210	50.00	210	50.00
Transportation	do					5,382.93	1,281.65			5,382.93	1,281.65
Total [2]							1,281.65		225.22		1,506.87
2d trip:											
Portugal	escudo							300.00	10.49	300.00	10.49
Turkey	lira							23.00	2.53	23.00	2.53

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate—Continued

[Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960]

Name and 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
Senator Allen J. Ellender—Continued 2d trip—Continued											
Lebanon	Lebanese pound							314.50	100.00	314.50	100.00
Jordan	dinar							26.650	75.00	26.650	75.00
India	rupee							118.18	25.00	118.18	25.00
Thailand	baht							2,095.00	100.00	2,095.00	100.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.							199.15	35.00	199.15	35.00
Transportation	deutsche mark					10,683.54	2,543.70			10,683.54	2,543.70
Total [2]							2,543.70		348.02		2,891.72
Senator Spessard L. Holland:											
Guatemala	U.S. dollar		18.00		4.40				14.17		36.57
El Salvador	do		14.60		4.25				14.37		33.22
Honduras	do		15.00		1.25				13.87		30.12
Nicaragua	do								20.97		20.97
Costa Rica	do		18.00		4.80				15.47		38.27
Panama	do		38.19		9.50				51.77		99.46
Transportation	do						191.20				191.20
Total			103.79		24.20		191.20		130.62		449.81
Senator Robert C. Byrd:											
Italy	lira					659,944	1,062.72			659,944	1,062.72
England	pound	15.14	43.96	7.6	20.44			4	11.20	27	75.60
Switzerland	franc	96	22.22	125.50	29.05	270.00	62.50	120.50	27.89	612.00	141.66
Germany	deutsche mark	141.88	33.79	108.00	25.71	50.00	11.90	640.00	152.38	933.88	223.78
France	new franc	267.50	54.59	80.00	16.33	20.00	4.08	10.00	2.04	377.50	77.04
Belgium	franc	600.00	12.00	1,900.00	38.00	250.00	5.00	250.00	5.00	3,000.00	60.00
Spain	peseta	371.00	6.20	1,200.00	20.05	300.00	5.01	300.00	5.01	2,171.00	36.27
Portugal	escudo	641.00	22.41	216.40	7.57	500.00	17.48	150.00	5.24	1,507.40	52.70
Total			195.17		157.15		1,168.69		208.76		1,729.77
Senator Gale W. McGee:											
Congo, Leopoldville	Belgian Congo franc.	4,672	93.44	5,696	113.92	1,119	22.40	390	7.80	11,877	237.56
Nigeria	Nigerian pound	18	40.40	11/16	32.54	13/7	37.34	1/4	3.35	44/7	113.63
Togo	U.S. dollar		15.00		18.60		20.00		2.00		55.60
Ghana	Ghanian pound	16/6	45.64	2/0	5.60	9/0	25.24	8/15	24.27	36/1	100.75
Ivory Coast	U.S. dollar				15.42		18.83		2.23		36.48
Liberia	do		39.60		29.02		10.00		5.50		84.12
Mali	Central African franc.	2,500	10.40	15,176	63.26	740	3.07	292	1.24	18,708	77.97
Guinea	U.S. dollar		28.00		21.84		1.50		4.24		55.58
Senegal	Central African franc.	4,500	18.75	240	1.00	333	1.38	595	2.48	5,668	23.61
En route, airplane	U.S. dollar				84.80						84.80
Total			291.23		386.00		139.76		53.11		870.10
Senator Karl E. Mundt:											
Japan	yen	26,640	74.00	4,320	12.00			3,013	8.37	33,973	94.37
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	342	60.00	199.50	35.00			93.20	16.35	634.70	111.35
Total			134.00		47.00				24.72		205.72
Senator Roman L. Hruska:											
Spain	peseta	3,809.50	63.83	1,500	25.00			1,190	19.83	6,499.50	108.66
Do	U.S. dollar				13.43		60.50				73.93
Italy	lira	553.24	89.24	43,514	70.11			38,123	63.00	136,961	222.35
Do	U.S. dollar				5.34		5.27		5.00		15.61
Transportation	do						705.60				705.60
Total			153.07		113.88		771.37		87.83		1,126.51
W. E. Cresswell:											
England	U.S. dollar		25.72		19.89		3.50		8.46		57.57
France	do		53.90		32.40		2.44		13.96		102.70
Luxembourg	do		12.76								12.76
Germany	do		30.30		40.59		40.78		12.59		124.26
Transportation	do				4.45		180.00				184.45
Total			122.68		97.33		226.72		35.01		481.74
Leonard E. Edwards: Canal Zone and Panama.	U.S. dollar		89.00		69.90		340.00		110.86		609.76
Joe E. Gonzales:											
Argentina	peso	12,419	150.26	5,000	60.49	79,988	967.80	981	11.87	98,388	1,190.42
Do	U.S. dollar				50.00				14.40		64.40
Panama	do				2.50						2.50
Total			150.26		112.99		967.80		26.27		1,257.32
William J. Kennedy, Jr.: South America and return.	U.S. dollar		(3)		(3)		2,680.00		150.00		2,830.00
Cecil C. McDaniel: Canal Zone and Panama.	do		87.00		80.56		340.00		81.90		589.46
V. M. Rexroad:											
Great Britain	pound	16	44.80	9	25.20	10	28.00	6	16.80	41	114.80
Germany	U.S. dollar		46.70		34.00		12.30		19.70		112.70
France	do		43.00		37.25		14.70		25.00		119.25
Spain	do		67.20		51.50		13.20		19.00		150.90
Total			201.70		147.95		68.20		80.50		498.35

[1] Trip was in 2 parts because of session after recess for convention.
[2] Unable to furnish exact amount used for meals and lodging. In countries where no funds drawn, used funds previously drawn, as well as my own cash.
[3] Lodging and meals included in fare.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$8,652.63
Appropriated funds:	
Government Department (identify each):	
State Department	2,896.90
Department of the Army	1,886.64
Department of the Air Force	700.16
Commerce Department	449.81
Panama Canal Company	589.46
Total	15,175.57

CARL HAYDEN, *Chairman.*

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1347. A bill for the relief of Georgia Ellen Thomason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 1348. A bill for the relief of the Sulzbach Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1349. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the former owners of mineral interests in certain submarginal lands acquired by the United States in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Colorado, and Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1350. A bill for the relief of Hsien-Chi Tseng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1351. A bill to amend section 103(d) of title 23 of the United States Code so as to authorize the construction of an additional 1,000 miles of interstate highways in economically depressed States; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1352. A bill for the relief of Jennifer Smith and her minor child, Michael Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1353. A bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants and scholarships for collegiate education in the field of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 1354. A bill for the relief of Yolan Michel; and

S. 1355. A bill for the relief of Helen Haroian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1356. A bill to provide for 3-year staggered terms for members of county committees; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1357. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the amortization over a 5-year period of facilities constructed or acquired by farmers for use in the feeding of beef cattle; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1358. A bill to repeal section 12 of the act of June 26, 1884, prohibiting a charge or collection of fees by consular officers for official services to American vessels and seamen, and to repeal the provision of the act of June 4, 1920, authorizing the free issuance of passports to seamen; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

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

S. 1359. A bill to present a declaration of objectives for senior Americans; provide for the establishment of a U.S. Office of Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to be headed by an Assistant Secretary for Aging; authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

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

S. 1360. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. KERR:

S. 1361. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose import taxes on lead and zinc; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Inter-American Children's Institute; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO INCREASE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY MILEAGE IN DEPRESSED AREAS IS INTRODUCED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, earlier today my colleague, the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and I presented for the consideration of our colleagues S. 1351, an amendment to the Federal Aid to Highways Act, which would authorize the construction of an additional 1,000 miles of interstate highways in economically distressed areas.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release with reference to the introduction of the measure be printed in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON, March 15, 1961.—Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, has introduced in the Senate for himself and Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, an amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act which would authorize the construction of an additional 1,000 miles of interstate highways in economically depressed States.

The measure is similar to one introduced in the House by Representative JOHN M. SLACK, Jr., Democrat, of West Virginia.

Eligible States under the bill would be those in which the rate of unemployment, excluding unemployment due primarily to temporary or seasonal factors, is currently 6 percent or more and has averaged at least 6 percent during 3 of the preceding 4 calendar years.

Also included in the eligibility formula are the requirements that the annual average rate of unemployment has been at least 50 percent above the national average for 3 of the 4 preceding calendar years, or 75 percent above the national average for 2 of the preceding 3 calendar years, or 100 percent above the national average for 1 of the preceding 2 years.

FEDERAL GRANTS FOR COLLEGIATE NURSING EDUCATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill which authorizes a 5-year program of grants and scholarships for collegiate education in the field of nursing.

The same basic reasons which have prompted Congress to enact legislation for advanced education prompts me to introduce this bill, namely, the need for personnel in an occupation in which there is a critical shortage. Congress must act now to prevent any further deficit in the numbers of professional nurses.

It is difficult to overemphasize the need for action in this area. The supply of nurses in this country has been increasing constantly, but it still falls far short of demand. Chiefly because of lack of funds, it has not been able to keep pace with the many rapid changes and developments which are taking place in our Nation—for example, the unprecedented population growth caused both by a higher birth rate and greater longevity; the expansion of hospital and medical insurance; rapid advances in medical science making possible types of health care never before dreamed of—all of which have resulted in steadily increasing public demand for health services. But our citizens cannot obtain the full benefits of these marvelous advances without an adequate supply of the highly skilled professional personnel essential to provide them.

Hospitals, the largest users of nurses today, operate on a 24-hour schedule. Illness, accidents, and other catastrophes, are no respecters of the daytime hours. The skilled nurse is just as essential at 4 a.m. as she is at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. Because of the shortage of nurses, hospitals are now faced with the problem of using large numbers of unskilled workers to provide care to their patients. These workers must be adequately supervised if this care is to be safe. Nurses with a broad educational background can assume the responsibility for protecting the patient by supervising the care given by these unskilled workers.

With continuing hospital expansion and the increased interest in and emphasis on the need for a rapid expansion in the number of nursing homes there will be still further demands for nursing personnel. Construction of the building alone does not provide health services—there must be a supply of skilled personnel, including nurses, to give care to the patients.

The public has learned the value of preventive health services. There is a crying need for more public health nurses; industry has expanded its nurse employees by 5,000 in the last 6 years; and there has been a 20-percent increase in the number of school nurses employed during this same period.

This need is acute today. It could well assume catastrophic proportions should the present precarious world situation become more critical.

Full recognition of the public's responsibility for financial support of nursing education is long overdue. Professional nursing services are important—in fact, often a key part—of expanding health programs which are contributing so much to our country's high standard of living.

Education for the practice of nursing had its early development within the confines of the hospital. There it was, and still is, financed largely by students through their services to the institution and through student fees. Only in relatively recent times, since the development of nursing programs in colleges and universities, has there been any substantial expenditure of public funds for nursing education. This country needs nurses. Yet we fail to make adequate provisions within our colleges and universities for educating young people to enter this important profession. It is unreasonable to expect those entering the field to continue to bear the cost of training programs in service institutions.

Unless educational opportunities in institutions of higher learning are expanded and adequately supported in the immediate future, the present shortage of professional nurses will become even more acute. In view of the past neglect of this field as one requiring public support, within established methods of financing education for the professions, immediate and special attention to its needs are demanded at this time.

The National League for Nursing has estimated that the number of annual graduations from collegiate schools of nursing must be tripled within the next few years if the need for highly skilled professional nurses is to be met. This means we must undertake an immediate expansion of nursing education in colleges and universities. In order for existing schools to expand in the next few years, and in order to stimulate the establishment of new nursing programs in institutions of higher education, I believe Federal aid is necessary for the next 5 years.

At the present time annual graduations from collegiate nursing programs are increasing—25 percent between 1954–56—but not at a rate large enough to meet the needs for professional nurses with broad educational backgrounds that prepare them for modern nursing practice, and for entrance into graduate programs.

In 1956 Congress passed Public Law 911, a 3-year program aimed at meeting a most critical need in nursing. This law provides for traineeships at the graduate level to prepare teachers, supervisors, administrators, clinical specialists. Some impact on this need has been met with this assistance. However, in some areas of the county, this program is not as effective as it might be because there are not enough nurses with baccalaureate degrees to take additional work in a master's or doctoral program. My bill proposes to fill this gap by providing an adequate number of highly skilled practitioners who are qualified to enroll for graduate work. The numbers of nurses who can be prepared in advanced programs in the future will depend upon the number of qualified candidates coming out of basic programs with baccalaureate degrees.

The proposed bill provides for three major areas of aid, the first of which is for construction. In a study conducted by the National League for Nursing, it was found that one of the deterrents to increasing enrollments was the great need for classrooms, laboratories, and libraries; offices and residence facilities. At the present time there are 193 schools of nursing offering a baccalaureate degree. The bill provides that schools may receive grants with no school receiving over $500,000 in the 5-year period. This matching formula has been tested in many other programs of the Federal Government and has proven to be sound.

The second section of the bill provides for costs of instruction. The schools queried also stated that if additional students are enrolled there will be need for more faculty. Even with their present enrollment schools could absorb more faculty. But in order to expand both the student enrollment and the teaching staff, financial assistance is needed. Scholarships alone increase the costs of instruction, they do not help the schools. I believe that aid for costs of instruction is an absolute necessity for expansion. I am proposing that each school receive not more than $25,000 each year of the 5-year program, and that new schools may be eligible for two-thirds of the costs for the 5 years.

The third section provides for scholarships. These would be available to the enrolling student in a collegiate program for the first time and for those graduate nurses who hold a diploma from a 3-year hospital school of nursing. At the present time about 4 percent of high school graduates enter nursing, but it is hoped that this bill will stimulate a larger number to choose nursing as a career. Graduate nurses who wish to pursue their education for positions in clinical specialties or additional responsibility need these scholarships.

To eliminate the current deficit of qualified professional nurses, to provide for future needs, to make sure that the country will not be caught short of this vital service in time of emergency, the public must give attention now to financing nursing programs in colleges and universities.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "If Funds Were Available," which appeared in the American Journal of Nursing, December 1959, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1353) to authorize a 5-year program of grants and scholarships for collegiate education in the field of nursing, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The article presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

IF FUNDS WERE AVAILABLE—NURSING EDUCATORS CITE NEEDS FOR PUBLIC SUPPORT IN COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS

Nursing's Federal legislative efforts will focus on securing financial aid for collegiate nursing education when Congress reconvenes in January. Expansion of such programs is one of the primary needs for public support outlined by the American Nurses' Association.

In spearheading this effort, the ANA will seek passage of H.R. 1251, a bill introduced last January by Representative EDITH S. GREEN, Democrat of Oregon, and its companion, S. 1118, introduced by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota.

These bills propose a 5-year, $100 million program of grants to schools for the construction of teaching facilities; a 5-year $50 million program of grants to assist with costs of instruction; and a 5-year, $50 million program of scholarship aid for nursing students in preservice baccalaureate programs and to graduate nurses in supplemental programs leading to a baccalaureate degree.

This effort is one of three priorities of need for public support outlined by the ANA Committee on Legislation in accordance with the ANA platform approved by the house of delegates in 1958. The other two priorities are traineeships or scholarships for nurses in advanced programs preparing for teaching, administration, and supervision in nursing; and research and research fellowships.

Focus on securing financial aid for supplemental and basic programs in nursing leading to a baccalaureate degree is possible now because of the 5-year extension of the Federal traineeship program. Through this program, administered by the Division of Nursing Resources, U.S. Public Health Service, nurses are able to secure funds to prepare for positions in administration, supervision, and teaching. During the past year, ANA devoted much of its legislative effort to the extension of this program.

As demands for more as well as better prepared nurses continue, ANA believes the public must provide financial support for nursing education as it does for education in other health professions.

WHY COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS?

The need for such aid has received support from nurses and nursing educators throughout the country. Many have urged action on this legislation. This is what they say:

University of Southern Illinois, Carbondale, Ill: "Teachers for schools of nursing are prepared only in institutions of higher learning. If the cost of higher education is prohibitive, the students may be forced into other fields, thus increasing the already distressing shortage of qualified personnel. Without financial assistance in some form,

teachers who are no better qualified than the students they teach must be utilized."—Virginia H. Harrison, chairman, department of nursing.

Visiting Nurse Association of Brooklyn, Inc., Brooklyn, N.Y.: "This bill (H.R. 1251) is an important step in meeting the critical need for qualified personnel in all areas of nursing, including public health."—Doris Eldredge, president.

Rutgers University, Newark, N.J.: "Most everyone knows that there is a shortage of nurses, but not all are aware that the shortage extends to quality as well as to numbers. The truth of the matter is, of course, that nursing education has not kept pace with changes in our social order that affect the health needs of our people. We are today, 50 years after the establishment of the first college program in nursing, preparing 82 percent of our people in hospital programs of nursing much as we were at the turn of the century. In other words, we are today preparing yesterday's nurses to meet today's need for nursing care."—Ella V. Stonsby, dean, college of nursing.

The Mary Fletcher Hospital, Burlington, Vt.: "It is our policy to help direct young people into the type of nursing program for which they seem best fitted. Many tell us they would like to go to the University of Vermont's nursing program, but they cannot afford it. We need students of nursing in hospital schools and in the new type of associate degree program, but our greatest need is to somehow direct more into a college nursing program. With additional preparation and experience, these nurses can more quickly fill the greatest gap we have—the lack of qualified teachers, supervisors, and administrators of nursing."—Grace B. Buttolph, director, school of nursing.

Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.: "There is indeed an acute and urgent need for financial aid in this area of education for essential health services. A school of nursing is ordinarily one of the most expensive educational units in the university because the number of students each faculty member has must be limited when teaching clinical nursing in hospitals and public health agencies."—Gladys Kiniery, dean, school of nursing.

PROGRAMS FOR R.N.'S LIMITED

University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.: "This university conducts no program for registered nurses since we do not have adequate faculty for the purpose. The constant increase in enrollment in our basic program has meant that all available funds must go for faculty in that program, and, even so, we do not have enough. Yet there is urgent need for a baccalaureate program for registered nurses at this university and for scholarships for such nurses."—Carolyn L. Widmer, dean, school of nursing.

University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass: "There is a growing demand for a supplementary program at the University of Massachusetts. Hospital administrators, directors of schools of nursing and of nursing service, and, indeed, graduates of diploma schools of nursing themselves, are increasingly urging such a program, not only because of the accessibility of the university and the modest tuition rate, but also because married faculty members find it difficult, if not impossible, to be far away from their children and family. The university administration is most sensitive to this education need. However, the problem of financing an educationally sound program is ever before us. The provision of H.R. 1251 for grants to assist in the costs of instruction in baccalaureate programs is a necessity if educationally sound collegiate nursing education is to survive."—Mary A. Maher, dean, school of nursing.

BASIC PROGRAMS SUFFER

Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.: "Washington University plans to offer the basic baccalaureate program in nursing, but funds are not yet available to meet the anticipated deficit for the first 4 years of operation. The registrar's office at the university estimates that about 50 applications were accepted from young women who did not enter the university in the fall semester when they discovered no program in nursing was available."—Louise Knapp, director, school of nursing.

University of Maine, Orono, Maine: "There are five diploma schools of nursing in Maine of which only one has received full accreditation by the National League for Nursing. One of the handicaps to full accreditation is the lack of prepared faculty. Another lack in the State is that of prepared public health nurses. A major reason for these lacks is that there is no baccalaureate program for nurses in the State. We plan to establish one as soon as we are able, but such a program will require additional faculty."—Jean MacLean, director, school of nursing.

SCHOLARSHIPS SADLY LACKING

University of Maryland, Baltimore, Md.: "The University of Maryland graduates a class of 50 to 60 students each year in the baccalaureate program. We have a huge medical center and could accommodate classes of at least 200 students if the applicants had scholarship aid. Then, too, we have many out-of-State requests from applicants who are unable to pay the fees and maintenance. Roughly, more than 50 percent of our applicants request financial assistance."—Florence M. Gipe, dean, school of nursing.

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.: "Many high school graduates and graduates of hospital schools of nursing who are eager to take advantage of the opportunities offered in baccalaureate programs at the School of Nursing of the University of Pennsylvania are unable to do so because of financial need. For example, 30 qualified high school graduates who live within commuting distance and who were interested in attending this university could not apply for admission to the basic baccalaureate program because of financial need. Because of lack of dormitory space at the present time, enrollment in this program is limited almost exclusively to students who can commute. In 1960, when the new women's dormitories are available, it will be possible to admit a much larger number of students and the need for scholarships will increase proportionately.

In the general nursing program (for graduates of diploma schools of nursing) 114 full-time students and 541 part-time students were enrolled in the fall term, 1958. Sixty-nine of the full-time students could not have attended without some financial assistance. Approximately 150 of the part-time students could have attended full time if scholarships had been available."—Theresa I. Lynch, dean, school of nursing.

Chico State College, Chico, Calif.: "If finances were available, Chico State College could prepare twice the number of students that we now have because of our excellent clinical program and the contract we have with the medical center in San Francisco for the use of clinical facilities."—Agnes A. Dix, coordinator, department of nursing.

University of Nebraska, Omaha, Nebr.: "Frequent requests come from students interested in the University of Nebraska program for scholarship aid. Very little such aid is available and, as a result, good degree candidates are frequently lost."—Irma M. Kyle, director of nursing, school of nursing.

Northwestern State College, Natchitoches, La.: "The majority of students desiring admission to our school come from rural areas and need to have financial assistance available to them in order to attend college."—Hilda C. Burnham, dean, school of nursing.

University of California, Berkeley, Calif.: "During 1958, the University of California accepted 65 students for admission to its basic baccalaureate program. Of this number, 15 asked that their names be withdrawn prior to admission because of inability to finance the program. In a recent survey of financial needs of the group of 50 who entered in September 1958, only 20 percent indicated they were having no financial difficulties."—Helen Nahm, dean, school of nursing.

University of Illinois, Chicago, Ill.: "There is a basic difference in the education for nursing which I believe makes financial assistance of more importance for students in this field than in many others. This is the nature of the clinical practice required. Even in the collegiate school, where the hours of clinical practice are limited to those required for educational purposes, the number of clock hours per week exceeds those of the students enrolled, for example, in the liberal arts and sciences. This factor makes it more difficult for the student in nursing to contribute significantly to the cost of her education."—Emily C. Cardew, dean, college of nursing.

OUTGROWING FACILITIES

University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio: "The college of nursing and health is one of two colleges on the university campus without a building of its own. It is estimated that a building of the size which would accommodate the college would cost at least $800,000. It has been necessary to use classrooms, laboratories, and offices belonging to other colleges in the university. With the present and anticipated increase in enrollment in all colleges in the university, those now sharing facilities with the college of nursing and health are finding it increasingly difficult to continue to provide for nursing."—Laura E. Rosnagle, dean, college of nursing and health.

Meharry Medical College, Nashville, Tenn.: "Since 1957, it has been necessary to use some double-decker beds in rooms designed to accommodate a single student. The recreational rooms, classrooms, and office space for instructors are also inadequate."—Laurie M. Gunter, dean, school of nursing.

University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.: "The University of Colorado has made great effort since 1941, but even now the medical center constructed through private donation in 1924 is sadly outgrown and money for adequate construction seems hard to come by. My own office is the unused motion picture booth behind the medical amphitheater. It will just hold my desk and four chairs. Classroom space is bitterly fought for with the nurse-teachers often the losers. Forty years of growth in the medical and nursing schools has to be provided for in some way."—Henrietta Adams Loughran, dean, school of nursing.

Boston University, Boston, Mass.: "To care for expanding enrollments we need additional teaching facilities which include a nursing laboratory, science laboratories, nutrition laboratories; offices for additional faculty, secretaries and a general counselor; four additional conference rooms, three additional classrooms accommodating 60 students, two accommodating 150, and other adjunct rooms.

"Boston University, like many other universities which have undertaken responsibility for nursing education, has already outgrown the limited physical plant with which it started. We have also estimated that 26 additional teachers would be needed for this kind of expansion."—Marie Farrell, dean, school of nursing.

QUALIFIED FACULTY SHORT

Russell Sage College, Troy, N.Y.: "Our problems in relation to instructors for our nursing programs are twofold. There are far too few adequately prepared instructors

to meet our minimal needs, and the number of instructors needed for clinical instruction is much higher in the collegiate school of nursing than in other departments of the college. A large number of students may be present in the classroom with one instructor, but in the clinical area of the hospital or in public health, the instructor is not only responsible for the teaching and supervision of the student learning to give nursing care but also for the maintenance of good quality of patient care and the safety of patients."—Dorothy McMullan, director, school of nursing.

Medical College of Georgia, Atlanta, Ga.: "Our approved budget does not permit the employment of an adequate number of faculty. Many of our present faculty are heavily burdened with an overload and will wear out long before they should. Financial assistance in this area would be of inestimable help. It would improve the program for those students currently enrolled, would improve faculty opportunities for study and research, and would make it possible to offer short courses, conferences, and make available other educational opportunities which, as a State institution, is our responsibility."—E. Louise Grant, dean, school of nursing.

Indiana University, Indianapolis, Ind.: "Our enrollment has increased more than four times since the collegiate program was first initiated in 1950. We have currently a considerably larger number of students interested in admission to the school than we had last year. Of this number, many of the more able students have indicated need for scholarship aid to enroll this coming fall. Even with such scholarship aid, it is impossible to accept the number who are in process of meeting the requirements for entrance without a decided increase in faculty and in instructional facilities. Without financial assistance the number of qualified faculty needed cannot be secured."—Emily Holmquist, dean, school of nursing.

University of Mississippi, Jackson, Miss.: "The University of Mississippi School of Nursing has been in existence only 10 years and is the only collegiate nursing program in the State. To date the enrollment has been low but is increasing each year. However, without additional teaching and instructional facilities it will not be possible to expand the school enough to meet the needs of the State.

H.R. 1251 could be used in Mississippi to increase enrollment from approximately 50 to 150 students if the following 5-year grants were made: construction, $300,000; instruction, $195,000; and scholarships, $50,000."—Christine Olgevee, dean, school of nursing.

CONSULAR SERVICES TO VESSELS AND SEAMEN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal section 12 of the act of June 26, 1884, prohibiting a charge or collection of fees by consular officers for official services to American vessels and seamen, and to repeal the provision of the act of June 4, 1920, authorizing the free issuance of passports to seamen.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State, dated January 19, 1961, to the Vice President in regard to it. I might add that the committee is also in receipt of a letter dated March 9, 1961, from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations in support of this legislation.

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

The bill (S. 1358) to repeal section 12 of the act of June 26, 1884, prohibiting a charge or collection of fees by consular officers for official services to American vessels and seamen, and to repeal the provision of the act of June 4, 1920, authorizing the free issuance of passports to seamen, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, 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 (1) section 12 of the Act of June 26, 1884 (23 Stat. 56; 22 U.S.C. 1186), shall be and the same is hereby repealed, and (2) that the second proviso of section 1 of chapter 223 of the Act of June 4, 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 750; 22 U.S.C. 214), shall be and the same is hereby further amended by striking out the phrase "or to seamen,".

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 19, 1961.

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

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith for the consideration of the Congress a draft bill to repeal section 12 of the act of June 26, 1884, prohibiting a charge or collection of fees by consular officers for official services to American vessels and seamen, and to repeal the provision of the act of June 4, 1920, authorizing the free issuance of passports to seamen.

The purpose of the draft bill is to enable the Department, under the Government's miscellaneous user charges program and the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 140, to charge and collect fees for certain official services rendered by consular officers to American vessels and seamen. This bill is the same as S. 2232 which was introduced in the 1st session of the 86th Congress and failed to pass.

The Bureau of the Budget on January 17, 1961, informed the Department that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary,
(For the Secretary of State).

DECLARATION OF OBJECTIVES FOR SENIOR AMERICANS ACT

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators CLARK and RANDOLPH and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a U.S. Office of Aging.

The reasons should be clear to all.

With the White House Conference on Aging behind us, there is no overall, coordinating agency on the Federal level dealing with the problems of the aged in our country.

The Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging recommended the creation of such an Office of Aging in each of its two reports.

The latest report devotes an entire chapter to the question—presenting a careful, studied argument for a top level agency concerned with:

First. Grants for planning assistance to the States for studies and program development;

Second. Demonstration programs to implement the declaration of objectives for senior citizens embodied in the bill;

Third. Assistance to institutions and organizations for research and training programs in aging;

Fourth. Stimulation and coordination of existing and new Federal programs in the field of aging.

The basic idea in this bill is not a completely new one. Earlier attempts along the same general line have been made since at least 1950. But this year, I urge that we finally make the idea a concrete reality.

I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum, prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1359) to present a declaration of objectives for senior Americans; provide for the establishment of a U.S. Office of Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to be headed by an Assistant Secretary for Aging; authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA for himself and Senators CLARK and RANDOLPH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The memorandum presented by Mr. MCNAMARA is as follows:

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR PAT MCNAMARA, CHAIRMAN, SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROBLEMS OF THE AGED AND AGING

A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE U.S. OFFICE OF AGING

A major recommendation of the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, in its report of February 1960, called for legislation to establish the U.S. Office of Aging, concerned full time with the full range of problems of America's senior citizens.

In line with this recommendation, the attached bill provides for the creation of the U.S. Office of Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and headed by an Assistant Secretary of HEW for Aging. The bill authorizes $2,090,000 for planning grants to the States to help them organize to meet the problems of aging in their States and to conduct necessary surveys and studies. It further authorizes $10 million in project grants to expand demonstrations, in sustaining the creative contributions of the elderly, and $2 million for training personnel and research.

A declaration of objectives for senior Americans

The bill sets forth a 10-point declaration of objectives for senior Americans as the

declared policy of the United States to insure for them a life of recognition, honor and dignity in active retirement. These objectives are:

1. An adequate income.
2. The best possible physical and mental health.
3. Suitable housing.
4. Full restorative services.
5. Equal opportunity to employment.
6. Retirement in health, honor, and dignity.
7. Pursuit of meaningful activity.
8. Efficient community services when needed.
9. Immediate benefit from proven research knowledge.
10. Freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative.

The U.S. Office of Aging

1. The act establishes the U.S. Office of Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

2. It creates a new position of the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Aging to be head of the Office of Aging and to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

3. Functions of the Office:

(a) A clearing house of information related to problems of the aged and aging.

(b) Assist the Secretary in all matters pertaining to the aging.

(c) Administer grants provided by the act.

(d) Conduct research and demonstration programs in the field of aging.

(e) Provide technical assistance and consultation to States and localities.

(f) Prepare and publish educational materials dealing with welfare of older persons.

(g) Gather statistics in the field of aging.

Grant programs

The act provides for three types of grant programs to be administered by the U.S. Office of Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

1. Planning grants of $2,090,000 ($40,000 to each State, $10,000 to the Virgin Islands) to assist each State to conduct studies, develop plans for new programs, and improve and coordinate existing programs.

2. Project grants to the States to initiate and operate projects to further the policies set forth in the declaration of objectives for senior Americans.

(a) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, $10 million are authorized for appropriation, rising to $15 million in 1963, $20 million in 1964, and $25 million for fiscal year 1965.

(b) These funds are to be granted to the States in accordance with a Hill-Burton formula of matching grants, with a minimum of $50,000 to each State.

(c) State plans for such project grants shall be approved by the Secretary.

3. The act authorizes grants to nonprofit institutions and organizations to conduct research and training programs. The sum of $2 million is authorized for this purpose.

An Advisory Committee on the Aged and Aging

The Secretary is authorized to establish an Advisory Committee on the Aged and Aging composed of professional and public members.

An Interdepartmental Committee on Problems of Aging

The act authorizes the creation of an Interdepartmental Committee on Aging composed of the Secretary of HEW as Chairman, and the Secretaries of Labor, Commerce, Treasury, and Agriculture, and the Administrators of HEW, VA, and the Civil Service Commission.

1. Functions of the interdepartmental committee:

(a) To strengthen and coordinate existing programs in the departments.

(b) Advise the President with respect to executive and legislative action.

(c) Facilitate Federal, State, local relationships across departmental lines.

2. The Assistant Secretary of HEW for Aging is to be the Executive Director of the committee and he would utilize the services of the U.S. Office of Aging as the staff of the interdepartmental committee.

Reports to the President and the Congress

The Secretary of HEW is to submit to the President and the Congress a report of progress under this act in the field of aging by January 1, 1963.

INTER-AMERICAN CHILDREN'S INSTITUTE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Inter-American Children's Institute.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific joint resolution to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this joint resolution as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, dated January 18, 1961, to the Vice President in regard to it. I might add that the committee is also in receipt of a letter dated March 9, 1961, from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations in support of this legislation.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Inter-American Children's Institute, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of February 16, 1960 (74 Stat. 3) which amended the Act of May 3, 1928, as amended (22 U.S.C. 269b) is hereby amended by deleting the phrase "for the fiscal years 1961 and 1962".

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

JANUARY 18, 1961.

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

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I submit herewith a proposed draft of an amendment to the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Inter-American Children's Institute.

This draft legislation has the purpose of deleting a phrase in the present legislation which, by limiting the authority for making appropriations to the fiscal years 1961 and 1962, in effect will end U.S. membership in the Inter-American Children's Institute, an organization in which we have participated and played a leading role since 1928.

The Inter-American Children's Institute is an entity whose proven technical abilities and whose contributions to the well-being of the children of the participating American states have been recognized throughout the Americas. Our leadership in this hemisphere and position of acknowledged competence in matters of children's social welfare, is unquestioned. Without U.S. membership the effectiveness of the organization's program would be adversely affected.

Within the framework of its primary purpose as a center for technical consultation, advisory services, to foster a helpful publications program, and for the dissemination of information on all matters pertinent to the welfare of the children of the Americas, the Inter-American Children's Institute has recently staged successful seminars on child nutrition which in turn have stimulated several Latin American countries to sponsor national seminars on the subject. In cooperation with UNICEF, the Institute is sponsoring a training course for pediatricians.

It is giving active support to reconstruction efforts in Chile by helping to plan and staff centers for child care training in Chilean disaster areas. Despite its comparatively low budget of $80,000 annually, the Institute is recognized throughout the Americas for its high degree of technical performance in matters of child welfare.

The elimination of a time limit on our membership is considered in the best interests of our effective participation in the activities of the Organization. Otherwise long-range consideration of the direction that the Organization should take and the most efficient way in which it should operate would not be possible since continuation of U.S. membership could not be assured beyond the time limits contained in the authorization act. It would appear paradoxical for the United States at every second year's meeting of the Directing Council of the Children's Institute to have to qualify the entire U.S. support of the Institute, to say nothing of our share of the assessment quota which is more than vital to the existence of the Organization.

It would also be more in conformity with the pattern of membership's authorization governing our participation in other international organizations, including the United Nations and its specialized agencies; the Organization of American States and other inter-American organizations, various other regional organizations and organizations of a more limited single-function type.

U.S. participation in the Children's Institute, a specialized organization of the Organization of American States, is a means of expressing this Government's support of Pan American solidarity. Our continuing membership in the Children's Institute, insured by the favorable consideration of the draft legislation submitted herewith, would assure the Americas of our willingness to continue to share our special skills and knowledge with the less developed countries. It is hoped that Congress will be able to give favorable consideration to this request during the present session.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Bureau of the Budget on January 13, 1961, informed the Department that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State.)

LEASES AND GRANTS OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY ON INDIAN LANDS IN STATE OF NEW YORK—AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING) submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1062) to authorize leases and grants of right-of-way on Indian lands in the State of New York, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

COMMUNIST AGGRESSION AGAINST HUNGARY AND TIBET

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I was deeply moved by the words of Monsignor Béla Varga's invocation this morning. It was a great privilege to have him with us again. He is a man who has the rare distinction of having been sentenced to death by both the Nazis and the Communists.

I am sure all of us joined with him in his prayer that the blessings of freedom be restored to the brave Hungarian people and to the hundreds of millions of other peoples in Europe, and also in Asia, who today are shut off from these blessings.

But an act of prayer, as I see it, is also an act of self-dedication. If we pray for freedom, but if in our actions we deny freedom or fall short of defending it, we shall not merit the divine assistance for which we pray.

It is from this standpoint, Mr. President, that I wish to comment on certain recent reports that have appeared in the press.

In the New York Herald Tribune of March 9 there was a report to the effect that Ambassador Stevenson favored dropping the so-called cold war issues from the United Nations agenda, thus cutting the agenda "to the bone." The article stated that Mr. Gromyko favored a deal whereby Russia would drop its U–2 and RB–47 charges of aggression against the United States, if we would drop charges of Communist aggression against Hungary and Tibet. The article further pointed out that the United States and Britain were unwilling to swap individual items in the manner proposed by Gromyko, but simply were asking for a blanket agreement to defer all major cold war items.

I earnestly hope the Herald Tribune report was in error. For my part, I can see no difference, morally, between an Anglo-American position that would strike out all so-called cold war items, and Gromyko's monstrously unequal horse-swapping proposal—the U–2 and the RB–47 for Hungary and Tibet.

In the long run, both proposals would add up to the same thing: Hungary and Tibet would be forgotten. If anything, I would find Gromyko's formulation less offensive precisely because it does not dissimulate.

Again let me say that I hope these reports are in error, as newspaper reports have sometimes been in the past. I have great admiration for the manner in which Mr. Stevenson has acquitted himself as American Ambassador to the U.N. He has spoken firmly and eloquently; and he has, in my opinion, more than held his own with the Russians. If the several accounts of his position are inaccurate, then I believe he does himself an injustice by not issuing a categorical denial. Indeed, the absence of such a denial has disturbed me as much as has the report itself.

The RB–47 and the U–2 matters are cold war issues in the sense that they are fraudulent and are deliberately designed to exacerbate tensions. But Hungary and Tibet are different. They involve fundamental, moral, humanitarian, and political issues which go to the very root of the U.N.'s existence. The U.N. cannot strike the questions of Hungary and Tibet from its agenda without abandoning all pretense to be an organization founded on the rule of law in international affairs.

Such an action, in my opinion, would sound the moral death knell of the U.N.

Murder does not cease to be murder after the passage of 4 years, nor does genocide cease to be genocide. If we are to accept evil and aggression as soon as they become faits accomplis, then one does not have to be a prophet to foresee that we shall be confronted with fait accompli after fait accompli.

Mr. President, today I have sent to Ambassador Stevenson a telegram in which I express the hope that the report was in error, and I set forth some of the thoughts I have presented here. In my telegram I have urged that the American delegation to the U.N. pursue with renewed diligence the questions of Hungary and Tibet, by way of emphasizing our unshakeable dedication to the ultimate goal of freedom for all nations.

If we thus commit ourselves and thus conduct ourselves—at the United Nations and at every other forum, and on every available occasion—then the prayer for freedom in which we have joined today will assume real significance and will offer real hope.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of an article entitled "Hungarians and Tibetans Fight for Action by U.N." which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 9, 1961.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a telegram from Christopher Emmet, chairman of the American Friends of the Captive Nations, sent to Ambassador Stevenson.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 9, 1961]

HUNGARIANS AND TIBETANS FIGHT FOR ACTION BY U.N.—OPPOSE STEVENSON'S PLAN TO TRIM AGENDA IF IT MEANS DESERTING THEM

(By Joseph Newman)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., March 8.—U.S. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, embarked on a policy of trying to reduce cold war antagonisms at the United Nations, ran into trouble today when Hungarian and Tibetan refugees accused him of abandoning their cause.

Speaking for the Hungarian committee, composed of Hungarian political leaders in exile, Bela Varga, its president, said that oral and written protests will be delivered to U.N. delegations sympathetic to their cause.

The Hungarian committee hopes to mobilize sufficient support among member nations to defeat Mr. Stevenson's proposal to cut the agenda of the current Assembly session "to the bone."

Tibetan exiles feel the way the Hungarians do, and they are seeking assurances from Malaya and Thailand, which have sponsored a resolution on their behalf, that they will hold out against Mr. Stevenson's proposal.

At a meeting with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko Monday, Mr. Stevenson suggested that the resumed session of the General Assembly limit itself to relatively routine matters, such as elections to the Economic and Social Council, defer consideration of cold war issues and then shut down as soon as possible.

RUSSIAN PROPOSAL

Mr. Gromyko was disposed toward a deal whereby Russia would drop its U–2 and RB–47 charges of aggression against the United States if the latter would drop charges of Communist aggression against Hungary and Tibet. He was unwilling to defer debate on disarmament, which is said to have been Mr. Gromyko's principal reason for coming to the resumed session, or on Cuban charges of aggression against the United States.

David Ormsby-Gore, chief British delegate, conferred today with Mr. Gromyko, and he reportedly had no more luck than Mr. Stevenson in persuading Russia to drop all cold war issues. The United States and Britain are unwilling to trade individual items and in effect are asking deferment of all major cold war items or nothing.

According to an informed delegate, the Soviet Union would agree to cut the agenda "to the bone," as requested by Mr. Stevenson, if the United States would agree to a special General Assembly on disarmament in the spring, as proposed by Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, or to a summit conference in the near future.

CONFUSION CREATED

The "bone" agenda proposal created some confusion among delegates in general, and they started speculating that there was much more behind it than meets the eye.

One version was that the United States was seeking to bring down the world temperature in preparation for a series of steps which would lead to the summit.

President Kennedy's letter now being carried to Mr. Khrushchev in Siberia was related to such an imagined action.

However, American sources at the U.N. discouraged all speculation about the "bone" agenda being related to a summit conference. They also dismissed the idea of a special session on disarmament.

MARCH 9, 1961.

Ambassador ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
U.S. Mission to the United Nations,
New York, N.Y.:

Our executive committee is deeply concerned about your statement Tuesday in favor of cutting U.N. agenda to bone in order to avoid discussing the cold war. Plan would indefinitely prolong recent U.N. silence about Soviet aggression in Hungary and total defiance of U.N. resolutions by Soviet Union and Kadar government. It would be most unfortunate, whatever our real intentions, if the United States appeared to be adopting Communist view and vocabulary, which defines the moral issues involved in aggressions against Hungary and Tibet as cold war issues.

We strongly support the appeal against omission of Hungary from agenda by Monsignor Bela Varga, chairman of the Hungarian committee, as reported in Thursday's New York Herald Tribune. We respectfully

urge that only valid reason to postpone discussion of Hungary and Tibet would be if meaningful negotiations were taking place to obtain Communist compliance with Assembly resolutions. Our information shows that U.N. debates on Hungary always tended to relieve Communist pressure on Hungarian people, at least to some extent. We are convinced that publicity about Hungary would increase, not diminish, our bargaining power in all negotiations with Soviet Union.

CHRISTOPHER EMMET,
Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN CONNECTICUT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, unemployment in Connecticut has reached critical proportions. The total of jobless is now 90,000—8.2 percent of Connecticut's working force. Nine percent or more of the working force is jobless in 11 of our major cities: Bristol, Danielson, Torrington, Norwich, Ansonia, Meriden, New Britain, Willimantic, Waterbury, Danbury, and Middletown. In the city of Bristol, 17 percent of the working force is out. This amounts to a serious situation, almost an emergency situation.

No question, other than peace and national security, is as important as this matter of unemployment. If a man cannot find a job, other happenings in the world matter little.

Combating unemployment involves many things, and action by Congress is one of them.

During the next few weeks I will support and work for prompt enactment of a program of Federal action aimed at putting people back to work in Connecticut and in the Nation.

This program includes:

First, extension of the duration of unemployment compensation benefits to keep unemployed workers afloat while we try to put them back on the job.

Second, passage of the depressed areas bill which will bring grants and loans for new plants and facilities, vocational training, and other aids into such depressed areas of Connecticut as Ansonia, Bristol, and Danielson.

Third, a long overdue program of tax reform which will grant all businesses, small and large, greater depreciation allowances for retooling with new equipment, and will give small business a better break on funds used for expansion and modernization.

Fourth, Federal aid for public-school construction and Federal loans for private and parochial school construction.

Fifth, a rapid buildup in the urban redevelopment program, which will speed action on many Connecticut projects now underway and will assure a faster start on projects now awaiting approval in Hartford, New Britain, Waterbury, New Haven, and West Haven.

Sixth, a liberalization of home-mortgage-loan provisions, which will mean lower downpayments and lower interest rates. This should spark an immediate upsurge in housing construction which will boost employment in a variety of fields.

Seventh, acceleration of the Federal highway construction program.

Eighth, increase in the minimum wage, and extension of its coverage—steps which will aid our own low-income workers, while pushing up wage scales in sections of the country that use low wages as one incentive to lure industry away from Connecticut.

Ninth, an expansion of military spending on missiles, aircraft, nuclear submarines, and other weapons—which will give needed strength to our national defense and a welcome boost to Connecticut's great defense industry.

Tenth, the development of a national mass transportation program, which will help to solve critical problems faced by the New Haven Railroad and other transportation lines whose survival is vital to the employment of thousands.

I recognize that these measures are only short-term, partial remedies for what has become a long-term problem. The American economy is essentially healthy, but not healthy enough. It is growing, but it is not growing fast enough.

It is a fact that just as our rate of employment is lagging, so, also, is our rate of construction of adequate public facilities. Each of the programs I have outlined, except for the unemployment compensation bill, would be fully justified on its own merits, even if there were no unemployment. And rising unemployment gives us an additional reason for pushing these measures with a sense of urgency.

Long-term solutions involve other factors: Finding some proper balance between raising tariffs to protect American industries that are being destroyed by imports, and lowering tariffs to assist industries which depend upon exports for their welfare; adjusting our tax laws to stimulate risk capital and to encourage American businesses to replace $80 billion worth of obsolete machinery and plant facilities with the new equipment necessary in order to be able to compete around the world; a reevaluation of all the factors that lead to the overpricing of American products, including a new look at work rules which protect featherbedding, wage increases which are not justified by increased productivity, and administered prices which are artificially high, due to monopolistic practices.

But those who are unemployed today cannot wait for long-term solutions. We can help to meet their immediate problem by speeding up these programs, which are fully justified in their own right, and, if acted upon now, can help greatly in the vital job of putting idle men and women back to work.

SENATE MANUAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I call attention to the new Senate Manuals which will be placed on the Members' desks. This edition of the manual, just issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration, incorporates all changes, up to adjournment of the 86th Congress, in the Standing Rules and Standing Orders of the Senate, in the public laws relating to the Senate, and in the statistical and other pertinent materials carried in the volume.

One editorial aspect of this revision is worthy of notice: I refer to the incorporation of section numbers in the margins throughout the manual. Index references are now to those section numbers, rather than to pages. By this device, one can go directly to a desired section without scanning an entire page. Also, if desired, the Senate Manual may henceforth be cited by its own section numbers.

Each Member of the Senate has been advised by the Sergeant at Arms that 10 cloth-bound copies of the manual are available in the Senate warehouse for his distribution. It is the hope of the Committee on Rules and Administration that each Member will assign some of these volumes to key personnel on his staff and his committees.

HUNGARIAN FREEDOM DAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, March 15 represents Hungarian Freedom Day, for it was on March 15, 1848, that a group of liberty-loving and patriotic Hungarians in their fervent desire for freedom and independence were able to gain certain freedoms from Chancellor Metternich, of Austria.

Today, the Hungarian people are again under the yoke of tyranny—this time, under Soviet Russia. However, we cannot speak of Hungarian Freedom Day without referring to the courageous Hungarian freedom fighters who, in a desperate and hopeful attempt to free themselves and their children, smashed through the Iron Curtain by sheer courage. The Red-dominated Hungarian Army, some defecting to the cause of liberty, was brushed aside. For a while it seemed that the Hungarian freedom fighters had gained their objective; but the Russians in an attempt to back the tide, sent across the frontier masses of savage troops with tanks, which systematically wiped out units of men and boys, and even women, armed only with rifles. Over 50,000 were killed. The Communists then unleashed terror beyond comprehension against these brave Hungarian people.

But the people of Hungary behind the Iron Curtain still have hopes for freedom, just as do the other brave people to the north and to the south of them, who also are behind the Iron Curtain. These people cannot speak or celebrate a freedom day on March 15, but the Hungarians and their friends throughout the free world can do so for them.

It is our fervent hope that the day will come when all freedom-loving people will be free from governmental tyrannies of all kinds. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the former Prime Minister of Hungary, Ferenc Nagy, and an attached memorandum on the Hungarian problem.

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

HUNGARIAN COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1961.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Permit us to draw your kind attention to the 113th anniversary of

the Hungarian revolution of March 15, 1848, which will be celebrated by Hungarians all over the world as a national holiday, in commemoration of the freedom fight of the Hungarian nation against the oppressing Hapsburg dynasty and which was finally crushed by the united Austrian and Russian Armies.

Since this year the celebration of this national holiday will precede the U.N. debate on the problem of Hungary we would be extremely grateful if you would kindly contribute to the commemoration of this anniversary by raising your invaluable voice in the Senate in favor of the Hungarian cause by demanding that the 12 political resolutions adopted by the U.N. General Assembly since the Hungarian revolution be enforced, that Soviet troops be withdrawn, that basic human rights and the right of self-determination be restored to the Hungarian people so that they could decide the form of government they want by free elections under international control.

It is the shame of the 20th century that at a time when underdeveloped nations are liberated one after another, the Hungarian people with a record of a thousand years' independence, are still in Soviet bondage despite their world-shaking freedom fight in 1956.

A massive and impressive demonstration in both Houses of the U.S. Congress for the Hungarian cause and the adoption of an appropriate resolution demanding the enforcement of the U.N. resolutions may considerably impress the governments and U.N. delegates of the new nations. Consequently they might devote more attention not only to the Hungarian question, but also to the Soviet falsehood of making Moscow appear as the true spokesman of self-determination and independence. To reveal this Soviet falsehood is of prime Western interest.

For that purpose we take the liberty to attach to this letter a memorandum which briefly summarizes the present situation in Hungary.

Being convinced that you, sir, will do your best in order to commemorate in this sense the Hungarian Independence Day, we convey to you the expression of our high esteem and warmest thanks.

Sincerely yours,

FERENC NAGY,
Former Prime Minister of Hungary.

MEMORANDUM ON THE HUNGARIAN PROBLEM

In his speech delivered in the Ganz factory in Budapest on December 2, 1959, Premier Khrushchev bluntly declared that the Hungarian revolution was crushed because the Soviets wanted to preserve the Communist regime in Hungary. He also openly admitted that the revolution was due to the extreme despair of the Hungarian people as a reaction to Rakosi's terror regime. His third sensational revelation was that even his colleagues in the party presidium had misgivings that the Soviet military intervention might be "misconstrued" abroad.

These revelations strikingly confirmed the facts established by the U.N. investigation organ that the nationwide Hungarian revolution of October 23, 1956, was due to the exasperation of the people with the Communist system and foreign domination.

However, although they were ready to sacrifice their lives for freedom and democracy, they very realistically stressed in their political manifestation the necessity of good-neighborly relations with the powerful Soviet Union. The authentic spokesmen of the revolution had many times declared that they were not intent on converting Hungary into an anti-Soviet base. On the contrary, they emphatically advocated the idea of an internationally recognized neutrality, as it was officially proclaimed by the Imre Nagy government.

The United Nations General Assembly has, since 1956, successively adopted 12 political resolutions on Hungary, demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops and free elections under international control, while condemning the Soviet Union for the brutal crushing of the victorious Hungarian revolution. The consistent Soviet defiance of these resolutions has gravely affected the prestige of the world organization by creating a dangerous precedent for the impunity of members who do not comply with the General Assembly resolutions in critical situations.

Although the political action of the United Nations could not be enforced, the mere discussion of the Hungarian situation during the annual sessions of the General Assembly on Hungary is keeping alive the Hungarian peoples' spirit of resistance under a seemingly quiet apathetic surface.

It is the most revolting injustice in the 20th century that the Hungarian people, with a record of a thousand years of independence, is languishing in the most ruthless colonial bondage of the Soviet Union, while even backward peoples are gaining nationhood and independence one after another, thanks to the help of the Western Powers.

The present situation in Hungary may be briefly illustrated as follows: Continuation of persecution of patriots, secret trials and executions, a ruthless drive for the collectivization of agriculture, institutional violation of basic human rights, psychological exploitation of the presence of Soviet troops, preservation of the forced labor camps despite official denials, and control and persecution of the clergy. It is a strikingly small minority which rules the country, with the help of the presence of the Soviet troops. Although the presence of the Soviet armed forces allegedly serve only the purpose to defend the country against attacks from abroad, this Communist explanation is refuted by the fact that they are encircling Budapest in order to be able to stifle in bud any attempt of a coup d'etat against the regime.

Speeches of the Communist Party leaders delivered at the Party Congress in 1959, and later on the rare occasions when the so-called National Assembly was convened, clearly indicate that Moscow wants to tighten the regime in Hungary, showing the Soviet determination to present Hungary as a completely socialized state in order to eliminate one of the most outstanding problems in Eastern Europe and to make it, thus, disappear from the U.N. General Assemby forever.

The Hungarian exile leaders are fully aware of the present difficult and complicated military and political world situation. They know that the situation is not favorable at the present time for a concrete solution of the Hungarian problem. They believe, however, that the raising by the Western world of the Hungarian question in the United Nations and at other international conferences, as well as in the parliaments of the free world would be a realistic political move presenting some important, immediate, and long-range advantages both for the West and for Hungary.

From the short-range point of view the most evident advantage of the West could derive would be the positive impact on the morale of the Hungarian people. Thus, the deterrent effect of the spirit of resistance of the Hungarian and other captive nations would not only be preserved, but enhanced.

In raising the Hungarian question the West may reap further short-range advantages since it would enable the West to denounce with striking evidence and arguments the true aims of the Soviet effort to pose in Africa, Asia, and Latin America as the greatest champion of anticolonialism, independence, and self-determination.

The consistent raising of the Hungarian question would also serve long-term interests, because it would display Western determination not to acquiesce in the communistic usurpation of power, which would have important significance for the future. Such a Western attitude would encourage smaller free nations and even America's smaller allies to resist Communist pressure and subversion.

The extreme effectiveness of Soviet diplomatic strategy lies in the very fact that the Soviets have a long-range prefixed program which they are realizing step by step with greatest determination and energy. Therefore, only a consistent and bold Western strategy, aimed at an overall settlement in Europe, instead of a piecemeal policy of making peace could counter the Soviet Union's diplomatic offensive in the long run.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, when future historians look back upon the 20th century, they almost certainly will remark on the great paradox of our times: That while great numbers of people achieved liberty, freedom, and sovereignty, equally large numbers were put under bondage.

March 15 is the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of 1848 when that nation cast off the yoke of the Hapsburg dynasty. This once proud national holiday is not celebrated in Hungary today because the Hungarian people are now captives of international communism.

Russian troops stand guard in Hungary to be sure that the people do not rise up as they did in 1956 in an attempt to break their bonds.

Since 1956, the United Nations General Assembly has adopted 12 resolutions condemning the Soviets for their brutality in crushing the revolution of 1956 and demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops and free elections under international controls.

But Moscow is disregarding outraged world opinion. The Red rulers are continuing their persecution of patriots and clergy. Secret trials and executions still take place, forced labor camps still exist, and collectivization of agriculture is still the objective of the Communists. Moscow hopes that complete sovietization of Hungary will encourage the world to remove the Hungarian item from the U.N. agenda and forget the story of the people who rose up to be free.

Our statements in Congress on this Hungarian national holiday are a reminder to those on both sides of the Iron Curtain that the memory of the Hungarian Revolution will not be erased. Our understanding of the progress of civilization is that man proceeds from slavery to freedom and not vice versa.

Perhaps it will not happen this year or next. But eventually dictatorship must crumble and policies of brutality and oppression must give way to sanity. When that comes to pass, we will be ready to welcome the Hungarian people into the world community of free and sovereign nations.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, friends of Hungarian independence all over the world are today celebrating the Hungarian revolution of 1848, in commemoration of one among many inspiring episodes in that nation's continuing struggle for national independence.

Today, too, representatives of the Hungarian Communist regime of Janos Kadar sit in the United Nations, unfortunate evidence that not all Hungarians are so dedicated to national independence. These representatives sit in the United Nations under a cloud, their credentials not acted upon by the international organization. Since the rising of the Hungarian freedom fighters in 1956, their ruthless repression by Soviet Russian tanks, and the reinstallation of a Communist puppet government in Hungary, the United Nations has passed a dozen resolutions on this tragic situation. All have been ignored by the Kadar regime.

While the Soviet Union continues its charges about Western imperialism, its own troops still remain on Hungarian soil, helping to maintain in power a Communist government clearly incapable of surviving any genuinely free election.

Having punished all the students and other patriots of the 1956 uprising it could find, the Kadar regime is now directing its efforts in persecution of members of the Catholic clergy and laity who have not sufficiently inclined before the dictatorship falsely called a dictatorship of the proletariat. And Cardinal Mindszenty, who took refuge in the American legation on November 4, 1956, remains there today for his safety.

Mr. President, in our dangerously divided world, the United Nations may not be able to take direct action to right these injustices. But it can keep the spotlight of publicity on such deprivations of individual rights and dignity as the tragic events in Hungary. On this anniversary of the Hungarian revolution, friends of freedom everywhere join in the fervent hope that the future holds a happier fate for the brave people of Hungary.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Hungary stands as the gateway of Europe, and as such it has always been a battleground for invaders from the east. Against all such invaders Hungarians had to defend themselves, and they did this successfully during most of their history. They succeeded in maintaining their national entity against all contending forces. In the 17th century, however, they were forced to submit to Austrian rule, and their country became part of Austria's multinational empire. Numerous times they tried to shake off the foreigner's unwanted yoke, but they were unsuccessful in their attempts. At last in 1848 their efforts along these lines succeeded.

In that year revolutionary forces undermined the authority of the Austrian Government under its outlying provinces. Even in Vienna the Government's authority was flouted. Hungarian leaders in Budapest were looking for just such an opportunity. When they learned of the troubles in Vienna, early in March they prepared a list of their demands and presented it to the Government in Budapest on March 15. The Government, not being in a position to refuse, acceded to the demands made by the Hungarian patriots on that same day. Since then March 15 has become the Hungarian national holiday, and every year its anniversary is celebrated by the Hungarian people.

Today, on the 113th anniversary of that historic event, the people in Hungary are not allowed to observe its anniversary. But they still cherish the ideas embodied in their Freedom Day, and they have no doubt of their eventual freedom. We are fully aware of their sufferings under communism, and particularly of the treacherous way they were dealt with in October of 1956. But while Khrushchev's ruthless agents are doing their worst to suppress all freedom in Hungary, freedom still lives and gathers force in the hearts of all stouthearted and liberty-loving Hungarians.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today marks the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of 1848. Unfortunately, the brutal suppression of the Hungarian revolution of November 1956 makes this a sad occasion. To me, this brutal suppression is particularly vivid, as I was on that Hungarian border, at the bridge of Andau, as thousands upon thousands of Hungarians walked to freedom through the freezing cold, the mines, and the barbed wire.

My admiration for these brave people and for their ideals increased with the passing of the ensuing year I spent working with the Hungarian refugees.

Mr. President, all those who enjoy the blessings of freedom extend their sympathy and admiration to the brave Hungarians who throughout history have demonstrated their desire to be free. We can never forget the sacrifices of the Hungarian people nor should we ever yield on our insistence that the United Nations resolutions dealing with the Hungarian revolution be implemented. This is the least we can do to demonstrate our solidarity with our Hungarian brothers who have shown the world that no amount of oppression can dampen man's innate desire for liberty.

On this day, Mr. President, our hearts and our thoughts go out to the Hungarian people with the fond hope that someday they will once again be free.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the celebration, on March 15, of the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of 1848 presents anew the opportunity to salute the embattled people of Hungary. A few minutes ago we heard the eloquent prayer delivered by Msgr. Béla Varga, who commented on that event. They have fought with undiminished courage for their freedom and independence, in spite of oppressive rulers and crushing defeats.

Today, oppression by a small ruling clique, which is supported by the armed might of Soviet troops, is the order of the day in Hungary. The United Nations General Assembly has, since 1956, adopted 12 resolutions condemning the Soviet Union for its brutal suppression of the Hungarian people's revolt, and demanding that Soviet troops be withdrawn and that free elections be held under international control. The Soviet Union has defied these United Nations resolutions; but, despite the fact that they cannot be enforced, the knowledge that the Hungarian situation is regularly discussed in the General Assembly of the United Nations helps to keep alive the spirit of resistance of the Hungarian people.

They serve notice that the free world will not yield to the power tactics of communism, and are a warning to the newly developing countries of Asia and Africa of the true aims of the Soviet Union, lurking behind the demagogic and deceitful slogans it employs. The freedom of Hungary is a touchstone of our fight for free world security. I will do all I can—and so will, I know, millions of others—to help the Hungarian people and other captive peoples held by communism to keep bright and clear the spirit of their ultimate freedom and independence.

WORLD TRADE CENTER IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the past decade has seen an expansion of world trade unprecedented in history. Between 1950 and 1960, world imports and exports have nearly doubled, from a total of $117 billion in 1950 to more than $225 billion last year. During this same period, the U.S. 75 percent increase of foreign trade was equally remarkable—from less than $20 billion in 1950 to more than $34 billion in 1960—especially when compared with our international trade of $5.5 billion in 1938, the last year before the outbreak of World War II.

The primary port and the great center of the U.S. participation in world trade has been the port of New York. Well over a quarter of this Nation's imports and exports have passed through the port during this period of trade expansion, and more than one-half of them have been financed on a few acres of land located on the island of Manhattan, which is the very heart of this great port.

Mr. President, millions of Americans throughout the Nation owe their livelihoods to the work which every day of every year draws the ships, trucks, and the planes of the world to the port of New York. Last year these ships, trucks, and planes carried 14 million tons of cargo, and brought hundreds of thousands of tourists, to and from the United States.

Now, after more than 2½ years of intensive work, the port of New York is proposing to establish a World Trade Center, under the auspices of the New York Port Authority and the Downtown-Lower Manhattan Association, under the leadership of David Rockefeller and John D. Butt, which will do honor to the greatest trading Nation in the world, as well as to the greatest port of this Nation. This World Trade Center will cost $355 million to build. Except for those features of it which envisage urban renewal, all of this money will come from private sources. Thus, the port of New York joins New Orleans, San Diego, San Francisco, Boston, and Houston in the establishment of a great trade center which will help to keep the United States as the leading trading nation of the world. The trade expansion of the 1950's was only a

precursor of what will take place during the coming decades, when the developing nations of the world will become the vast markets for our products. The port of New York will be ready.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the presentation of the Port of New York Authority of this project, including its letter of transmittal to the Governors of New Jersey and New York and the mayor of the city of New York. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD editorials from the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Times on this subject.

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

THE PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY,
New York, N.Y., March 10, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT B. MEYNER,
Governor of the State of New Jersey.
Hon. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor of the State of New York.
Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Mayor of the City of New York:

On January 27, 1960, the Downtown-Lower Manhattan Association addressed a report to Your Excellencies, the Governors of the States of New Jersey and New York, and to Your Honor, the mayor of the city of New York, in which it proposed the establishment of a World Trade Center in the New York-New Jersey port district. The association recommended to you that the Port of New York Authority undertake a study of the planning, financing, and activation of such a facility of commerce. That study, authorized by the commissioners of the port authority at its meeting of February 11, 1960, has now been completed.

A World Trade Center in the bistate port, as developed in the study, would bring together the many government agencies, American as well as foreign, for the greatly improved coordination of the governmental and administrative procedures involved in negotiating, financing, arranging for and clearing the movement of import-export cargo through the port; centralize the existing trade information agencies located in the port; provide a central marketplace for international trade through the port; stimulate the entry of U.S. manufacturers and business firms into foreign trade activities through the port; and assist oversea concerns and representatives in their negotiations with American agencies and companies using the port.

The essential findings of the World Trade Center study are:

1. The establishment of a World Trade Center in this port would benefit the people of the entire port area. It would maintain and stimulate the flow of commerce through the port district of northern New Jersey and New York and thus would increase employment at the marine terminals of the port as well as in related businesses and industries in the two States.

2. The development of a World Trade Center with its conforming architectural plan developed during the study is in the public interest and is economically feasible.

3. The unique problems inherent in the financing, organization and operation of a World Trade Center make it probable that the project could be undertaken successfully only by a public agency.

There has been a positive response to the concept of a World Trade Center from representatives of the world trade community. For example, the U.S. Customs Service, foreign consulates and trade promotion offices, and the New York Stock Exchange have already expressed interest in participating in the center.

A final decision on the establishment of a World Trade Center can be made only after additional planning and conclusive negotiation with prospective participants. Further progress in these activities, however, can be made authoritatively only by an organization empowered to enter into commitments and to proceed with financing and construction. We recommend, therefore, that an appropriate organization be authorized to be responsible for the planning, financing and establishment of a World Trade Center in the port of New York.

The Port of New York Authority has been honored to have had the opportunity to make this study which, if implemented, can be of enormous significance to the citizens of the States of New Jersey and New York and particularly to the millions of people who depend upon the continued prosperity of the port of New York for their livelihood.

The commissioners of the port authority respectfully submit this report to the Governors of the States of New Jersey and New York and to the mayor of the City of New York for their consideration and determination of any further action they may wish to direct toward the establishment of a World Trade Center in the port of New York.

Sincerely,

S. Sloan Colt, Howard S. Cullman, N. Baxter Jackson, Joseph A. Martino, Bayard F. Pope, Alexander Halpern, James C. Kellogg III, Donald V. Lowe, John J. Clancy, Robert F. McAlevy, Jr., W. Paul Stillman, Charles W. Engelhard.

THE NEED FOR A WORLD TRADE CENTER

The generally accepted concept of a World Trade Center involves the establishment and operation of a facility of commerce that would stimulate and facilitate world trade and make more effective and efficient the functioning of related service agencies by bringing together the offices of government and industry involved in world trade activities.

A center was established in New Orleans by the organization of "International House" in 1945 and its companion "International Trade Mart" in 1948. Since then, other world trade centers have been established in San Diego, San Francisco, and Boston, and one is now under construction in Houston. A center also was recently established in Rome, Italy. These centers generally provide merchandise display areas, office space, trade libraries, promotional activities, and related functions. They have in each case reflected a community interest in their establishment and have received, in most cases, public financial support or assistance.

WORLD TRADE IS BASIC TO THE ECONOMY OF THE NEW JERSEY-NEW YORK METROPOLITAN AREA

The proposal of a World Trade Center in the port of New York recognizes that the flow of foreign and domestic cargoes through the port of New York is the most important single economic factor in the prosperity of the New Jersey-New York metropolitan area. A study conducted by the port authority in 1956 indicated that some 430,000 jobs paying over $2.1 billion in wages each year are provided by the movement of oceanborne cargo through the port of New York.

Equally important, each of the 430,000 port jobs creates an economic condition equivalent to two additional jobs—or a total of 1,300,000 jobs, representing an annual income of $6.3 billion. Considering the worker and his family, a total of 3,120,000 port district residents of a total population of about 13 million are found to be directly or indirectly dependent for their livelihood upon the port's waterborne commerce. Thus, the port provides the economic basis for existence for one out of every four persons who live in the port district and provides more than 25 percent of the total wages earned annually in the port district.

In addition, the availability of the unparalleled transportation facilities of the port of New York has been of significant importance to the development of export manufacturing operations in the States of New Jersey and New York. Based on the latest available statistics, 14 percent of the total U.S. general cargo exports originate in the States of New Jersey and New York, thus making the bistate area adjoining the port the Nation's leading export manufacturing center. Indeed, approximately 20 percent of the manufactured output of the State of New Jersey, valued at more than $1 billion annually, goes into foreign markets. Approximately 140,000 New Jersey industrial workers are dependent upon this foreign trade for their income. The State of New York sends approximately 12 percent of its manufactured output valued at more than $1.5 billion annually into foreign markets. Approximately 206,000 of New York's industrial workers are dependent upon this foreign trade for their income.

The volume of oceanborne general cargo, the most important income-generating segment of the port of New York's foreign trade, in 1959 climbed to 13.1 million tons, or 8.4 percent above 1958. The growth of the port's general cargo, however, did not keep abreast of the national expansion of general cargo in foreign trade. Hence, New York's share of U.S. oceanborne general cargo declined from 27.0 percent in 1958 to 24.7 percent in 1959. Oversea air cargo, consisting primarily of high-value freight, continued its dynamic growth in 1959, increasing 32 percent over 1958, to 42,600 tons.

In viewing the port's strong performance in 1959, it must be noted that the record tonnage obscures the fact that the competitive position of the port as the Nation's leading port has been slowly declining since the end of World War II. The 24.7 percent share of total U.S. oceanborne general cargo is the lowest which the port has ever recorded. This low percentage continued the trend which has been evident since 1952 when the port handled almost 33 percent of the total U.S. oceanborne general cargo in foreign trade. The trend is evidenced further by preliminary reports of the cargo tonnages moving through the port in 1960. Although the volume is higher than it was for the same period in 1959, the percentage share is even lower. This decreasing share reflects the intense competition existing among ports of the United States. It is also representative of the industrial development of southern, midwest, and far west sections of the Nation and the resultant growth of the ports adjacent to these sections. It results too from the many artificial freight rate handicaps which favor other U.S. ports in their competition with the port of New York.

It is thus of overwhelming importance to the metropolitan area of northern New Jersey and New York, to its economy and its population, to do everything possible to maintain the preeminence of the port of New York, to insure that increasing amounts of cargo in foreign trade continue to move through the port, and to make every effort to preserve and enhance the port's competitive position as the focal point for U.S. foreign trade.

The establishment of a World Trade Center in the port of New York, the Nation's leading port and the established center of international trade, thus would be a challenging undertaking. The existing world trade community of the port includes a complete range of world trade services and involves a multitude of individual organizations and agencies. Not only is the port of New York the Nation's leading port, but to a great extent the international trade community of the United States is focused

on the port. Over one-half of the Nation's foreign trade is financed in lower Manhattan. The largest concentration of foreign consulates, exporters and importers in the entire United States is loctaed in the metropolitan area of the port, and the port is the natural gateway for the growing influx of foreign business visitors to the United States.

The economic unity of the bistate port is exemplified by the operations of this world trade community. Although the service and transaction functions of the community itself are to a great extent located in Manhattan, the cargo with which it is concerned flows across piers located throughout the harbor without regard to State or municipal boundaries. This is illustrated by inbound voyages of four general cargo ships which recently arrived at port Newark, Jersey City, and Hoboken. These ships discharged approximately 24,000 tons of general cargo involving 832 individual shipments. The processing of the import documents for 821 of these shipments occurred at the customhouse in Manhattan and in most cases was performed by customs brokers whose offices are in Manhattan. Of the total shipments, 657 were controlled by consignees located in Manhattan. These same ships carried approximately 9,700 tons of general cargo involving 543 separate shipments on their outbound voyages. All of these ships were arranged for by freight forwarders or by shippers located in Manhattan and all export declarations on the cargo were processed at the customhouse in Manhattan. Similarly, the financial, insurance, and other necessary service functions vital to world trade, while concentrated in Manhattan, serve all the marine facilities of the bistate port area.

Although historically the world trade community is the very basis of the economy of the port district, to a great extent it suffers today from its dispersal over widely separated areas of Manhattan. A World Trade Center in the port of New York, therefore, should have as its objectives the providing of a focal point for as great as possible representation of the world trade community and of its many and varied functions—consolidated in an effective and efficient working relationship.

On the basis of the study of the need for a World Trade Center in the port of New York, a World Trade Center should provide for:

1. The marketing activities of international trade.

2. The multitude of administrative services essential to the movement of goods in international trade including customhouse services.

3. A concentration of the various exchanges for commodities and securities and of the banking institutions which serve international trade.

4. A concentration of informational facilities to enable world traders to transact business more efficiently and expeditiously.

5. A focal point for the world trade community leading to more extensive exchange of ideas and more direct action in the solution of problems in the international trade field.

WORLD TRADE CENTER BENEFITS TO PORT

The study covered the feasibility and desirability of a World Trade Center designed to provide for this wide range of services and activities. A positive response has been received to the concept of a World Trade Center for the port of New York embodying these functions. Qualified and competent representatives of every segment of the world trade community have endorsed the proposed World Trade Center as being advantageous to them and to world trade. While this response cannot be interpreted as guaranteeing the ultimate realization of the center, it provides a sound basis for a reasonable expectation that an economically feasible World Trade Center can be developed.

In general, the approval of the concept of a World Trade Center in the port of New York-New Jersey resulted from a recognition that such a center would provide the following advantages to the world trade community and to the port:

1. Simplify and expedite the processing of administrative and procedural matters involved in arranging for the movement of export and import cargo through the port, resulting in savings in time and money as well as improved service.

2. Centralize and improve the trade information services now located in scattered areas of the port.

3. Provide a marketplace for U.S. products available for export through the port which would attract foreign buyers from around the world.

4. Provide an international marketplace for import products for U.S. buyers.

5. Establish a central location for agencies of the United States and foreign governments concerned with the port's commerce, thereby making it possible for them to serve the world trade community more effectively.

6. Simplify communication among members of the world trade community in the port, permitting them to identify more easily their common problems, to devise means of solving these problems and to implement programs to achieve solutions.

7. Stimulate the entry of U.S. manufacturers into export activities by providing information on foreign markets, giving them exposure to buyers for these foreign markets, and offering assistance in identifying and using efficient procedures for their export trade operations through the port.

Most importantly, to our two States and to the many municipalities along the shores of this great harbor, such a World Trade Center in the port of New York would have the direct benefit of increasing the amount of cargo moving across the docks in every area of the New Jersey-New York port. These increases could be expected to result from the fact that the World Trade Center would:

1. Further enhance the port's ability to provide shippers with the most efficient possible service.

2. Attract more buyers and sellers to world trade, thus expanding the port's trade.

3. Bind more tightly to the port the management offices controlling export and import operations of U.S. and foreign firms, thus keeping them especially aware of the port of New York and of the many advantages it offers.

4. Enhance the competitive position of the New Jersey-New York port by bringing together into more efficient working relationships the participating segments of the port's world trade community and by serving as a constructive symbol of the port's leadership in handling international trade.

WORLD TRADE MARKETING

Perhaps the greatest challenge lies in the world trade marketing area. A world trade market must be basically a place for the buying and selling of goods.

The various channels of marketing now available to the international trader are numerous. They include distribution channels based in the United States, such as resident buyers or other types of middlemen, which will be described in subsequent sections of this report; the direct use of distribution channels based abroad, such as agents, distributors, salesmen or buyers located in foreign markets, and an increasingly important segment of marketing, the direct production of goods in the foreign market area, either through subsidiary corporations or through licensing agreements. Many firms may use several of these different channels of distribution, depending upon the requirements of individual foreign markets or, in some cases, the requirements of specific transactions.

Most proposals for a World Trade Center have involved a marketplace consisting primarily of permanent exhibition facilities. Permanent exhibit facilities, however, are but one aspect of the many and varied marketing mechanisms and activities involved in the conduct and development of world trade. This study, therefore, has evolved a concept for the provision of facilities to suit the individual needs of all those agencies and firms involved in the exchange of goods in international trade. Thus, the World Trade Center would provide for the varied office functions involved in international trade operations and also for permanent exhibition of goods, but in quantities and spatial relationships that would suit the needs of the individual participating firms. The concept then is one which focuses both on the goods moving in international trade and on the persons and organizations involved in the exchange of goods.

The proposed World Trade Center, therefore, should include an area which provides (1) substantial quantities of space suitable for permanent exhibits, and (2) office space adjacent to the display areas. This area, combining both office and exhibit facilities, would be available to a continuing flow of buyers throughout the year. The response to this proposal during the study indicates substantial interest in participation in an area designed along these lines and which might appropriately be called a world trade mart. The study indicates also a general recognition by world traders that significant benefits could be obtained in creating such a central point for world trade marketing operations.

There are three general areas of the international trade process that should be accommodated within a world trade mart:

(a) U.S. export activities.
(b) U.S. import activities.
(c) Trade promotional activities.

EXPORT ACTIVITIES IN THE WORLD TRADE CENTER

While a precise measure of the number of firms in the export trade is not available, studies indicate the following potential market:

1. Two thousand nine hundred U.S. corporations whose products account for 76 percent of the total dollar volume of U.S. exports.

2. Two hundred combination export managers who represent over 3,000 manufacturers, and are responsible for more than half of the dollar volume of business through combination export managers.

3. Two thousand general exporters with operations large and stable enough to be considered for possible interest in a World Trade Center.

From the standpoint of export operations, the U.S. Department of Commerce has stated that less than 4 percent of the manufacturing concerns in the United States maintain continuing export programs. This concept of a world trade mart therefore offers a possible starting point for entry into international trade by the multitude of U.S. firms which do not now participate. These firms could gain exposure to thousands of foreign businessmen arriving through the port of New York. The U.S. export expansion program is aimed at enlarging the number of American firms participating in export trade, and such a program would undoubtedly complement actively the participation of such firms in a world trade mart.

IMPORT ACTIVITIES IN THE WORLD TRADE CENTER

There are in the United States at the present time approximately 4,200 import establishments. Of these, almost one-half are located in the port of New York. Our studies indicate that the potential market for in-

terest of importers in the world trade center would include:

1. One thousand eight hundred import merchants. Statistics from the U.S. Bureau of the Census indicate that the number of firms and the volume of import business of this group and of the import agents has, since 1954, been growing at a more accelerated rate than that of the overall import volume. The concentration of world trade services and information facilities is of particular interest to this group.

2. Two hundred fifty import agents. With the increase of actual buying for the volume of imports for various areas of commerce within the United States, the import agent has become increasingly important. His function does not ordinarily require display space.

3. One hundred fifty foreign firms having sales offices in the United States. With the increasing expansion of production of corporations in foreign countries has come an increase in the number of sales offices established by these companies in the United States.

SURVEY SHOWS MART CONCEPT FEASIBLE

Conferences were held with executives of 67 representative national import and export trade associations and with executives of 57 U.S. corporations exporting abroad, which for the most part represented leading firms in their respective fields. In these discussions, the reaction to the proposed world trade mart was overwhelmingly favorable.

There was uneven interest in the mart by those in the import field. Those importers currently located in market areas for consumer goods have little interest in moving from these market areas. However, they do express specific interest in the more extensive and more easily accessible information which could be available in a World Trade Center. Those importers active in the commodity trades more easily fit into the concept of the World Trade Center. Their interest in participation, however, would depend upon the inclusion in the center of the various commodity exchanges described in a succeeding portion of this report.

In contrast, there has been active and significant interest in the establishment of national areas within the World Trade Center. As explained in the following section of this report, these national areas would be concerned initially with trade promotion and development rather than with actual business transactions.

TRADE PROMOTION IN THE WORLD TRADE CENTER

Perhaps the most enthusiastic response to the world trade marketing concept has come from those agencies interested in promoting the international exchange of goods rather than in actually transacting business. One group of agencies involved in such promotional efforts are the foreign consulates, foreign trade commissions, and foreign chambers of commerce. Interviews with 68 of the foreign consulates and trade commissions and with 14 of the foreign chambers of commerce indicated strongly that there is a sound basis for organizing promotional activities through national units. The mart thus might contain numerous foreign areas, each incorporating the consulate (or at least the commercial section), trade commission, chamber of commerce, and sales offices of major corporations or a combination of two or more of these activities of each nation involved.

Another area of participation in the mart by promotional agencies is that of various U.S. regional organizations. A prime example of this type of agency is the Port of New York Authority, which unquestionably would move its eastern trade development office to the world trade mart. Similarly, it can be expected that other regional groups of the United States might want to locate exhibit areas in the world trade mart. The study has not attempted to evaluate through actual formal survey the possibility of such participation on a regional basis, although informal expressions of interest have been received from several out-of-town sources.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 14, 1961]

THE WORLD TRADE CENTER WE MUST HAVE

About the proposed World Trade Center, let's pull out all the adjectival stops at once and cheer.

This is what New York has wanted for years—one big facility to bring together governmental agencies, coordinate the procedures of international commerce, centralize trade information, provide a central marketplace, and in general meet all the infinite needs of world business in America's No. 1 port.

The Port of New York Authority, at the behest of the Downtown-Lower Manhattan Association, has now reported back to Governors Rockefeller and Meyner and Mayor Wagner that the World Trade Center is economically feasible, would stimulate commerce and increase employment.

Now, this is precisely what has been said all along. But now we have the specific recommendations in exciting magnitude—a 16-acre complex on the lower East River with a 72-story world trade mart, a 30-story world commerce exchange, a 20-story trade center gateway, and for good measure a new home for the Stock Exchange.

The port authority estimates the required investment at $335 million, assuming this is to be urban renewal, says the development would best be guided by one organization, and suggests that only a public agency undertake the job.

That, pretty obviously, means that the port authority, which has the resources, is eagerly waiting to be asked. And of course it should be, for the World Trade Center means more business, more jobs, more money to every part of the metropolitan region. Certainly this is of overwhelming common importance to New York and New Jersey as partners in the port district.

There is a familiar statistic that one out of every 4 persons in 13 million regional dwellers is directly or indirectly dependent on our port's commerce for a livelihood. The World Trade Center will fortify that economy by stimulating foreign trade and enhancing our competitive position against rival ports.

The investment of $335 million, a self-liquidating proposition with no property taxes lost, means a mighty great lot of advantage in going after the export-import dollar. The only wonder is that the World Trade Center with all that it promises in so many civic and economic directions, wasn't built long ago.

The thing to do now is to make up for lost time. The port authority, by reason of its substance and its record as port salesman and port developer, is clearly the right party. The respective legislatures ought to have no misgivings in charging the bistate agency to proceed with the World Trade Center, for this is surely the most important development for the port of New York in many a year.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 14, 1961]

A WORLD TRADE CENTER

The $355 million World Trade Center proposed for the bi-State port of New York would have a stimulating influence on the whole metropolitan area. The location chosen, a 16-acre site in lower Manhattan, bounded by Old Slip, Fulton Street, and Pearl and Water Streets, is logical—one might almost say mandated by circumstances, historic and present. In this strip along the East River a multilevel concourse, a 72-story world trade mart, a circular 8-story securities exchange, a 30-story world commerce exchange, and a 20-story trade center gateway would be built in a construction schedule that calls for the completion of these structures by 1968.

When David Rockefeller and John D. Butt, acting for the Downtown-Lower Manhattan Association, delivered a package of ideas to city hall October 14, 1958, for salvage and redevelopment of the southern part of the island it was the forecast of a great future, in which hundreds of millions of dollars would be invested. The idea for a World Trade Center was a sequel of this early planning, and was put to the Port of New York Authority to study and test out feasibility. The port authority has spent a year in such study, has even enlarged the horizons of what in the beginning seemed a highly ambitious undertaking, and has declared its confidence that the project is practicable, financially and otherwise.

The essence of the plan and the genius of the idea are to bring together in one concentration as completely as possible the governmental and private functions and personnel having to do with world trade. It would be a central market place, clearinghouse, gathering place for American and foreign interests. It would simplify and expedite the doing of business; it would centralize information; it would unify all governmental agencies, simplify communication and contact.

The port authority is the agency to undertake this vast job. In fact there are no other takers. It can do so only with the authorization of the legislatures, which are its masters. With the New York Legislature in its final weeks, the time is short if a year's delay is to be avoided. A bill to authorize the port authority to finance and construct the world trade center is ready. It should be passed, with the hope and expectation that New Jersey likewise will see the great advantage of the continued cooperation between the States in promoting the port welfare so long demonstrated to be indivisible by political boundaries.

CONFLICTS-OF-INTEREST LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on Monday, March 13, 1961, the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, of which I am a member, issued a staff report entitled "The Private Citizen and the National Service." This report, which grew out of hearings held last year by the subcommittee, points out the serious need for legislative action to revise the outdated conflicts of interest statutes now on the books. These hearings heard from a number of experts in the field, including Roswell Perkins, former Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who was chairman of a special committee of the association of the bar of the city of New York which studied this problem, and Prof. Bayless Manning of Yale University, who had served as staff consultant to the association of the bar study. That project resulted in specific legislative proposals, which I have introduced in the Senate together with my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], and which are now pending before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary as S. 603. This bill should be given prompt consideration.

The subcommittee's staff report also concerns itself with the effect of the present dual compensation statutes, which prevent the Government from availing itself of the services of retired

military officers who may be experts in areas in which our country seriously requires their continued service. I have also introduced a bill, S. 1103, which would amend these statutes, in order to make possible such employment, by establishing a reasonable relationship between the amount of retired pay the officer may receive and the salary schedule for the civil service position concerned. I believe that such legislation should also be promptly considered, particularly in the light of our desire to limit the employment by defense contractors of retired military officers where such employment results in conflicts of interest of a different type—those between the interests of the contractor and of the service with which the officer retains a number of close connections even in retired status.

I am hopeful that these bills may receive early consideration by the Committees on the Judiciary and on Armed Services, and that the strong support for such legislation contained in the National Policy Machinery Subcommittee report will be carefully considered by those committees.

UNITED SHAREHOLDERS OF AMERICA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the economic phenomena that distinguishes the United States of the 20th century is the broad diffusion of corporate ownership among the people of our country. This is a tribute to American private enterprise which has made it possible for so many millions of people to share in the benefits of our industrial and commercial initiative. Their special interest in the well-being of American economy has led to the formation of an organization called the United Shareholders of America, under the leadership of my brother, Benjamin A. Javits, of New York, who is its president. This organization was recently described in a newspaper feature column, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the account by Bob Considine, entitled, "Voice of the Shareholder," which appeared in the New York Journal American, January 31, 1961.

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

VOICE OF THE SHAREHOLDER

(By Bob Considine)

It's true. Many men lead lives of quiet desperation. But don't class Benjamin A. Javits among them. The New York attorney-author, who organized and is president of a group named the United Shareholders of America, is a rarity in today's world; he's completely confident about the road we should travel.

"I'm an amalgam of all the great teachers of the past," the 67-year-old brother of New York's Senator JACK JAVITS told us. He stated it as a fact, not a boast. His complaint is that not enough persons listen to what he teaches. This, in brief, is the unheralded crusade of the once-poor East Side boy who put himself through Fordham Law School and made millions.

He wants to organize the 13 million American shareholders into a group as tightly knit and influential as are the Nation's private organizations of veterans, trade unionists, manufacturers, lawyers, doctors, farmers and so forth. As things now stand, Javits says, shareholders supinely let political and other factions regulate and dominate the companies in which they have invested. They don't have the unity that would enable them to fight restrictive legislation, excessive demands by labor and incompetence on the part of company executives.

"There must be an economic electorate in this country as well as a political electorate," he told us. "We've got to cure our industrial leaders of the guilt complex they seem to possess because of the fact that they make money. We've got to teach the people, too, to bring about a standard of living in which they, too, share to the hilt. We've got to stop parroting the Russian propaganda that there is something evil about making a profit.

"The rate of a country's growth is regulated by the size of the profit of its industry. Our profits have dropped from about 8 percent to 2 percent in recent years. Look at the progress West Germany and Italy have made since the end of World War II. In each case, industrial leaders took the workers aside and said, in effect, 'Suffer with us for a bit until we make a lot of money. The more money we make, the bigger we'll get. There will be more jobs, then more money for everybody.' The Government and unions played ball, and you see the result. Russia achieved the same goals with the help of a gun at each worker's head."

Javits sees the stockholder's group as an equal to any other organization in the country. Its spokesmen, he feels, should be present at all labor-management discussions and be heard by Congress before the passage of any bill affecting production, profits, tariffs and trade. They should hover over management, too, he believes, instead of being bullied or scorned. Or submissive. He points out that A. T. & T., for example, has nearly four times as many stockholders as employees.

"If the stockholders ever worked as a cohesive force they could change the course of our history," Javits asserts with confidence. "They could, for example, say through the presidents they employ to run the great companies, General Motors, General Electric, United States Steel, and so forth, 'We declare a 10-year plan which, if free of Government meddling, false notions about monopolies, relief from confiscatory taxes, fear of bigness, and full cooperation with labor, will bring about a golden era in which there will not only be no unemployment but a need for 10 million more workers.'

"We need a rebirth of fervor for capitalism.

"The Communists have a fervor for communism. If they didn't, they would not have made their industrial gains. Our industry on the other hand is so strapped by rule, bad conscience and the indifference of the people who own it—the stockholders—that we're listlessly losing ground. We're moving toward socialism by default. What's gone wrong with us?"

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance may have until midnight tonight to file its report, with any individual views, on H.R. 4806 to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, to provide for a temporary increase in the rate of the Federal unemployment tax, and for other purposes; extension of unemployment compensation benefits; and that the Labor and Public Welfare Committee may have until midnight tonight to file its report on H.R. 5078, to provide temporary extended railroad unemployment insurance benefits, and for other purposes.

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

TEMPORARY EXTENDED RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Subsequently, Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 5075) to provide temporary extended railroad unemployment insurance benefits, and for other purposes, reported it favorably, without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 72) thereon, which report was ordered to be printed, and the bill to be placed on the calendar.

DUMPING OF SWEDISH CEMENT—STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE TUPPER

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent statement by Representative STANLEY R. TUPPER, of Maine. At a recent public hearing before the U.S. Tariff Commission on the injury caused by the fact that, as determined by the Department of the Treasury, cement from Sweden is being and is likely to be sold in the United States at less than fair value, Mr. TUPPER testified on the impact of this unfair trade practice upon the cement mill and other business interests in his congressional district.

In the course of his testimony, Mr. TUPPER reported that he had the support and concern for this situation of Senators HUGH SCOTT, KENNETH KEATING, JACOB JAVITS, and myself, and that of Representative CARLETON KING of New York. He pointed out that cement producers in Maine, Pennsylvania, and New York have been hard hit by the dumping of foreign cement.

I am delighted to join with my distinguished colleagues in calling for corrective action.

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

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE STANLEY R. TUPPER, REPUBLICAN, OF MAINE, BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, FEBRUARY 28, 1961

At my own initiative, I have asked for the opportunity to appear before you today to express my concern with the continued dumping of Swedish cement in parts of New England. I am deeply interested as a Congressman and as a lawyer in making certain that unfair trade practices are not permitted to continue in the United States, whether such practices are engaged in by domestic companies or by foreign suppliers. Moreover, I should like to point out that the impact of the importation of cement from Sweden at less than fair value has caused serious disturbance to the economy in New England and has had an especially bad effect upon

a cement plant at Thomaston, Maine, which is owned and operated by the Dragon Cement Co.

My inquiries into this question and into this case in particular have provided some relevant facts about the situation. I understand that on December 30, 1960, the Treasury Department announced its determination that Swedish cement has been sold in the United States at dumped prices. I have been advised that this conclusion was reached only after a thorough investigation which began at the end of 1958 and covers all imports of Swedish cement in 1959 and 1960. During those 2 years, the bulk of these imports were entered at Providence, R.I., and Fall River, Mass. In 1959 such imports of Swedish cement totaled 228,000 barrels and were nearly twice the 1958 volume of 121,000 barrels. Notwithstanding a public announcement by Treasury in June of 1959, that the Department had reason to believe or suspect that Swedish cement was being dumped in the United States, Bureau of the Census figures indicate that the importers at Providence and Fall River increased their entries of Swedish cement in 1960 to 248,835 barrels.

Government statistics indicate that the importers turned to other foreign countries during the past 2 years for their supplies of cement. Treasury's investigation of these activities has resulted in a preliminary determination of suspected dumping with respect to Belgian, Polish, West German, Israeli and Portugese cement entered in 1959 and 1960 at Providence and Fall River. Also, imports of Tunisian cement at these ports are currently being investigated by the Treasury Department. However, it seems that withholding of appraisement has merely served as a spur to the importers to change their source of supply in order to avoid or postpone additional antidumping charges. Thus, the total of dumped or suspected imports at Providence and Fall River in 1959 came to 552,000 barrels as compared with 179,492 barrels in 1958—more than three times as great. In 1960, despite the withholding of appraisement actions taken by the Treasury Department, such imports increased further to a total of 586,721 barrels.

All the imported cement in question has been sold in the market in Rhode Island and parts of Massachusetts and Connecticut in competition with domestic cement. For the Thomaston plant, this market is a vital one because in this industry freight and trucking costs are such as to limit the size of the area in which a plant can be competitive. Clearly, this cement mill cannot expand its operations to the east or south because of the Atlantic Ocean, or to the north because there is very little construction work in that region. Therefore, the Thomaston plant must look to the near southwest where it sells its cement primarily in the New England market and competes for its sales with the Hudson Valley and Lehigh Valley mills.

At this point, I should like to comment briefly about the purpose of the Antidumping Act, a trade law that is a companion measure to our antitrust laws. As you gentlemen know, the Antidumping Act provides for offsetting dumping duties which are aimed at eliminating unfair price competition of the foreign producer who sells in this market at prices that are lower than the prices at which he sells in his home market. The purpose of the act as originally enacted in 1921, and as strengthened through amendments in 1958, is to protect domestic industries which are damaged as a result of dumping.

All the plants that compete in the New England market area are restrained from engaging in unfair price competition or any other unfair trade practices because of the antitrust laws. These domestic companies should not have to contend with unfair price competition from foreign cement under the provisions of the Antidumping Act. They may not use self-help such as is available under the antitrust laws, such as treble damages, because the Antidumping Act does not authorize such proceedings. Therefore, these mills must rely solely on the fair and efficient administration of the act by the Treasury Department and by the Tariff Commission.

In the course of your investigation and in arriving at the determination of the extent of injury, it would seem that the courts in antitrust cases have provided helpful precedents. This is a relevant and appropriate consideration, I feel, because the Antidumping Act, like the antitrust laws, is directed against unfair trade practices. For example, in determining markets and lines of commerce, the courts do not require precise mathematical computations in their determination of damages or injury under the antitrust laws; in general, any indication that a particular company or group of companies has been adversely affected is submitted to the jury, which then determines a monetary figure. Under the Antidumping Act, the monetary figure has already been determined by Treasury; thus, if the practice under the antitrust laws were to be considered as a guide, the Tariff Commission would look at all evidence that would be regarded as relevant for purposes of treble damage cases.

It is pertinent to recall that the House Ways and Means Committee, in its report on the Antidumping Act in 1921, offered the following explanation of the purpose of the special dumping duty in offsetting the difference between the home market price and the U.S. price. I quote:

"The principle underlying the proposed additional duty to be added in prevention of dumping * * * is to add such an amount of duty as will equalize sales (at lower prices) * * * thereby making it unprofitable to dump goods on the markets of the United States at lower prices. If the seller of the goods is compelled to add as duty the difference between the sales price and what he would receive by selling in the otherwise highest obtainable market, all reward or inducement to dumping is removed." (H. Rept. No. 1, 67th Cong., 1st sess. 23 (1921).)

I have checked and found that domestic shipments to this market have declined during the past 2 years while imports have increased. In a commodity such as cement, which is a product of the same general grade or quality, the increase of imports at the same time as domestic shipments are decreasing is directly attributable to the importer's lower prices. These prices were made made possible by the dumping of Swedish cement into this market and therefore there would appear to be a clear case of injury.

There have been shutdowns at the Thomaston plant during the last 2 years, with the result of lost employment, wages, and profits. Unemployment, as is true elsewhere today, is a serious matter in my district and throughout Maine. Any unemployment resulting from violations of the Antidumping Act is inexcusable and it is my hope that the remedial action provided for under the Antidumping Act will be brought into full force and effect.

In response to additional inquiries, I have found that there are producers of cement in three States who ship into the New England area. These States are Pennsylvania, New York, and Maine. Naturally, I can speak only for what I understand to be the impact of this unfair trade practice upon the cement plant in my congressional district and the effect the dumping of Swedish cement has had upon other business interests in this area.

I know, however, that cement mills in Pennsylvania and New York have been hard hit as well and that similar economic effects have been reported to the Tariff Commission by three distinguished Senators: Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, and Senators KENNETH KEATING and JACOB JAVITS, of New York. Because of the seriousness of this dumping case, and its precedent implications, I am especially pleased to have their support and expressions of deep concern. In addition, the distinguished Senior Senator from Maine, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, and Representative CARLETON KING of New York have asked me to express their endorsement of this testimony. Each of us urge that remedial steps be taken in your determination of injury in this case to: (1) alleviate the impact of unfairly priced Swedish cement; and (2) avoid recurrences of this serious form of unfair trade practice.

May I express my appreciation for your courtesy in permitting me to present these considered views on a subject which I firmly believe is of importance—not only to Maine and New England but, as a matter of principle and because of the bad effect of any perpetuation of such a practice, to the economy of the United States itself.

DEATH OF K. C. LI

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the sudden and untimely passing last week of one of America's foremost citizens, K. C. Li, shocked and deeply saddened me. A mighty oak has indeed fallen, and in the forest of humanity there is a great void.

Preeminent in his chosen profession of mining, an international authority on tungsten, a very successful businessman, and industrialist, K. C. Li long ago established a unique and unshakable claim to fame on his technical merit. But more than this, he also established himself in the hearts of his countrymen and his associates and friends, whose numbers are legion, all over the globe. We who knew him loved him, admired him, and respected him. There was truly a whole man.

One who found joy in hard work and who never spared himself even in the twilight of his life when rest and relaxation were surely his due, K. C. Li remained active and interested in many varied endeavors. Just prior to his fatal heart attack last Tuesday, he had traveled to Europe and the Middle East as a member of the delegation planning the New York World's Fair of 1964 and 1965. It is somehow a fitting finale to his brilliant and exemplary career that he should have been on the job when his heart beat its last measure.

K. C. Li was born in Changsha, China, in 1892. He was educated at Hunan Technical Institute, China, and at the Royal School of Mines in London. He discovered and developed the first tungsten deposits in China and shipped the first ore to this country in 1915. In China he was secretary of the mining board in Hunan Province and president of the Government in mines before leaving to come to the United States, where in 1916, he established the Wah Chang Co., a name that proved apt, meaning "great development."

Under his outstanding leadership, the company expanded its operations to include the processing and production of molybdenum, columbium, tantalum, tin, zirconium, and hafnium. With affiliates all over the world, Wah Chang operates its own plants in Glen Cove, N.Y.; Fairlawn, N.J.; Texas City, Tex.; Albany,

Oreg.; and Huntsville, Ala. His company operated tungsten mines in California, Nevada, and Brazil. K. C. Li served as an officer of many other companies and at various times as a governor of the Commodity and National Metals Exchanges.

During World War I, he was asked to serve as adviser on antimony to the Allied and British Governments and, during World War II, an adviser on tungsten to the U.S. Government, having responsibility for providing the Allies with strategic materials. He also served as representative of the Chinese Ministry of Finance and Commerce, as adviser to the Chinese Embassy in Washington, and as a Chinese delegate to the Bretton Woods Conference in 1944.

K. C. Li was an inventor, jointly discovering the Li process for tungsten carbide manufacture. He was an author, too, writing Chinese textbooks on mathematics and a book on tungsten. He also contributed significant and important scientific writings to professional journals and edited American Diplomacy in the Far East.

L. C. Li's interests spread far and encompassed many fields. He served actively on the Council on Foreign Relations. He was a trustee of China Foundation for Education and Culture and the China Institute in America. He was a member on the development council of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and on the visiting committee on Far Eastern civilizations at Harvard.

A humanitarian in the finest sense, he established the Li Foundation which grants 20 scholarships annually to promising American students. It was his pleasant duty each year to award the K. C. Li Medal and Prize at Columbia University as well as scholarships at the University of Nevada for students excelling in mining engineering and research.

An industrialist and businessman, K. C. Li nevertheless found time for civic and philanthropic activities. He had been a member of the Mayor's Reception Committee of the City of New York and of the executive committee of the United Nations Committee of the City of New York. At the time of his death, he was honorary president of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce of New York; general chairman of the New York-Tokyo Sister-City Affiliation; and a director of the New York World's Fair Corp.

Throughout his distinguished career, K. C. Li always remained a man of great kindliness toward his fellow man, hospitable and unostentatious. He had a capacity to enjoy the simplest of pleasures. One of his special joys was raising flowers. Both he and his wife were ardent gardeners. Their azaleas and tulips were prizewinners, and his gardens were a showplace of New York. It is all the more tragic that he could not live to savor one more spring, one more blooming of his favorite flowers.

It was my privilege to know K. C. Li for more than a decade. I greatly esteemed the friendship of this immigrant from China who contributed so much to his adopted country economically, industrially, politically, socially, and culturally. President Eisenhower once said there was no period in which immigrants to this country have not richly rewarded it for its liberality in receiving them. K. C. Li occupies an illustrious place in the grand procession of immigrants who have enriched our shores. Born in the Orient, he came in young manhood to this land of opportunity, and, finding himself accepted on merit, rose to the top of his calling. America found him exceptionally worthy, a good and faithful servant in peace and in war. With his death, America has lost a fine mind, a great benefactor, and a true patriot; the world has lost a lover of freedom and a foe of tyranny; and I have lost a cherished friend. My heart goes out to his fine family in their bereavement.

THE FATAL FLAW IN MARXISM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, our philosophers have long warned us against those that profess love for humanity—yet at the same time fail to recognize the needs of humans. In world history we have long known of political philosophies and individual philosophers who claim to be all consumed by the love of humanity generally, yet, they completely fail to concern themselves with the happiness and freedom of the single individuals that make up humanity.

Marxism is an example of one of these philosophies. It claims to have as its aim human betterment. Yet, in pursuing such betterment it enslaves the individual. As long as communism is offered as a panacea to starving and illiterate people, it somehow manages to give the appearance of a real humanitarian formula. But when the hungry people have some of their most basic needs supplied, and they look around, they soon discover that Marxism and communism in no way answer the real questions of human life. Communism and Marxism tell them that society takes precedence over the individual. Yet, Marxism fails to tell the individual what there is in life that is worthwhile. This, I believe, is the fatal flaw of Marxism. It is this flaw which will eventually cause the downfall of communism.

A most interesting discussion of this subject was contained recently in an article published in the communist press of Poland by the noted Polish philosopher, Adam Schaff. The New York Times of today in its editorial page makes some very interesting comments on this subject. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

THE GAP IN MARXISM

The noted Polish Communist philosopher Adam Schaff has obviously entered ground that is dangerous and treacherous for any Marxist in his latest writing. Rather belatedly, M. Schaff has discovered that there is a gap in Marxism. It has nothing to say about the "meaning of life," about the fate of the individual in the face of the mysterious universe. Having been roused to the importance of such questions by the insistent queries of young Poles before whom he has spoken, M. Schaff has now dared wonder out loud whether communism is not in danger of losing "the struggle for the mind of man" because of this deficiency.

As M. Schaff certainly knows, the questions he raises are precisely those for whose answers men have traditionally looked to religion. We may suspect that it was precisely because he knew he had no answers for these questions that Marx called religion "opium" and sought to banish its concerns from his materialistic philosophy. Dialectical materialism sheds no light on the mysteries of life and death. Such questions as why we are here, where we came from and where we go find no answers that can satisfy the human heart in all the arid pages of Marxist writing. Yet the questions will not go away. Each new generation, even one raised in the Marxist faith, as have been Poland's young people, asks them anew.

Once it is granted that the individual and his fate are important, what happens to a philosophy which glorifies only the collective, which looks at history only as the work of faceless masses and impersonal social forces, and which is deeply hostile to any expression of individual nonconformity? Since M. Schaff is too intelligent not to realize all this, we may wonder if his public expression of concern over Marxism's chances in the struggle for man's mind is not implicit confession Marxism has lost his mind and heart.

A BETTER FORMULA FOR THE ALLOCATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR EDUCATION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, yesterday I testified before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in connection with its hearings on S. 1021, a bill to authorize a program of Federal assistance for education. I have long been a convinced advocate of this type of legislation—Federal aid for education.

In the course of my testimony, I noted that the allocation formula contained in the bill as introduced could be refined so as to meet more accurately the objectives of distributing the Federal funds more equitably.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with the exhibits, tables and proposed amendment.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues in both the Senate and House to the effects of my amendment upon the allocation of the funds to the various States. It is, in my opinion, a more logical and fairer distribution than was originally proposed.

I wish to pay tribute at this point to the yeoman work performed in the development of these refinements of the original formula by Dr. George Rogers, professor of economics at the University of Alaska. We should be especially grateful to him, to President William R. Wood, of the University of Alaska, and to Mr. George E. Smith, president of the Alaska Board of Education who with the other members of the board made Dr. Rogers' services available to work out this much more logical approach to the equitable distribution of Federal funds for school aid.

Of great practical concern in securing the enactment of S. 1021 is the adverse effect upon Federal-impact States resulting from the proposed amendments to Public Laws 815 and 874. The amendment I have proposed to title I, although not directly concerned with this problem, does have an important bearing upon it. The proposed amendment deducts military payments from State personal income used in the allotment formula. This increases the payments to those States having large military populations over payments they would receive without the amendment. Because Federal impact is principally military related, the adjusted formula would result in largely offsetting the decreases suffered by these States under the proposed title II and III provisions of the bill.

EXHIBIT 1.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING, OF ALASKA, ON S. 1021, BEFORE THE EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, MARCH 13, 1961

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you and this distinguished committee for giving me an opportunity to appear here to testify with respect to S. 1021, a bill to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

An educated citizenry is fundamental to the existence of a vigorous democracy. If ours is to continue to be a government of, by and for the people, we must have an informed electorate. As I believe deeply that democracy and education are one and inseparable I cannot but feel that it is the duty of the Federal Government to help remedy the inadequate conditions which now exist in our public schools where there are far too few classrooms and an insufficient number of qualified teachers. The waste of human resources resulting from inadequate education is a reproach to the Nation and it is a weakening of our Nation when it will need increasingly to be strong—strong not merely physically but mentally—alert and able to grapple with the complexities of a rapidly changing world and to maintain the leadership in that world which we have assumed. That this condition cannot be remedied by local governments without help on the scale which can only come from the Federal Government has long been clear.

Therefore, I have only the highest praise for President Kennedy for his action in throwing his powerful support behind legislation to provide aid to public schools. Nor can it be said too often to overcome the constantly reiterated but spurious objection that Federal aid means Federal control that this legislation provides that the manner in which the funds appropriated will be spent is left wholly to the State educational authorities.

Also, I support the basic principle by which funds would be allocated to the States so as to channel greater assistance to the areas where the need is greater.

It is my understanding that the principle of this legislation is to compensate for lack of local ability to finance costs of adequate education. In other words, this legislation seeks to relate needs for assistance in providing education to our children to the ability of the Federal Government to supply this assistance.

After careful analysis of the provisions of S. 1021, and consultation with Dr. George Rogers, a distinguished economist now a member of the faculty of the University of Alaska, and author of the authoritative book entitled "Alaska in Transition," published by Johns Hopkins, it seems to me that the principle of the legislation could be more effectively served by a refinement of the formula now proposed which would truly relate costs of education to resources of local governments and the Federal Government for financing those costs.

The formula proposed in S. 1021 for allocation of funds among the States is based primarily on the relationship between income of a State and the number of children to be educated. This would appear a useful means of measuring ability to afford decent education. It should provide a significant index of fiscal capability of a State to educate its children.

However, a more precise and realistic result, leading to accomplishment of the real objectives of this legislation, can be achieved only if we add to the factor of State income the vital factor which represents the actual costs to a State of school construction and teachers' salaries. In this legislation we are attempting to make an equitable allocation of funds needed to construct classrooms and to pay teachers' salaries. I respectfully submit for the consideration of the committee the proposition that this cannot be done equitably without taking into consideration the cost to the States of these items.

The State of Alaska represents perhaps the most dramatic example of the inequities arising from application of the formula proposed in S. 1021 without adjustment for the cost of education.

A review of the proposed allotment of funds on a State-by-State basis as determined under S. 1021 shows that Alaska would be entitled only to the minimum amount provided by the bill, or $15 per school child, or $555,000 for the first fiscal year of operations under the legislation.

Our allotment per schoolchild is the same as that allowed the great and prosperous States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Delaware, and Illinois.

Now Alaska is flattered, indeed, to find itself, so newly a State, in the same class with these rich and powerful giants of commerce and industry, all but Illinois among the Original Thirteen States, with a century and three-quarters of political equality behind them and the economic advantages stemming therefrom.

But we are surprised by the honor, puzzled and, upon analysis, distressed. One day Alaskans intend that their capacities will rival that of any State in the Union. But at this moment the great natural resources which will bring us to that status lie largely undeveloped and the industry they will someday serve does not exist.

Now it is true that the exact application of a formula based on income statistics brings the result shown in tabulations of proposed allocations under S. 1021. I do not necessarily contend that there is a mistake in the arithmetic.

I feel the mistake is in the failure to consider the factor of real costs of education. I can find no better way of explaining this than to read into the record the telegram which, on February 28, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is a telegram from the Alaska State Board of Education in response to my request for an analysis of the needs of Alaska for Federal assistance to public schools in relationship to the aid which would be forthcoming under S. 1021:

"FEBRUARY 24, 1961.

"The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,

"U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

"Following wire sent to HEW Secretary Ribicoff:

" 'The Alaska State Board of Education fully endorses and supports a program of Federal aid to education. However, the board strongly objects to the formula used as it relates to the State of Alaska. Raw figures on per capita income in Alaska are not a valid measure of the wealth of the State, nor a sound basis for determining the ability of the State to adequately support an educational program. The following factors must be considered if comparisons with other States are to be fair and equitable:

" '1. On the basis of the "1959 Consumer Price Index in Seven Alaskan Cities," prepared by Joseph Ward, the cost of food and housing in central Alaska, which area accounts for three-fourths of the total income and two-thirds of the population of the State, were 42.7 percent and 45.7 percent higher than in Seattle. Since the costs of living in Seattle are above the national average, this would indicate that Alaskan costs would be more than 50 percent above the national average. The costs of food and housing in Fairbanks were 50.1 percent, 83.9 percent respectively higher than Seattle. These items in towns and cities not on regularly scheduled air routes were even higher, due to additional transportation costs.

" '1. Since Alaska's labor is seasonal, a large proportion of this income goes to transient laborers with most of the earnings going outside Alaska to support families or become savings.

" '3. The ratio of school-age children in Alaska to the adult population is twice as high as the national average, and one-third higher than the next ranking State.

" '4. Alaska's schools are scattered across four time zones, and in most instances people, supplies, equipment, building materials, and fuel must rely upon airplane transportation. Many of the schools are not in areas served by scheduled carriers. The result is that flights must be chartered, which greatly increases costs. As an extreme example, the cost of delivering 75 drums of stove oil to Anaktuvuk Pass was $6,300 or $233 per student.

" '5. Since so many schools are located in areas where housing is not available for teachers, the State has the additional cost of providing teacherages.

" '6. Instructional costs must be much higher than in other States, when the costs of living are so much higher.

" '7. Construction costs in most of rural Alaska are extremely high. A school building just completed at Bethel, Alaska, cost $44 a square foot. If $555,000 is to be in the annual amount of Federal aid and if the entire amount were to be spent on construction, using the cost of construction at Bethel as a basis we could build only 14 classrooms per year. Our immediate need is for 369 new classrooms.

" '8. Twenty-eight percent of the elementary schools in Alaska have fewer than 20 students. The smaller the number of students, the higher the per-pupil cost. Most of Alaska's high schools are small, and to provide an adequate high school program, the pupil-teacher ratio must be low. The cost per student is considerably higher than in other States which can have large consolidated schools. Thirty-three percent of Alaska's high schools have enrollments of less than 40 students.

" '9. All of these small schools must be maintained. In the native villages it is not possible to secure competent maintenance help. Consequently, it is necessary to fly people into these areas to perform necessary maintenance work.

" '10. The sparsity of population in Alaska makes it necessary to transport both elementary and high school students great distances to schools. One out of every ten dollars appropriated by the State legislature for education is spent for student transportation.

" '11. National Education Association statistics show that the per-pupil cost of education in Alaska is the highest in the Nation. If Alaska were to provide the same type of educational opportunity as some other States which provide swimming pools,

elaborate athletic fields, gymnasiums, auditoriums, etc., the costs would be even higher. Alaska cannot afford many of the educational advantages which other States have and consider essential.

" 'STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
" 'GEORGE E. SMITH,
" 'President.
" 'HUNT GRUENING,
" 'Vice President.
" 'WILLIAM V. BOGGESS,
" 'Member.
" 'WILLIAM G. MORAN,
" 'Member.
" 'Mrs. MARCELLA C. BUCKALEW,
" 'Member.
" 'Mrs. MARY M. KELLIHER,
" 'Member.
" 'Dr. THEO J. NORBY,
" 'Commissioner of Education.' "

Obviously, the $15 per school child Alaska would receive under S. 1021 would not be much more than enough to buy the chalk and erasers needed for our high schools. It certainly would do nothing to raise our standards of education, improve our classrooms, or pay higher salaries to our teachers.

Now, aside from the disappointment Alaskans feel in realizing the limitations of the proposed Federal aid to education legislation to which we had looked forward so long—a disappointment made even greater by the crushing effects of cuts proposed in the impacted area legislation—we feel that, while the case of Alaska is dramatic, the same factors which distort our position also operate to the disadvantage of other States.

Therefore, we have developed a refinement of the proposed formula to incorporate recognition of the actual cost of educating children in each State. This we have done by inserting in section 105(b) an alternative minimum allotment. In other words, we would provide that the minimum allotment for a State would be either $15 multiplied by the number of public school pupils in a State or, alternatively an amount representing the expenditures by a State per public school child divided by the expenditures per public school pupil for all the States, multiplied by the State allotment ratio.

We have further adjusted the State income factor of section 105(c)(3) to establish a more realistic basis of fiscal ability of a State by subtracting from the income data for each State that part which represents income of military personnel stationed in the State. The reason for this latter adjustment is that this is income which cannot be reached by State taxation; therefore it should not be included in estimating the ability of a State to pay for education.

These refinements are based on reliable data which are readily available. I believe their incorporation into the allocation formula will produce a more equitable result than can be reached without applying them.

In explanation of the way in which the subtraction of military income from State income combined with application of the cost of education factor operates, I submit for the record a comparison of the allotments under S. 1021 and under the proposals which I am advancing.

It is apparent this will require a slightly augmented authorization of funds for the program in order that an equitable result will be achieved. Therefore, it will be necessary to amend section 104 to do this. The increase in authorization for the first year of operation of this program would be a total of $84 million, or from $666 million to $750 million.

Obviously, this change in the proposed formula works to the benefit of Alaska, but it is more equitable to many other States as well. I urge its adoption for that reason, of course. However, I also urge adoption of this amendment on the ground it provides a means of more truly achieving the objectives for which this legislation was introduced.

In closing, I would comment on the relationship of the cuts in the impacted area legislation recommended by S. 1021 to the discussion above concerning the provisions of title I of the bill.

As I pointed out on the floor of the Senate on March 2, Alaska would lose so much money as a result of the decrease in funds under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 that even if we received our $555,000 allotted under title I in 1962, we would wind up with a deficit of approximately $70,000.

The reason for this may be explained as follows:

Under Public Law 874, Alaska would receive, for the 1962 fiscal year, for operational and maintenance expenses, under the provisions of S. 1021, an amount which would exceed its 1961 entitlement by $545,800. However, if the program were extended without change, Alaska would be entitled to an increase in these funds of $1,058,000. Thus, under the Public Law 874 program, Alaska would lose $512,000 to which it would be entitled if the program were extended without change.

Under Public Law 815, Alaska would receive in 1962 under the provisions of S. 1021, $2,336,000. If the program were extended without change, the State would receive $2,447,300, or $111,300 more than under S. 1021 in the 1962 fiscal year. So, adding the loss of Public Law 874 funds ($512,000) and the loss of Public Law 815 funds ($111,300) Alaska would lose $623,500. Now, if consideration is given to the allocation of $555,000 to Alaska under title I of S. 1021, it appears that we would still have a net loss of $68,500.

For this reason I have announced my cosponsorship of the bill, S. 1078, introduced by Senator ENGLE, Democrat, of California, which would extend the provisions of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 in their present form.

Well, as much as I favor Federal aid to education and as much as Alaska needs it, I am forced to say, with all possible respect for the wisdom of all those who have labored so hard to enact this legislation, that, should the bill be enacted in its present form, Alaska will be in greater need of Federal aid to education than it has been before we pass a Federal aid to education bill. Thus, I feel I must reserve my position on the bill until I know the form in which it will be reported to the floor.

I hereby submit, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the subcommittee, an amendment to S. 1021 which carries out these refinements in the proposed formula.

There are many possible variations of this formula which would avoid the injustice to Alaska which would result in the enactment of S. 1021 in its present form. However, considering all the factors involved, I believe the amendment I am now proposing is the most logical approach to attaining the objectives sought by the administration and works most fairly for all the States in the Union.

I therefore ask for your favorable consideration of my amendment.

S. 1021

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. GRUENING to the bill (S. 1021), to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education

Amend section 105(b) to read:

"Subject to the provisions of section 106, a State's minimum allotment for any fiscal year shall be the product of $15 multiplied by the number of public school pupils in such State in the preceding fiscal year, or the allotment computed in subsection (a) multiplied by the quotient obtained by dividing the State's expenditure per public school pupil by the expenditure per public school pupil for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands) for the same fiscal years used in computing allotment ratios, whichever is the greater."

Amend section 105(c)(3) to read:

"The term ('income per public school pupil') for any fiscal year for a State or for all the States means the total personal income less military income disbursements for the State or for all the States in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands), respectively, divided by the number of public school pupils in the State or in all the States, respectively, in such fiscal year."

Amend section 104 to read:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated * * * for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, $750,000,000, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, $850,000,000 and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, $1,000,000,000."

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of State allotments under School Assistance Act of 1961 (S. 1021) and amendments proposed by Senator* ERNEST GRUENING

	Administration proposal	Amendment proposal	Increase
50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands	$666,000,000	$750,000,000	$84,000,000
Alabama	19,691,692	21,040,600	1,348,908
Alaska	555,000	1,139,000	584,000
Arizona	6,260,276	8,128,000	1,867,724
Arkansas	10,538,844	11,310,800	771,956
California	52,733,321	71,841,900	19,108,579
Colorado	7,157,176	8,637,900	1,480,724
Connecticut	6,600,000	6,600,000	----------
Delaware	1,155,000	1,155,000	----------
Florida	19,120,968	20,797,300	1,676,332
Georgia	22,014,247	23,756,800	1,742,553
Hawaii	3,121,256	3,608,100	486,844
Idaho	3,760,723	4,013,500	252,777
Illinois	23,310,000	23,310,000	----------
Indiana	16,956,529	17,756,800	800,271
Iowa	11,280,457	11,878,400	597,943
Kansas	$9,445,918	$10,175,700	$729,782
Kentucky	14,583,887	15,648,900	1,065,013
Louisiana	15,034,329	18,556,000	3,521,671
Maine	4,125,926	4,459,500	333,574
Maryland	8,976,670	10,999,300	2,022,630
Massachusetts	11,790,000	12,475,700	685,700
Michigan	27,070,253	34,161,000	7,090,747
Minnesota	13,062,937	16,614,300	3,551,363
Mississippi	14,687,634	15,689,200	1,001,566
Missouri	12,246,808	12,932,500	685,692
Montana	2,919,012	3,081,100	162,088
Nebraska	5,321,259	5,675,700	354,441
Nevada	952,274	1,054,100	101,826
New Hampshire	1,734,218	1,864,900	130,680
New Jersey	14,400,000	14,930,000	530,002
New Mexico	5,275,194	5,756,800	481,606
New York	37,650,000	37,650,000	----------
North Carolina	27,905,485	30,000,100	2,094,615
North Dakota	3,100,067	3,283,800	183,733

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of State allotments under School Assistance Act of 1961 (S. 1021) and amendments proposed by Senator* ERNEST GRUENING—Continued

	Administration proposal	Amendment proposal	Increase		Administration proposal	Amendment proposal	Increase
Ohio	$28,735,988	$30,000,100	$1,264,112	Vermont	$1,459,990	$1,540,500	$80,510
Oklahoma	11,951,838	12,810,800	858,962	Virginia	17,846,093	19,824,400	1,978,307
Oregon	7,095,843	9,736,100	2,640,257	Washington	11,408,373	15,246,200	3,837,827
Pennsylvania	26,880,000	33,282,000	6,402,000	West Virginia	10,658,865	11,270,300	611,435
Rhode Island	1,800,000	2,037,400	237,400	Wisconsin	11,615,012	14,214,400	2,599,388
South Carolina	15,228,456	16,500,000	1,271,544	Wyoming	1,541,357	2,259,400	718,043
South Dakota	3,262,057	3,486,500	224,443	District of Columbia	1,620,000	1,620,000	----------
Tennessee	19,542,885	20,797,300	1,254,415	Guam	363,080	405,400	42,320
Texas	40,262,707	43,500,000	3,237,293	Puerto Rico	14,243,895	15,162,200	918,305
Utah	5,778,627	6,121,600	342,973	Virgin Islands	167,575	202,700	35,125

NOTE.—Prepared by Dr. George Rogers, University of Alaska, College, Alaska.
Sources: Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, August 1960. Office of Education, "Statistical Summary of Educational Data, 1957-58." National Education Association, "Estimates of School Statistics, 1960-61."

TABLE 2.—*State allotment ratios under amendment proposed School Assistance Act of 1961*

[Based on 1957 income and 1957-58 attendance in public schools]

State	Total personal income 1957 [1] less military income (millions)	Pupils in attendance in public schools 1957-58 [2] (thousands)	Personal income (1957) per pupil in attendance in public schools (1957-58)	0.5 times State income per pupil divided by national income per pupil	Allotment ratio 1957-58 (1 minus col. 5)
50 States and District of Columbia	$342,665	29,875	$11,469.96	----------	----------
Alabama	4,092	670	6,107.46	0.2662	0.7338
Alaska	394	31	12,709.68	.5540	.4460
Arizona	1,922	218	8,816.51	.3843	.6157
Arkansas	1,974	361	5,468.14	.2384	.7616
California	34,470	2,767	12,457.53	.5430	.4570
Colorado	3,228	307	10,514.66	.4584	.5416
Connecticut	6,414	384	16,703.13	.7281	.2719
Delaware	1,183	65	18,200.00	.7934	.2066
Florida	7,403	743	9,963.66	.4343	.5657
Georgia	5,149	771	6,678.34	.2911	.7089
Hawaii	925	122	7,581.97	.3305	.6695
Idaho	1,053	138	7,630.43	.3326	.6674
Illinois	23,703	1,414	16,763.08	.7307	.2693
Indiana	9,157	781	11,724.71	.5111	.4889
Iowa	5,085	506	10,049.41	.4381	.5619
Kansas	3,692	399	9,253.13	.4034	.5966
Kentucky	4,053	544	7,450.37	.3248	.6752
Louisiana	4,735	567	8,350.97	.3640	.6360
Maine	1,531	169	9,059.17	.3949	.6051
Maryland	6,109	479	12,753.65	.5560	.4440
Massachusetts	11,146	733	15,206.00	.6629	.3361
Michigan	16,824	1,373	12,253.46	.5342	.4658
Minnesota	6,134	578	10,612.46	.4626	.5374
Mississippi	2,045	444	4,605.86	.2008	.7992
Missouri	8,188	653	12,539.05	.5466	.4534
Montana	$1,258	124	$10,145.16	0.4422	0.5578
Nebraska	2,585	243	10,629.63	.4634	.5366
Nevada	615	48	12,812.50	.5585	.4415
New Hampshire	1,044	87	12,000.00	.5231	.4769
New Jersey	14,017	842	16,647.26	.7257	.2743
New Mexico	1,311	180	7,283.33	.3175	.6825
New York	40,909	2,262	18,085.32	.7884	.2116
North Carolina	5,701	950	6,001.05	.2616	.7384
North Dakota	931	118	7,889.83	.3439	.6561
Ohio	20,768	1,585	13,102.84	.5712	.4288
Oklahoma	3,603	461	7,815.62	.3407	.6593
Oregon	3,374	315	10,711.11	.4669	.5331
Pennsylvania	23,375	1,678	13,930.27	.6072	.3928
Rhode Island	1,601	108	14,824.07	.6462	.3538
South Carolina	2,622	498	5,265.06	.2295	.7705
South Dakota	1,066	129	8,263.57	.3602	.6398
Tennessee	4,776	695	6,871.94	.2996	.7004
Texas	15,873	1,660	9,562.04	.4168	.5832
Utah	1,444	195	7,405.13	.3228	.6772
Vermont	620	62	10,000.00	.4359	.5641
Virginia	5,835	706	8,264.87	.3603	.6397
Washington	5,599	527	10,624.29	.4631	.5369
West Virginia	3,065	419	7,315.04	.3189	.6811
Wisconsin	7,443	606	12,282.18	.5354	.4646
Wyoming	625	64	9,765.63	.4257	.5743
District of Columbia	1,998	96	20,812.50	.9073	.0927
Guam	----------	12	----------	----------	----------
Puerto Rico	----------	491	----------	----------	----------
Virgin Islands	----------	6	----------	----------	----------

[1] Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, August 1960.
[2] Office of Education, "Statistical Summary of Educational Data, 1957-58."

TABLE 3.—*Data for estimating unadjusted State allotments under amendments proposed to the School Assistance Act of 1961*

State	Allotment ratios unadjusted for limits [1]	Estimated a.d.a. 1960-61 [2] (thousands)	State product	State product (percent)
50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands	----------	$33,716	$16,959,146	1.0000
Alabama	0.7338	722	529,804	.0312
Alaska	.4460	37	16,502	.0010
Arizona	.6157	277	170,549	.0101
Arkansas	.7616	374	284,838	.0168
California	.4570	3,135	1,432,695	.0845
Colorado	.5416	361	195,518	.0115
Connecticut	.2719	440	119,636	.0071
Delaware	.2066	77	15,908	.0009
Florida	.5657	926	523,838	.0309
Georgia	.7089	845	599,021	.0353
Hawaii	.6695	136	91,052	.0054
Idaho	.6674	151	100,777	.0059
Illinois	.2693	1,554	418,492	.0247
Indiana	.4889	916	447,832	.0264
Iowa	.5619	532	298,931	.0176
Kansas	.5966	430	256,538	.0151
Kentucky	.6752	584	394,317	.0233
Louisiana	.6360	638	405,768	.0239
Maine	.6051	185	111,944	.0066
Maryland	.4440	558	247,752	.0146
Massachusetts	.3361	786	264,175	.0156
Michigan	.4658	1,532	713,606	.0421
Minnesota	.5374	644	346,086	.0204
Mississippi	.7992	495	395,604	.0233
Missouri	.4534	719	325,995	.0192
Montana	0.5578	$140	$78,092	0.0046
Nebraska	.5366	266	142,736	.0084
Nevada	.4415	60	26,490	.0016
New Hampshire	.4769	98	46,736	.0028
New Jersey	.2743	960	263,328	.0155
New Mexico	.6825	212	144,690	.0085
New York	.2116	2,510	531,116	.0313
North Carolina	.7384	1,024	756,122	.0446
North Dakota	.6561	126	82,669	.0049
Ohio	.4288	1,763	755,974	.0446
Oklahoma	.6593	490	323,057	.0190
Oregon	.5331	353	188,184	.0111
Pennsylvania	.3928	1,792	703,898	.0415
Rhode Island	.3538	120	42,456	.0025
South Carolina	.7705	539	415,300	.0245
South Dakota	.6398	137	87,653	.0052
Tennessee	.7004	748	523,899	.0308
Texas	.5832	1,881	1,096,999	.0647
Utah	.6772	228	154,402	.0091
Vermont	.5641	69	38,923	.0023
Virginia	.6397	780	498,966	.0294
Washington	.5369	580	311,402	.0184
West Virginia	.6811	417	284,019	.0167
Wisconsin	.4646	659	306,171	.0181
Wyoming	.5743	73	41,924	.0025
District of Columbia	.0927	108	10,012	.0006
Guam	.7500	13	9,750	.0006
Puerto Rico	.7500	510	382,500	.0226
Virgin Islands	.7500	6	4,500	.0003

[1] Based on total personal income less military (1957) and average daily attendance (1957-58).
[2] National Education Association, "Estimates of School Statistics, 1960-61."

TABLE 4.—*Data for estimating adjusted State allocations under amendments proposed by Senator* ERNEST GRUENING *to the School Assistance Act of 1961 (S. 1021)*

	State allotment unadjusted	Amount per a.d.a. unadjusted	State pupil cost divided by national pupil cost	State allotment adjusted	Amount per a.d.a. adjusted
50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands	$750,000,000	$22.24	1.0000	$750,000,000	$22.24
Alabama	23,400,000	32.41		21,040,600	29.14
Alaska	750,000	20.27	1.5187	1,139,000	30.78
Arizona	7,575,000	27.35	1.0730	8,128,000	29.34
Arkansas	12,600,000	33.69		11,310,800	30.24
California	63,375,000	20.22	1.1336	71,841,900	22.92
Colorado	8,625,000	23.89	1.0015	8,637,900	23.93
Connecticut	5,325,000	12.10	1.1413	6,600,000	15.00
Delaware	675,000	8.77	1.2934	1,155,000	15.00
Florida	23,175,000	25.03		20,797,300	22.46
Georgia	26,475,000	31.33		23,756,800	28.11
Hawaii	4,050,000	29.78		3,608,100	26.53
Idaho	4,425,000	29.30		4,013,500	26.58
Illinois	18,525,000	11.92	1.1170	23,310,000	15.00
Indiana	19,800,000	21.62		17,756,800	19.38
Iowa	13,200,000	24.81		11,878,400	22.33
Kansas	11,325,000	26.34		10,175,700	23.66
Kentucky	17,475,000	29.92		15,648,900	26.80
Louisiana	17,925,000	28.10	1.0352	18,556,000	29.08
Maine	4,950,000	26.76		4,459,500	24.11
Maryland	10,950,000	19.62	1.0045	10,999,300	19.71
Massachusetts	11,700,000	14.89	1.0663	12,475,700	15.87
Michigan	31,575,000	20.61	1.0819	34,161,000	22.30
Minnesota	15,300,000	23.76	1.0859	16,614,300	25.80
Mississippi	17,475,000	35.30		15,689,200	31.70
Missouri	$14,400,000	$20.03		$12,932,500	$17.99
Montana	3,450,000	24.64		3,081,100	22.01
Nebraska	6,300,000	23.68		5,675,700	21.34
Nevada	1,200,000	20.00		1,054,100	17.57
New Hampshire	2,100,000	21.43		1,864,900	19.03
New Jersey	11,625,000	12.11	1.2843	14,930,000	15.55
New Mexico	6,375,000	30.07		5,756,800	27.15
New York	23,475,000	9.35	1.4683	37,650,000	15.00
North Carolina	33,450,000	32.67		30,000,100	29.30
North Dakota	3,675,000	29.17		3,283,800	26.06
Ohio	33,450,000	18.97		30,000,100	17.02
Oklahoma	14,250,000	29.08		12,810,800	26.14
Oregon	8,325,000	23.58	1.1695	9,736,100	27.58
Pennsylvania	31,125,000	17.37	1.0693	33,283,000	18.57
Rhode Island	1,875,000	15.63	1.0866	2,037,400	16.98
South Carolina	18,375,000	34.09		16,500,000	30.61
South Dakota	3,900,000	28.47		3,486,500	25.45
Tennessee	23,100,000	30.88		20,797,300	27.80
Texas	48,525,000	25.80		43,500,000	23.13
Utah	6,825,000	29.93		6,121,600	26.85
Vermont	1,725,000	25.00		1,540,500	22.33
Virginia	22,050,000	28.27		19,824,400	25.42
Washington	13,800,000	23.79	1.1048	15,246,200	26.29
West Virginia	12,525,000	30.04		11,270,300	27.03
Wisconsin	13,575,000	20.60	1.0471	14,214,400	21.57
Wyoming	1,875,000	25.68	1.2050	2,259,400	30.95
District of Columbia	450,000	4.17	1.1588	1,620,000	15.00
Guam	450,000	34.62		405,400	31.18
Puerto Rico	16,950,100	33.24		15,162,000	29.73
Virgin Islands	225,000	37.50		202,700	33.78

Source: Prepared by Dr. George Rogers, University of Alaska, College, Alaska.

PEACE CORPS SURVEY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have recently had completed and printed as a Senate document what I call the "Peace Corps Survey," which demonstrates the need for a program to prepare students for work abroad.

The survey of 32 universities and colleges in the United States has spotlighted the need for expanding and improving programs to prepare students for government or civilian work abroad, programs which would prove indispensable to the preparation of Peace Corps volunteers.

The survey, begun before the organization of the Peace Corps was announced, was conducted by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress at my request. The results of its findings are being published in a 28-page Senate document—Document No. 13.

Major conclusions of the survey are:

First. The national need for people with knowledge in fields related to international affairs is not currently being met.

Second. Specialized programs preparing students for work abroad should be further developed at both the graduate and undergraduate levels.

Third. The present scope of the National Defense Education Act should be expanded to provide greater Federal assistance, both to students and institutions, to promote the preparation of American students planning to work abroad.

The Library of Congress has prepared this document at a very opportune time, when the Nation is discussing the recruitment and training of a Peace Corps for work abroad. I enthusiastically applaud the idea of a Peace Corps. This study underlines the vital importance of preparing and orientating our young people, country by country, to the high duties in the national interest they face abroad.

Inadequate preparation in foreign languages was listed by the colleges surveyed as the most frequent common failing of students who applied for graduate programs in international affairs and area studies programs. Many universities emphasized the seriousness of this handicap in pursuing advanced study in this field.

In addition to foreign language, a number of universities stated that their applicants needed better preparation at the undergraduate level in basic subjects.

Many of them urged legislation to establish programs of internships, loans, fellowships and scholarships for international affairs study both in the United States and abroad; and to make Federal funds available to colleges and universities to improve the quality and expand the present facilities of programs in international affairs and foreign area study.

The colleges and universities surveyed were: Harvard University, University of Minnesota, Ohio State University, Wisconsin University, Johns Hopkins University, American University, University of Colorado, New York University, Tufts University, University of Kansas, University of Chicago, Brown University, Columbia University, University of Southern California, University of Michigan, San Francisco State College, Yale University, Carleton College, Dartmouth College, City College of New York, University of Pennsylvania, University of Virginia, American Institute for Foreign Trade, Cornell University, Princeton University, Iowa State University, Florida State University, Indiana University, George Washington University, Georgetown University, Northwestern University, and Syracuse University.

Mr. President, a great many programs are now going on, and the survey contains information which is indispensable for every one of us, because of the interest in the Peace Corps. The document is now printed and is available through my office, through the Senate Document Room, or through the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, recently I had occasion to speak on the floor in commemoration of the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Since that time I have received a resolution commemorating this date which was adopted by the Cleveland section No. 14 of the Lithuania Alliance of America, and I ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING THE 43D ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

We, the members of the Lithuanian Alliance of America, at a general meeting held on this 12th day of February 1961, at the Lithuanian Hall in Cleveland, Ohio, for the purpose of commemorating the 43d year of independence of Lithuania, unanimously adopted the following resolution to be submitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the U.S. Senate, and the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations:

"Whereas Lithuania has been freed on the 16th day of February 1918, and on the 12th day of July 1920, made an agreement with

Soviet Russia whereby the Soviet Russia renounced all claims to the Lithuanian territory for all times and recognized the independence and sovereignty of Lithuania; and

"Whereas on September 28, 1926, the Soviet Union signed a nonaggression treaty guaranteeing the integrity of the Lithuanian territory and on July 5, 1933, signed a convention defining aggression as follows:

"'An aggressor shall be that state which commits any one of the following acts:

"'1. Declares war against another state;

"'2. Invades by its armed forces, even without a declaration of war, the territory of another state;

"'3. Attacks by its land, naval, or air forces, even without declaration of war, the territory of another state.

"'4. No consideration of its political economic, military, or any other nature shall serve as an excuse for justification of aggression, as specified in foregoing articles'; and

"Whereas the last bilateral treaty between Lithuania and the Soviet Union was the mutual assistance pact concluded on October 10, 1939, reaffirming the aforesaid treaties and pledges and agreeing to solve all differences by peaceful means and refraining from participating in any alliance or coalition directed against either party and specifically stating that 'the realization of this treaty must not interfere (not infringe upon) the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, especially the structure of the state, their economic, political, or social systems'; and

"Whereas October 3, 1939, the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs, Molotov, supported by the Supreme Soviet, reaffirmed the pact and further proclaimed that 'This treaty stipulates the inviolability of the sovereignty of the signatory states and the principle of nonintervention in each others internal affairs,' and further declared, 'We stand for scrupulous observance of treaties and declare that all nonsense about sovietization of the Baltic States is only to the interest of our enemies and all anti-Soviet provocateurs;' and

"Whereas the same Minister of Foreign Affairs, Molotov, on September 28, 1939, had already entered into a secret agreement with the Nazi German Reich Minister of Foreign Affairs, J. Von Ribbentropp, assigning Lithuania to Russia and the biggest part of Poland and a small section of Lithuania to Germany; and

"Whereas the Soviet claim was that Lithuania was occupied as a war necessity and that after the war was over, Lithuania would be a free country again: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That all freedom loving countries which believe in democracy and freedom declare themselves to avoid any talks, conferences, discussions, and enter any agreements with the Soviet Union which broke every agreement, every treaty, pledge, or promise in the last 45 years, until Lithuania, all the Baltic States, and other occupied countries are freed and their independence restored; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the United States and all the democracies cease supporting the United Nations until they cease being an international farce bent upon appeasing large powers and thus sacrificing small nations by failing to demand the restitution of their freedom; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the restoration of freedom to Lithuania be placed on the agenda of the United Nations by our Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, and that the representatives of Lithuania be given full rights to present their case; and finally be it

"*Resolved*, That all Americans of Lithuanian descent beseech the Government of the United States to take a firm stand and definite action to safeguard the freedoms and liberties of those in Soviet bondage before we lose our friends abroad and the respect of the free world.

"V. BRAZIULIS,
"President, Lithuanian Alliance of America, Cleveland Section No. 14.
"MARY MISCHIK, *Secretary.*"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1 be made the pending business, despite the fact that it is not yet 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to the committee amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, do I still have the floor? The reason I make the suggestion is that I should like to have a quorum call at the appropriate time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the majority leader wishes to do so, very well. I would not like to yield time from the time allotted to me. I think I have only 45 minutes left. Would the majority leader be willing to take it out of the joint time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the amendment before the Senate been read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been read.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being taken out of the time allotted to this amendment.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I suggest to the majority leader that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Should not the quorum call be continued, since there will be a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is true. However, permission was granted to certain committees to meet until 12 o'clock. I suggest, if it is agreeable to the Senator from New York, that we proceed, and suggest the absence of a quorum later. Senators will be coming to the Chamber anyway.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New Hampshire without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOT FRONT IN THE COLD WAR

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a penetrating analysis of the economic aspects of the cold war, prepared by Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, retired.

Major General Klein, who is well known throughout this country and abroad for his distinguished ability in civic, business, and military affairs, unquestionably is a highly qualified observer of the economic problems inherent in this extremely complex situation. He has rendered valuable service to this country in the past, for example, with regard to the preparation of studies conducted under the auspices of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

His most recent contribution to our understanding of the nature and tactical against the free world presents yet anobjectives of the Soviet economic war other highly useful public service. His well-prepared analysis was the subject of an interview with the Chicago Tribune followed by a story based on that interview in the Sunday edition of the Tribune of October 9, 1960. I ask unanimous consent that this newspaper summary by Wayne Thomis be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of that portion of General Klein's analysis entitled "Hot Front in the Cold War."

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

HOT FRONT IN THE COLD WAR

(An analysis of the U.S. position in the global economic conflict with the U.S.S.R., by Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, retired)

(Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, retired, is a former Chicago newspaperman and foreign correspondent who now heads an international public relations firm. He has been called upon frequently to conduct special studies for committees of the U.S. Senate and Federal agencies on the administration of U.S. foreign aid programs. His firm, Julius Klein Public Relations, Inc., represents United States and European industrial organizations engaged in international trade and investment. General Klein's analysis of problems confronting the Western nations in coping with the mounting Soviet economic offensive is an outgrowth of numerous surveys he has conducted for his clients as well

as for the U.S. Government. Material contained in this analysis has been obtained from authoritative sources in the United States and Europe.)

THE U.S. ECONOMIC STAKE IN EUROPE

Millions of words have been expended in recent years to adduce comparisons between the relative economic growth rates of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Rival pundits have predicted, on the one hand, that the U.S.S.R. is on the road to economic supremacy over the United States and, on the other hand, that inherent drawbacks in the Soviet economy assure that East and West will be able to coexist peacefully for an indefinite period.

Statistics can be shaped to support either view, as long as they fail to take account of the political and psychological factors that are at play. Those who confidently predict that coexistence will prove feasible argue that in time the Soviet citizen will wear himself out politically and that this ideological attrition will lead to a progressive decrease in Soviet economic productivity.

These hopeful speculations have built-in errors and dangers. They ignore the central fact that the Soviets have demonstrated an uncommon ability to organize both the will to work and their national productive capacity. The hard truth is that the Soviet economy has shown an unusual growth rate over a considerable number of years. By 1957, Soviet industrial production was 40 percent of the U.S. level and about 70 percent of the Western European production. Should present rates of growth remain constant, the Soviets by 1965 will be producing at 90 percent of the U.S. rate.

In estimating the future pace of economic development, Western savants make the mistake of hinging their comparisons of the rival systems to the standards of living that obtain on each side. The Soviets cannot, of course, match the Western nations in the creature comforts that go with gracious living. It may well be possible to travel from the Crimea to Siberia without ever finding an electric cocktail mixer on Soviet store shelves. But what is overlooked is that the production of such gadgets is totally irrelevant to the requirements of Soviet designs for world domination, the sole criterion that is applied to every phase of Soviet life.

The virility of Soviet productive capacity is perhaps most sharply evident in its rate of agricultural production, particularly in the wake of governmental relaxation of the once harsh collective farm policies. Discerning tourists have seen no sign of ideological or productive weakening. It would, therefore, be suicidal folly to assume that Soviet agriculture will continue to lag behind U.S. farm production.

An even more threatening portent is to be found in the field of foreign trade, where the Soviets have been waging an all-out offensive. Maximum efforts are being made to obtain credits and favorable terms of payment. Meanwhile, the Soviet economy is buttressed by a great wealth of natural resources and the U.S.S.R.'s organization is a pushbutton state that can switch its economy in any direction without difficulty. This high degree of flexibility raises the question of whether the Soviets are nearing a position from which they strike damaging blows at U.S. economy, and whether they can enlist the services of other economies for their political aims.

That such a design is in being cannot be doubted. Already, several nations have found themselves hip deep in crises because, for reasons best known to the Soviets, trade was abruptly terminated, forcing the dependent states to scurry about for new markets.

One of the most ominous developments of the cold war is the emergence of the possibility that some sectors of the European economy could come to depend on trade with the Soviets. In Europe, just as in the United States, nothing is more feared than the thought of an economic recession. Any offer of trade would then be acceptable, provided it offered a path, no matter how tenuous, toward fending off the specter of unemployment. Meanwhile, the Soviet's captive states in Europe give the Kremlin a number of advance strongholds which already maintain extensive trade relations with the Western States. There can be no doubt that these satellites function under the central direction of the Soviets and constitute direct arms of Soviet policy in Europe.

The dread significance of the Soviet trade foothold in Europe is that it reduces the necessity of military conflict to achieve Soviet objectives. With skillful manipulation, trade relations could be further extended with European states—probably against a background of soothing talk from the Soviets on the theme of coexistence—and then suddenly suspended with devastating impacts on Europe's economy.

Could such a move affect the U.S. economy?

It might be argued that U.S. exports and imports are a relatively small factor in the total U.S. economy and their loss could therefore be sustained without major ill effects. To accept so soothing a conclusion would be a tragic error. Whether we like it or not, the entire structure of international relationships has produced so marked a degree of interdependence that serious economic disturbances in any one sector can set off damaging temblors that affect all.

The Soviet economy, bolstered by the resources of its satellites and the economic potential of other European states, would give the U.S.S.R. a degree of power that would constitute a direct political and economic threat to the survival of the United States.

It is obvious that the United States could not afford to look on complacently if the economies of its friends in Western Europe were to be severely shaken or unhinged. It is equally obvious that the United States, no less than any other individual nation, would soon find itself in a vise if it had to depend entirely on itself.

The measure of the Soviet economic challenge is to be seen in the fact that the industrial production of the states that make up the European Economic Community is lagging behind U.S.S.R. production. Should the Soviets contrive to harness the European economic potential for their own purposes, the productive capacity of such an economic bloc would quickly surpass the U.S. capability by a wide margin. By 1965, the crude steel production of such a bloc would be 25 to 30 percent higher than the U.S. capacity. Similar ratios would apply to chemical products and machinery. As long ago as 1957, U.S. exports amounted to $20,600 million, while exports of the European Economic Community states came to $32 billion.

The sobering conclusions to be drawn from continuing Soviet economic incursions do not require emphasis. It would be courting national suicide to assume that the U.S. economy is sufficiently shockproof to warrant a sense of full security. Europe's economy cannot be permitted to fall into the hands of the Soviets, either through yielding to the narcosis of the Soviets' coexistence line or through naked force. More than at any time in the history of this century, the economic security of the United States, like that of the Western European nations, is vitally dependent on the development and execution of bold and unwavering policies within Europe itself.

It would be an invitation to disaster to assume that the Soviets are prepared to act in accordance with the principles of economic common sense or to sacrifice their political aims to ideals of friendly cooperation. Any time it suits Soviet plans, or proves necessary to the achievement of their goals of world hegemony, they will not hesitate to initiate what they would regard as a reasonable destruction of non-Communist economies, even if this would require an extremely unreasonable use of economic resources.

The compelling logic of the Soviet design is that the security of Western Europe's economy is vital to American self-interest. To abandon our friends in Europe, even without the incidence of a war, would be to abandon ourselves.

THE SOVIETS' ECONOMIC SPIDER WEB

Initial Soviet reaction to the Marshall Plan in 1947 appeared to reflect a disposition to cooperate in the multilateral economic reconstruction plan organized on U.S. initiative. But in one of the acrobatic policy shifts that has become the hallmark of Soviet tactics, Vyacheslav Molotov, in July 1947, walked out on the Paris Marshall Plan Conference. The Soviets' satellites were ordered to disassociate themselves promptly from any further participation in the Marshall plan.

Three months later, in October 1947, the Kremlin spawned the Cominform and the era of the cold war was born. The U.S.S.R. turned full speed ahead to the prosecution of strengthen its war potential while at the its doctrinaire objectives. It set out to same time establishing the production allocations necessary to its goal of sapping and destroying the political and economic foundations of the countries of the free world.

The breakneck pace of the Soviet economic offensive has become most sharply discernible in its effect on world raw material markets. Soviet pressures have been most insistently felt in trade currents affecting nonferrous metals (tin, zinc, aluminum, etc.). Some muddled, though hopeful, observers contended that Soviet tactics resulted from a domestic economic dilemma; they argued that the Soviets' market manipulations could be explained by Russian surpluses of tin, zinc and aluminum, against a shortage of copper. Nevertheless, the Soviets managed to play havoc with the Western raw material economy in the nonferrous metals sector. But a grinning Khrushchev could chortle, "You ain't seen nothing yet."

The Western nations were brought to a shocking realization that they could be hit harder and even more painfully by Soviet inroads in the Afro-Asian countries.

During his visit to the United States, Soviet boss Khrushchev blandly conceded that the economic assimilation of the newly developing countries was a cardinal objective in his economic and trade offensive against the Western nations. To a query by an American trade union leader as to why the Soviets preferred to extend economic aid to newly developing countries via bilateral agreements rather than through neutral international institutions such as the United Nations, the Soviet dictator replied: "The bread of bilateral agreements is not tainted. If it tastes of socialism that is a pleasant taste."

This was a deliberate understatement of an extremely complex situation. In point of fact, the Communist countries regard bilateral agreements as essential to strengthening their negotiating position in relation to weaker trade partners. Once they are induced to sell raw materials in return for credits and technical assistance the newly developing countries soon find themselves enmeshed in a Communist economic spider web. Trapped into a debtor position, these countries are not long in discovering that the Communist states demand particularly high prices for their export goods to the underdeveloped lands. What hopes may be spurred for the achievement of satisfactory economic levels are completely at the mercy of the Communists; the larger the propor-

tion of trade with the Communist bloc, the more vulnerable is the economy of the state that relies on this trade. Meanwhile, Communist technicians, whatever their management or supervisory skills, are above all highly trained in political subversion so that new governments which show any disposition to cock a friendly ear toward the West soon find their foundations tottering.

The menace of the Soviet economic offensive lies not so much in its scope, which by now is generally grasped in the West, but in its tactical concepts. The U.S.S.R. has been adroit enough to secure the execution of spectacular projects, such as the Aswan Dam, and to wring every last iota of propaganda advantage out of such undertakings. The Soviets have an immense reservoir of technical experts who can be assigned at a moment's notice to any part of Asia and Africa, particularly any area that is susceptible to political penetration. While the Western nations feel obliged to deal with the economic needs of the underdeveloped world as a whole, the Soviets are getting incomparably more mileage at less cost by concentrating on the establishment of key points, areas which offer the largest political return per trade ruble. One case in point is Egypt, where the Soviets effectively capitalized on Nasser's ambition to become the kingpin of the Arab world.

Up to the most recent harvests, about two-thirds of Egypt's total cotton production was bought up by the Communist bloc. The volume of cotton purchases exceeded by far the Eastern bloc's own requirement. Motivating the Communist deal for Egyptian cotton were these considerations:

1. The establishment of a Communist hold on Egypt's economic needs;

2. Ample opportunity to sell Egyptian cotton in excess of Communist needs for hard foreign currency, if necessary below prevailing market prices.

Nor should it be ignored that the acquisition of hard foreign currency appears at times to be more important to the Communists than obtaining good prices.

Egypt may already have found reason to ponder the wisdom of its trade tie with the Soviet bloc. Latest figures indicate that probably only 40 percent of the yield from the latest Egyptian cotton harvest will be bought by the Communist combine, as against 66 percent last year.

By all odds the most threatening Soviet coup in striking at an economic target area designed to give maximum discomfort to the United States is the sugar purchase agreement with Cuba. Of Cuba's entire sugar exports for the next 5 years, about 20 percent each year will go to the U.S.S.R. The political consequences that quickly flowed from this agreement are on naked view in Castro's recognition of Red China and North Korea, without which no Soviet satellite can claim full membership in the Kremlin's colonial empire.

In addition to Egypt and Cuba, Soviet economic tentacles have also been fastened on Burma, Syria, Iran, Ceylon, Uruguay, and Iceland. One-third of Iceland's fish exports go to the Eastern bloc, although the Soviet's fishing industry is one of the world's largest.

It is dim consolation to take into account that the Soviet economic offensive is governed by inherent limitations enforced by the need to allocate a share of the Soviet bloc's production surplus for trade within the bloc itself.

EUROPE: U.S. NEED VERSUS SOVIET GOAL

Repeatedly needled by Western newsmen on his threat to the United States: "We will bury you," Nikita Khrushchev has sought an out by insisting that his frame of reference was economic rather than military. Specifically, he has predicted that the Soviets will overtake and surpass the United States in industrial production.

The otherwise well-briefed Soviet boss is apparently unaware that the American economy is already passing through a second industrial revolution. Coal is giving way to other sources of energy, ranging from oil and gas to atomic power. Steel is finding itself under vigorous competition from plastics and light metals. In these and other new fields, U.S. production far exceeds Soviet achievements.

The relative volume of United States and Soviet industrial production now varies from year to year. But the extent of Soviet penetration in countries producing raw materials vital to U.S. needs is an eye opener when measured against the ability of the United States to attain self-sufficiency in basic materials essential to national security. The United States depends to a very large extent on imports of natural rubber, tin, chromium, manganese, tungsten, and bauxite. And it is this dependence that is uppermost in Soviet selection of targets for economic aggrandizement.

Given the advantages it has already acquired through footholds in key raw material producing areas, the interment ceremonies Khrushchev had in mind for the United States would need only the acquisition of productive resources necessary to give him overwhelming economic superiority. There is only one area of the world to which he can look for the achievement of this ambition: Europe.

In 1956, the United States, the countries of the European Economic Community, and the U.S.S.R. could count some 17 million industrial workers each. The acquisition of Europe's industrial resources and manpower, by whatever means it might be achieved, would give Khrushchev the tools necessary to bury the United States.

Four years ago, roughly 17 percent of the world's mining production was accounted for by Western Europe and roughly 21 percent by the Eastern bloc, including Red China. In that same period, the combined mining production of Western and Eastern Europe equaled the U.S. percentage of world mining production (38 percent).

The value of Western European industrial production was calculated at $84 billion for 1955, computed on the basis of 1948 exchange rates and prices (value of world industrial production including that of the Soviet Union and her satellites: $305 billion).

The industrial states of Western Europe are each other's best customers. They exchange half of their total exports among themselves. Western Europe markets one-half of its industrial finished products within Europe, a relatively small portion in the peripheral regions of Europe, and the very considerable remainder outside Europe, where it purchases about 50 percent of its raw materials and more than 30 percent of its foodstuffs.

Western Europe's share in overall world trade in 1956 amounted to 39.6 percent. The United States' share in world trade was 20.9 percent, that of the Soviet Union 3.5 percent, that of Red China 1.5 percent. The percentage distribution of world exports in 1955 according to places of origin and of destination clearly shows that in that year about three-quarters of the foreign trade turnover in the Eastern bloc was effected internally. In Western Europe, internal foreign trade turnover amounted to 51 percent. In the same year, 25 percent of all exports from the United States and Canada went to Western Europe.

In 1959, 30 percent (i.e., approximately $4,700 million of the total U.S. exports went to Western Europe).

The sobering conclusions to be drawn from these figures need no overemphasis.

Were the productive resources of Western Europe to be sucked into the Soviet vortex, Europe would be canceled out as an export market for the United States. More damaging still, American capital investments in Europe ($4.5 billion as of 1958) would be in dire and direct jeopardy. Moreover, the marshaling of this economic might would quickly be turned by the Soviets against destruction of remaining U.S. markets outside Europe.

To date, Soviet forays have been able to disturb raw materials markets and unsettle prices, but basically trade in raw materials has been under at least a semblance of control because a relationship still exists between supply and demand. The peril that must be fended off, therefore, is further Soviet economic encroachment in Western Europe. The overriding importance of Western Europe's industrial potential and the volume of Western foreign trade make it plain that any degree of Soviet hegemony over Western Europe would touch off violent assaults on the international price structure with consequences from which the United States could not escape. Finally, Soviet sway over Europe's productive might would spell doom for the entire structure of Western cooperation through such institutions as GATT, the World Bank, and joint programs for economic aid to newly developing countries.

These are facts which point in only one direction:

Economic ties between the United States and Europe have become so close and complex that in the event of even partial encroachments or harassing operations by the Soviets in Western European markets, the U.S. economy could not remain unaffected.

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune, Oct. 9, 1960]

JULIUS KLEIN WARNS UNITED STATES OF SOVIET MOVES—RED ECONOMIC GROWTH HELD TOP DANGER

(By Wayne Thomis)

It is not Communist missiles or infantry but enormous new economic and industrial advances within the Soviet Union that pose major threats to Western European nations and the United States, according to Julius Klein, former Chicago newspaperman and now head of a European public relations network.

In an interview in Chicago, Klein said Russian civil production gains will merely add strength to the Soviet worldwide aggression programs. The new capacities will be used and are being used, Klein said, to achieve Soviet political aims just as in other circumstances in the recent past, Russian totalitarians used military power to gain similar ends.

MAKES ECONOMIC STUDIES

"I have just concluded a series of economic studies for the U.S. Senate committees interested in foreign aid programs and for some of my clients," Klein said. "During the course of seven extended visits to Germany, France, and the Benelux countries, I had the benefit of conferences with some of the foremost bankers, economists, and Government financial experts in arriving at my conclusions.

"I must say that after the widest possible inquiry, I concur in the general European opinion that a big atomic war with its wholesale destructions on all sides is highly unlikely.

"I am just as certain, however, that the cold war will go on and that the Russian attitude indicated when Premier Khrushchev said, 'We will bury you,' is that Russian productivity will climb up to and exceed that of the United States—if sheer effort alone can achieve this goal.

HARASSMENT EVERYWHERE

"Harassment of the United States by Soviet leadership extends into all realms of trade and commerce," Klein said. "The Soviet Union's share in international commerce in 1956—last full year available—was only 3.5 percent of the world trade total whereas

the U.S. international trade was 21 percent—but Russian maneuvering hurt.

"In the case of a number of raw and basic materials, the United States is dependent on imports," said Klein. "Some of these are mineral oil, natural rubber, various nonferrous metals, wool, sugar, and luxuries such as tea and coffee.

"By carefully coordinated purchases, particularly in the form of long-term commitments of supplying countries, the Soviet Union can and has caused shortages and sent prices soaring.

CITES SUDDEN SHIFTS

"Soviet economic activity in individual raw material markets and in certain countries is characterized by sudden, uncoordinated measures, which, by Western concepts, frequently appear to make little economic sense. The considerations in a free, competitive economy are completely alien to the Soviet system of a planned state.

"The line of thought which takes costs and profitability into consideration is foreign to the Soviets.

"Therefore, in making extraordinary purchases or sales of raw materials the Soviets gain two ways—one in psychological victories and two by making the countries with which they trade beholden to the Soviet Union. The Soviet contracts always provide for compensatory transactions—that is, they compel the supplying or buying countries to accept Soviet goods in payment. This automatically cuts down export opportunities of the United States or other Western producers."

REASON IS MILITARY

Klein said there are obvious reasons why the Soviets maintain a constant pressure to separate the United States and the Western European nations in their NATO and economic cooperations. Foremost of these is, of course, military, he said.

"But should the Soviet Union receive any substantial reinforcement through intensification of the economic relations with Eastern Europe, it is obvious that disturbance of equilibrium in world economy by coordinated Soviet maneuvers would have an intensified effect on the United States internal welfare," Klein said.

"In a recent year the industrial production of the United States represented 39 percent of the world economy and that of Western Europe 25 percent so that together they represented almost two-thirds of the world's production.

PRODUCES 20 PERCENT

"In the same year the Eastern bloc accounted for 20 percent of world production. But if the ties shifted, the Soviets might achieve a Communist controlled 45 percent of the world's production."

Klein pointed out that loss of Western Europe to the Soviets even on a free trade basis would result in major shifts in production areas where the West holds a solid superiority. In mineral production the United States share is 28 percent and Europe's is 10 percent. The Eastern bloc share including Red China, Klein said, is 24 percent. If the Soviets got European production they would lead by 34 percent.

In hard coal the present United States-Western Europe lead is 56 percent compared with the Soviet-controlled 34 percent. But a shift could put the Soviets ahead by 27 percent.

In steel the United States produces 35 percent of world tonnages, Europe 30 percent.

The Soviet steel production was only 25 percent. But Soviet-controlled steel would become 55 percent, if the combinations were switched, Klein pointed out.

SWITCH COULD HURT

"Cooperation between Western Europe and the Soviet Union—in view of the great importance of the Western European industrial potential and volume of foreign trade—would permit violent assaults on the international price structure entailing catastrophic consequences which the American market could not escape," Klein said.

"Economic ties between the United States and Western Europe have grown so close and complex that in the event of even partial encroachment or harassing activities undertaken by the Soviets * * * the United States economy could not remain unaffected.

"The United States needs Western European economy and the latter remains linked with the American economy for better or for worse," Klein concluded.

AMERICANS AND INSTITUTIONS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the United States is still a young, virile, and idealistic Nation. We are also a law-abiding Nation. Our proudest boast is that we are a Nation governed by laws and not by men.

Unfortunately, when we try to export or extend our idealism and philosophy of government to other lands and to other peoples we run into trouble; particularly so when we try to deal with Communist conspirators through our traditional openhanded concept of law and treaties.

William Henry Chamberlin is a distinguished American historian and authority on international communism. His monumental two volume "History of the Russian Revolution" is still an acknowledged standard reference work on the subject. The Wall Street Journal of March 1 carried a very important, thought-provoking article which challenges some of the serious misconceptions many Americans still entertain about dealing with the Soviets.

As this article, "Americans and Institutions," may have escaped the attention of some Senators, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

AMERICANS AND INSTITUTIONS: THE UNITED STATES TOO MUCH BELIEVES THAT WORLD ORDER CAN BE GUARANTEED THROUGH TREATIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Optimism is a recognized American trait. The best traits, however, have their reverse sides. And one byproduct of the American optimism is a far too confident belief in salvation through institutions.

Hence the attempts to deal by law or judicial fiat with problems that lie in the field of individual morality and emotional reaction and prejudice. Making prohibition the law of the land did not make Americans a people of total abstainers. The most famous of recent Supreme Court rulings has not eliminated strife and bitterness from the process of desegregating school systems in the Southern States.

This yearning for an institutional "gimmick" that will make everything come right is even stronger in international than in domestic affairs. When the United Nations was in process of formation, a large religious organization urged its members to support the effort with the hopeful slogan: "You can win the peace with a 3-cent stamp." Alas, the price of peace is much, much higher, as the course of events during the last 15 years has shown.

"There ought to be a stronger U.N." "All international disputes should be settled by enforceable world law." "Let's keep the cold war out of the Congo." Such are the recurring themes of letters to newspapers, of statements by more or less distinguished figures, in and out of public service. Well intentioned persons go on crusades for such causes and win rounds of applause from sympathetic audiences.

What is overlooked is that the United Nations cannot be any stronger, or any more "united," than the powers which make up its membership wish it to be. A stream cannot rise higher than its source. One of the charter members of the U.N. is the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has never concluded a treaty with another nation providing for the settlement of differences by impartial arbitration.

THE CASE OF HUNGARY

The favorite Soviet treaty form is the "pact of nonaggression and neutrality." The Soviet Government has concluded a number of such pacts and periodically comes up with the suggestion of willingness to sign such treaties with the United States, Great Britain, and other Western Powers. The value of such suggestions may be gaged from two facts. The Soviet Union has abruptly ended many of these pacts by attacking its partner and annexing all or part of its territory. And such pacts provide neither an impartial tribunal to decide when aggression has taken place nor sanctions against a proved aggressor.

How, then, can one reasonably expect a stronger United Nations so long as the Soviet Union is a member? Is it reasonable to expect a government which does not admit the principle of arbitration in its treaty relations with foreign powers to accept the authority of an international organization which it does not fully control?

Soviet behavior in Hungary furnishes one eloquent answer to these questions. The determined, persistent effort of the Soviet Government to destroy the power, even the existence of the office of Secretary General furnishes another. It is a pretty safe prediction that the United Nations will never be stronger so long as the Soviet Union remains a member, barring a very unlikely change in Soviet policy.

Should the aim, then, be a United Nations without the participation of the Soviet Union, whose chief contribution to that organization has been the casting of about 100 vetoes? There would be strong opposition to any such proposal and the elimination of the Communist-ruled powers from United Nations membership would not make the cause of peace any stronger.

Everything that a United Nations without the Communist powers could do is already being done by such regional alliances as NATO, SEATO, OAS, etc. And these alliances, in turn, are no stronger than the will and resolution of their member states.

THE DECEIT OF MORALITY

"Enforceable world law" is an attractive phrase; but it bears no relation to the realities or possibilities of today's world. To the Communist mind right is what promotes the victory of the Communist cause. As Lenin put it: "Morality is what serves the destruction of old exploiters' society and the union of all the workers around the proletariat, which creates a new society of Communists. * * * We do not believe in eternal morality and we expose the deceit of all legends about morality."

Such a mental attitude is quite inconsistent with law, which presupposes general acceptance, by those who live under it, of universally applicable principles of justice and equity. Nor would it be possible to find an acceptable legal common denominator for the French settler in Algeria and the nationalist guerrilla, for Boer and Bantu in South Africa.

Our thinking on international affairs will be much clearer and more realistic if we can clear our minds of the common delusion

that there is an institutional gimmick for every difficulty. Constitutions and treaties are, after all, scraps of paper which derive their ultimate sanction from the character and good faith of the peoples who live under them and the governments which sign them.

The British statesman William E. Gladstone referred to the American Constitution as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." Most Americans would be inclined to agree. Yet it is quite probable that the American people, with their inherited instinct for liberty under law, would have maintained orderly self-government even under a less impressive instrument.

On the other hand it is unlikely that a committee composed of the most eminent masters of political science, of men like Locke, Montesquieu, de Tocqueville, Adams, and Madison, could devise a constitution that would function effectively in the Congo, or in some other backward and disturbed areas of the world today.

It is men who determine the validity of documents, not documents that shape the actions of men. It is crucial that Americans realize their own concept of institutions, and their respect for them, has almost no meaning through much of the world.

GROWING POWER OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, we cannot be reminded too forcibly or too frequently of the dangers of big government and its tendency to tax and tax and spend and spend.

Foster's Daily Democrat, a newspaper serving the southeastern part of New Hampshire since 1873, has called this fact to our attention in an excellent editorial dated March 10, 1961.

The editorial reminds us that our tax money is dissipated by administrative costs in Washington, partly channeled to other States and partly returned to the taxpayers of New Hampshire. Meanwhile, new agencies and departments are added to our Federal Government that require more and heavier spending and the cycle goes on.

I commend this fine editorial to my colleagues and request unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

GROWING POWER OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

During the past few weeks economists have been showing some concern over the rapid increase in indebtedness in the United States, particularly private debt, and State and municipal debt.

Private debt of individuals in the United States has gone up $441 billion since World War II to a total of $581 billion. State and municipal debt has climbed from $46.3 billion to $60 billion in the same period.

Leftwing economists argue that debt rise goes along with expansion and growth. In many cases States and cities are heavily in debt, relative to income (Dover is a typical example). Private debt at $581 billion is immense. Say the planners: It may be necessary to find new ways to use the Federal Government's borrowing power to finance growth.

Along this line it is proposed to set up a new Government department on Cabinet level, that of Housing and Urban Affairs. In our opinion it is one more step in the move to make this Nation a purely socialistic state.

When are the American people going to wake up to the fact that all Federal money comes out of their own pockets? Of every dollar in Federal taxes raised in New Hampshire at least 25 cents remains in Washington in the form of administrative costs. Another heavy slice goes to some of the less wealthy States in the South. What is left for us is probably about 65 cents out of every dollar.

When are people going to realize that it would be more economical to tax themselves directly for local improvements, rather than to pay a 50-percent bonus to the Federal Government for creating hundreds of hidden taxes in addition to some direct taxes?

We go along with many economists in declaring that local people know more about their needs than does the Government in Washington. Less costly Government aid, rather than more, should be what we seek. If the Federal Government would let up on taxation, and permit local and State government to take over more of this responsibility, the better off would all of us be. That is perhaps too much to expect.

We hope that the idea of creating a new department in Washington to take over more of the responsibilities that belong to us as citizens of Dover, and other New Hampshire cities, will not go through.

TRIBUTE TO HERMAN A. LOWE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the great circle of friends of Herman A. Lowe was saddened Monday to learn of his sudden passing on Sunday at Philadelphia. He was a prominent Washington correspondent for varicus newspapers and periodicals for a number of years and was one of the most astute journalists in the press corps.

He was an alert and conscientious correspondent and he had the keen ability of determining the political implications of daily events in the Nation's Capital.

Herman was a good friend of mine for years and I always enjoyed my association with him. He and his widow, Florence, made an excellent newspaper team and kept their publication clients up to the minute on all events of importance. It was only a few years ago that he left his Washington assignment to accept a key position with the Albert Einstein Medical Center in Philadelphia. However, his many years of newspaper work and public relations activities in Washington and Pennsylvania prompted him recently to decide on returning to Washington to reestablish his correspondence work. This was closer to his heart and he was looking forward to opening a news bureau within a few days.

Herman Lowe was very well known in my State of New Hampshire because of his excellent news coverage for the Manchester Union and the New Hampshire Sunday News.

Mrs. Bridges and I want to join his legion of friends in extending our deepest sympathy to his widow, Florence, and to their wonderful daughter and son.

THE ISSUES OF HUNGARY AND TIBET BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, these days we hear a great deal about the image of the United States of America abroad.

Unfortunately, we have learned through bitter experience that false theories about America and American ideals have spread throughout the world in the past with little or no justification.

It is with this in mind that I invite attention to disturbing reports of attempts by this country's Ambassador to the United Nations to postpone until a later date debate on the issues of Hungary and Tibet. I have noted the timely statement made before this body by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], with which I agree wholeheartedly. Yesterday I sent a wire to Ambassador Stevenson setting forth my views in this regard. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this wire be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

MARCH 14, 1961.

Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations,
United Nations Building, New York, N.Y.:

I am greatly disturbed by reports that several items, including the Hungary and Tibet issues, may be postponed from the current agenda of the United Nations. In my estimation such action would be a grave mistake and could only set the stage for further conquests and slaughters of equal magnitude in the future.

I am convinced that the Hungarian and Tibetan issues need to be discussed fully at an early date. This is vital if we are to show the rest of the world that we neither condone nor do we take lightly unwarranted aggression by Soviet Russia or Communist China.

To postpone debate on these issues would be too great a price to pay for creating a quieter international climate for negotiation on other matters. I urge you to resist any temptation to allow these issues to be deferred to a later session of the General Assembly.

STYLES BRIDGES,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, for the life of me, I cannot understand what we hope to gain by seeking deferment of a thorough airing of the events surrounding the Hungarian and Tibetan massacres. From what I can piece together in the news reports, it would appear that we are seeking to either save time in order to concentrate on other measures or to create a favorable international climate for discussion of other topics.

I fully realize the importance of other matters on the United Nations agenda, with particular reference to the Congo crisis, but I submit that we are wasting a great deal of time trying to save time.

On the other hand, the unfavorable international climate which we are trying to rectify is not of our making. It was created by such incidents as the inexcusable and indefensible slaughters of the peoples of Hungary and Tibet.

One does not cure cancer with a Band-aid.

And we are not going to calm world tensions by placing a huge adhesive plaster over the wounds of Hungary and Tibet.

I sincerely hope that the reports of our desire to postpone action on these two issues will not mislead peoples of other nations into thinking that the United States considers these acts of aggression to be unimportant. We consider the loss of a single life to be all important, and the senseless murders

of countless Hungarians and Tibetans is not treated lightly by any American.

I would hope that these problems will be discussed as soon as possible in order that responsibility might be firmly fixed and our position made decidedly clear.

We have nothing to lose by a complete disclosure of these facts but I fear that we have much to lose by vacillating on such important matters.

I thank the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe the Senator from New Hampshire is absolutely correct in urging that the United Nations at our behest, if no other—and I am sure there will be others—retain on its agenda the Hungary and Tibet items. I make that statement for this reason: I yield to no one in my desire to bring about some accommodation between ourselves and the Communists in the Soviet Union which will bring about a lessening of world tension. But I am not blind to the fact—and I do not think the American people should be—that we are dealing in an area in which each of the parties must play its own game to the full. If it does not, it will be defeated. The Russians are not letting up in Laos, the Congo, Berlin, Algeria, or Latin America. They are riding every horse that suits them and fits their case.

It seems to me the affront to civilized man and the whole moral tone of the world represented by the terrors in Hungary and Tibet represent our case. This result is what people who think they can find an easy way to development through the Russian system are going to run into themselves in terms of repression.

Therefore, we should press our case. I do not see in what manner that kind of dignity and starch in one's backbone would interfere with coming to an accommodation with the Russians in Geneva on atomic testing or any other issue, if they wish to accommodate. I think the point that the Senator from New Hampshire properly makes, one which is implied in everything that he has said, is that the Russians will not wish to accommodate unless we try our case in the world forum as actively as they do.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the distinguished Senator for his contribution. He is absolutely truthful and accurate.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to the committee amendment as amended. The Senator from New York has 47 minutes remaining.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

We come to a discussion of the amendment which is before the Senate, and which proposes to strike any reference to machinery and equipment from the distressed areas bill which we are now considering.

In the first place, Senators should be clear that the bill is specific in what it authorizes money to be used for, and the specifics are found at the foot of page 45 and on page 48, as follows: Under the terms of the bill the money can be used to aid in financing any project within a redevelopment area for the purchase or development of land and facilities. Then we skip to the phrase which relates to machinery and equipment, to which I just referred, and which I am moving to strike—

> For the purchase or development of land and facilities (including machinery and equipment in cases of demonstrated need) for industrial or commercial usage, including the construction of new buildings, the rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied buildings, and the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of existing buildings.

What my amendment proposes to do is to say, "You can use the money provided under the bill for all these purposes, but you may not actually supply the machinery and equipment for the plants which you are going to encourage by providing land, facilities, the utilities which they require, making tax deals, and any other arrangements which are normal in the promotion of inducing industrial enterprises to enter into an area in which they have not operated before."

I should like to put into focus and perspective the reason for the amendment. I make this statement as a friend of the bill. I am one of the cosponsors of the bill. I voted to report the bill from the committee. I showed, in a very difficult vote yesterday on financing through Government bond issues the loans funds provided in the bill, that I believe in the bill. This vote was not an easy one for any Senator on this side of the aisle to make. I proposed the amendment because I think the bill must be fair in terms of the larger industrial States of the Nation.

I believe the bill will be very helpful, particularly to communities which have had great difficulties in terms of permanent technological unemployment. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is present in the Chamber. The State which he represents in part has been one of the hardest hit. My own State has pockets of the same kind, as Pennsylvania and other States also have. We believe that the bill will help those particular areas. Hence the bill.

But the competition between States to attract industrial firms to locate within them will continue. Obviously, a bill of this scope and size in terms of the amount involved will not end the competitive activity between the States for attracting business into their States; and naturally the largest industrial States must do the biggest job on that score.

For example, it is said that President Kennedy has alleged that we must find 25,000 new jobs a week. I respectfully submit that if we are to find 25,000 new jobs a week in order to employ the normal accretions to the work force in the United States, we shall have to find at least 2,500 of those jobs within the State of New York itself, because we have 10 percent of the employables of the United States. In order to employ that number, we must go out and dig. I might say, too, because I think it is important to put this problem in focus, that during the Eisenhower administration, which is being somewhat economically maligned now, about 18,000 new jobs a week were found. No one understands better than I—and many Senators on this side of the aisle feel exactly the same way—that we have a problem of unemployment. Even so, the fact is that we have the highest employment in history, and we must think not only of the 6½ percent or 7 percent who may be unemployed and who we are seeking to help in every way humanly possible, but also we must think about and plan for opportunities for the 93 percent plus who are employed. In my State they number approximately 6 million people.

So I am interested in the bill, which is not especially for the benefit of my State, but will benefit other States. I believe it is very true that with the great interest we have, if the country is in better shape, we are in better shape. But at the same time, we do not want to load the deck against normal competition between the States, which will continue after the bill becomes law as it has operated in the past.

In normal competition there are ground rules. Normally a State or locality is very well able by its own devices—and many have done so—to work out a solution. The junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I have an outstanding example in Utica, N.Y., which suffered a devastating blow when the textile industry moved out of that community overnight and cut employment to ribbons, and which by setting up a development agency of its own, with the use of many people and private credit, restored itself to a very high degree of effectiveness in industrial terms. We are coming to the rescue of particular communities which apparently are unable to do so because of the inadequacy of their resources.

However, it seems to me we do not want to come to their rescue to such an extent that they then will be in a better position to compete with their neighbors than they would have a right to be if they were restored to their normal competitive status.

The normal pattern of development in any American community, in terms of the bill, has been for the community, with its own resources and with private resources, to offer people tax accommodations, retrained help through vocational training in the schools or in analogous ways, and a good climate in terms of taxation. Perhaps they might be offered some arrangements with respect to taxation on real estate, and buildings which might have been either vacated by other industries as a result of technological unemployment, or which the community might undertake to construct.

But it has been most unusual, and indeed considered to be unfair competition among the respective States, to try to give to an industry, in order to attract it into a particular area, a plant fully

equipped. Nonetheless, that is exactly what the bill contemplates.

Therefore, the first point is that we would be loading against the industrial States a competitive situation which had previously existed in terms of trying to get new business, which situation exists now, and which will exist tomorrow, even when the bill is passed, by giving an advantage beyond restoring the community to the normal ability to compete, by giving to the redevelopment areas an advantage beyond what is contemplated by the bill, if we persist in including the item respecting machinery and equipment. I think it is most unfair to the industrial States, which will be financing this whole operation very heavily, because they are the principal tax producers in the country.

I say this as a friend of the bill and as one who is interested in seeing the bill pass. The provision to which I object represents a distortion of the purpose of the bill, and therefore should be corrected for the reasons I have mentioned.

It is very well known—and I do not believe any authority need be cited for it—that the normal pattern of attracting business by American industry does not include the furnishing to a particular industry or a small business with machinery and equipment. Such a proposal has been protested against many times as representing unfair competition, and as being particularly unfair to many of the States. For example, many States send representatives to other States. They send them to my State—and this is particularly true of Southern States, who do a great deal of this—to attract business to their States. However, it is most unusual for an inducement to be held out in terms of machinery and equipment.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

As I said, it is very unusual that machinery and equipment has been offered as an inducement. That has always been considered as being a most unfair inducement, and has certainly been frowned upon, and generally not employed. That is reason No. 1.

The second reason I find very persuasive with me, and I hope it will be persuasive to many Senators as well. We know that machinery and equipment are sold on very long terms of credit. A machinery and equipment supplier will look over the auspices under which a new business is being organized—and we are dealing here with the organization of new businesses—and the supplier will decide whether it is a worthy credit risk to go along with that business in terms of supplying machinery and equipment on a fairly long term basis. Usually that credit will be extended by way of a chattel mortgage, because in most cases the supplying of the machinery and equipment is considered to be a safe bet, inasmuch as the depreciation is not rapid. This represents by the seller of the machinery and equipment an overriding economic judgment on the soundness of the enterprise, which is produced, as it were, from the dynamics of the private enterprise system.

It seems to me that we should be very careful not to omit that from our considerations, not to strike it from our considerations, by enabling local communities in developing areas to supply machinery and equipment with Federal aid, which could be done under the provisions of the pending bill. If we do that we deny ourselves a very effective economic governor, in which the self-interest of the supplier of machinery and equipment gives some control over the establishment of an improvident enterprise. I believe we all agree that one of the worst things that could happen to this whole concept represented by the pending bill would be if that were to happen. That would be the end of the concept for decades, and would be decidedly harmful to it.

Those reasons, Mr. President, are very persuasive in terms of eliminating the machinery and equipment provision from the bill.

I should like to point out that when the bill was first proposed it stated "including machinery and equipment in unusual circumstances," or words to that effect. The precise words were "in exceptional cases." Then when the bill came to us from committee the language was changed to read: "including machinery and equipment in cases of demonstrated need." It seems to me that this represents an open license with respect to machinery and equipment, because "in cases of demonstrated need" would apply to every project in the bill. The provisions of the bill would not be utilized to finance a small business except in a case of demonstrated need. Therefore, the supplying of machinery and equipment, by the change in those words, has had taken out of it whatever cautions were expressed within the bill. Machinery and equipment become as much an integral part of the bill, without any limitation whatever, as "industrial or commercial usage, including the construction of new buildings," and so forth. That language is found at page 45 of the bill.

It seems to me that these two points are endemic in the provision now contained in the bill. They are the points with respect to unfair competition between States in respect of attracting new business and bringing underdeveloped States up to normal.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Is the Senator from New York aware that under our foreign aid program we have for years been supplying machinery of all kinds to foreign countries, with that machinery in many cases competing with our own domestic industries, and that that policy has been approved by the Executive, at least in the past, and voted by the Congress?

I am wondering whether the Senator does not believe that it is somewhat of a paradox and an error to deny such aid to our own depressed areas when we are giving it all over the world with our taxpayers' dollars?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not believe it is a paradox, and I do not believe it is an error. These broad generalizations will not hold up. I have in mind the standard of living and the conditions with which we must deal abroad. They are totally different not only as between ourselves and the foreign countries, but also as between these foreign countries themselves. If we try to go into generalizations in this respect we will never have a depressed area bill or a foreign aid program. We must approach this subject on a case-to-case basis. That is the only way we can get an effective result.

Supplying of machinery and equipment under the foreign aid program was an aspect of the reconstruction of economies abroad which had been very heavily destroyed or damaged by war. That included machinery and equipment.

Furthermore, I believe now there is no longer any necessity to supply this form of aid to these industrial countries which have been made whole, and that now we may be supplying, either directly or indirectly, machinery and equipment to countries in less-developed areas, but which have conditions not even remotely resembling those which occur within a State with the lowest per capita income, which is going to be helped in the pending bill.

I have already given my reasons for a very deep conviction, after hearing all the testimony, and as a friend of the bill, that this provision will distort the competitive picture.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I merely wish to comment that aid by way of machinery has gone to foreign countries which were not devastated by war, but to overcome the same kind of depression that we are trying to cure in our country. I point out again, as I have before, the inconsistency of the double standard that we have been pursuing in failing to aid American depressed areas and setting up all kinds of obstacles and conditions and qualifications and restrictions to weaken or sidetrack these purposes, while we do not pursue these same tactics when we so generously distribute aid to foreign countries, many of which are in exactly the same kind of condition that we are trying to cure at home.

The American people are getting increasingly concerned about this double standard, and they will be concerned even more if the depressed areas bill is so changed that it will cease to be effective.

Mr. JAVITS. We have an enormous interest with respect to sending machinery abroad, because we export it.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Apropos what the Senator has just said, we are rapidly losing most of our machinery business in foreign countries. We are at present exporting almost nothing such as farm machinery and other equipment, compared with what we exported previously. The foreign countries are taking

the market away from us in every country of the world, because they are selling at half the prices that our businesses much charge.

What I was going to ask the Senator from New York was in connection with the tables. Do these tables, which appear in the report, come from the Bureau of Labor Statistics?

I notice particularly that the labor force of Plattsburgh, N.Y., is given as 21,350, which is somewhat above the population of the town. I am wondering how it got that way. I wondered who furnished the figures and if they are absolutely correct.

Mr. JAVITS. The concept here is of labor market areas; and a labor market area, though it may be designated with the name of a particular community which is its center, is not necessarily confined to that community. But I would not wish to engage in a debate with the Senator on these figures, which are not mine. If the Senator desires to know more about that, I will have a check made.

Mr. AIKEN. Are they figures which were supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics?

Mr. JAVITS. My understanding is that they are, but I will have them checked.

Mr. AIKEN. They may be correct, but in the Plattsburgh labor force are included 5,000 members of the Air Force and perhaps 800 or 900 students at the teachers' college. I notice that in the figure for estimated unemployment, the age goes down to age 14, which would include most high school and college students as well.

Mr. JAVITS. I will certainly check on the Senator's point.

Mr. AIKEN. I refer to page 68, the figures of the State employment security agency. It seems that in Clinton County—and it is a large county, having a population of something like 50,000—the labor force given is 21,350. That seems to be considerably above the national average in relation to population, even if we include the whole county.

Mr. JAVITS. I will certainly check those figures.

Mr. AIKEN. I simply was curious as to how those figures were obtained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

In response to the Senator's first point, about machinery and equipment, I wish the Senator would check those figures. I think I can say that there is no Senator whom I respect more than I do my dear friend and colleague from Vermont. However, it is a fact—and I wish he would check it, because I know he is always very meticulous about his figures—that one of the elements in the increase in our exports has been machinery. It may not be the particular types to which the Senator from Vermont refers; but even if it is shifting in type, it has represented, and still represents, a critically important part of our export picture.

Mr. AIKEN. I think a good part of our export machinery goes to equip American branch plants overseas. They are being established so rapidly that if we do not look out, we will not find any left here.

Mr. JAVITS. I cannot agree. The hearings before the Joint Economic Committee demonstrate that American business is not being priced out of the world markets, even though we are fearful of it, and have a right to be, and have much to learn about it. However, I do not believe generalizations are quite fair.

If the Senator will allow me to do so, although it certainly will not be ready in time for this bill, I shall make a full dress presentation to the Senate on both subjects. I think the Senator from Vermont has perhaps prompted me to do something concerning a prevailing misconception. I am all for measures which will fortify against danger; but I do not think we ought to be any longer under illusions that all our American business is running away, that we are losing our machinery by exports, and so forth.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I correct that under the bill there are certain areas in New York—a half dozen, anyway—which would qualify for assistance under the depressed areas bill?

Mr. JAVITS. There are.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I further correct in my understanding that any manufacturing plant in Vermont could establish a branch in New York in order to get the advantages provided in the bill, including low-cost money?

Mr. JAVITS. That is not so, because the antipirating provisions of the bill are quite tight. I call the Senator's attention to the tests. Such a move must not reduce employment in other areas of the United States. It must not result in substantial detriment to the area of original location. It may not transfer jobs from one community to another. There has been a very considerable tightening of the antipirating and antiraiding provisions.

The difficulty is that the antiraiding provisions deal with established business or with new branches of the established business.

I am trying to deal with the normal competition among the States for new business. That is the objective toward which the machinery and equipment amendment is directed.

Mr. AIKEN. Could not a company in my State establish a branch in Gloversville, N.Y., and obtain low-cost money for that purpose?

Mr. JAVITS. It could only if that represented no detriment of any substantial nature to the location in the Senator's own State.

Mr. AIKEN. Could any expansion of the industry be transferred to the branch plant?

Mr. JAVITS. Further expansion could be transferred to the branch plant, provided it did not result detrimentally to the original location and, if my amendment shall be adopted, provided that no machinery or equipment is involved in the deal.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator from New York point out how the bill would permit a manufacturing concern in New York to establish a branch plant in Vermont and obtain a low-cost loan?

Mr. JAVITS. That would entirely depend on Vermont having any areas which would be eligible for redevelopment under the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Senator from New York knows—or perhaps he does not know—that under the bill no area in Vermont could possibly qualify for benefits, and probably never could qualify for benefits.

Mr. JAVITS. There are two tests in the bill. I will check to determine whether any community in Vermont qualifies.

Mr. AIKEN. There would be none, according to the book.

Mr. JAVITS. If no community in Vermont qualifies, then the purpose of the bill would not be served by extending the program to Vermont. After all, some argument can be made for aid to agriculture, which extensively helps other States; it could be made for aid to dependent children; and aid in almost any category of welfare we could conceive of.

If Vermont is that prosperous—and I am happy it is—it is paying out far more than it is receiving. My colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I know how much more New York is paying out than it is receiving; but that is no reason why one should not support a program of such great economic breadth for the benefit of the entire country.

Mr. AIKEN. Should not the per capita income of a State enter into the aid to be given?

Mr. JAVITS. Not the per capita income of the State, but the per capita income of the particular communities encompassed. There is $100 million, leaving out community facilities, subject to the test of State percentages of unemployment, and covering three periods of time which are set forth in the bill.

Then there is the other test of unusually low income when compared with the average national income in particular communities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. That may be so, but it appears to me that the Jolly Roger is flying at the masthead of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at this time I yield 5 minutes in favor of the amendment to my colleague from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I heartily support the Javits amendment, and I hope Senators have read the debate on this amendment or, before they vote, will read the very carefully worded individual views of my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. In this statement, he develops the several key arguments against permitting the use of area redevelopment funds for the purchase of equipment and machinery.

Last year, as many Senators will remember, this language was voted on, together with the amendment on pirating offered by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. Although when joined together the two

were defeated by approximately 20 votes, I hope that this year, in light of the time we have had to study this proposal, and voting individually on this amendment, that it will be possible for us to muster enough votes to bring about its adoption.

My colleague from New York has made an important and convincing case for his point that aid for machinery and equipment affords an unfair competitive advantage to the firms which receive the aid, vis-a-vis competitors in their own industries.

In fact, under certain conditions, the lure of loans for machinery and equipment, could undermine the well worded antipirating provisions contained in Senate bill 1. As the bill now reads, an area can receive loans only for new plants and for new branch plants. This important and necessary language was devised in order to prevent industrial raiding. It was developed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and is intended to prevent the enticement of industries away from the healthy areas—of which, I must confess, there are many in New York State, just as there are many in the States represented by other Members of the Senate here at this moment.

Certainly we do not want to create new depressed areas, in our efforts to help areas which now are in distress. If loans for machinery and equipment are available, this presents a real temptation to firms which now have obsolete equipment. They could establish plants in depressed areas, using Federal funds to buy all new machinery, and then could close their home plants or scale to a minimum their operations there. I think it would be much better if we concentrated area redevelopment assistance on permanent facilities, which are inherently a part of the distressed area and which will remain there permanently to contribute to the economy of the area.

Mr. President, I want at this time to make a point which thus far has been passed over rather lightly. I refer to the fact that the total amount authorized under Senate bill 1 is a little less than $400 million for 3 years. Thus, a good argument can be made for limiting the type of assistance given to any single area or any single firm. If we gave too much aid to one firm or one area, that would have the effect of limiting the total national impact of Senate bill 1, which establishes or at least seeks to establish a truly national program.

It is important that we have a clear understanding of just what the overall impact of Senate bill 1 will be. The total amount—$389 million—for 3 years, as authorized under this bill—is less than the cost of two *Forrestal*-class aircraft carriers. When this amount of capital is spread throughout the country, it certainly will not provide very large amounts of assistance to any single distressed area.

In a sense, this is a pilot program. For this reason, I was pleased that the so-called Bush amendment was accepted yesterday to terminate this program at a given date, in order that Congress may again evaluate it.

I think my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has made an extremely strong case for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. May I have 1 more minute?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield an additional minute to my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, this amendment is important to healthy areas, such as New York State. Fortunately, most of our States are presently in a generally good state of economic health. Unless we adopt the amendment, there will be a real danger that the purposes of this bill will be violated and undermined by giving an unfair competitive advantage to the areas eligible for receiving area redevelopment assistance.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask the question for purposes of information: Does not the condition stated in the bill—namely that the money shall not be loaned or granted, if in doing so industries may be moved, thus causing substantial unemployment in the area from which the movement is made—apply equally to the moneys provided for the purchase of machinery and equipment?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, it does. The only difficulty is—and I am sure the Senator from Ohio will remember this, if he listened to what I said before, for I, myself, made that point—that the antipirating provisions are now excellent, although they were not before; but the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] have really tightened them up. However, they deal with existing businesses and branches and affiliates of existing businesses which we would have objection to losing; and in such case the antipirating provision is effective.

But I am talking about new businesses, which constantly are being created. They are needed in every so-called under par area, in order to help put it on an equal basis, so it can compete with New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Michigan, and other States. But if we permit this money to be used for the purchase of machinery and equipment, we shall be giving a competitive advantage beyond the normal basis. That is the argument I make, and therefore I believe that provision should be stricken from the bill.

I have just come across a point which may be of interest to other Senators—namely, that private business is not the only source of funds for machinery and equipment. I have already referred to this fact, which provides a safety valve, because some machinery manufacturers will also have to pass on the question of whether the new plants placed in these areas are economic enterprises. But I find that, in addition, the Small Business Administration has much money to loan for equipment and machinery. That, too, is an independent agency. Of course, in making legislative provisions, we constantly have a tendency to duplicate. For example, I am greatly concerned about the provisions of the bill for rural development, because we already have in the Department of Agriculture an excellent rural development program which could well be buttressed with $5 million, instead of providing $100 million for such a purpose in connection with this bill. That program in the Department of Agriculture has been very widely hailed. For instance, the report states:

> Since the inception of SBA in 1953, over $955 million in loans have been approved in the business loan program. Of this amount, $106,523,000 was authorized to be used for financing machinery and equipment.

There, too, we have an economic sanction; and that agency has had a large amount of experience in regard to the likelihood of success of a small business enterprise which, with any kind of chance for success, will be loaned such funds for the purchase of machinery and equipment.

But if we deal with that matter in this measure, we shall be giving more than the normal advantages to an area which is trying to attract business in a competitive way—for instance, as regards tax indulgence, training help constructing a building—and now we would be giving it an opportunity to have a plant built and completely equipped. I think that would be most unfair to many of the States which constantly have to compete for business. For instance, in New York we, too, need 2,500 jobs, every week, according to President Kennedy's figure; and every week Ohio and other States need new jobs, also, as do the areas which are in distress. I simply do not like to have the dice loaded against our States.

Mr. President, let me ask the Chair to advise me when I have used all but 3 minutes of the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield again?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us assume that in New York there is a plant that is not located in a substandard area; and let us assume that the managers of the plant learn that they can obtain funds for the purchase of machinery and equipment if they locate the plant in a substandard area, but that they cannot obtain such funds for the plant which is located in New York. Would the provision relating to a substantial impact on employment be of any help to New York State in the matter?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, it would, to the extent that it would prevent the company from moving out of New York or moving any important part of its operations out of New York. But if the company were going to expand into the production of a new product, and wanted to establish a new factory for it, the provision would not stop it. In fact, the company would be given a special inducement to locate elsewhere than in New York.

The Senator from Ohio is helping me greatly, because this situation is precisely what we are shooting at. We industrial States are going to pay for the bill, and we are going to underwrite it. Let us assume most of us are willing to do it because a real problem is presented; but we are not willing to do it at the cost of creating unfair competition as between us and other States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has cited the example of a company in New York. It could not get aid if it was found that substantial unemployment would be created if the company moved out.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But it could establish another branch of the company in another State, open up a whole new business, and borrow money for machinery and equipment, which it could not borrow if it remained in New York. Is that correct?

Mr. JAVITS. That is precisely correct.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. In the original text of the bill, in reference to the matter under discussion, it stated, in parentheses: "including in exceptional cases machinery and equipment."

That language was changed in the bill as now before the Senate, but the parentheses remain, enclosing the phrase "including machinery and equipment in cases of demonstrated need."

My question to the Senator is, Why were the parentheses included in the first place, and why are they still there?

Mr. JAVITS. They are still there as a matter of form only. The parentheses are not needed, because demonstrated need is the test. The parentheses were there because of the original language "exceptional circumstance" or "exceptional need." Now the parentheses are no longer needed, but they have been carried over in order to make the grammar appear as if there is a difference; but there is no difference.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is very generous to the author of the bill; but my impression is that the parentheses are there as an element of doubt. In other words, they do not believe it, and put the language in parentheses and closed it off from the rest of the language, hoping they might get away with it. Does the Senator from New York think there is any ground for that suspicion?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Connecticut has had exceedingly wide experience. I certainly know he may be right and I may be wrong. May I say, for that reason, that the language can easily be stricken, and it would not in any way interfere with the organic content of the bill if it is stricken.

Mr. BUSH. I am certainly supporting the Senator in his amendment, as he knew I was.

I ask the Senator if it is or is not very loose language to talk about demonstrated need. How do we distinguish need on the basis of its being a demonstrated need? I do not understand it. I would not want to have the responsibility of determining it. In other words, if it is proper to include machinery and equipment for investment under this bill, it ought to be stated. If it is not, it ought to be stricken, as the Senator proposes to strike it. It is difficult to interpret words like "substantially," "substantial unemployment," and "demonstrated need." To me, that kind of language does not belong in legislation. Either money is going to be lent for a certain purpose, or it is not. Does the Senator think that is a valid statement?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. I again want to give credit to the Senator for the adoption of the antipirating provision, which has the interest of Senators coming from industrial States like New York, Connecticut, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Let me also point out I am trying to "button up" the one element which still remains to be taken care of, and that is normal competition, which cannot be covered by the antipirating provision. I point out that my position absolutely relies upon the achievement the Senator from Connecticut has already been successful in obtaining by way of the antipirating provision.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to compliment the Senator from New York for his very fine minority views as stated in the report, in which he makes a classic case for his amendment. I compliment him on the very able presentation of the amendment this morning.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if the Senator has time, will he yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has referred to the substantial impact on employment in the movement of a plant. May I ask—and this is asked from a philosophical standpoint—what right does the Federal Government have to lend or to grant or to give its money to one State, the money to be used to take jobs away from another State?

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall not press the question. I shall develop it later.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield me 5 minutes on the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator follow what I have in mind?

Mr. JAVITS. I do.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Why is it right to take a small number of jobs——

Mr. JAVITS. Even a small number of jobs.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, but not a large number of jobs, away from a State? If a job is taken away from a State, how is there a difference, except in degree, in the moral quality of the taking?

Mr. JAVITS. There are two answers to the question. One is the antipirating provision is even better than the Senator has indicated, because it deals not only with a substantial detriment—which is what the Senator from Ohio is speaking of—but deals with merely transferring jobs from one community to another. So we assume, if there was a transfer of jobs there would be a substantial detriment.

I shall pursue this matter in a discussion with the Senator handling the bill. I wish to make it very clear for the RECORD that the antipirating provision includes not only the case of substantial detriment but a loss of jobs as the Senator has pointed out.

The second answer is the obvious one, which affects us in everything we do—namely, the greatest good for the greatest number. Some States are under par, whether it be in natural resources, educational facilities, or economic development. Most of us want to help them, but not at the cost of putting them in a better position than we are in an opportunity to compete for new business and jobs, which the country urgently needs.

It is for that purpose that I offer the amendment.

I wish to state to the minority leader that I have concluded the presentation of my case for the amendment, with the most gracious aid of my colleagues.

I wish to emphasize the point made by my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] that the money provided under the bill is inadequate, so why load it down with another requirement that loans be made for machinery and equipment, instead of spreading it as far as that can go, even though it is a pilot plan.

I should like to ask the minority leader whether any time is to be taken in opposition to the amendment, or whether we are ready to vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the acting majority leader [Mr. HUMPHREY] whether the chairman intends to oppose the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; the committee intends to oppose the amendment. I understand the same amendment was considered in committee, and voted down.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] went to the Finance Committee. If the proponents of the amendment have concluded their argument, I suggest we might have a quorum call. In the meantime I shall discuss the matter with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], because I know he wishes to express some views on the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I know he does.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] asked me yesterday for about 5 minutes to discuss a matter. I wonder if he is ready to do so at this time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, if it is convenient at this time. I merely wanted to state my position on the pending bill before it came to a final vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why not do it now?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Very well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, my first inclination was to support this bill. Its alleged purpose has an appeal to all of us. That purpose, I understand, is to relieve distressed areas which may exist in some sections of our country.

At first thought, this may seem to be a worthy objective for the Federal Government to undertake by legislation. Upon second thought I wonder whether it is the function of the Government, by the expenditure of public funds, through loans and grants, in an area or in many areas in the country, to undertake the making of investments for the sole purpose of resuscitating or strengthening the economy in a particular locality.

If so, Mr. President, we are now launching a gigantic project, one of no small magnitude. I cannot give my consent to such an undertaking. I foresee that the minute this is done, many areas which now do not contemplate such action will conclude that if it is a proper function of the Government to help finance industry in any section or any area by the expenditure of public funds from the U.S. Treasury to help build the economy in that area, in one section or in one community, then that responsibility devolves upon the Government to give equal aid in every area, in every section and community. The next step will be to have the Federal Government take the full responsibility for providing a prosperous economy everywhere throughout the land.

I cannot support it, Mr. President, for in my judgment that just should not be done.

I wish to mention some things in the bill which I could not support even if I favored the program.

The bill has been amended now to remove one of the objectionable features, which was the setting up of an exclusively independent new agency with all the powers the measure contains vested in an administrator. However, Mr. President, the powers which were vested in the Administrator under the terms of the bill originally are now to be vested in the Secretary of Commerce as the bill has been amended. Not only will the Secretary of Commerce be endowed with broad authority to determine the areas which will receive assistance under the bill, Mr. President, but also he will control to an alarming degree how much and upon what terms such assistance will be given.

For instance, there is no limit placed on the amount of Federal loans or grants that the Secretary of Commerce can make to any one project. The language of section 8(b) implies that in the case of public facilities, he is authorized to make both loans and grants to a single project. Further, section 8(b)(2) indicates that the local governments need contribute nothing in the case of constructing public facilities. Thus the Federal Government conceivably could be required to foot the entire cost of the project.

Mr. President, if we ever begin permitting the Government to enter one area, one community, and foot the entire cost of a project, then we shall have every community in the country appealing to the Federal Government for the same treatment.

With respect to loans to private industries under section 6 of the bill, the Secretary's discretion is also shockingly extensive. To illustrate, section 6(b)(7) limits such loans to a term of not exceeding 25 years, but the Secretary of Commerce may under section 12(5) extend such loans for an additional 10 years. He is given similar authority with respect to loans for construction of public facilities. The Secretary of Commerce is given discretion to extend the latter from 40 to 50 years.

Mr. President, let us make no mistake about this. This proposal is not for temporary legislation. It is for a permanent program for 50 years. It could well take that long for the program to be executed and consummated under the terms of this measure.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield, if I have any time remaining.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am sure the Senator knows that under the terms of the bill the Secretary of Commerce could lend all of the money to one concern.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have so intimated.

Mr. CAPEHART. I simply wish to emphasize it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is true.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Secretary could lend all of the money to one concern.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am stating what I believe to be the proposal. This is not a measure to provide temporary relief in a distressed area or in distressed areas. This is to be a permanent program of the Government, to operate in this field from now until the end of the next half century, under the terms of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. We brought out yesterday in the colloquy the fact that the Small Business Administration can do everything provided under the terms of the bill, and in addition the Small Business Administration can lend money for working capital.

There is an amendment pending which would strike out of the bill the provision with regard to machinery and equipment, yet the Small Business Administration can make loans up to 100 percent on machinery and equipment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the bill in some respects, at least, would provide a duplication of authority now in existence.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Small Business Administration can do everything for industry and business that the bill would permit, and in addition can make loans for working capital and can make loans on machinery and equipment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe that is true. I have not examined the law carefully enough to be sure, but I believe the bill would provide a duplication of authority in certain areas, and it encompasses an extension of powers which would make the program permanent for 50 years.

Mr. CAPEHART. We placed in the RECORD yesterday the exact language with respect to the Small Business Administration, which permits such to be done.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. President, section 6(b)(9)(D) and section 7(d) gives the Secretary of Commerce authority to subordinate the Federal Government's security on loans. This, in effect, makes the Government a second mortgagee on all projects in which it would participate under the bill. What is worse, Mr. President, if the Secretary so desires he can in his discretion defer any payments on the indebtedness to the Federal Government until such time as all "other loans made in connection with such project and in accordance with this section have been repaid in full."

The powers granted to the Secretary of Commerce in section 12(4) are likewise exceedingly broad. For example, he may "under regulations prescribed by him, assign or at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans made under this act."

I emphasize the following words: "and collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection."

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, may I have an additional 2 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 2 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is apparent that the proposed legislation would repose unconscionably wide and extensive powers in the Secretary. It would virtually make him dictator over the various programs prescribed in the bill.

It is also my firm conviction that in many respects the provisions of the bill would duplicate Federal enactments already on the statute books. For example, we now have functioning loan programs for private industry under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. Loans for public facilities are presently being made by the Community Facilities Administration within the Housing and Home Finance Agency. So as the need arises to adapt these existing programs to the needs of our depressed areas, it seems to me that the better method would be to amend these statutes rather than to create a completely new and unnecessary administrative agency which will surely be done—another agency within the Department of Commerce.

The bill is also objectionable to me because its major financing will be not through annual appropriations from the Congress, but through borrowing by the Administrator from the Treasury Department. This is the familiar method of back-door financing that frustrates

an annual review of the legislation's effectiveness by the Congress. Indeed, the whole flavor and essence of the bill smacks of a desire to get the control of the essential elements of the programs away from Congress and into the head of an executive agency. This, I believe, is completely uncalled for. I do not believe the Congress should abdicate its responsibility and duty to make or, in its judgment, to reject annual appropriations for this program.

Finally, I noted with interest the very candid remarks of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] last week when he stated that—

> This measure will not reduce this recession * * *. S. 1 is not an antirecession measure (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 9, p. 3612, col. 3).

I agree with him.

S. 1 is not a temporary measure designed to lessen the effect of the current recession. Let no one regard it as such. It is the commencement of a permanent program. For 50 years the bill envisions 40-year loans that may be extended for 10 years, making a half century. Once the bill is passed and the program is inaugurated, it will grow and grow, and more and more communities and businesses will seek the favors that the bill bestows. Either the requests of other communities will have to be granted, or rank discrimination will be imposed.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much additional time does the Senator from Arkansas desire?

Mr. McCLELLAN. One minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not want to see American citizen taxpayers saddled with this uneconomical, extravagant, and unnecessary burden.

I cannot support a bill of the magnitude and consequences entailed by this measure. It is with regret that I decide I cannot do so, but the consequences I foresee preclude me from giving it my endorsement and vote.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very happy to yield if I have any time remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Arkansas mentioned the existence of the Small Business Administration Act, and the Community Facilities Act, which is embodied in the Housing Administration's functions, and he stated that the bill would pile further lending and giving programs on top of these other acts.

May I have the view of the Senator from Arkansas on this question: Congress passed the Small Business Administration Act, which provides liberal authority to make loans for the construction of buildings and the purchase of machinery to be located wherever the borrower determines to place his business. The Community Facilities Act, in order to stimulate development in communities, provides money to be loaned for the installation of gas lines, water lines, sidewalks, powerplants, and so forth.

The Rural Electrification Administration also lends money to provide plants for the distribution or the generation of electricity.

Efforts were made through those several means to induce businesses to settle in what are supposed to be rural communities and undeveloped communities, but such efforts failed.

By the terms of the bill, Congress, through legislative declaration, would attempt to convert what are unacceptable areas for the establishment of a business into areas that supposedly would be acceptable.

I now ask my question. Through the appropriation of money can Congress provide buildings in an area close to a supply of raw material and close to the supply of the consuming public, and thus create out of an undesirable area one that is desirable from the standpoint of maintenance of good government, reasonable taxes, and pleasant surroundings?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not believe Congress can do so without incurring a continuous heavy subsidy. I believe the bill would ultimately lead to such result.

I point out another weakness in the bill. If we should establish a plant or project to bring economic life into a community, we would have provided all the money that can be borrowed, and there would be no working capital remaining. There is not even a requirement that sufficient working capital be shown to be available for the operation of the project, plant, or factory after it has been built.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may the Senator from Arkansas have an additional 3 minutes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before we yield additional time, how much time remains to our side on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One hundred and sixty-eight minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Arkansas was the chairman of the McClellan investigating committee. Six or seven years ago, while I was Governor of Ohio, a strike took place in 5 States, including Ohio. The strike was in progress for a number of weeks.

The Governor of Ohio received a call from a top echelon official of another State, suggesting that a shutout was in existence, and that shutout unemployment compensation ought to be paid. The knowledge of the Governor of Ohio concerning the facts was in complete disagreement with that recitation. Ohio did not award unemployment compensation, because there was in existence a voluntary work stoppage. The State from which the call came did make an award of unemployment compensation. Subsequently, the courts of that State ruled the award invalid. I respectfully submit that the provisions of this bill regardless of how much money is spent will not generally operate as an inducement for stable business to settle in such surroundings.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not, I must confess, an astute businessman, but I believe that anyone with any judgment at all would take into consideration that factor in establishing a business in any place. Particularly is that true today. I should like to point out that the businesses that may be established by the use of loans and grants under this bill will have to bring in raw materials, and meet all the other expenses connected with such operation just as is done in other areas where the same product is manufactured. They must still meet the competition in marketing their product. Otherwise, they cannot survive. I can well understand that a man might decide to set up a business and for that purpose get a temporary loan from a bank for a small amount and then get a grant, 65 percent of it from the Government, and put in very little capital of his own. When he does that, he is in business. Perhaps he will be a success. If he is not, he has had his chance without any loss of consequence, and the taxpayers have footed the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this is bad legislation.

ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS' UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes. A very important convention is taking place in our Capital City. It is the 1961 convention of the National Farmers' Union, which opened on Monday, March 13, at the departmental auditorium. We welcome this great farm organization. It represents the finest traditions and principles of our democracy.

Last evening, the Secretary of Agriculture addressed the delegates. He delivered a splendid and informative address on the agricultural policy of the Kennedy administration. He is doing a good job in his new responsibility as the Secretary of Agriculture.

Other members of the administration have spoken to the assembled delegates. Mr. Chester Bowles, Under Secretary of State, addressed the delegates on Tuesday. He made a remarkable address on American foreign policy and revealed some of the new approaches in our foreign policy as developed by the Kennedy administration.

This morning the delegates were addressed by Mr. John A. Baker, Director of Agricultural Credit Services. As we know, one of the needs of agriculture is an improved and expanded farm credit structure. I am happy to call to the attention of the Senate that Mr. Baker has announced plans for broader and a much improved farm credit program, particularly in the Farmers Home Administration. Already, the Department has taken emergency action to release additional credit to our family farmers.

This afternoon Mr. Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, will address the delegates. Mr. Holum comes from South Dakota. He is a farmer and well acquainted with the needs of our family farmers. He vigorously supports the public power program which is so

vital to many of our Western States. The Presiding Officer [Mr. METCALF] comes from a State where some of the great electrical energy resources of the Nation are found and developed.

On Thursday the delegates will hear Mr. George McGovern, director of the food for peace program. On Friday Mr. Arthur Goldberg, Secretary of Labor, will address the convention.

Finally, the concluding session will be addressed by Mr. David Brinkley, NBC news commentator. I do not know what happened to Mr. Huntley, but at least Mr. Brinkley will speak to the delegates.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend Mr. McGovern on his outstanding work as director of the food for peace program, particularly for the proposals he has made for long-term sales of food under a food for peace program. Soon the administration will propose a much expanded program. Our food reserves can and will be converted into a powerful ally to our overall foreign policy.

I wish to salute Mr. Patton, the national president of the Farmers Union, and to commend him for his outstanding leadership, for our family farmers and, indeed, for all of America. I am very proud that at this convention some 300 members of the Minnesota Farmers Union are in attendance. We are very pleased with the splendid record of our Farmers Union in Minnesota. The State president, Mr. Edwin Christensen, of the Minnesota Farmers Union, is in Washington attending the convention. The Minnesotans, coming from Farmers Union locals throughout the State, are here because of their desire to participate in the proceedings of the convention and because they wish to see the Nation's Capital. I commend to all Senators in the deliberations of this very important convention. The program of the Farmers Union is good for America.

Mr. President, I observe that the Senator from Illinois has come to the floor and that he wishes to reply to some of the comments which have been made by the opposition to the area redevelopment bill.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to address myself primarily to the amendment now before the Senate; namely, the amendment of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to strike from the bill the provision which permits, in loans on machinery and equipment in cases of demonstrated need. The Senator from New York wishes to eliminate that provision completely, and, I take it, on two grounds.

First, he says it is not necessary, because private credit will meet the need for such machinery; and second, that this would hurt industrial States such as New York. Let me point out there is a feature in the bill which seems to have been neglected in the whole debate. I tried to point this out yesterday. It is in the RECORD, but apparently has escaped attention. On page 47, in section 6(b)(4), will be found this proviso:

> No such assistance shall be extended hereunder unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders or other Federal agencies on reasonable terms.

This means that if a business can obtain loans on machinery and equipment for, say, 5 years' duration on reasonable terms, no loan under the area redevelopment bill can be made to that business firm. So we hope that private credit facilities will be adequate to provide funds for machinery and equipment to new business firms or to business firms which wish to expand. We simply say that if private funds are not available, and if the business and the local redevelopment committees are able to demonstrate that the private firm needs a loan on machinery and equipment, the loan could be permitted to be made under the act. It is not mandatory to make such a loan; in fact, there are a series of hurdles which the applicant must be able to pass. He must prove that the loan is not available from private sources, and then must prove that there is a demonstrated need for it.

It is anticipated that the majority of the loans will be exclusively for land and buildings, without an allowance for machinery and equipment; but we do not wish to include an absolute prohibition of such loans which the Senator from New York would now fasten upon the bill.

I would like to point out that land and buildings normally do not comprise much more than 25 percent of the capital cost of a manufacturing enterprise. We are limiting the maximum percentage of the loan which can be made by the Area Redevelopment Administration to 65 percent of the cost; so the maximum would be approximately 65 percent of 25 percent, or roughly 16 percent of the total cost. In addition to this, the actual benefit which the bill provides is only a lower rate of interest; namely, a probable rate of around 4¼ percent, as compared with a commercial rate of something over 6 percent. So the inducement which would be customarily held out would be a 2-percent annual saving upon one-sixth of the capital cost—a 2-percent economy on one-sixth of the capital charge.

This is far from being the hydra-headed monster which some previous speakers have said it to be. On the contrary it is an extremely modest proposal. There may be certain cases in hard-pressed communities where this will not be a sufficient inducement to new industry; therefore, we do not wish to rule out completely the possibility of loans for machinery and equipment. The Senator from New York would completely eliminate any possibility of doing this.

I know the Senator from New York is a fine-spirited man. He has been a sincere supporter of the bill. Not only has he been a sponsor of the bill, but yesterday I think he was one of the Republicans who voted against the crucial Robertson amendment. I express my indebtedness to the Senator from New York for that vote, and say that it was really the acid test, which he passed, in my judgment, with high credit, as he does virtually every test which is imposed upon him in the Senate.

Now, concerning his statement that this provision in the bill would cripple New York and—that it might be used to draw industry away from New York—I remind him that the bill contains a very stringent provision against pirating, a provision which I was very glad to have included. So far as growth of our economy is concerned, we want New York, as well as other areas, to share in the growth.

This morning, I was in the Committee on Finance and vigorously supported the position of some of the large industrial States, of which my State of Illinois is not one, but of which New York is one, to try to have a larger burden of the cyclical unemployment borne by the Nation as a whole, instead of being thrown upon the employers of a particular State which has been hard hit by unemployment. New York is one of the States which has been hard hit. So I do not think I need say anything more about my desire to protect the employers and the people of the State of New York.

However, I call attention to the fact that New York has a number of so-called depressed areas of high and persistent unemployment. They are listed on page 68 of the report of the committee. I shall read them:

> Amsterdam, where there is 14 percent unemployment.
>
> Auburn, which has 9 percent unemployment.
>
> Gloversville, the center of the glove industry, has 15 percent unemployment.
>
> Jamestown-Dunkirk, with 5.8 percent unemployment.

In the northern New York area, the area of Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone has 14 percent unemployment; and Plattsburg, on Lake George, has more than 8 percent unemployment.

So New York would be as much in need for machinery and equipment loans as any other State in the Union. I do not think we should adopt a parochial point of view on this matter. In general, the Senator from New York does not adopt a parochial point of view.

But in the cases of those communities which are hard pressed, if we confine ourselves in all instances purely to lower interest rate loans on buildings and land, we may not have enough of an inducement to help rebuild the economy of the area. If adequate private capital is not available, and if the need for capital can be demonstrated, then I do not believe we should foreclose completely the possibility of helping those people with loans for machinery and equipment.

Moreover, I am a little puzzled by the criticisms which come from the other side of the aisle, and in some instances from this side of the aisle, about the bill.

The Senator from New York is saying that we should not make loans for machinery and equipment. Last night the Senator from Indiana said we were not

lending enough, and that we should provide working capital as well as fixed capital. I think working capital should be provided by the commercial banking system. The advances for raw materials and for payrolls should be met by private business, out of the resources of the individual enterprises, and out of the local banks.

I am very happy to see entering the Chamber the two distinguished Senators from West Virginia, who have been stalwarts in connection with this matter. I say frankly—as all of us know—that West Virginia is one of the States which has been most severely hit. If we rule out the possibility of the making of loans for the purchase of machinery and equipment, it will be much more difficult to get new industries into those areas, and it will be harder to get new industries into eastern Kentucky, eastern Tennessee, southwest Pennsylvania, southern Illinois, northern Michigan, northern Minnesota, and, I may say, also the depressed areas of upper New York State.

So, Mr. President, I hope very much the amendment of the Senator from New York will be rejected.

Possibly we may be able to make adjustments, in conference; but I do not think this is the time to make such adjustments. I think yesterday I demonstrated conclusively that I was in a most cooperative mood; I accepted various amendments, both because I felt the weight of the votes was against me, and also because of a desire to show that I was conciliatory.

But, Mr. President, much as I like to demonstrate my liking for the Senator from New York, I frankly state that I cannot consent to "selling out" the hard-pressed areas.

I see across the aisle from me the genial senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I would remind him that the cutover regions in northern Wisconsin are also in trouble.

Mr. President, I think that is about all I wish to say on this issue.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from New York will be rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself the remainder of the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to reply to two points which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

First of all, I assure him that these comments are not to be construed as in any way a reflection on our respect for each other, which will continue to survive, regardless of the result of the vote taken on this amendment. Of course, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The Senator from Illinois spoke of the possibility that the provisions of the amendment will be used for the purchase of machinery and equipment, "except in rare cases"—those were his words. But I point out that a change was made from the original draft of the bill. Originally the draft of the bill used the words "exceptional cases"; but that was changed so as to use the words "except in rare cases." But, Mr. President, I say that the words "except in rare cases of demonstrated need" are much less stringent than the words "exceptional cases."

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am perfectly willing to revert to the original language, "exceptional cases," if the Senator from New York will agree to withdraw the amendment and will obtain consent of the Senate to have that change made.

Mr. JAVITS. I would say that would not go to meet the full objection. But I was making that point as bearing upon the way Members should vote on this amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we revert to the original language of "exceptional cases," and if we eliminate the words "of demonstrated need," would the Senator from New York then be willing to accept the change and to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. No; I have already made that clear.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the Senator from New York wants a dictated agreement.

Mr. JAVITS. No, Mr. President; I am sorry that the Senator from Illinois is not being quite just to me. I was alluding to the fact that it is claimed that one of the arguments in favor of defeating my amendment is that it will be used only rarely; and the Senator from Illinois himself used, in referring to that point, the words "in rare cases."

I have pointed out that it has been made easier, rather than more difficult, although that is by no means the total answer.

The Senator from Illinois also said we may not have enough inducement for building up or redeveloping an area. I say there is too much inducement. That is the whole nubbin of my argument. There would be more inducement than would constitute fair competition as between depressed areas and States such as my own.

Finally, the Senator from Illinois said aid is available under this amendment when it is not available from other sources—from Government sources, such as the Small Business Administration, or from private sources, such as machinery and equipment suppliers. But I say that is a source we should not give up. The success of a project may depend upon whether credit is available on reasonable terms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if credit on reasonable terms is not available, then I say that by turning over to the local community the right to finance it, nonetheless, out of credit available under this bill, we shall be depriving ourselves of a piece of insurance which represents the independent judgment of the Small Business Administration or of the private supplier; and I do not think we should do that.

Mr. President, that is my whole argument in behalf of the amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I support the amendment of the Senator from New York. It must be used for land and facilities for the building of plants only.

The use of the words "exceptional cases," as directed to machinery and equipment, is to my mind vague and indefinite. That provision might be used to favor one section of the country over another, or even to favor one section of a State over another, by permitting a more generous allocation or a more varied kind of aid to a favored section.

In view of the fact that a number of communities have an unfortunate labor surplus, I think the purpose of the bill can better be accomplished, and certainly it would be more simple to administer, if we confined ourselves to the land and facilities provision.

Therefore, as I have stated, I am very happy to support the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I should like to make a final point: If Senators really want to make the bill go as far as it can, to aid in restoring these communities to a normal competitive situation, then my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time we may have a quorum call, without charging to either side the time required for the quorum call.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from New York yield back the remainder of the time available to him?

Mr. JAVITS. No more time is available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

Let the Chair inquire whether the Senator from Illinois will yield back the remainder of the time available to him.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from West Virginia wishes to speak at this time. I shall be glad to yield to him, if the Senator from New York will withdraw his request for the time being.

Mr. JAVITS. Of course.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia whatever time he may wish to have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from New York for temporarily withholding his suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

I do not desire to make a formal speech. But with the manager of the bill, the Senator from Illinois, now present, and with the Senator from New

York, the author of the amendment, also present on the floor, I say to them and to my other colleagues that insofar as West Virginia is concerned, and I believe that in this matter my colleague from West Virginia [Senator BYRD], and I are joined—more than a mere building would be needed in many instances.

The structure itself may not provide the answer. It is very reasonable to expect that there could well be, on merit, an application which would require the loan of funds necessary to provide machinery. In the State of West Virginia this problem is something that concerns us very much. There are already too many empty buildings.

The rehabilitation of an old building or the construction of a new one will provide employment in the construction stage—but it takes more than a structure to create new permanent job opportunities. It is only when there is machinery in place and functioning that there is production—and it is production and marketing that brings manpower into action, sustains payrolls, and makes for economic growth.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes, I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the Senator has sufficient time, or, if he does not, time may be yielded to him on the bill. I do not wish to use any of the time he may find necessary to take.

However, it seems to me, in fairness to the argument—and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has been very kind in saying that I am friendly to the bill, which I am—this is a matter involving a narrower fulcrum than merely the question of lending money. It involves the question of lending money for machinery that might be available for other purposes. We are assuming the fact that the money that would be available, on reasonable terms, represents a penalty for us. The Small Business Administration, the banker, or other lender, can make the money available, and it should not be taken away from the money that will otherwise be made available under this bill. It should not be so used, even if it cannot come from anywhere else, because we defeat ourselves, and defeat those in West Virginia, from the economic viewpoint. The lenders can look at the purpose of the loan and say, "It is worth making a loan for machinery and equipment." It is not that the money is not available; the point is that the money will be available on reasonable terms, so I think we should leave it that way. Then there is the sanction of a banker or a Government official, who has looked at it from the economic point of view, and has said, "This loan is feasible. Let us lend the money for the machinery or equipment."

Mr. RANDOLPH. I understand the point made by my eminent colleague. I heard that argument in the days when loans were made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I hear that argument made when loans are administered through the Small Business Administration. Do not misunderstand me when I say I have heard that argument; but constantly we are told there are other avenues through which we may proceed to procure the necessary funds with which to do the job, let us say, of rehabilitating an industry.

I ask my colleague from New York now, if it is good in one agency and the lending ability is present in that agency to provide the funds, what is wrong with setting the opportunity in motion under this bill to provide funds in relation to machinery?

Mr. JAVITS. Again, the judgment of the Senator from West Virginia may be better than my own. I can only advance my best judgment. I say it is wrong because there are different criteria. The very criteria in the bill permit uneconomic loans for machinery and equipment, whereas the criteria in the Small Business Act provide for economic loans. So I say, surely, if we have to do it, be uneconomic in buildings or other facilities; but do not be uneconomic when it comes to machinery and equipment.

That is precisely my argument. It is why I have submitted the amendment. It is a business reason. I am not living in an abstract world. I have had experience in business, in service on boards, and so forth. There is a business reason for the amendment. There is a different criterion if the money is obtained somewhere else than if it is obtained under the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will my colleague from West Virginia yield to me?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; I am delighted to yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am sure my colleague joins me in stating that sources from which financial assistance might normally be expected certainly have not proved to be the whole answer to the problems of our own business firms in West Virginia.

The distinguished senior Senator from New York made reference to the Small Businesss Administration and to bankers and to others who might be willing, in some States at least, to provide financial assistance. He indicated that it would be good for those people to enter into the picture.

I should like, with my colleague's permission, and with the unanimous consent of the Senate, to present for the RECORD some letters that have been written to me by businessmen in West Virginia, which testify to the fact that long-term, low-interest capital simply is not available to our people in West Virginia.

I have in my hand a letter from Mr. Roswell H. Alt, president of the Petersburg Industrial Development Corp., Petersburg, W. Va., located in the congressional district which my able and distinguished senior colleague represented in the House of Representatives for so many years.

Mr. RANDOLPH. If I may, I interpose only to say that Grant County is one of the strongest Republican counties in the State, Petersburg being the county seat of the county. Its citizens of all political affiliations are generally enterprising and frugal.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I insert the letter in the RECORD with unanimous consent, but I want to read only one or two sentences. The president of the Petersburg Industrial Development Corp. says:

> Again, we want to bring to your attention our conversation on the pressing and immediate need for long-term, low-interest-rate financing for prospective industry. From the dozens and dozens of proposals we have submitted to interested industrial companies, this seems to be our largest obstacle. The best industrial financing we can offer at present is our community participation in a Small Business Administration loan. Needless to say, under today's competition for industry, this is very inadequate due to length of term, interest rate, and other problems.

That has reference to the difficulty involved in attempting to get loans from the Small Business Administration.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PETERSBURG INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORP.,
Petersburg, W. Va., February 10, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator from West Virginia,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: We want to express our appreciation to you for your interest in and your visit to our area in connection with the West Virginia unemployment situation and, in particular, your efforts in exploring the possibilities of improving the national forests in West Virginia. The improvement of the national forests, as we see this, not only affords immediate employment but also provides by far the largest gain for the future in increased recreational facilities, watershed control, water impoundments, reforestation, increased future timber yield, etc.

Again, we want to bring to your attention our conversation on the pressing and immediate need for long-term, low-interest-rate financing for prospective industry. From the dozens and dozens of proposals we have submitted to interested industrial companies, this seems to be our largest obstacle. The best industrial financing we can offer at present is our community participation in a Small Business Administration loan. Needless to say, under today's competition for industry, this is very inadequate due to the length of term, interest rate, and other problems. We earnestly solicit the efforts of you and your colleagues in the Congress to enact some type legislation to enable such communities as ours to offer long-term, low-interest-rate loans to prospective industry.

Thanking you, we are,
Very truly yours,
ROSWELL H. ALT, *President.*

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have in my hand a letter which I received from Mr. James Paul Geary, secretary-treasurer of the same corporation, in which he says:

> The actual purpose of my writing is to reiterate statements made by me at said meeting with reference to the operating procedures of Small Business Administration. From personal knowledge, it takes approximately 6 months to 1 year from the time application is made to the closing of a loan.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

PETERSBURG INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORP.,
Petersburg, W. Va., February 15, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BYRD: Your personal letter and acknowledgment of the meeting held in Petersburg, Grant County, W. Va., was appreciated, and I was particularly interested in your interest for the Forest Service. Frankly, a large appropriation for this Department would definitely benefit the surrounding area of the Monongahela National Forest.

The actual purpose of my writing is to reiterate statements made by me at said meeting with reference to the operating procedures of Small Business Administration. From personal knowledge, it takes approximately 6 months to 1 year from the time application is made to the closing of a loan. This time element does not necessarily injure local businesses that make application, but is a hindrance when and if Small Business Administration is needed for securing assistance to small businesses or industries that might desire to come into a community. Also, we have been faced with a tremendous problem of competitive interest rates, and, as you know, the 5, 5½, or 6 percent interest rates prohibit communities in West Virginia from competing with State programs such as Pennsylvania and North Carolina now have in effect.

I would like to suggest the possibility of creating a Federal agency specifically designed to assist States such as West Virginia in procuring loans for qualified industries with two principal factors underlying its operation: (1) Immediate action upon application; (2) low interest rates.

Perhaps this could be a temporary agency and the administration of same attached to the now existing Small Business Administration setup.

Very truly yours,
JAMES PAUL GEARY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I should also like to enter into the RECORD a letter which has been made available to me, a letter written by the president of the Raleigh County Bank.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I point out that Raleigh is his home county.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes, it is my home county.

This letter is written by one of our most capable past Governors, the Honorable Okey L. Patteson, now president of that bank.

I think it would be worthwhile if I took the time of the Senate to read the entire context of the letter. I think this letter will be of particular interest to the author of the bill, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. It reads:

FEBRUARY 24, 1961.

Mr. CHARLES S. LEWIS, Jr.,
Beckley, W. Va.

DEAR MR. LEWIS: You have handed me a copy of Senator ROBERT C. BYRD's letter to you of February 10 with reference to depressed area legislation.

Unquestionably risk capital has for some time been a great need in the depressed areas of West Virginia. In my opinion the availability of low rate risk capital would be extremely beneficial to the present effort to aid our State generally and this area in particular. Our bank has had numerous applications for business loans that we were unable to accommodate. Our inability is explained in several ways:

First, we are strictly supervised by the State banking department and the Federal Reserve System. Both of these agencies are extremely critical of any loans that are not on a reasonably short term basis and are not adequately collateraled.

Secondly, because of the large number of depositors whose money we are using as trust funds we have to be able at all times to meet with their withdrawal demands.

Thirdly, approximately 50 percent of our deposits are on savings accounts or time certificates. These require payment by us of an interest rate of a minimum of 2 percent and a maximum of 3 percent. Patently, we cannot make loans at approximately the same rate we are paying for money and continue in business.

Fourthly, our loan limit by law for any one loan, either to any one person or corporation, is approximately $150,000, if we have it available. It would, therefore, be apparent that even the full amount of our loan capacity would be of no practical help to any sizable industry or business.

There are many other reasons that could be given for the bank's inability to meet the present need, but in the interest of brevity we mention only the above. But, from the above, I am thoroughly convinced of the great need for the availability of financial help to business and industry here.

Sincerely yours,
OKEY L. PATTESON,
President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to Mr. Lewis from Elmer L. Davis, executive vice president of the Beckley National Bank of Beckley, W. Va.

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

BECKLEY NATIONAL BANK,
Beckley, W. Va., February 14, 1961.

Mr. CHARLES S. LEWIS, Jr.,
Lewis Chevrolet Co.,
Beckley, W. Va.

DEAR MR. LEWIS: With reference to your memorandum requesting my opinion of the need for long-term, low-interest capital loans to interested persons seeking to locate in our great State, I am very pleased to pass along to you my thoughts in this connection.

I am very sure the need for long-term, low-interest capital in West Virginia would be desirable and attractive to any industry planning on locating or expanding their facilities. The availability of this type of financing, I am sure, would be an excellent talking point to anyone considering our State.

Banks are limited by regulations as to the type of loans that they are permitted to make as well as the size of the loan. Banks are, as a rule, conservative and are not in a position to extend loans that would be considered risk capital for expansion or new development. They also are limited to 10 percent of the capital and surplus of the individual banks. Our bank's loan limit is $150,000 by regulation.

I certainly believe, if an arrangement could be made by the Federal Government to make available to industry long-term, capital loans at an attractive interest rate, this would be most encouraging and attractive to those wishing to locate within our State.

I trust the above information will be helpful to you in preparing your report on this matter to Senator ROBERT C. BYRD.

Sincerely yours,
ELMER L. DAVIS,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, without imposing upon the time of the Senate further, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Tug Valley Chamber of Commerce; a letter from the Morgantown Chamber of Commerce; an editorial from the August 22, 1960, Huntington Advertiser; a letter from Andrew W. McLaughlin, of the Blue Grass Federal Savings and Loan Association of Lewisburg, W. Va.; and a letter from Charles J. Eib, of Marlinton, W. Va.

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

TUG VALLEY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Williamson, W. Va., February 28, 1961.

Subject: Risk capital requirements for Tug Valley area.

Senator ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: During your efforts in behalf of assisting areas with persistent unemployment, your attention should be directed toward the need for risk capital in many areas.

Within the Tug Valley area we have experienced this need for several years, because our local banking facilities are rather conservative with their lending policies, thereby creating an extremely difficult situation for many of our local business firms and/or individuals who are in dire need of additional financing.

Many of these individuals borrowed money several years ago during a period that their operating capital was such that high monthly payments were possible without any inconvenience; however, today these same people experience financial difficulty as a result of our depressing economic conditions and cannot maintain satisfactory repayments schedules. Although their position within our communities is excellent, their potential to borrow funds for the purpose of refinancing is limited within our immediate area. This condition necessitates trips to other cities for the purpose of securing additional funds with which to survive businesswise and on a basis which would provide sufficient operating capital.

Assuming that a young man wished to embark on a new venture in our area, the odds would be that he would have a difficult time establishing himself sufficiently so that he could borrow any sufficient sum of money, assuming, of course, that there was no one here to endorse his note for a loan or that he did not possess any type of security in fixed assets or real estate.

Then again, we have several established business firms and/or individuals who have tried to expand their present business operation or strengthen their present financial status who have been presented with this constant refusal to loan them the necessary funds.

For example, several months ago, one of our local established businessmen visited our office to discuss a planned improvement to his property which is located almost directly across the street from my office. This improvement would have greatly improved not only his property, but a section of our downtown business district. He could not secure the necessary capital from our local banks. He had to leave our city—our county—and our State to secure the necessary funds with which to do the work. I might add that he is currently engaged in the property improvement and, upon completion, he will have a beautiful retail outlet.

Even our lumber dealers resort to utilization of outside capital to finance some of their homebuilding programs, because our

local banking institutions will not provide necessary funds.

Generally speaking, I would state that our local banking facilities do not possess the confidence required for a vigorous, aggressive approach to our economic survival within this area. Risk capital is a phrase which is frowned upon within these circles.

I strongly feel that risk capital which would be made available to our area would permit several smaller business firms to secure a vital "shot in the arm," so that they can survive the future economic problems which we will encounter.

Realizing of course that these loans with risk capital would be repaid, our business firms and/or individuals could stimulate our local economy via necessary arrangements for improving their business conditions and operations.

Another example, several months ago we had a local man visit us to discuss the possible establishment of a garment industry within our area. He needed $10,000 with which to start the project. He was willing to invest an additional $5,000 of his personal funds for the business. Neither of our county banks would loan him the requested amount of capital, because they did not feel that he would survive the current economic conditions. The Tug Valley Industrial Corp., Williamson, Mingo County, W. Va., finally approved a $10,000 loan to this individual. He has been in operation since December 1960. Today he is out taking orders for finished goods which have already been completed. He is experiencing difficulty with this venture, but he is trying to do his best and is devoting a great amount of time and effort toward this goal. He is also trying to secure Government contracts and subcontracts for his firm in order to prove successful. Under the terms of our loan, his first payments do not become effective until the end of 1963, therefore, he has plenty of time to overcome his problems.

We also refer to a metalworking plant which had a desire to locate within our area. This project consumed approximately 12 months of contacts, investigation, and coordination. In the final analysis, our local bank refused to assume a participating loan portion in the amount of $12,500. The total loan agreement with the Small Business Administration was for $50,000. We lost the firm. The financial status of this firm was not the best in the world; however, the man is still in operation and seems to be surviving.

In a nutshell, we do not anticipate any new industry coming into our area with any "gold-plated" proposition, because we are in an area which is in dire need of internal improvements, many of which must be accomplished via local effort. Risk capital is but one of our many local problems.

We do feel that a change of heart with some of the lending policies within our area will assist substantially with overcoming this present defect within our economy. The sooner the better.

Your assistance in this respect with regard to any type Federal action in this field would be greatly appreciated by many small businessmen and business firms.

Thank you.

FRANK G. TSUTRAS,
Managing Director.

MORGANTOWN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Morgantown, W. Va., March 1, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I have received your letter of February 22 and I appreciate the opportunity to pass along to you local data substantiating the need for long-term, low-interest capital in West Virginia.

Our local chamber of commerce, just in the past 3 months, has been aiding three local manufacturing companies to obtain long-term, low-interest capital for expansion in these plants. These companies are the Valley Manufacturing & Distributing Co., the Galis Electric & Machine Co., and the Industrial Manufacturing Co., all local Morgantown companies. These companies at the moment all have loans from our local banks but the companies are still in need of more financial assistance and risk capital. One company already has an application in for a Small Business Administration loan, we are assisting one of the other companies in making an application for a Small Business Administration loan, and the third company still does not have a solution to its needed capital problem. These are all three good companies employing a total of over 250 local workers.

Another company that has not contacted the chamber concerning needed capital but has requested an additional loan from one of our banks is the Industrial Machine & Manufacturing Co. of Morgantown.

As you know, Morgantown does not have too great a number of local industries. Quite a portion of our basic salaries comes from employment at West Virginia University, the U.S. Bureau of Mines Appalachian Experiment Station, and the local coal companies.

To a reasonable extent our local banks have been able to provide a limited amount of capital for our local industries. However, a good part of it has not been nearly as long-term or as low-interest rate as would be desired. I also feel that if business does not take an upturn for the better, more local companies will be in need of additional long-term capital.

Hoping that this information will be of some assistance to you in preparing your comments on the proposed depressed areas legislation and thanking you again for the opportunity to make these observations, I remain,

Most sincerely,

JAMES R. MCCARTNEY,
Managing Director.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser, Aug. 22, 1960]

FINANCING IS MAJOR OBSTACLE TO STATE INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

An illuminating and challenging letter for all West Virginia has come to us from Lloyd A. Cook, president and general manager of Ravens-Metal Products, Inc., of Parkersburg.

The company was the first to organize in the Ohio Valley for fabricating aluminum from the giant Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. works at Ravenswood.

At the time it was formed 4 years ago, the Advertiser published an editorial commenting on the opportunities here and all along the Ohio Valley for men with enterprise and know-how to launch similar industries.

The Kaiser Co. itself had expected such satellite plants to spring up in West Virginia as they had near the firm's operations at Spokane, Wash. But even after 4 years the development is not taking place.

At least one of the major reasons why it is not was pointed out in Mr. Cook's letter referring to our editorial. The difficulty his company has encountered, he believes, may apply to the entire area of industrial development.

So his experience seems to tell in part why the State has lagged in creating new jobs for men idled by the mechanization of coal mines.

The difficulty is financing.

To begin operations the Ravens-Metal Co. had to sell stock to the public.

Those who bought at that time have seen the value of their shares rise from $10 to $15. The advance has taken place as a result of steady growth of the business that has required the opening of two new plants, one at Elizabeth and another at Ellenboro.

During the 4 years the number of employees has risen from 5 to 55. Assets have climbed from $127,000 to $400,000. Annual sales have leaped from $57,000 in 1957 to a 1959 total of $500,000. The sales goal for this year is $750,000.

That is substantial progress. No doubt it has required hard work, dedication, and loyal cooperation throughout the team of management and employees.

But even with all the company's human and material assets and its remarkable record of growth, it still has to go to the public for its financing.

Neither banks nor Government agencies have responded to the need.

And having to go to the public week after week to sell stock to finance expansion needed almost constantly to keep production up with sales takes time and effort that should go into planning, development, and supervision of operations.

The problem is of particular importance here because the chamber of commerce has adopted as a major project for the year the development of plants to fabricate products of basic industries in this area.

Solving it would help meet the State's particular need of small plants in the mountainous mining areas unsuitable for large industries.

One solution has been suggested by Andrew W. McLaughlin, Lewisburg businessman, who spoke before the Rotary Club here this month. His plan calls for the creation of a State manufacturing and marketing commission composed of a five-man board in each county.

The county boards would choose a seven-member board of managing directors. This group would employ a paid managing director and an auditor.

The commission would be provided with at least $15 million for loans to new industries and those needing money for expansion. The money might come from a State appropriation or partly from Federal funds for assisting the recovery of depressed areas.

An obstacle would be the necessity of a constitutional amendment for authorizing the commission to make loans to private corporations.

The urgent need of some such plan has been demonstrated not only by the slow industrial growth in West Virginia but by the faster development in other States that have programs for helping new concerns get started and to meet the needs of expansion.

The problem should get the serious attention of officials and of all organizations interested in speeding industrial expansion to move the State out of the economic doldrums.

BLUE GRASS FEDERAL
SAVINGS & LOAN ASSOCIATION,
Lewisburg, W. Va., February 15, 1961.

Mr. WENDELL S. REYNOLDS,
Huntington Publishing Co.,
Huntington, W. Va.

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: I have your letter of February 13, requesting information of new industries that are in need of capital in their expansion and growth.

I could list many of these for you in various counties throughout the State, but I shall limit this list to those in our immediate vicinity which is as follows: Greenbrier Instruments and Greenbrier Electronics in Ronceverte, Fairlea Metal Works, Fairlea, Maxwelton Manufacturing Co., Lewisburg.

These are a few of those that have been established and managed to survive to a certain point; one thing needed for industrial development and expansion is capital.

I have read with interest, your various editorials on industrial development; Jean Harper sends them to me. I certainly commend you for the work that you are doing.

Very sincerely,

ANDREW W. MCLAUGHLIN.

MARLINTON, W. VA., *February 13, 1961.*
Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In answer to your request for my views on helping West Virginia and Pocahontas County, made at a dinner meeting here, I submit the following suggestions:

It is my belief that too many people for too long have been looking to the Government to take care of all their problems, thus causing many to lose their self-reliance. It is my contention that Government should only help people to help themselves, and that free handouts should be held to a minimum.

However, there are vast projects such as the national forests, flood and power dams, reclamation work, etc., which could not be handled by private individuals alone, and it is in these fields that Government must step in. But in this connection I would like to point out that probably 95 percent of the people believe or delude themselves into thinking that Government projects are free since the Government furnishes them, not realizing that Government work is very costly in the long run.

Also, we must face the fact that the unemployment crisis in West Virginia has been building up for a long time, and hungry people cannot wait for long-range projects and must be put to work immediately. However, I believe that while a crash program is in progress, attention must be given to long-range planning so that our economy can again be rebuilt.

For example, Pocahontas County is an important producer of lumber, yet the majority of this product is exported to other States for manufacture. I am reliably informed by U.S. Forest Service employees that last year only 30 percent of the timber on the Monongahela National Forest was cut that should have been cut, because there was no suitable market. It is my belief that small woodworking plants throughout the area would give real help to the unemployment problems * * * let's produce our own furniture, dimension stock, pressed board, etc., right here where the timber is grown. The same theory applies to other West Virginia products.

Since its inception 2 years ago, I have been associated with a small furniture plant here, the buildings of which were the former exhibit buildings of the Pocahontas County Fair. The principal products of this factory, two-piece living room suites (upholstered) have been widely accepted and compare favorably with those produced in other States and are sold at a better price, yet because the plant was started on a shoestring, it has never been able to really get going because of lack of sufficient working capital. The local people who are interested in this project do not have the money, while the people who have the money are not interested in local development.

It was my dream, in helping to get this plant started, that it would prove to be a pilot plant for other woodworking and furniture establishments throughout the Greenbrier Valley area, and I still believe that this dream can become a reality. There are still many people left who have courage, imagination, and initiative, and were they to be encouraged to the point where the Government could furnish sufficient risk capital on a long-term basis, say on a 50-50 matching basis, I believe that establishment of many small plants would result. I realize that when the Government puts up money of this type, it wants security, as is shown by the Small Business Administration, but we as a people have lately squandered billions around the world, so it should not be too great a problem to take a chance on reputable people in our own land. We residents of West Virginia should learn to create wealth through the products that the Creator has given us. We have the products, but we must learn how wealth is created. This phase of manufacture should be included in a retraining program, which could well give some thought to the tourist potential also.

If any of the thoughts or experiences I have mentioned here can be of any help in assisting West Virginia to rise to the place it should occupy, I will indeed be very grateful.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES J. EIB.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, these letters all testify to the fact that adequate sources of risk capital simply do not exist in West Virginia.

I point out, as I did during the hearings on the bill, that of 77 national banks operating in West Virginia at the close of business June 30, 1960, only 16 had assets in excess of $10 million, and only 5 had assets in excess of $25 million. Of the 106 State banks and trust companies in West Virginia, only 16 had assets in excess of $10 million, and only 2 had assets in excess of $25 million.

Mr. President, I say again, in support of the contention of my colleague from West Virginia, that in our State there simply are not available sources to meet the financial needs which must be met if business is to expand and industry is to be attracted to these depressed areas.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it seems unnecessary, in the light of the compelling comments and the helpful supporting evidence which has been placed in the RECORD by my colleague from West Virginia, to labor the matter further. We believe, if such an amendment were placed in the measure before us, there would be an inhibiting impact on potential industrial growth and new job opportunities in West Virginia. I trust the amendment of the Senator from New York will not prevail.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, unless there are other Senators who wish to speak on the amendment, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield back my remaining time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to the committee amendment.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 61, as follows:

[No. 10]

YEAS—32

Aiken	Curtis	Lausche
Beall	Dirksen	Miller
Bennett	Dworshak	Mundt
Boggs	Fong	Robertson
Bridges	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Bush	Hart	Schoeppel
Butler	Hickenlooper	Scott
Carlson	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Case, N.J.	Javits	Williams, Del.
Case, S. Dak.	Keating	Young, N. Dak.
Cotton	Kuchel	

NAYS—61

Anderson	Hickey	Moss
Bible	Hill	Muskie
Burdick	Holland	Neuberger
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Pell
Cannon	Johnston	Proxmire
Capehart	Jordan	Randolph
Carroll	Kefauver	Russell
Church	Kerr	Smathers
Clark	Long, Mo.	Smith, Mass.
Cooper	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Dodd	Long, La.	Stennis
Douglas	Magnuson	Symington
Eastland	Mansfield	Talmadge
Ellender	McClellan	Thurmond
Engle	McGee	Wiley
Fulbright	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Metcalf	Yarborough
Gruening	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Morse	
Hayden	Morton	

NOT VOTING—7

Allott	Chavez	McCarthy
Bartlett	Ervin	Prouty
Blakley		

So Mr. JAVITS' amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for recognition on the bill in order to offer an amendment, but I shall not submit the amendment until after I have yielded to the Senator from Minnesota, who wishes to offer two technical amendments which have been cleared with the ranking Republican member and other members of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, the amendments are designated 3-14-61-A and 3-14-61-B. Last evening I discussed the amendments in the Senate, but because the minority leader was not here and the ranking Republican member of the

Committee on Banking and Currency was not here, and at the request of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I did not press for the consideration of the amendments.

My amendments do two things. Amendment designated "B" permits, under sections 6 and 7, participation by an Indian tribe in providing a share of the funds required for any type of program. This is not to increase the cost; it merely makes a participant out of the tribe, as it well should.

The amendment designated "A" includes in the definition of the United States, where the islands are spelled out, "and the Virgin Islands."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to address an inquiry to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has not yet offered his amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall do so now. I have cited the amendments. I ask that they be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 80, line 6, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert "and the Virgin Islands."

Amend section 6(b)(9)(B) to read:

"That not less than 10 per centum of such aggregate cost be supplied by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof, or by an Indian tribe or a community or area organization which is nongovernmental in character, as equity capital or as a loan;".

Amend section 7(c) to read:

"In making any loan under this section, the Secretary shall require that not less than 10 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied by the State (including any political subdivision thereof) within which such project is located or by the Indian tribe on whose reservation such project is located as equity capital or as a loan."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the only new words in the amendment designated "B" are the words "Indian tribe." The rest of the language is in the bill.

In some States, where there is a substantial Indian population, it is possible that a State might not provide, as the bill does, equity capital on the part of the State for a project on an Indian reservation. Therefore, if the State, through its legislature, is unwilling to provide such capital, all the amendment provides is that if an Indian tribe has private resources—tribal resources—and is willing to put up 10 percent or more, as would be required under the language of the bill for any political subdivision or nongovernmental organization, the tribe would not be denied that opportunity.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to address an inquiry to the Senator from Minnesota, based upon the fact that I have several times expressed concern that the attempt to relieve areas of actual continuing, chronic unemployment might be so diluted or watered down as to defeat some of the purposes of the bill. I had been of the impression that the tourist trade and other resources of the Virgin Islands had rendered it an area which would hardly be considered a distressed area. Is the Senator from Minnesota in possession of any facts which would indicate that the criteria of the bill would bring the Virgin Islands under the need for aid to distressed areas, under the distress criteria?

Mr. HUMPHREY. My response is simply that the Virgin Islands were included together with Puerto Rico simply because they are a part of the United States of America. If it is a distressed area, it does not qualify. There is no mandate that every inch of territory or every group of people in the United States automatically qualifies. They qualify only if the request for assistance meets the criteria established in the bill. I do not believe we ought to exclude this area, because it may very well have its own problems.

Mr. SCOTT. I thought the Senator from Minnesota could enlighten me. I was curious as to whether or not the Virgins were in distress. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will comment privately to the Senator a little later.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am glad to accept the amendments. I think they are meritorious. A number of Senators from the Northwestern States and Southwestern States have suggested them. I hope they will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc, to the amendments offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

THE OECD CONVENTION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the proposed Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development is a recognition of a shift in economic strength which has been taking place steadily since World War II.

At the end of the war, the United States was the giant which dominated the world's economy, and for several years thereafter the rest of the world, and particularly devastated Western Europe, was dependent upon exports from this country, paid for to a considerable extent by U.S. aid.

The very success of our foreign economic programs has created new problems and new opportunities. The renewal of the industrial power of Western Europe, as well as that of Japan, has brought about an ability of those countries to bear a larger share of the free world's requirements of trade and investment, and opportunities for coordinating far greater total economic resources.

While the OECD gives the United States an opportunity to bring about a more equitable sharing by others of the economic problems, of which it has carried a disproportionate share, the Senate should not ratify this convention under any illusion that our own share should be smaller, absolutely. However, it may be, and, in my opinion should be, smaller, relative to the total effort which the free world must make.

While the industrialized nations of the free world have been growing apace, the gap between them and the less developed nations has steadily widened. An effort to narrow this gap is one of the primary purposes of the OECD.

Does it need to be argued, now, that this disparity is something which ought to concern us? I think not, but let me repeat here what the President said about it in his inaugural address.

To those peoples in the huts and villages across the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communist may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

The shift, from dependence upon the United States, as the dominant economic power of the free world, to interdependence among the countries of Western Europe, Japan, and the United States, has been brought to the forefront by the decline in our balance of payments position.

For the past 10 years our balance of payments has resulted in a deficit—except for 1957, the year of the Suez crisis. From 1951 to 1957 this deficit averaged about $1 billion a year. During these years foreigners held these net dollar earnings in the form of dollars or dollar-earning investments, and at the end of that period our gold reserves were actually slightly larger than at the beginning. In 1958, 1959, and 1960, however, the much larger deficits of $3.5 billion, $3.8 billion, and $3.8 billion, respectively, resulted in outflows of gold of approximately $4.7 billion, total.

The earlier deficits in our balance of payments were, on the whole, beneficial. They financed the export of American goods and services which enabled the rebuilding of other industrialized countries, made possible the restoration of convertible currencies, and increased free world trade. The dollar was being used as the primary reserve currency of the non-Communist world. But the accumulation of dollar holdings abroad placed a heavy burden upon the United States to maintain a dollar "as good as gold." When foreigners began to doubt this would be done they began, increasingly, to exchange dollars for gold.

As the President said—

These gold transfers did not make the underlying balance of payments worse. They did reflect a decision by foreigners to take more of their earnings in gold and to hold less in dollars.

The causes of our balance of payments deficits are well known, and I shall not detail them here. Broadly speaking, our excess of exports over imports have not been sufficient to cover military expenditures abroad, foreign aid programs, and private investment.

While our exports increased substantially last year by more than $3 billion, some of this increase was in goods, such as raw cotton and jet aircraft, which cannot be expected to be repeated, and it is doubtful that we can rely upon last year's rate of increased exports to cover our deficit.

Furthermore, the other industrialized countries are offering increasing competition to our exports, both within those countries and elsewhere.

As currencies of most industrialized countries have become convertible, American investment abroad has become more attractive.

The American economy has not grown at the same rate, in recent years, as have those of other advanced economies of the world. In the OEEC countries of Europe as a whole, gross national product rose at an annual rate of 4.6 percent from 1950 to 1957, while it was rising in the United States at a rate of only 3.6 percent. Canadian GNP rose at a rate of 4.4; France's GNP rose at a rate of 4.7; Germany's at 8.0 percent; Italy's at 5.8 percent. The development of the Common Market and the European Free Trade Association enhanced the attractiveness of American investment in the participating countries.

At the same time, the development of the Common Market and the European Free Trade Association created potentialities of further discriminations against our exports, those of other nations, and as between the two groups themselves.

Monetary policies of other nations have contributed to the imbalance of payments of the United States. At a time when our Federal Reserve discount rate was being reduced to 3 percent, because of recession, the German Bundesbank, fearing inflation, raised its comparable rate to 5 percent, and the Bank of England increased its rate to 6 percent.

This resulted in a flood of short-term funds leaving New York for Germany and Britain, a large increase in gold outflow and speculation on the value of gold. At the same time, the large inflows of American funds contributed to inflationary pressures in Germany. When this was realized, the Germans and British cut back their discount rates. In the meantime, our own monetary authorities have had to maintain relatively high short-term rates, and to operate primarily in the long-term market to bring about an easier monetary situation within the United States.

These developments brought a new awareness of the interdependence of the industrialized nations outside the Iron Curtain. The OECD is designed to deal with such problems.

Developments in the Soviet bloc have emphasized the dangers of division outside it. Some of these are summarized in a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations by the Corporation for Economic and Industrial Research, as follows:

> The Soviet intention is to attempt to take over the world for communism, and its latest economic plans show that it is mobilizing its rapidly growing industrial strength for precisely this purpose.
>
> While the income of the Soviet bloc will grow by 120 percent by 1970, that of the free world will grow by only 83 percent, and that of the United States by less than 70 percent. In industrial output, other than for consumers, the Soviet might overtake the United States before 1970.
>
> Soviet cold war efforts are now being focused increasingly on the economic arena, and they have selected as tragets the underdeveloped countries and will soon have substantial capital goods production to support their campaign.
>
> World population will rise rapidly (22 percent) by 1970, that of the free world underdeveloped countries by almost 30 percent. Because of this, disparities in per capita income will grow even greater between the rich and the poor countries of the free world.
>
> The underdeveloped countries are stirring under a worldwide dissatisfaction with present conditions and methods, and impatience for rapid economic growth. Unless the free world can make a distinct change and create soundly based hope for rapid economic improvement, the underdevelopment countries might fall prey to the "growth without consumption" formula of the Communist system.
>
> Loss of the resources of the underdeveloped countries to the Communist community would completely change the world balance of power in favor of the U.S.S.R.

This is the background for the necessity of economic cooperation and development, among the nations outside the Soviet bloc.

In 1948, when the Marshall plan first began operation, representatives of 16 European nations formed the Organization of European Economic Cooperation. This was an organization which recognized the interdependence of the nations of Western Europe, as well as their dependence upon the United States for economic reconstruction. The OEEC played an important part in Western Europe's recovery. Through it, the member nations liberalized their trade, and, through it, they created the European Payments Union, a system by which the member nations maintained balances of payments among themselves. The OEEC, founded as it was in European dependence upon the U.S. economic power, was rendered obsolete, not only by the development of the Common Market, and the European Free Trade Association by members within the OEEC, but also by the growing interdependence of Canada and the United States and the OEEC countries.

Against this background, the Eisenhower administration, late in 1959, took the initiative of proposing the conversion of the OEEC into a new Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, comprising the OEEC countries, with Canada and the United States as full members.

The threefold aims of the Organization are set forth in article 1 of the convention as follows:

> 1. To achieve the highest sustainable economic growth and employment and a rising standard of living in member countries, while maintaining financial stability, and thus to contribute to the development of the world economy;
>
> 2. to contribute to sound economic expansion in member as well as nonmember countries in the process of economic development; and
>
> 3. to contribute to the expansion of world trade on a multilateral, nondiscriminatory basis in accordance with international obligations.

Under article 2 of the convention, the members agree that in pursuit of these aims they will, individually and jointly, in general terms of objectives, rather than specifically, promote and pursue policies which will contribute to the economic development of both member and nonmember countries.

In article 3, the members agree that they will keep each other informed, consult on a continuing basis, carry out studies, cooperate closely and, where appropriate, take coordinated action.

Article 5 empowers the Organization to take decisions, make recommendations, and enter into agreements. The decisions, however, are subject to a provision in article 6 that is worthy of special note. It provides that no decision shall be binding upon any member until it has complied with the requirements of its own constitutional procedures, although the other members may agree that such a decision shall apply provisionally to them.

Article 6 also provides for voting procedures which give each member veto power. Under Secretary Ball explained this provision as follows:

> A nation which opposes a particular proposal has the option either of voting against it, in which case the proposal is killed, or of abstaining, in which case the proposal does not apply to that country.

In both the committee report and the resolution of ratification, the committee has gone to considerable pains to explain that nothing in the convention enlarges, diminishes, or alters the powers of the President or the Congress in respect to any substantive actions which may be taken by the OECD. A clear expression of the interpretation and understanding of the Senate is incorporated in the act of ratification.

The President, in his message on the balance of the payments and gold outflow, described the role of the OECD as follows:

> The OECD, in which the industrialized countries of Western Europe, the United States, and Canada will be joined, is of vital importance for assisting, on a cooperative basis, the developing countries of the free world. It will also provide a solid framework within which we can carry out intensive and frequent international consultations on the financial and monetary policies which must be pursued in order to achieve and maintain better balance in the international payments position.

The OECD is to be primarily a forum for communication, education, and understanding. Countries with common interests and common problems will be able to discuss their goals and problems within an organization designed precisely for that purpose.

Within the OECD there will be a Development Assistance Committee, which will include Japan, whose function it will be to consider steps to be taken to increase the total effort of the industrialized nations of the world to close the gap between their own development and that of the less developed areas. This Committee will succeed the Development Assistance Group which was established in January 1960, when the negotiations for the OECD began. According to the Secretary of State, the discussions which have taken place within the DAG already have borne fruit, with some European countries increasing their aid programs and making arrangements to provide grants as well as

loans, and long-term development credits as well as short-term export credits.

Also within the OECD will be a Trade Committee. I hasten to quote the words of the Secretary of State with regard to what the OECD and its Trade Committee will not do, as follows:

I can state unequivocally that the OECD will not assume broad trade functions. It will not cut tariffs. It will not assume any of the functions which had been planned for the Organization for Trade Cooperation. Nor will the OECD in any way infringe upon or control the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) * * * The OECD will have nothing to do with tariff making. It carefully recognizes the constitutional requirements in the United States. It is designed to expand economic activity, including U.S. export markets, not to contract it. It is an essential instrument in our efforts to develop the strength and cohesion of the entire free world.

The Trade Committee will serve as a forum for confrontation on general trade policies. This will provide the United States with an opportunity to press those countries which still maintain restrictions on our exports, particularly our agricultural exports, for the removal of them.

For my own part, let me state here that I believe the time has long since passed when countries in strong reserve positions have legitimate reasons for discriminating against U.S. exports. I intend to do everything in my power to persuade our State, Agriculture, and Commerce Departments and our missions abroad to insist on the removal of these remaining discriminations. It is true that some progress has been made, but it is also true that many protective devices still exist, particularly with respect to American agricultural products, with no substantiation in sound economic policy.

The same observations can be made with respect to the ability of these nations to contribute to programs for the development of the less developed countries of the world.

While much has been said in the hearings and discussions of the OECD about what it will not do, much more needs to be said about what its possibilities are. In determining these we should consider the viewpoint of the administration as to its intentions, for much will depend upon this.

The Wall Street Journal of March 3, 1961, carried an article calling attention to an aide memoire presented to the German Government by the State Department. This article called the aide memoire:

The most definitive declaration to date of a quietly evolving program of far-reaching consequences. * * * The chief draftsman of the aide memoire, in the final stages, was President Kennedy himself.

I read from the text of the aide memoire.

We are on the eve of creating a new phase in the history of the North Atlantic Alliance. We have new tasks; and the recovery of Western Europe in the 1950's has given us new resources. Together the resources which we dispose are much larger than those we could command in the immediate postwar years and they are better distributed among us.

To deal with these new tasks we must begin by recognizing that we are interdependent in all we do; and that our common burdens must be shared in a way that our peoples will recognize as fair.

The economic questions now under discussion between the United States and Germany are not bilateral questions. The deficit of the United States arises wholly from its commitments and actions in the common defense of the free world. Without these freely assumed obligations the United States would now be running a heavy surplus in its balance of payments. These matters therefore must be approached in terms of a rebuilding of the alliance and in terms of the principles which should govern the effort over coming months and years.

Specifically, we must examine how we can share fairly two burdens: the burden of the common defense; and the burden of long-term economic assistance to the underdeveloped areas.

It is clear that we must design formula which take account of the proportions of our total resources now flowing to these two common purposes; and which make allowance, as we do in our domestic taxation systems, for the principle that the richer among us shall bear a higher relative burden than the poorer.

In addition, we must all come to recognize a principle on which the United States has acted in the years after World War II. That principle is that a sustained accumulation of gold and other international reserves by any one country is disruptive to the international community. Especially now, when trade is expanding faster than gold production, we must learn to use our reserves on a communal basis, recognizing that one nation's gain can only be another nation's loss.

The Government of the United States believes that the question of equitable shares in the common effort to assist the underdeveloped nations of the free world should be urgently examined within OEEC, in anticipation of the OECD coming into effect; and that the question of equitable shares in the common defense be urgently examined within NATO.

The United States could have reacted to its balance-of-payments situation—and to the political, economic, and military disagreements which have arisen in the Western alliance—as a rationale for escape back into that era of our history characterized by withdrawal, isolationism, and Smoot-Hawleyism.

I think it is clear that the present administration—and this applies, in fact, to the past administration as well, for it, after all, originated this convention—has no intention of doing this. I welcome this decision which is, I think, embodied in the OECD, not in any legal sense, nor, in fact, even by way of a moral commitment which would be binding upon those who do not wish to be bound. The OECD, nevertheless, represents a decision on the part of the United States, as well as the other members that, while we may not step forward, in terms of free world unity, as vigorously as some think we should, we need not, perforce, step backward. We shall, in fact, search for ways to move toward closer cooperation through the OECD.

We in the United States can agree, I think, that the other industrialized nations of the world should do more, in terms of trade and aid, without this necessarily meaning that we should do less. This, I think, is the meaning and the opportunity of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment in the nature of a substitute. I ask unanimous consent that, in lieu of its being read, the amendment may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Area Assistance Act of 1961".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress declares that, even during periods of prosperity for the Nation as a whole, some of our communities suffer substantial and persistent unemployment; that such unemployment causes hardship to many individuals and their families and detracts from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic development; that Federal assistance should enable communities to achieve lasting improvement and decrease economic vulnerability by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies; and that new employment opportunities should be created rather than merely transferred from one community to another.

AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary of Commerce, hereinafter referred to as the Secretary, may designate as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment any area certified as eligible for such designation by the Secretary of Labor.

(b) To assist areas in the United States designated as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment, the Secretary is authorized—

(1) to make grants for technical assistance for such areas in accordance with the provisions of section 106(a) of this Act; and

(2) to provide loans for such areas in accordance with the provisions of section 107 of this Act.

(c) The Secretary is also authorized—

(1) to extend the full cooperation of the Federal Government to all areas in the United States (including Puerto Rico) in promoting the more effective use of local resources, in the establishment of new industries based on local resources, and in the expansion of existing industries; such cooperation to be provided through technical advice and consultation and, when necessary, through the conduct of special studies.

(2) to decrease, through grants made in accordance with the provisions of section 106(b) of this Act, the economic vulnerability of (i) towns predominantly dependent on one industry, (ii) small towns which could serve as centers for economic diversification of low-income rural areas, and (iii) other low-income rural areas not subject to assistance as in (ii), by helping them to develop manufacturing, processing, and

other activities calculated to diversify and improve their economies; and

(3) to coordinate his functions under this Act with those of the Secretary of Agriculture and other officials administering Federal programs affecting local economic conditions.

(d) As used in this Act:

(1) The term "United States" includes the several States and the District of Columbia;

(2) The term "State" refers to an individual State or the District of Columbia; and

(3) The term "loan" includes loans, immediate participation in loans, and purchase of evidences of indebtedness.

AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF LABOR

SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall from time to time, or upon the request of the Secretary, certify the existence of areas eligible for designation as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment whenever he finds, on the basis of available labor force data, or studies which he initiates when he deems necessary that—

(1) the rate of unemployment in the area, excluding unemployment due primarily to temporary or seasonal factors is currently 6 per centum and has averaged at least 6 per centum for the qualifying time periods specified in (2) below; and

(2) the annual average rate of unemployment in the area has been at least—

(A) 50 per centum above the national average for three of the preceding four calendar years, or

(B) 75 per centum above the national average for two of the preceding three calendar years, or

(C) 100 per centum above the national average for one of the preceding two calendar years.

(b) In the case of labor market areas for which appropriate historical labor force data have not been compiled, the Secretary of Labor shall certify as eligible for designation as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment those areas in which the unemployment rate and duration, based on a survey of available labor force data, generally equals or exceeds the rate and duration specified in section 102(a).

(c) The Secretary of Labor may also certify under subsection (a) or (b) of this section the existence of eligible areas upon request of any appropriate State government agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision.

(d) The Secretary of Labor is authorized, upon request and whenever he determines that such studies are needed, to undertake, or to provide assistance to others in studies of the size, characteristics, skills, adaptability, occupational potentialities, and related aspects of the labor force of an area certified under this section.

(e) When skills of the labor force in an area designated under section 101 are not such as to facilitate full utilization of the human resources in such area, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide advice and technical assistance in developing and carrying out a program to improve the utilization of such labor force.

(f) Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds a need for vocational education services in an area designated under section 101 and when such area has an economic development program as provided in section 107(b)(10) he is authorized to assist interested agencies to determine the vocational training needs of unemployed individuals residing in the area, and he shall notify the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the vocational training or retraining requirements of the area. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Commissioner of Education, is authorized to provide assistance, including financial assistance when necessary or appropriate, to the State vocational education agency for the provision of such services in the area. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $1,500,000 annually for the purpose of providing financial assistance under this subsection.

AUTHORITY OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 103. Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding the following new heading and section at the end of title I:

"AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL AND PERSISTENT UNEMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 113. (a) When the Secretary of Commerce certifies to the Administrator (1) that any county, city, or other municipality (referred to as 'municipality' in this section) is situated in an area designated by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the Area Assistance Act of 1961 as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment, and (2) that there is a reasonable probability that with assistance provided under the Area Assistance Act of 1961 and other undertakings the area will be able to achieve lasting improvement in its economic development, the Administrator is authorized to extend financial assistance to a local public agency in any such municipality under this title and the provisions of this section.

"(b) The Administrator may provide such financial assistance under this section without regard to the requirements or limitations of section 110(c) of this title that the project area be clearly predominantly residential in character or that it will be predominatly residential under the urban renewal plan.

"(c) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for any project involving a project area including primarily industrial or commercial structures suitable for rehabilitation under the urban renewal plan for the area.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, a contract for financial assistance under this section may include provisions permitting the disposition of any land in the project area designated under the urban renewal plan for industrial or commercial uses to any public agency or nonprofit corporation for subsequent disposition as promptly as practicable by such public agency or corporation for the redevelopment of the land in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *Provided*, That any disposition of such land to such public agency or corporation under this section shall be made at not less than its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *And provided further*, That the purchaser from or lessees of such public agency or corporation, and their assignees, shall be required to assume the obligations imposed in conformity with the requirements of section 105(b) hereof.

"(e) Following the execution of any contract for financial assistance under this section with respect to any project, the Administrator may exercise the authority vested under this section for the completion of such project notwithstanding any determination made after the execution of such contract that the area in which the project is located may no longer be an area of substantial and persistent unemployment.

"(f) Not more than 10 per centum of the funds authorized for capital grants under section 103 after June 30, 1960, shall be available to provide financial assistance under this section."

SEC. 104. (a) The first sentence of section 202(c) of title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In the processing of applications for financial assistance under this section, the Administrator shall give priority to applications of counties, cities, and other municipalities and political subdivisions for financing needed public facilities in areas determined to be areas of substantial and persistent unemployment under the Area Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Commerce certifies there is reasonable probability that with assistance made available under the Area Assistance Act of 1961 and other undertakings such areas will be able to achieve lasting improvement in their economic development; and equal priority to applications of smaller municipalities for assistance in the construction of basic public works (including works for the storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water; sewage, sewage treatment, and sewer facilities; and gas distribution systems) for which there is an urgent and vital public need; the Administrator shall give a first priority above all others to applications for financing needed public facilities in connection with, and that will directly serve, a project eligible under section 107 of the Area Assistance Act of 1961."

(b) The first sentence of section 203(a) of title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In order to finance activities under this title, the Administrator is authorized and empowered to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time, and to have outstanding at any one time in an amount not exceeding $150,000,000, notes and other obligations, which limit shall be increased by such amounts, not exceeding $100,000,000, as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts."

URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

SEC. 105. Paragraph (3) of section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after "Cities, other municipalities, and counties which" the following: "(A) are situated in areas designated as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment under section 101(a) of the Area Assistance Act of 1961, or (B)."

GRANTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 106. (a) In carrying out section 101(b)(1), the Secretary is authorized to make grants for technical assistance including studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of areas designated under section 101(a). These grants may be made without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529). Appropriations are hereby authorized for these grants in an amount not to exceed $1,500,000 annually.

(b) In carrying out section 101(c)(2), the Secretary is authorized to make similar grants for the benefit of towns and areas described therein. Negotiations taking into account the financial ability of the grantee and other relevant considerations shall be made for contributions to costs of projects undertaken hereunder. These grants may be made without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and appropriations therefore are hereby authorized in an amount not to exceed $2,000,000 annually.

LOANS

SEC. 107. (a) In carrying out section 101(b)(2) of this Act the Secretary is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans (including immediate participations therein) to aid in financing any project within an area of substantial and persistent unemployment for the purchase or development of land and facilities for industrial usage, for the construction of new factory buildings, for rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied factory buildings, or for the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of any existing buildings for industrial use. Such financial assistance shall not be extended for working capital, for purchase of machinery or equipment, or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another.

(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, subject, how-

ever, to the following restrictions and limitations:

(1) The total amount of loans and loan participations (including purchased evidences of indebtedness) outstanding at any one time under this section shall not exceed $75,000,000;

(2) Such assistance shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public, approved by the State (or any agency or instrumentality thereof concerned with problems of economic development) in which the project to be financed shall be located;

(3) The project for which financial assistance is sought is reasonably calculated to provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment within the area of substantial and persistent unemployment wherein it is, or will be, located;

(4) No such assistance shall be extended hereunder unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders or other Federal agencies on reasonable terms;

(5) No loans shall be made unless it is determined that an immediate participation is not available;

(6) No evidences of indebtedness shall be purchased and no loans shall be made unless it is determined that there is a reasonable assurance of repayment;

(7) No loan, including renewals or extension thereof, may be made hereunder for a period exceeding thirty years and no evidence of indebtedness maturing more than thirty years from date of purchase may be purchased hereunder: *Provided,* That the foregoing restrictions on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Secretary as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in other proceedings attendant upon insolvency of the obligor, or if extension or renewal for additional periods, not to exceed, however, a total of ten years, will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loans or of such evidence of indebtedness;

(8) Each loan shall bear interest at a rate equal to the interest rate currently payable under section 108(e) on advances from the Treasury, plus one-half of 1 per centum per annum for administrative expenses and a reserve for losses on loans;

(9)(A) Not less than 15 per centum of the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities, and of constructing, altering, converting, rehabilitating, or enlarging the building or buildings of the particular project shall be supplied by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof, or by a community or area organization, as equity capital or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance hereunder has been repaid in full according to the terms thereof, and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance hereunder;

(B) Of the remaining 85 per centum of the aggregate cost, 35 per centum of the aggregate cost may be loaned by the Secretary under the terms of this Act and security for such a loan may be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens which secure any loan or financing other than funds required by section 107(b)(9)(A).

(C) Loans shall not be available hereunder unless other funds are available in an amount which, together with assistance provided hereunder and funds provided under section 107(b)(9)(A), shall be sufficient to pay such aggregate cost; and

(10) No such assistance shall be extended unless there shall be submitted to and approved by the Secretary an overall program for the economic development of the area and a finding by the State, or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof, that the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall authorize financial assistance for any project prohibited by laws of the State or local political subdivision in which the project would be located.

AREA ASSISTANCE FUND

SEC. 108. (a) There is hereby authorized to be established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund to be known as the area assistance fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund"), which shall be available to the Secretary for the payment of all obligations and expenses in connection with the loans authorized under section 101(b)(2).

(b) When requested by the Secretary, advances shall be made to the fund from the appropriations made therefor. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of making advances to the fund, without fiscal year limitation, an amount not exceeding $75,000,000.

(c) Receipts arising from the loan program shall be credited to the fund.

(d) Any moneys in the fund determined by the Secretary to be in excess of current needs shall be credited to the appropriation from which advanced to be held for future advances to the fund.

(e) There shall be paid into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury at the close of each fiscal year interest on advances to the fund at rates which shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury at the time the advances or commitments for advances are made after taking into consideration the current average market yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to loans made by the Secretary.

(f) Contributions shall be made from the fund to the civil service retirement and disability fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Civil Service Commission, for the Government's share of the cost of the civil service retirement system applicable to employees (and their beneficiaries) performing activities authorized under section 101(b)(2). Contributions shall also be made to the employee's compensation fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Secretary of Labor, for the benefit payments made from such fund on account of employees performing activities authorized under section 101(b)(2). The annual billings shall also include a statement of the fair portion of the cost of the administration of the respective funds, which shall be paid by the Secretary into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE

SEC. 109. Whenever the Secretary shall determine that employment conditions within any area previously designated by him as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment have changed to such an extent that such area is no longer eligible for such designation under section 101(a) of this Act, no further assistance shall be granted under this Act, with respect to such area and, for the purposes of this Act, such area shall not be considered an area of substantial and persistent unemployment: *Provided,* That nothing contained herein shall—

(a) prevent any such area from again being designated an area of substantial and persistent unemployment under section 101(a) of this Act if the Secretary determines it to be eligible under such section or

(b) affect the validity of any contracts or undertakings with respect to such area which were entered into pursuant to this Act prior to a determination by the Secretary that such area no longer qualifies as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment. The Secretary shall keep the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and interested State or local agencies, advised at all times of any changes made hereunder with respect to the designation of any area.

BUDGET AND AUDIT

SEC. 110. In the performance of and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by section 107 of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(a) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended; and

(b) maintain a set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided,* That the Secretary with respect to the program of financial assistance authorized by section 101(b)(2) shall determine the character of and the necessity for obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to provisions of law specifically applicable to Government corporations.

AREA ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 111. There shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate an Area Assistance Administrator in the Department of Commerce who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to that received by Assistant Secretaries of Commerce. The Administrator shall perform such duties in the execution of this Act as the Secretary may assign.

POWERS

SEC. 112. In the performance of, and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties vested in him under this Act, the Secretary may—

(a) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed; and subject to the civil service and classification laws, select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and define their authority and duties;

(b) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

(c) under such regulations as he may prescribe, make such findings and determinations as may be required for the proper administration of this Act and such findings and determinations, together with those required to be made by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 102 hereof, shall be final and shall not be subject to review in any court by mandamus or otherwise: *Provided,* That with respect to the validity, effect, and enforcement of section 101(b)(2) hereof or security taken thereunder, statutes, rules, and regulations pertaining generally to suits by and against the United States shall be applicable;

(d) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans granted under this title, and to collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligation may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(e) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable, any real property conveyed to or otherwise acquired by

him in connection with the payment of loans granted under this title;

(f) pursue to final collection by way of compromise or other administrative action prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to the Secretary in connection with loans made by him. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), shall not be construed to apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Secretary as a result of loans made under this title if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute in the name of the Secretary deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real property or any interest therein acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this title may be exercised by the Secretary or by any officer or agent appointed by him for the purpose;

(g) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in section 101(b)(2) of this Act; and

(h) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made or securities acquired under the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That no attorney's services shall be produced by contract in any office where an attorney or attorneys are or can be economically employed full time to render such service.

ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 113. To advise the Secretary in the performance of functions authorized by this Act, there is authorized to be created an Area Assistance Advisory Board, hereinafter referred to as the "Board", which shall consist of the following members, all ex officio: The Secretary, as Chairman, the Secretaries of Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, and Treasury, the Administrators of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and of the Small Business Administration. The Chairman may from time to time invite the participation of officials of other agencies of the executive branch interested in the functions herein authorized. Each member of the Board may designate an officer of his agency to act for him as a member of the Board with respect to any matter there considered.

DEPOSITARIES AND AGENTS

SEC. 114. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as custodians and fiscal agents for the Secretary in the general performance of the powers conferred by this title. Each Federal Reserve bank shall be entitled to be reimbursed for all expenses incurred as such fiscal agents. Any banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, when designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, may act as custodians and depositaries for the Secretary.

PENALTIES

SEC. 115. With respect to financial assistance authorized by this Act:

(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal, deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Secretary, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Secretary—

(1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or

(2) with intent to defraud the Secretary or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Secretary makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Secretary, or, without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or

(3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Secretary, or

(4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Secretary which might affect the value of securities, or, having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Secretary shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

(c) As used in this section, the term "Secretary" shall mean, with respect to the lending activities of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator authorized under this Act, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

USE OF OTHER FACILITIES

SEC. 116. (a) To avoid duplication of activities and minimize expense in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall to the extent practicable and with their consent use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. This Act shall be supplemental to any existing authority and nothing herein shall be deemed to be restrictive of any existing powers, duties, and functions of any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

CONSULTANTS

SEC. 117. The Secretary is authorized to obtain services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55(a)), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 118. The Secretary shall make a comprehensive annual report of his operations under this Act for the fiscal year ending on the preceding June 30, to the President, for transmission to the Congress as soon as practicable in each year, but in no case later than the third day of the following January.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 119. In addition to appropriations specifically authorized by sections 106 and 108, appropriations are further authorized for the carrying out of other provisions and purposes of this Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall make a 10-minute record on the amendment. I think I should ask for the yeas and nays on it.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I may well yield back some of my time on the amendment, unless there is a request by other Senators for time. The amendment in the nature of a substitute has been before the committee and has been considered. It is a more modest proposal than S. 1, which is now pending before the Senate. It is almost identical with the bill which was introduced last year after the President's veto.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute provides for $100 million in community facility loans, $75 million in loans for the essential purpose of the bill, and then sufficient money for vocational training, for consulting service, and for technical service to assist in providing aid to distressed areas.

We are familiar with the fact that there is a problem in certain areas of the country. There is something of a problem in my own State. We recognize it. The residual question, then, is: How far do we go, and what do we do?

We can approach the problem from the standpoint of all grants or all loans or a combination of loans and grants. The amendment in the nature of a substitute adopts the loan basis with technical and consulting service and vocational and educational service.

It is not necessary to explain the proposal. It follows, in general lines, the bill which is the business of the Senate at the present time.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute preserves as a mechanism the office of the Secretary of Commerce.

The criteria are substantially the same as those provided in S. 1. The amendment brings into focus the cooperation of the States, and that is important, because in the recital of purposes there is the declaration that the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, shall carry on the program. That is the point of emphasis. I think that if we fail to energize and put the emphasis on the whole element of self-help, supplemented by some Government effort, the whole proposal will ultimately prove to be illusory, and, in my judgment, it will fail.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute brings into play the first and second titles of the Housing Act. There we already have a form. We have a mechanism with which to do a part of the work.

It includes cities, counties, and municipalities; and it is expanded to include commercial and industrial areas, under the urban renewal plan.

It gives priority.

It provides for planning grants.

Then the loan section provides that no loans for working capital shall be made; no loans for machinery or equipment shall be made. They can be made to public or to private bodies, but there must be State approval. No funds shall be available from this means if funds from other sources are available.

There must be a reasonable chance for repayment.

The evidences of indebtedness can have maturity of up to 30 years.

The interest rate shall be the current rate, plus one-half of 1 percent.

There shall be participation by State or local or private organizations; and 35 percent of the remaining aggregate will

be the burden of the Federal Government.

I believe that is where the emphasis must be placed.

The substitute seeks to avoid duplication insofar as the Small Business Administration is concerned, and also insofar as concerns the small business investment associations which Congress authorized last year.

In addition, I have removed the provision in regard to rural areas. The reason for that is that at the present time we have a rural development program, and it is making progress. The aid of a good many State universities has been enlisted, in order to help in that cause; and I do not believe that in a bill of this sort we should include provision for the so-called rural areas.

So this is a streamlined measure. It falls far short of what is contemplated by Senate bill 1.

I think that tells the whole story. This is the measure in which the prior administration had an interest; it is the measure in which President Eisenhower expressed an interest when he entreated the Congress, after 5 years of inaction, to give him a bill dealing with the problems in this field.

So, Mr. President, that is where I rest the case.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for several questions?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. First, let me ask whether it would be necessary for a State to pass enabling legislation, in order that the State or its municipalities could take advantage of the proposed benefits?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. But if I had submitted an amendment which I had intended to submit, and might still submit—I refer to an amendment which would permit the Secretary of Commerce to pick up general obligations or revenue bonds issued under State industrial revenue bond provisions—then if the amendment were agreed to, of course if there were no authority under the general obligation authority or if there were no statute authorizing the issuance of revenue bonds, there would have to be enabling legislation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. North Dakota has a statute under which the State Bank of North Dakota can purchase revenue bonds issued by municipalities. Apparently that is proving quite successful; at least, some activity has developed under it, and, so far as I know, it has been paying up fairly well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may add that Arkansas, West Virginia, Illinois, and Kentucky have comparable statutes, insofar as I know. So certainly those States could take advantage of the kind of provision I had in mind. But it is embodied in a separate amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Next, would Indian tribes, as such, be eligible under the Senator's substitute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not checked on that, as a matter of fact, although I should have done so, in view of the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I did not run through the language of my amendment to see whether Indian tribes were included. But if the substitute were adopted, of course that could be done.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Yesterday, the Senate adopted an amendment which placed a termination point on the bill; that amendment was adopted by the Senate with agreeable participation of the distinguished colleague of the Senator from Illinois.

I wonder whether the Senator will be willing to modify his substitute so as to accept an exactly similar amendment for termination of the authority.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Inasmuch as that amendment is in print and was adopted, I think it offers no difficulty.

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So, Mr. President, I modify the substitute, so as to append or insert after line 2, on page 26, section 118, the text of the amendment adopted on yesterday by the Senate, after the amendment was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. I modify the substitute accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this point, unanimous consent must be had, for that purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, Mr. President; and I ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? Without objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute will be modified accordingly; and the modification will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The modification is as follows:

On page 26, after line 2, insert:

"TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY

"SEC. 27. (a) This Act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1965.

"(b) Notwithstanding the foregoing, effective on July 1, 1965, those assets, funds, contracts, loans, liabilities, commitments, authorizations, allocations, and records of the Secretary under this Act which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine are necessary to the liquidation of the affairs and functions conducted under this Act, are transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury for purposes of liquidation.

"(c) The termination of this Act shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, commitment, or other obligation entered into pursuant to this Act prior to the date of such termination, or the taking of any action necessary to preserve or protect the interests of the United States in any amounts advanced or paid out in carrying on operations under this Act."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois also ask unanimous consent to modify his amendment so as to insert "Indian tribes or Indian reservations," so the substitute will be on all fours with the original bill, in that respect?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We would have to find the appropriate place in the substitute. However, I have no objection, if the Chair will entertain an amendment to the effect that where it appears in the substitute, the words "and Indian tribes," as an organization that can function as a body for the purposes of the bill; shall be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That would follow, actually, the amendment submitted a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the modification will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The modification is as follows:

On page 6, line 25, following the word "municipality" insert "or any Indian tribe".

On page 9, line 7, following the word "subdivisions" insert the following: "and Indian tribes".

On page 12, line 14, following the word "public", insert the following: "(Including Indian tribes)".

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I appreciate that, because I feared that if the substitute were first adopted, it would then be too late to amend it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield briefly to me, either from the time available on the bill or from the time available on his amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of the time available to me on my amendment; and at this time I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts 2 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, the area redevelopment bill which we have before us is essentially a new undertaking on the part of the Government. We hope that in certain areas of our country it will prove very helpful. At the same time, we must not forget that it is an experiment. We want to make it work, so it can be helpful to the building up of communities which need assistance in order to provide employment for their citizens and in order to have profitable enterprises. In doing this, part of the effort must be directed to building public utilities where they cannot otherwise be built.

For some years now, a number of our communities throughout the United States have suffered from substantial and chronic unemployment. That has brought hardship to many of our citizens and their families, and involves a serious waste of our resources, because able citizens who desire employment do not have it.

While there has been general agreement on the importance of stimulating financial aid and technical assistance for these areas, no comprehensive program has ever been enacted into law, because we have not agreed on the size and type of the program.

This is, as I have stated, an experiment on the part of the Federal Government. It will succeed only if local initiative,

local energy, and local money have been utilized to attract and to keep industry. In my State of Massachusetts, we are proud of the initiative of our local communities. In many of our cities and towns, this local energy and local initiative have been ingeniously utilized to attract new industry, to train the citizens to become skilled in the new industry, and thus to build up a new type of employment. This has been particularly true in the so-called one-industry towns, and I am always proud of my fellow citizens in these areas who are responsible for this effort, which has made real progress possible. I cite only two examples, the towns of Clinton and Ware, but there are a number of others. Yet in many places, both in New England and elsewhere in our country, such community endeavor has not been strong enough, even though local leadership has done its best to bring about a healthy economic balance of reasonable prosperity. These are the cases where local efforts supplemented by Federal funds may make the difference between successful effort and prolonged frustration. But I repeat emphatically, it is not a matter of substitution; it is a matter of supplementation. Our distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], told us, on January 5 of this year:

> Government aid, if it is forthcoming, will not work without the will of a city to revitalize itself.

That will across the United States must be stimulated, and not suffocated.

I consider an important part of this program to be assistance in reeducation. In my State, our skilled workers were first employed, in the early 19th century, in the manufacture of sailing ships made of wood. Later, the descendants of these workers helped to harness the power of our rivers for the production of textiles, and we became an important part of the textile industry. We also became, and still are, one of the leading manufacturers of shoes. But while the shoe industry and the textile industry still employ many people, we have recently developed industrial competence in electronics research and development. Essentially, the people who work in the electronics industry are the people who have developed their skills through education in our schools, through training in these industries, and, ultimately, through hard endeavor from day to day as skilled operators of the tools of the new trade, so to speak. Clearly, it will be helpful if these people can have training, in areas where unemployment now exists, to understand new industry and to operate its new machinery.

As I have stated, I am in favor of the principles involved in this proposed legislation, and I intend to support it.

If we regard this act as an experiment of the Federal Government, then we must from time to time determine if that experiment has been successful. I believe the sound way of doing this is to make the act a temporary measure that will expire in a given number of years—say 2, 3 or 5 years.

We did that yesterday by accepting the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut providing for 4 years.

In this way Congress can determine whether or not to go forward with it. This is a much better method of determining the success and continuing legitimacy of the program than to have a committee make a study and investigation of it and its administration after a given period of time.

New industry comes essentially within the purview of the Department of Commerce, and certainly the Secretary of that Department should be the ultimate responsible officer of the Federal Government. I agree that the Administrator of this program will have a demanding job, but his office should come under the day-to-day responsibility of the Secretary of Commerce himself. I am glad that the Senate has adopted an amendment to this effect.

This raises the question, in a new law of this character, as to the value of grants rather than loans. Grants tend to stifle rather than to encourage local initiative and participation in self-help efforts. On the other hand, a revolving fund, to be used for loans for qualified public facilities projects in redeveloped areas wherein local cost sharing of at least 10 percent of the total expense of any project is involved, should be adequate if the citizens in that locality really intend to make the effort successful.

I voted for an amendment which would prevent the use of funds under this program for the purchase of machinery and equipment. In its original form, S. 1 provided that funds could be used for this purpose "in exceptional cases." S. 9, which I cosponsored and will vote for should it be offered in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill, specifically prohibits such assistance. The committee bill allows loan funds to be used for the purchase of machinery and equipment in "case of demonstrated need." I do not believe that this qualification on the use of Federal funds really constitutes any significant limitation. All assistance under the bill requires evidence of demonstrated need, and therefore the restriction is virtually meaningless. I agreed with the senior Senator from New York, who has stated that loans for machinery and equipment have no proper place in area redevelopment legislation. This kind of assistance, in my opinion, is basically outside the stated purpose of the bill and unduly interferes with private industrial enterprise and our free competitive economy.

We in Massachusetts are essentially an industrial community. The rural redevelopment provisions of the bill should, in my opinion, be handled in separate legislation, and not in legislation of this character. If they are to be included in S. 1, then certainly we should make every effort to make the language clear that all sections of our country will benefit if the criteria provisions of the bill are satisfied. The aid to build up new businesses in areas which are now agricultural or lacking in industry should be carefully and fairly administered.

I voted against the bill submitted last year because it seemed to me to work to the disadvantage of our State and to aid other regions of the Nation at our expense. It might well have encouraged the pirating of industries. This was a very important consideration from our point of view. Federal funds, I think we are all agreed, should not be used to encourage the stealing of industries from communities which already have, and badly need those industries. S. 1 has been amended so that this difficulty has been removed; and it is removed in the substitute offered by the Senator from Illinois.

No one can object to the expansion of industry, but certainly we can all resist the taking of an industry from a community, which is fully employed, and is successfully operating a plant, and the moving of it to another community in another area which needs industry.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me reiterate that I feel early enactment of a comprehensive program of Federal redevelopment aid is urgent. I hope, however, there may be amendments offered and adopted to this bill that will make it, in my opinion, even more helpful and will make better administration of its provisions possible. When we adopt Federal legislation of this character, we must always make its provisions consistent with efforts to nurture local initiative, local drive, and local responsibility, and not take away those qualities which have built our communities, our States, and our Nation over the years. For these reasons, and in this manner, I intend to support the bill, but hope that some amendments may be adopted to make it even more helpful, in my opinion, to carry out these principles of self-help.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the substitute proposed by my colleague from Illinois is the so-called Eisenhower bill which the President sent to Congress last year, after he had vetoed an area redevelopment bill for the second time.

It will be remembered that the Republican leaders in the House in 1956 refused to permit a Senate-passed bill to be considered in the closing hours or closing days of that session.

It will be remembered that in 1958 the House and the Senate passed an area redevelopment bill, which was given a pocket veto by President Eisenhower.

It will be remembered that in 1960 the House and the Senate passed another area redevelopment bill, which was vetoed by the President; and, in an attempt to escape the just wrath of the voters, the President sent to Congress a substitute measure, in order to be able to argue that he had proposed a superior measure.

Mr. President, this issue was fought out before the country last year. The people had a referendum on this issue, amongst others last year and the issue was clear to the American people. They preferred the program which had been advanced by the Democratic Party, and they turned down the program which had been proposed by the Republican Party.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I want to finish.

Mr. BUSH. I have a very interesting comment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to finish. Then I shall yield for a question.

I fought this issue up and down the State of Illinois. My opponent urged the Eisenhower program. I urged that the Democratic proposal was better. I do not like to boast about majorities. Let me say merely that I was elected by a resounding majority, and I think every newspaper in the State was against me, except two.

My good friend, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] fought in West Virginia on this very measure, and he was also reelected by an overwhelming vote.

Wherever the people had an opportunity to register their opinions, they voted down the Republican-Eisenhower program and supported the Kennedy-Democratic program.

So what our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying to do is reverse the results of the election. This issue was decided. But our Republican friends die hard. They will never admit defeat. When they are beaten in a fair election, they find fault with the election returns. When the people return a clear and unmistaken mandate to the Democratic Party, they say "Our plan is superior."

So, my friends, the question is whether we are going to reverse the popular decision of last fall or stick by the decision which the people have already made.

Let me now discuss the substance of the Eisenhower-Dirksen-Republican amendment. As my colleague has said, it has no rural provisions in it at all. Any help for rural areas is completely omitted.

We pointed out again and again that rural poverty and rural underemployment present an even greater problem than industrial unemployment.

While perhaps we do not get much support from the Senators from the areas which would be chiefly benefited by the passage of S. 1, with certain honorable exceptions, nevertheless I do not propose to cut the people from those areas loose and deny to them benefits because they are in need and they need help.

The program of the Eisenhower administration made no allowance for grants for public industrial and commercial facilities. It provided for some loans to be administered through the Community Facilities Administration, but up to last summer the Administration had made no loans for industrial and commercial purposes, for industrial parks or industrial water. The loans were confined entirely to domestic water drinking systems and sewerage disposal systems. There was nothing so far as industrial water or industrial parks were concerned.

Perhaps under the new administration there would be more leniency in this regard, but the language is not perfectly clear as to how far the Community Facilities Administration could proceed.

So far as the grants are concerned, there is a provision in the Democratic bill (S. 1) for $75 million to help communities which, hard pressed, cannot fully repay loans which are made for needed public facility improvements as industrial water. Some of these facilities will not be directly income producing. They will help to attract industry. They will build up the tax base, but the facilities themselves may not be directly income producing. For a period of time, at least, grants may be needed in order to make the entire process solvent. A combination of loans and grants frequently will be needed. The Eisenhower-Dirksen-Republican proposal would omit this provision completely.

So far as industrial loans are concerned, there would be no loans for machinery and equipment. We have just settled that question by a vote of almost 2 to 1. The Senate decided we should not completely exclude from consideration the possibility of loans for machinery and equipment, even though these were not to be normally the objects of loans. Now my colleague wishes to reverse this recent decision.

The Republicans were beaten at the polls last fall. The Republicans were beaten in the Senate only a few minutes ago, by a vote of nearly 2 to 1, but they never say "die." They come back with the idea that we must eliminate all possibility of loans for machinery and equipment.

Furthermore, the Republicans would restrict to 35 percent the loans on land and buildings. We pointed out a few minutes ago that land and buildings generally form only 25 percent of the cost of a manufacturing enterprise. The Republican proposal would provide only 35 percent of 25 percent, or approximately 9 percent of the capital needed. How much inducement will an interest differential of, let us say, 2 percent provide for only 9 percent of the capital? It will not be sufficient.

In fact, the Eisenhower Republican program, which has been repudiated by the voters, well answers the description Abraham Lincoln gave of a proposal which had no more substance than a soup made out of the pale shadow of a crow which had starved to death. It has no more substance than that. It has been repudiated once.

I hope my friend from Illinois will pardon me if I say he seems to have had a change of heart so far as the percentage of loans which should be made is concerned. In fact, I am amused as I look across the center aisle. One group would restrict the type of investment upon which loans can be made to land and buildings. Almost a solid phalanx on that side of the aisle voted for that proposal, although yesterday the very eloquent and able Senator from Indiana found fault with the bill because it did not provide for working capital.

Some Senators would not vote to permit loans for a part of fixed capital.

In checking over the roll, I find that the Senator from Indiana voted to take out the provision with regard to machinery and equipment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Just a minute. Yesterday the Senator said "Oh, you do not provide enough. In addition to land and buildings and machinery, you should provide for working capital."

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will yield in just a moment.

In fact, my Republican friends remind me of that character in Stephen Leacock's novel who mounted his horse and rode off in all directions.

The Senator from Indiana yesterday rode off in one direction. The Senator from Indiana now is riding off in the other direction.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But never forward.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But never forward. I simply ask the Senator to coordinate his cavalry movement.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask, as a personal privilege, that the Presiding Officer announce how I voted with respect to the machinery and equipment amendment offered by the Senator from New York. I ask that the Presiding Officer make the announcement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator voted in the negative.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I withdraw the comment.

In the first tabulation of votes I saw the Senator's name recorded as having voted for the amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if the able Senator is no more accurate in regard to everything else he is saying than he is in regard to the vote, we know exactly what to do with his statements—throw them in the wastebasket.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I say to the Senator, I have in my hand a tabulation sheet. It has the Senator from Indiana tabulated as being the fourth Senator to have voted for the Javits amendment. Somebody may have made a mistake, but the Senator from Illinois was going by what seemed to be the record.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator saying that the Presiding Officer made a mistake? [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I am not saying that. I think it is quite possible the Senator from Indiana may have changed his vote after he became aware of what he had done. [Laughter.] And I am unofficially informed that such a change was made.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think such statements as the able Senator has made about my vote are absolutely unwarranted and uncalled for. He knows I voted to keep the provision in regard to machinery and equipment in the bill in the committee. I voted to do that today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator will vote against the Eisenhower-Dirksen Republican substitute.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know that the Senator from Indiana always follows the hopes of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. He seldom does.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the Senator when I think he is right. I disagree with the Senator when I think he is wrong. I thought he was correct with respect to machinery and equipment. I think he is incorrect with regard to many of the things he is saying today.

I repeat what I said yesterday. The bill, in my opinion, will prove to be a

hoax which will fool the people of the United States.

I think those who are unemployed in the chronically depressed areas of the United States deserve something better than the particular piece of proposed legislation we are considering, because the bill will not do the job the authors think it will, and will not do the kind of job which, in my opinion, we ought to do for the people who live in the chronically depressed areas of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. For example, I pointed out that the Small Business Administration has more power and more latitude and can make more and better loans than could be made under the terms of the bill. The bill is limited, so far as business is concerned, to loans on land and new buildings, or for the rehabilitation of old buildings.

One thing these communities do not need is more buildings or rehabilitation of old buildings. What is needed is a business which will employ people, and working capital. The communities do not need old buildings, for they have old buildings.

That is why I voted against taking out the provision in regard to machinery and equipment, because one thing which will create jobs is a machine for a man to run to make things. Without machines to be run to make things, jobs cannot be supplied.

For that reason I say the bill would not do what its authors maintain it would accomplish.

What I should like to do is to refer the bill back to the committee with instructions to report a bill that would accomplish what we hope it would. One of the things I should like to see in a bill is a limitation of its application to areas in which chronic unemployment is 100 percent, areas into which any 6-year-old child could go and see that unless someone would build a new factory or would open a new mine, there would never be a new job in that town. Such a measure would help West Virginia and southern Illinois, where the coal mines have been closed. I wish to limit a bill on this subject to areas of 100 percent chronic unemployment, areas in which anyone could see that unless someone builds a new processing plant or opens a new mine there will never be another job in that area.

When that development occurs, I wish to lend money to such plant or mine for working capital. I wish to lend money for machinery. I want to do a job for people in such areas. That kind of bill I would favor.

We are now appealing to the emotions of people in discussing a bill that might appeal to unemployed people throughout the Nation. We know the bill will not help them.

Through acts passed by Congress we now have a Small Business Administration that can do anything for business that the bill would provide, plus the fact that the agency can lend money for working capital. Under the provisions of the bill which we are considering money could not be lent for that purpose.

I repeat that I shall vote against the bill unless we can make its terms more liberal, because I shall not be a party to a hoax. I am not a hypocrite. As a businessman, a farmer, one who grew up in a marginal section of Indiana, and one who knows what is necessary to create jobs, I shall not support a bill that I know would be disappointing to the people of the United States. In my opinion, such action is not necessary. We ought to send the bill back to the committee with instructions to write a good bill or to defeat it. We ought not to fool the people; and unfortunately that is exactly what the bill would do. It would not accomplish what is proposed to be accomplished.

I listened to the remarks of the able Senator from Massachusetts on the bill. I must say in all frankness that I do not think he understands the terms of the bill. I honestly do not, because, with respect to employment in Massachusetts, for example, there are all the buildings in that State that are needed. No new buildings are needed. Machinery and working capital are needed.

The need is for some man or group of men who would come in with an idea of a product to manufacture. They would need working capital to manufacture that product. Then they could give permanent jobs to the people in that area.

I could discuss other sections of the bill. There is the farm-rural area section. There is also the section relating to public facilities. I am not discussing those two subjects at the moment. I am talking only about the business end of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield time to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Minnesota desire?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish only 3 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am touched by the arguments of the Senator from Indiana. I know of his sincerity, and I agree that he is surely a man of deep conviction.

Let us face it. The opposition to the bill has not presented any program that is considerably broader and considerably more meaningful in its application. Area redevelopment legislation has been before the Congress since 1955.

There have been vetoes of such measures, and we have not had offered more constructive measures on this subject than those we have been able to report from the committee.

Every vote has been rather close, and each time we have had the determined opposition of pretty much the same group that opposes it in the Senate today.

It is true that the bill does not have in it all the provisions that I would like to have in it.

First, working capital will be available from the Small Business Administration under the administration of the proposed legislation, when the Small Business Administration makes loans to independent business on the basis of a philosophy of being a little more liberal than the most conservative banking terms.

Second, the Farmers Home Administration makes loans in rural areas for working capital.

Third, the Community Facilities Division of the Housing and Home Finance Agency makes loans and grants available for certain types of community facilities.

There are two sections of the bill which relate to loans. They are sections 6 and 7. Section 6 relates to loans to the individual firm that may be establishing facilities or acquiring land or rehabilitating structures.

Section 7 relates to the public agency that may wish to move in and improve the land, establish facilities, and build a factory.

If we can get factory sites, if we can acquire land, if we can provide the renovation of old facilities, making them sufficiently modern for new-type production, we shall be able to attract capital. There is capital available in our capitalistic society. Let me say to my friend who is in opposition to the bill that if there is not capital available from private sources, and since there are bleeding hearts about the lack of jobs because of the inability to acquire capital, perhaps the Federal Government ought to go into a loan program of that kind over and beyond what it has.

But the administration is attempting to be reasonable. This administration, through our President, has extended the hand of cooperation to business. Every newspaper has so noted. The President went out of his way to do so, and the President has said, "We are going to use the Small Business Administration to its maximum. We are going to utilize the Housing and Home Finance Agency with respect to these facilities. We are going to use the Farm Credit Administration, and the Farmers Home Administration."

The President has said that, as a former U.S. Senator, on three occasions he helped to lead the fight for the proposed legislation in the Senate. He said, "I need the area redevelopment program." He did not say it was a cure-all. The President does not say that the Federal Government ought to remedy every problem. The President and the administration are merely saying, "Give us some of the tools to do the job to help private industry and localities, and to help the development corporations that are established as public bodies in many of our States and localities. Give us a little extra equipment, tools, and financing to do this job, and we will attempt to put these people back to constructive work."

We have debated this measure for nearly 6 years. Some of the unemployed who live in the chronic unemployment areas must be becoming a little bit disillusioned. The issue is quite simple. I believe the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has been very fair and candid about it. He has an alternate substitute proposal. He has presented it on other occasions. It is well known and has been debated on the public platform. His proposal has been debated in the Senate.

I say to the Senator from Illinois that we can vote this measure up or down, as he suggested. If we vote for the proposal of the Senator from Illinois, we will know exactly what we shall get. We shall get a watered down, lukewarm proposal that has been before the Senate on other occasions.

If we vote for the area redevelopment bill—S. 1—we shall get a bill that is a middle-of-the-ground approach, I must say in all candor, to try to remedy some of the problems of unemployment.

The Senator from Illinois has already said that we have had a vote on this subject in the country at large. I wish to say in conclusion that I hope the vote here will result in a little larger majority than the last time we went to the country. I have a feeling that my fellow Democrats who support this measure would like to rally around the flag for this particular experience; and, as suggested by the song sung at the famous Gridiron Club dinner, "Two for You and Three for Me"—on that basis we will settle.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How right my distinguished friend from Minnesota is. "Three for them and two for us."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Votes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What difficulty we had in getting the count. Perhaps we can organize a new agency against the next election day. I would not suggest a corps for it. Only to get a count.

I am intrigued by the industrial wisdom of some people who never met a payroll in their lives. I have looked at a good many balance sheets, as a contractor and as a businessman, and sometimes they have been in the red. Sometimes it makes one a little goggle eyed. I did not get all my business wisdom out of an economics textbook in a college. It does make some difference. Therefore we can discount some of the wisdom, even though it has the the habiliments of omniscience, when it is uttered on the floor of the Senate. Some of the omniscience which is uttered on the floor, under the cold and calculating scrutiny which is required when looking at this kind of proposal, takes on an absolutely different form.

I have a little article from a newspaper in a distressed area in Illinois. I will put the whole article in the RECORD later. First I wish to quote from it.

The article comes from Pinckneyville, in Washington County, Ill. The first paragraph reads:

> A drive to bring a $700,000 factory employing 200 men has started in Pinckneyville and the chamber of commerce says $30,000 in contributions is needed to buy a plant site.

The man who sent the article to me resides in a different town. He said:

> DEAR SENATOR: This article appeared in our local paper on March 1. Somebody had better go down to Pinckneyville and inform these characters that they are in a depressed area and they should wait for help from Washington.
>
> They are being un-American. These jokers may even set a precedent. I realize you must be under terrific pressure from various groups, but don't go overboard on financial assistance programs. It is surprising how many local problems we can solve without Federal aid.

I have an editorial from the Marion Daily Republican of March 3, 1961. It reads, in part:

> Marion and Williamson County, which are included in the areas that Senator DOUGLAS has described as depressed, have been busy—and still are busy—and are not asking for more Federal "Santa Claus" visits.
>
> Wednesday, the Central Illinois Public Service Co. announced that they planned to spend $1,700,000 on projects in the southern division, headquarters of which are in Marion. Much of it will be in Williamson County.
>
> Previously the General Telephone Co. had announced plans for spending $4,876,000 in southern Illinois, a large portion to be in Marion and Williamson County.

Evidently all of this is not coming to the attention of the spenders. It is going to bother me more than some of the messages which are now coming every hour on the hour from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Continuing, the editorial says:

> Work has started on the new Federal prison to cost $10 million. Herrin recently voted 2 to 1 to spend $130,000 for additional sewers.
>
> Marion is building a $60,000 waterline to serve the industrial area in the northwest part of the city.
>
> Allen Industries at Herrin is consolidating a Michigan plant with their Herrin plant.

They are in a depressed area, but even though it is not December they are not looking for Santa Claus.

Therefore I would like to approach this matter rather hard-heartedly and realistically. I do not mind if my distinguished colleage from Illinois puts on it the Eisenhower tag. It was an Eisenhower bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not care that he puts the Dirksen tag on it. It was my bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I introduced it the day after the veto message of last year. Our friends on the other side could not get the original S. 722 out of the Senate except by a majority of 3 votes, and then they could not sustain a veto, because the President pointed out there were other agencies doing comparable work. Here was waste. Here was inequity. Here was duplication. In the comments the President made he was on good ground. So, let them call it the Dirksen bill, or call it the Eisenhower bill. They say, "We have a mandate." It is by 113,000 out of 69 million votes. What a slender mandate it is. That fits into the classical pattern of the Lincoln quotation—"a soup made from the shadow of a hungry crow." That is how thin that majority was.

I believe we have a mandate, too. We propose to present our mandate, because we are talking for half the voters in the country. Let no one make any mistake about it.

Therefore, we are not going to deplete the Federal Treasury. Why not see where we are going on this thing before authorizing nearly $400 million in loans and grants? Once we set our feet on that pathway there will be no coming back. This will proliferate and extend into other areas. Even though these areas shift from depressed to nondepressed areas, as they keep doing, and as the Labor Department statistics show, we will get into this thing so deeply that there will be no coming back. Perhaps they do not want to come back. I do not know. I have some regard for what I think will be feasible and practical and what will work, and what is consonant with the budget and the solvency of our country.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yesterday the Senator from Ohio submitted an amendment, which is pending, and which, if adopted, will eliminate the grant provision of the bill sponsored by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. Will the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] tell me whether his bill deals with grants?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Only a few million dollars for vocational education and technical assistance. However, the $75 million over and above the loan money for community facilities is loan money, not grant money.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is no giveaway money?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Except for the provision of technical aid for retraining?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is a partial retraining provision, insofar as it can be called that, in vocational education.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the amount?

Mr. DIRKSEN. For community facilities, as expanded, $100 million. In addition to that, $75 million. Then about $5 million for grant money for technical assistance, vocational education, and so forth.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Marion Daily Republican, Mar. 3, 1961]

ANOTHER REPORT FROM SENATOR DOUGLAS' DEPRESSED AREA

> Since January 1, 1961, Marion and Williamson County, which are included in the areas that Senator DOUGLAS has described as depressed have been busy—and still are busy—and are not asking for more Federal Santa Claus visits.
>
> Wednesday, the Central Illinois Public Service Co. announced that they planned to spend $1,700,000 on projects in the southern division, headquarters of which are in Marion. Much of it will be in Williamson County.
>
> Previously the General Telephone Co. had announced plans for spending $4,876,000 in southern Illinois, a large portion to be in Marion and Williamson County.
>
> Work has started on the new Federal prison to cost $10 million.
>
> Herrin recently voted 2 to 1 to spend $130,000 for additional sewers.
>
> Marion is building a $60,000 waterline to serve the industrial area in the northwest part of the city.
>
> Allen Industries at Herrin is consolidating a Michigan plant with their Herrin plant.
>
> The Government plans to call for bids within a few days for the new $200,000 armory in Marion.
>
> Marion Memorial Hospital has completed reroofing their building at a cost of $19,237.

Bank of Egypt has doubled the size of its building and added a walkup window and the Bank of Marion and the Bank of Egypt have spent over $20,000 for new banking machines to handle their growing business.

Sales of U.S. Government savings bonds reached $215,368 last January of which $95,150 were sold in Marion alone.

Work is progressing on the new $400,000 Bracy warehouse; Thurmond Monument Co. have built a new factory and office building north of the city; a $35,000 Burger Chef has been built on South Court Street.

Limerick Finance Co. has remodeled and moved to new quarters on the public square and the Marion Finance Co. has opened on North Market Street; Mrs. Mary Dungey is building an office in the north part of the city; Roberts Insurance have moved to new quarters on East Union; Arthur Melvin is tearing down the old Bracy home, west of his new office on West Main Street.

The Marion Presbyterian Church is to meet Sunday to consider plans for their new church building; Coles Asphalt Co. have constructed a new office building north of the city; a new filling station is to be built at West Main and Carbon Streets; Bargain Center has an attractive new awning.

Postal service has been expanded to several streets; bank deposits of individuals have increased over a half million dollars since January 1; and this is not all the progressive items about Marion, which continue to prove that Senator DOUGLAS is wrong when he says we live in a depressed area. We think the figures are much stronger evidence than hearsay, or occasional television pictures of care given the needy, or the mouthings of the Democratic Senator from Illinois.

[From the Belleville News Democrat, Mar. 1, 1961]

PINCKNEYVILLE SEEKING FACTORY

PINCKNEYVILLE, Ill.—(AP)—A drive to bring a $700,000 factory employing 200 men has started in Pinckneyville and the chamber of commerce says $30,000 in contributions is needed to buy a plant site.

Deadline for collection of the money and raising an additional $210,000 in loans is March 6. The loans would be at 4 percent interest over 20 years.

Name of the prospective firm was not disclosed but it reportedly is a metal fabricating manufacturer.

If the drive is successful, the firm would be the third industry to locate in the Pinckneyville area in 8 years as a result of chamber of commerce drives.

Penick and Ford, makers of pudding products, built a plant in 1953. Decca Records, Inc., has rented a plant from the chamber since 1956.

The new plant would be located at the east city limits and would contain 150,000 square feet of floor space.

In basketball-minded Pinckneyville, that's big enough for 37 basketball courts.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I have been trying to get some specific information on one provision of the bill. If a State has a per capita income of $3,500, but there is a town or county in that State which can qualify as a depressed area, under the criteria set up in the bill we are considering, will the State get Federal assistance, or will it be necessary to take into consideration the income of the whole State?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We do not take into consideration the per capita income.

Mr. AIKEN. My State has a low per capita income, but no community could possibly qualify for any assistance under the bill which we are now considering. Other States probably have twice the per capita income of my State, but may have a community from which business has moved out.

Does that community and does that State still qualify for assistance regardless of the overall income of the whole State?

Mr. DIRKSEN. All it is necessary to establish under my amendment, or under Senate bill 1—and this is covered in section 102(a) of my amendment—are the criteria. The conditions must fit the criteria set forth in the bill and determined by the Administrator and the Secretary of Labor. When that certification is made—6 percent unemployment in the area, and an average annual rate of unemployment in the area of at least 50 percent above the national average for 3 of the preceding 4 years; 75 percent above the national average for 2 of the preceding 3 years; or 100 percent above the national average for one of the preceding 2 calendar years—then the area may qualify.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the community would be entitled to Federal aid, regardless of the ability of the State to take care of its own depressed areas?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Of course, there is only one illusion here, and that is the approval of the State; but that does not involve the per capita income of the people of the State.

Mr. AIKEN. In a colloquy with the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] this morning, I pointed out the situation in Plattsburg, N.Y., which evidently qualifies for assistance under the bill we are considering. Plattsburg is a mighty fine town of about 17,000 population. The number of employables is given as about 21,000. I assume that includes some of the surrounding area. The Federal Government maintains an airbase there at a cost of, probably, $30 million a year, which goes into that community. The Federal Government now is constructing a $50 million series of missile sites in the same community. Will the fact that the Federal Government is spending, let us say, between $50 and $100 million be taken into consideration before deciding whether to give aid to the city of Plattsburg?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The per capita income of the State is not a condition for assistance. The assistance goes to a depressed area, which is so denominated, if it falls within the formula set forth in the bill: so much unemployment over a given period, or so much above the national average of unemployment. That is all that has to be shown. From there on, it is simply a question whether the community and the State, conjointly with the Federal Government, can work out all the details which will justify the making of a loan or grant. That is the simplest way in which I can express the purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. All of which adds up to the fact that some of the wealthier States in the Union would be entitled to Federal assistance and low-cost loans under the bill, while some of the States having the lowest per capita income could never qualify for any assistance whatsoever.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would call Pennsylvania a rather well-heeled State. I understand that 25 percent of all the areas which are designated "depressed" are in the great Keystone State of Pennsylvania. I think that answers the Senator's question.

Mr. AIKEN. But northern New England—Vermont and New Hampshire, for instance—does not qualify, and undoubtedly never can qualify, for assistance under the bill. If a State or a community has, we will say, full employment for 3 months of the year, and then a high percentage of unemployment during the other 9 months of the year, it does not qualify.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. AIKEN. It never will; it never can. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, apropos the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I think he might be interested in section 5(d), on page 45 of the bill itself. The Administrator has very wide authority in determining what is a redevelopment area. He has to take into account certain criteria which are listed under section 5(a); and also under section 5(b) there are certain considerations with respect to the so-called rural development section of the bill.

However, under section 5(d) we see the wide authority which is given him in the following language:

> As used in this Act, the term "redevelopment area" refers to any area within the United States which has been designated by the Administrator as a redevelopment area and may include one or more States, one or more counties, or one or more municipalities, or a part of a county or municipality.

So, to answer the Senator's question, I believe any community in the Senators' State—the city of Montpelier, for instance, which is not much of an industrial city, but is a very thriving city—if it should fall upon hard times could have the Administrator designate it as a redevelopment area within the State of Vermont without designating the whole State of Vermont as a redevelopment area.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Connecticut is willing to rely on the whim of the Administrator to determine what areas would be eligible for benefits, then why does he not agree to strike out the criteria completely, and leave it all to the whim of the Administrator?

Is it not true that under the bill, any manufacturing company in Vermont could locate a branch plant in the Ansonia, Bristol, or Danielson areas of Connecticut and receive low-cost money for the construction of a plant? And is it not also true that no manufacturing company in Connecticut could locate a branch plant in Vermont and receive any low-cost money? In other words, is it not a one-way proposition? Any Vermont company could get an inducement

to go to Connecticut or Rhode Island, let us say; but no company from those States would be permitted to go into Vermont or New Hampshire and get any of the benefits of the bill. That is the way the bill reads.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For clarification, the Douglas bill, S. 1, contains a provision that the Administrator can take into account the per capita income, so far as public facility loans are concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. I have just been reading something about public facilities. As I understand, if a plant moves into a rural area and locates within a mile of the REA, on one side, and within a mile of a private utility, on the other side, the REA would not be able to furnish light and power for that plant. The plant would have to use the facilities of the private utility, even though it might be more advantageous for the plant to go the other way.

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

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to make an observation as a result of the colloquy between the able Senator from Vermont and the able Senator from Connecticut. After the Administrator has decided that the region or the area is entitled to some help—I am talking now about the industrial or business end of the situation—what kind of help does the Senator think he can get? Only 65 percent of the valuation of the land or 65 percent of the cost of putting up a new factory without any machinery or electrical equipment of any kind. The way the bill is written, that provision is now in it, but we are talking about taking it out. Despite all that is written in the newspapers and that is being said all over the United States, and after the Administrator decides that an area is a so-called depressed area, all he can do under the act is provide 65 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. It appears to me that the Senator from Indiana believes the bill will not work anyway.

Mr. CAPEHART. No, it will not work. I sometimes wonder if it is intended that it shall work. The reason I say that is that we already have the Small Business Administration, which can do everything it is intended the bill shall do, and more, so far as business is concerned.

We have the Facilities Division of the Federal Government, which is doing exactly what the bill calls for, and which grants loans for the building of water systems.

Then, on top of those agencies, we have the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Farm Administration, which are doing practically all that the bill calls for in respect to the rural sections of the United States.

The only thing which is provided in the bill, which we do not have in other places—and I do not think the Department of Commerce should be the agency to handle it—is the provision for teaching vocational training to certain people in certain sections of the country. In my opinion, that program should be handled by the schools or by an educational agency, rather than by the Department of Commerce.

Mr. AIKEN. I will accept the explanation of the Senator from Indiana that the bill probably will not work anyway. But if it should work, I believe it would be detrimental to my State.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has no time remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I shall support the Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute. I was a sponsor of the Dirksen substitute last year, when it was sent down, after the President vetoed the bill; and I was a sponsor of the amendment in the nature of a substitute this year, when the Senator introduced it—the reason being that I believe it provides a more modest approach to an untried situation.

As I have said repeatedly during the debate and in committee, the entire proposition of Federal assistance to redevelopment areas is an experiment; it is a pilot adventure. Therefore, I think it should be done on a more modest basis than that called for by the Douglas bill.

I have tried, along with other Senators, to modify or amend the Douglas bill, so as to make it more acceptable and, I think, more practical. But I much prefer to see a more modest approach taken—as I did last year, in supporting what was then the Eisenhower recommendation and the Dirksen bill.

So I say to my friend, the junior Senator from Illinois, that I am glad that he has resubmitted his measure as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill No. 1; and I shall support the substitute.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me say the issue is very clear: Senators who believe in the Eisenhower-Republican plan should vote "yea" on this question; Senators who believe in the Kennedy-Democratic plan should vote "nay."

I yield back the remainder of the time available to me; and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LAUSCHE. First, Mr. President, may I have a little time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly; I withhold my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, yesterday, I submitted an amendment contemplating the elimination from the pending bill of the section which provides for giveaways. My attitude on that matter was declared on yesterday: I do not subscribe to the thought that the Federal Government should expand its gift programs.

I shall support a provision which will make loans available. But I will not support the ever-growing habit of the Federal Government in saying that "With the gift of money we shall be able to achieve what you have not been able to achieve otherwise."

I have observed that giving away the taxpayers' money is too frequently used for the purpose of buying votes, rather than for the purpose of promoting the welfare of the country.

Therefore, I shall vote for the Dirksen amendment, or substitute, because it eliminates the giveaway program. Unless we stop soon the concept of giving away, we shall rue the day when we began it. The piper will have to be paid, and he will have to be paid far sooner than we realize.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do both Senators who have control of the time yield back the remaining time available to them?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do, Mr. President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time for debate has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, as amended.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 66, as follows:

[No. 11]

YEAS—27

Beall	Dirksen	Miller
Boggs	Dworshak	Morton
Bridges	Fong	Mundt
Bush	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Carlson	Holland	Thurmond
Case, S. Dak.	Hruska	Wiley
Cotton	Kuchel	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Lausche	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—66

Aiken	Case, N. J.	Fulbright
Anderson	Church	Gore
Bennett	Clark	Gruening
Bible	Cooper	Hart
Burdick	Dodd	Hartke
Butler	Douglas	Hayden
Byrd, Va.	Eastland	Hickey
Byrd, W. Va.	Ellender	Hill
Cannon	Engle	Humphrey
Carroll	Ervin	Jackson

Javits	McGee	Russell
Johnston	McNamara	Scott
Jordan	Metcalf	Smathers
Keating	Monroney	Smith, Mass.
Kefauver	Morse	Smith, Maine
Kerr	Moss	Sparkman
Long, Mo.	Muskie	Stennis
Long, Hawaii	Neuberger	Symington
Long, La.	Pastore	Talmadge
Magnuson	Pell	Williams, N.J.
Mansfield	Randolph	Yarborough
McClellan	Robertson	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—7

Allott	Chavez	Prouty
Bartlett	McCarthy	Proxmire
Blakley		

So Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the substitute was defeated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to table the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, designated 3-8-61—A, and ask unanimous consent to have it stated by title only and printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. An amendment, on page 42, beginning with line 4, to strike out all through line 10, on page 43, and insert certain language.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 42, beginning with line 4, strike out all through line 10, on page 43, and insert the following:

"SEC. 5. (a)(1) The Secretary of Labor shall from time to time, or upon the request of the Administrator, certify to the Administrator the location of any labor market area within the United States which he finds (on the basis of available labor force data or such special studies as he deems necessary) is sufficiently limited in the size of its labor force and in the character of its economy so as to be dependent on a single industry for its employment opportunities. For the purposes of this subsection, a labor market area shall be deemed dependent on a single industry for its employment opportunities if (A) the area has a labor force of less than fifteen thousand and at least 25 per centum of that labor force has been employed in one industry during any one of the preceding ten calendar years, or (B) the area has a labor force of fifteen thousand or more and at least 20 per centum of that labor force has been employed in one industry during any one of the preceding ten calendar years.

"(2) The Administrator shall designate as a 'redevelopment area' any labor market area, with respect to which a certification is made under paragraph (1) of this subsection, which he determines is an area—

"(A) where the rate of unemployment, excluding unemployment due primarily to temporary or seasonal factors, is currently 6 per centum or more and has averaged at least 6 per centum for the qualifying time periods specified in subparagraph (B) below; and

"(B) where the annual average rate of unemployment has been at least—

"(i) 50 per centum above the national average for three of the preceding four calendar years; or

"(ii) 75 per centum above the national average for two of the preceding three calendar years; or

"(iii) 100 per centum above the national average for one of the preceding two calendar years; and

"(C) where there exists no reasonable probability of substantial improvement in employment opportunities in the foreseeable future without assistance of the type provided in this Act."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the majority leader with respect to H.R. 4806, which I understand was reported by the Finance Committee. That is the temporary unemployment compensation bill. I understand there is no objection to the consideration of that bill tomorrow if we complete action on the pending bill today.

Then I make a further inquiry about a session on Friday, in view of the fact that there will be a rather generally diffused celebration of the anniversary of the great patron saint of Ireland.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, does the Senator wish an answer?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is our hope to complete action on the pending bill tonight, and to have as the unfinished business tomorrow the measure reported by the Senate Finance Committee today, having to do with the extension of unemployment compensation benefits.

Shortly after that bill is acted on, it is the intention to consider the extension of unemployment compensation benefits for railroad workers, which of course operates not under Social Security but under the Railway Labor Act.

It is hoped we can then consider the two treaties relating to the OECD and the Columbia River basin.

None of those measures should require much time. I hope the Senate will act expeditiously.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana, who has an amendment pending, if he would be amenable, despite the unanimous-consent agreement with regard to limitation of time on amendments and on the bill, to a 20-minute limitation on his amendment, with 10 minutes for the proponents and 10 minutes in opposition. The proposal relates to the one amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it was my hope I might be recognized following the Senator from Indiana. So far as I am concerned, I should be glad to agree to a similar limitation with respect to my amendment—perhaps 15 minutes to a side.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am obliged to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I had asked the Presiding Officer, while the last amendment was under consideration, for recognition, since I intended to offer my amendment. Agreement to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania would mean he and I would be in conflict.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator from Ohio made an earlier request, of course I shall be glad to defer to the Senator from Ohio. I hope we can have some indication as to how long the Senator from Ohio expects to require, so that I can guide myself.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the seemingly near unanimity and good fellowship, I wonder if the Senate will consider a unanimous-consent request to limit debate to 30 minutes on each amendment from now on to be divided equally, 15 minutes to a side?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. This would leave considerable time on the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; there is time remaining on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, Mr. President, I object, so far as my amendment is concerned.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw my request, and I ask unanimous consent that the time limitation of 20 minutes apply to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let us make it 30 minutes, 15 minutes for each side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limitation of 30 minutes on the Capehart amendment, to be divided 15 minutes on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the proposal I am now going to discuss with respect to the bill, in my opinion concerns the very heart of the bill and may mean the difference between success and failure of the program.

My amendment would not apply to the rural sections of the bill. It would not touch the public facilities section of the bill. It would apply only to the so-called business section of the bill, or that portion of the bill which attempts to create employment.

I am in favor, as I think every other Senator is, of seeing the Federal Government, the States, and the counties help towns or communities in the United States which have 100 percent chronic unemployment.

What do I mean when I say "chronic unemployment"? I refer to the town with one industry, or, let us say, a mining town in which the mines are depleted and closed. Let us assume that in a one-industry town the factory has

closed; there is absolutely no possibility of anybody getting a new job in that town or community unless someone brings in a new facility.

My amendment would be very helpful to the State of West Virginia. It would be helpful to western Pennsylvania, where the coal mines have been depleted.

Unless the Senate agrees to this amendment or to the kind of formula suggested for arriving at help for the areas which have chronic unemployment in the United States, we shall face an almost impossible situation. In the first place, only $290 million are to be provided under the bill to help communities all over the United States.

If my amendment or some other criterion or formula is not agreed to, we will face the situation, for example, that the city of Detroit at the moment, as well as many, many other cities, falls within the formula described in the bill.

Thirty days from now those cities may not come under the formula. Sufficient manufacturing facilities or job opportunities will be available in Detroit, let us say, when the existing factories and businesses put the men back to work. Then there will not be unemployment in Detroit. Detroit is not a city with chronic unemployment. The unemployment in Detroit is a result of operations of the automobile industry.

If the Federal Government attempts to finance temporary unemployment wherever it shows its head all over the United States, in every town and every community, we shall have the greatest confusion and chaos.

Under the formula in S. 1 a city could be entitled to help today and 30 days from now not be entitled to help, or vice versa. Today the city may not qualify, and 30 days from today it may.

We do not have enough money, under the terms of the bill, to do the entire job. By the time the Secretary started helping Detroit the money would be gone. How could Detroit, which has two and a half million people, be helped? What could be done? All that could be done under the bill with respect to unemployment, about which we talk so much, is to make loans—65 percent of the cost of a building or a factory, 65 percent of the cost to rehabilitate a factory, or 65 percent of the cost to buy land. That is all the bill provides. The provisions are ridiculous and afford too little.

We should confine the assistance to the towns in the United States—how many there are I do not know—in which there is never going to be another job unless some private enterpriser or someone builds a factory or a facility such as a processing plant.

Then we can do some good.

In addition, there is not enough money provided. There is only $290 million under the terms of the bill. How far will $290 million go toward building factories? We could not build the south end of the Ford factory in Detroit, or a General Motors factory in Detroit, for $290 million.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I am happy to yield to the Senator in the Senator's own time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Indiana wish to offer an amendment to double the sum of money available under the bill, since he thinks the sum is not adequate in amount?

Mr. CAPEHART. I should be happy to double the amount provided in the bill if the Senator would accept my amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. If the Senator will double the amount, then we can do more for the areas for which his heart is bleeding.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the Senator from Illinois will confine the effort with respect to the communities having 100 percent chronic unemployment, with regard to which either private enterprise or Government operation in connection with private enterprise is necessary, with assistance from States and counties, in order to start new businesses, then I will go along as to doubling the amount of money, because I am in favor of helping those areas in the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not think the Senator would have help from many of his colleagues on his side.

Mr. CAPEHART. Perhaps not, but I speak only for myself. Therefore I say that if we wish to help the chronically unemployed sections of the United States, then we should confine the activities set forth in the bill to the chronically unemployed. We should amend the bill to permit the Administrator to lend working capital as well as money to rehabilitate a factory. There is already in the bill a provision for machinery and equipment. That provision remains. I think we could accomplish some good, then, with the proposed legislation.

Unless action as proposed by my amendment is taken, we shall have a small amount of money scattered all over the United States, and we shall never know whether or not a town is included within the provisions of the bill. In my opinion the bill will accomplish nothing, and many thousands of unemployed will be disappointed.

I have said a thousand times that if there is one man in the United States who is unemployed and is able to work and is willing to work, that is too many. I am perfectly willing to help solve the problem, as I always have been. I think I know how to create jobs. I think I know what it takes to create jobs. But we are not going to accomplish our object unless we confine the provisions of the bill to the chronically unemployed.

Originally that was our object. I honestly believe that practically every Senator thinks that is what the bill would do. I believe Senators thought they were accomplishing that object under the bill. I say that such purpose will not be accomplished unless my amendment or some similar amendment is agreed to.

Temporary unemployment and permanent unemployment are being confused in our discussion of the bill. Dealing with both at one time will not work. Let us take care of the permanently unemployed by helping those who are permanently unemployed. If it is necessary to take care of those affected by a recession or those temporarily unemployed, let us do so under some other bill, because temporary unemployment moves up and down. One day we have plenty of employment, and the next day we do not.

I have nothing further to add. I tried to have my amendment agreed to in the committee. I tried to have it agreed to on the floor. I shall vote for the bill if the amendment is agreed to. If it is not, I shall not support the bill, because to do so without the amendment in my opinion would be pulling a hoax on the unemployed in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statement I have prepared included in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

I have risen in a last effort to try to convince Members of the Senate that, in my humble opinion, the adoption of S. 1 without a proper definition of what is a "depressed area" or what is "chronic unemployment" may well lead to a bureaucratic fiasco.

I have offered a criteria, in the form of an amendment to S. 1, which I believe to be a proper description of a community which can never again partake of the benefits of a growing economy unless some help reaches that community in the form of new employment.

This criteria was not accepted by the majority of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

Maybe it was because my explanation of the proposal was as faulty and as loose as the bill is.

If that be true, I will try now to improve my effort.

Perhaps the amendment was not accepted in committee because some of the Senators have a different idea of what is "chronic unemployment" and what constitutes a "depressed area."

Obviously, the criteria which is now in the bill does not describe my type of "chronic unemployment" or what I think of as a "depressed area" because under the existing criteria so-called depressed areas go on and off the eligible list as if they weren't sure whether they wanted to be "depressed" or not.

My type of "depressed area" would be eligible, period, until such time as our legislation would do something about it.

I think of a community like Beckley, W. Va., as fitting the true description of an area of persistent unemployment that is due to a chronic cause.

Chronic means "consistent" and "continuous."

How in the world can we have a "chronic" area which is eligible one month and not eligible another month if "chronic" means "consistent" and "continuous"?

Now, before somebody takes issue with my use of the term "chronic" as not fully describing the intent and purpose of the bill, I should like to admit the terms have been changed through the course of months.

Why were they changed?

I would have to turn to the architects of the bill for that answer.

I realize as well as any Member of the Senate that the principal author of the bill did say at one point in the hearings on the bill in January that he no longer referred to the eligible areas as "depressed areas"; they were being called "areas of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment."

From this point on the bill "just growed" like Topsy.

But we can take the language in the declaration of purpose of S. 1 and raise a

question as to the appropriateness of the criteria in S. 1.

There the authors use the word "persistent."

"Persistent" means "existing continuously, enduring" and, appropriately, "tenacious."

Again I say if that is the type of condition this bill is to combat then the existing criteria will never do the job.

Turning just once more to the declaration of purpose of the bill, I want to consider for a moment the use of the words "substantial unemployment."

The declaration observes that some of our communities are suffering "substantial" unemployment.

This is where the bill bursts wide open and no longer is it a bill to help the Beckleys of our country.

It becomes a hybrid bill. They have grafted a depressed areas bill with an anti-recession bill and brought forth upon this Senate Chamber a two-headed beast and not enough food for either head.

Are we going to try to help the Beckleys in our Nation with $390 million which is little enough, or are we going to help the Detroits, the Pittsburghs or any other metropolis where we find "substantial unemployment"?

If we are to use this bill to solve all the problems of "substantial unemployment" which breeds on temporary causes for the most part, then, we need to get out pencil and paper and start figuring the financial section all over again.

We all know what "substantial" means. It means "not imaginery" not illusive; real; true; having substance; strong; stout; solid; firm; possessed of goods; moderately wealthy; responsible; something substantial."

Sure, it is very simple. All the Administrator of this program has to do is find that a good stout unemployment condition exists anywhere and a-way we go!

Since this bill also includes a considerable rural program, we might well find a super-PWA being operated on a miniature budget.

If this bill means what it says, the Beckleys are going to come to Washington with the plea: "Mister, can you spare a dime?"

I am going to explain my amendment in what I hope will be a word-picture of communities like Beckley, W. Va.; the kind of communities this bill was originally intended to assist and communities which I sincerely believe need the assistance of this bill.

First of all, there must be two sizes of such communities so we divide them by using a labor market force of 15,000 as the dividing point.

Those areas having more than 15,000 are the large areas, of course, and those below are the small. I am not attempting to insult the intelligence of the Senate; I am just trying to be careful in my explanation so that the amendment will be duly understood.

The cause of "chronic" or "persistent" economic conditions in such communities is consistently dominant-industry employment. The community basks in the glory of boom times when the dominant industry blossoms, but its plight becomes desperate when the dominant industry collapses for any reason.

We can think quickly of mining towns, railroad centers, and textile mill locations. We think of the Beckleys.

So, to distinguish such communities from others with different economic problems, my amendment would classify industry-dominated large communities when 20 percent of the labor market force has in one of the past 10 years, been employed in a given industry.

By the same method, the amendment classifies a small industry-dominated community, but the employment of 25 percent of the labor market force in a given industry in one of the last 10 years is required.

Now we have a big Beckley and a small Beckley.

Next, of course, we must measure the unemployment in such a community to determine whether it is of such magnitude as to fit the picture of our Beckley.

So the amendment uses the same unemployment criteria now contained in S. 1, but the criteria now has a new meaning because it is only one of three factors which constitute the word picture of our community.

There has to be a third factor and a most important one.

The amendment then requires that the Administrator must find that there exists in this community no reasonable probability of substantial improvement in employment opportunities in the foreseeable future without assistance of the type we are trying to provide in this legislation.

This is not a crystal-ball amendment because I am certain that any Member of this Senate can walk into one of the communities described in my amendment and determine in a matter of a few hours whether industry in that community can ever again absorb the unemployed without the creation of new jobs.

I have tried my level best to show the difference between this bill and what it long ago was intended for.

Unless this Senate can be presented with a bill which will do what we promised to do for the Beckley, West Virginian's in our land, then I guess I will have to vote against the bill because I do not want to be a party to telling the people in a community one day that "you are going to get help from this bill" and telling them the next day that "you are not entitled to any help from this bill."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to restrict the assistance under S. 1 to one-industry labor market areas in which there is substantial and persistent unemployment. In effect this amendment says that assistance will be extended only to those areas which have a chronic unemployment problem and which have been a one-industry town or area.

I am sure that in practice the loans will be made primarily to localities where unemployment has existed for a long period of time. Such areas are shown on the chart in the rear of the Chamber. The length of the bars indicates the periods during which there has been substantial unemployment. The test is both substantial and persistent unemployment. The fact that a locality can meet the minimum test laid down in the bill does not mean that the loans must be made in that area. The Administrator, though he has discretion, will undoubtedly concentrate the loans in the areas where unemployment has been not only high but has persisted over a long period of time.

To be sure there are many one-industry towns or areas among those areas which have been suffering from persistent underemployment or unemployment. However, depending on a single industry is only one of many causes for these areas in distress. There are a great number of factors responsible for the present condition of these underdeveloped areas. The reasons for their present distress are both numerous and complex. They may differ from region to region in the United States.

Out of the many years of hearings a number of primary causes for distress in these areas have been identified. Among them are technological change, migration of industry, shifts of demand and depletion of resource base.

The purpose of S. 1 is to assist those areas suffering from chronic and persistent unemployment, whatever the cause for their persistent predicament might have been. It would seem arbitrary and capricious to merely tie assistance under section 5(a) of this act to so-called one-industry towns where there is chronic and persistent unemployment problems. All areas of persistent and chronic unemployment should receive equal treatment and should have equal opportunity to apply for assistance under this act.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Indiana will be rejected by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana to the committee amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 71, as follows:

[No. 12]

YEAS—19

Bennett	Dirksen	Kuchel
Butler	Dworshak	Miller
Capehart	Fong	Robertson
Carlson	Goldwater	Wiley
Case, S. Dak.	Hartke	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Hickenlooper	
Curtis	Hruska	

NAYS—71

Aiken	Hayden	Morton
Anderson	Hickey	Moss
Beall	Hill	Mundt
Bible	Holland	Muskie
Boggs	Humphrey	Pastore
Burdick	Jackson	Pell
Bush	Javits	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Johnston	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan	Russell
Cannon	Keating	Saltonstall
Carroll	Kefauver	Scott
Case, N. J.	Kerr	Smathers
Church	Lausche	Smith, Mass.
Clark	Long, Mo.	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Dodd	Long, La.	Stennis
Douglas	Magnuson	Symington
Eastland	Mansfield	Talmadge
Ellender	McClellan	Thurmond
Engle	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McNamara	Yarborough
Gore	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Hart	Morse	

NOT VOTING—10

Allott	Chavez	Neuberger
Bartlett	Fulbright	Prouty
Blakley	McCarthy	Schoeppel
Bridges		

So Mr. CAPEHART'S amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated 3-14-61—C and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 53, beginning with line 10, it is proposed to strike out all through line 12 on page 56.

Renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator be agreeable to a unanimous-consent agreement to limit the time on his amendment?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No. I will try to present the issue involved in my amendment quickly. I do not wish to incur a hazard by limiting myself to a specified time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall, however, try to present the amendment to the Senate as rapidly as I can.

My amendment contemplates striking section 8 from the bill. Section 8 provides for the making of grants as distinguished from loans. The grants may be made when certain conditions are met by the Administrator, and the grants may be made to—

> Any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or public or private nonprofit organization or association representing any redevelopment area, or part thereof.

I am reading from page 54 of the bill, paragraph (b).

The grants can be used—

> For land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within a redevelopment area.

In this section, as is indicated in paragraph (e), on page 56 of the bill, there is—

> Authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $75 million for the purpose of making grants under this section.

Mr. President, although one could rather well argue that the making of loans is not a hazardous indulgence by the Federal Government, under the other sections of the bill, as I wish to point out, when grants are made, they are gifts to the particular agencies which receive the funds. This is an innovation in the provision of aid to develop small business, to develop community facilities, or to aid in the development of rural areas.

It has already been pointed out that we have approximately three specific methods of trying to give aid. The first is by means of the loan provisions in the Agricultural Acts; and those acts contain, in addition, provisions for the training of men, the giving of advice in regard to how to run farms, and so forth.

The second method of giving help is embodied in the provisions of the Small Business Administration Act. The provisions of that act are exceedingly broad. They allow the making of loans to individuals for the purchase of land, the construction of shops, and the purchase of equipment. However, when such a loan is made, interest must be paid, and later on the loan has to be repaid.

The third method is by means of the Community Facilities Act, in connection with the functions of the Federal Housing Administration. The Community Facilities Act allows the making of loans for the construction of sewers, sidewalks, generating plants, gas lines, and so forth. Likewise, it involves the payment of interest at a certain rate, although the rate is favorable to the borrower.

Past experience indicates that we already have available the farmers' redevelopment program and the means of making loans to small business concerns for the functions set forth in this bill; and we have allowed loans to be made for the development of public service facilities.

Mr. President, in the pending bill, we again provide for the making of loans. One might ask why provision is being made for the making of loans, by means of the pending bill, when loans are already covered by the Small Business Administration Act and by the Federal Housing Act?

The pending bill allows the making of loans on extremely liberal bases; what I have called secondary or tertiary security can be taken when the loan is made. A first mortgage or a first bonded indenture is not required in order to make such a loan; there can be a second-class or a third-class or even a fourth-class security.

I submit to my colleagues that when we have gone that far, we have gone practically the full length of justification.

But the proponents of the bill are not satisfied with the provision that 65 percent of the cost of purchasing land or constructing a building or purchasing machinery can be loaned and the Federal Government is to take, as security a second mortgage or a third mortgage or a fourth mortgage. The proponents of the bill say we must go one step further. Mr. President, what is that step? It is to give the money away. But I cannot agree to that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is there not another question, in addition to that of the actual money to be appropriated for such a grant? It is that this bill is an experiment; and if we remove initiative and the effort of those in the localities to build up new businesses or to build up a new public utility, if we remove such initiative by giving them the funds needed, we shall take away very much of what we are trying to accomplish in order to have new industries and more employment in the towns developed. nI that case, shall we not be making every city and every town attempt to come under the grant provision, rather than under the loan provision? But if we make grants available under those conditions, we shall have destroyed local initiative.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I think the very statement the Senator from Massachusetts has made of the proposition establishes its strength and its truth.

Are we to say, "Do not exert yourself in your community. Do not solicit the chamber of commerce to provide the needed funds. Do not go to your local bank, to see whether you can persuade it to provide the money you need. Instead, wait; the Federal Government will give the money to you." That is the essence of the whole matter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield again to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is that not completely different from making grants—which this bill would do—in

smaller amounts, for reeducation or for subsistence during reeducation? That is a proper form of grant.

But to provide the facilities themselves will take away all the zeal with which an individual or a locality would work.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have no objection to provisions for retraining and for aid in that respect.

My objection goes to the program of giving away.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, let me ask whether the Senator from Ohio has asked that the yeas and nays be ordered on the question of agreeing to his amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have not.

Mr. President, I make that request now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Later, Mr. President, when there is a larger attendance, I shall renew my request.

Mr. President, we began by providing for the making of loans through the Small Business Administration, which asks for security. We continued, by providing for the making of loans for community facilities.

Now it is proposed that we provide for the making of loans for the construction of factories.

But some Senators are not content with even that; and they say that in addition to the loans, there must be grants.

Mr. President, I submit to my colleagues that we can go only one step further; and that step is that when those who are offered the grants refuse to accept them, the Federal Government can say to them, "We will give you a premium if you will take our money." [Laughter.]

That is the only step that lies beyond, Mr. President; beyond that there is ne plus ultra, as it is said; when that step is taken, nothing else remains; we shall then have gone the whole way.

Obviously, great inspection has been made. But how much further can we go?

Furthermore, Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of my amendment on the basis of the constantly growing tendency on the part of the U.S. Congress to subsidize. As matters now stand, we are told that the lead and the zinc industries cannot survive unless money is given to them; we are told that the merchant marine is about to collapse unless money is given to it, as a subsidy; we are told that the airlines cannot succeed unless we subsidize them; and there is talk about the ceramics industry begging for money, as a subsidy. All up and down the line we hear the argument, "We cannot survive unless money is given to us out of the Federal Treasury."

Why am I opposed to this constant giving away of money? If we continue it, we are robbing the person who bought U.S. Government bonds; we are stealing from the person who was thrifty and tried to put away money to take care of himself in his old age; we are taking away a part of the pensions and the annuities and the retirement payments that people have anticipated to sustain them in their older years.

If Senators ask me, "How are we doing it?" my answer is, "By 24 out of 30 years of deficit operations." The dollar that bought 100 cents' worth of material in 1941 now purchases 46 cents' worth of material.

We had a debt of $255 billion after the war. It is now $290 billion. Our gold reserves are flowing out of the country. Short term foreign creditors are declaring that they do not want our paper; they want our gold.

Keep giving away, keep pushing the Federal Government into programs that historically have belonged to local and State governments, and, instead of ending the problem, we are going to make it worse.

It might be said that $75 million is not much; and I suppose it is not to those who have never had fiscal responsibility. I think it means much to a man who was once a Governor, to a man who knows what it means to impose taxes and to have revenues commensurate with expenditures. But $75 million is merely the beginning. Three years from now it will be $150 million, and then $250 million; and, when it is projected into future years, the cost goes far beyond our imagination.

I can go along with the lending phases of the bill, although they are weak. They are weak because they provide that second, third, and fourth class securities can be accepted.

Yesterday we had a very interesting discussion on the floor of the Senate. It was pointed out that we have reached such a stage that when, in some instances the Department of Defense finds it ought to move from a section because the section is uneconomical to operate, new conditions may have arisen which seemingly make it mandatory for the Department of Defense to stay in the community. These were the facts offered in support of such a decision: There is a housing project near an Army base. The Federal Government has money loaned on that housing project. If the Army base moves, the loan of the Federal Government will become lost or greatly impaired.

Therefore, the operation should not be discontinued. It should be continued so that the loan which the Federal Government made will be protected.

If that argument is sound, how many communities shall we go into which have been unacceptable for businesses to settle in? Once we go in, with a $500,000 plant or a $1 million plant, how shall we ever get out? We shall have to feed good money into it to save bad money. We shall never get out. There will be a perpetuation of bad conditions. And, I say to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is sitting near me, I foresee the arrival of that day, in view of the many actions we are taking.

Mr. President, I suppose the easy course would be to say to my citizens back in Ohio, "I have succeeded in getting $75 million for you as a gift. Is that not wonderful? The Federal Government is going to dip into its Treasury and provide $75 million for you, and it will cost you nothing." How wonderful that would be. But cold realism labels that statement as untrue, and I shall not subscribe to it.

Only one more thought, and I shall close. In 10 years, as Governor of Ohio, I fought intensely to bring business to Ohio, and I brought it into my State from Pennsylvania, Michigan, and other States. Though it may sound vain, the business was brought there because we tried to maintain law and order and make sure that preferential treatment was given to no one.

When troubles were rampant, not only in my State, but in adjoining States, I had calls to get me to throw my governmental strength on the side of one party in a controversy, and to throw that support on the basis of abandoning my sense of morality. I did not do it.

Mr. President, where does business settle? When an attempt is made to attract business to a State, the prospects will ask, "Are you close to the consuming market? Are you close to raw materials? Do you have a supply of manpower? What highway, railway, and waterway transportation do you have? Do you have electricity and water supply? What type of government do you run? Is government in the hands of the people, or is it in the hands of those who want to exploit?"

If I were a businessman, I would say, "All I ask is, give me the protection of law and order, and do not punish me when I come into your State with a business."

With money there can be provided buildings, land, sidewalks, sewer and gas lines, but, my colleagues, law and order cannot be provided by a congressional declaration or congressional provision of money. Nor can we put a community close to the consuming public or raw materials.

By this bill we are contemplating arrogating to the U.S. Congress the proposition that, by a magic wand, the spending of $375 million will do that which nature itself shows does not exist.

In one of the legislative sessions early in the 1950's there was in progress a very bitter debate in the Legislature of Ohio. A group of breeders of what is known as the Ohio Improved Chester White hog wanted that breed made a separate breed by legislative declaration. They had had difficulty with the breeders of the Chester White hog. The Chester White hog breeders said that the Ohio Improved Chester White hog was simply an offspring of the Chester White hog. Not being able to get the Ohio Improved Chester White hog into the county fairs and State fairs, the breeders went to the legislature and had a bill introduced to declare this to be a special breed. The legislature passed the bill. The bill came to my desk.

A farmer wrote to me and he said:

> I object to the signing and the passage of the bill.

He went on to say:

> Commonsense from time immemorial indicates clearly that new breeds are always created by new biological combinations and never by legislative declaration.

That, in my opinion, applies to the bill before the Senate. By legislative declaration the Senate is trying to change a condition which cannot be changed.

I have seen the maps. I have seen the Ohio areas which have been delineated. I know them. The provisions of the bill before the Senate will not aid in the solution of the problems.

On that basis I ask my colleagues to strike from the bill section 8, which provides for grants to be used in the building of and in the remodeling of buildings and in the buying of land, and so forth.

That is my case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I regret that I am not such an authority on the breeding of hogs as my good friend from Ohio. However, while the amendment is directed ostensibly against the $75 million of grants provided for public facilities, his speech was, in effect, a broadside against the bill as a whole.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will vote for the bill if the grant provision is eliminated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I regard the grant provision as essential to the bill. As the Senator from Ohio has said, industrial concerns, for one thing, weigh the presence or absence of sufficient supplies of water as one of the major considerations in determining whether they will locate in a community. There are many areas in the country with high unemployment which have abundant rainfall, but capital is lacking for the construction of dams to hold back the water and to create the industrial lakes which are needed to provide large quantities of industrial water to attract industry. This would be one of the major purposes for which loans and grants could be made.

There are many localities which have been bled white for such a long period of unemployment that they lack the tax resources from their own taxable property to finance the purchase of land for such a lake and for the construction of a dam.

If we were merely to provide loans, even at the interest rate set forth in the bill, many communities would not be able to take advantage of the loan provision, and hence would be ruled out. Consequently, the communities would not be able to attract industry and would not be able to reduce unemployment in the area.

The grant is intended to be a supplement to the loans, to help out. The loans are intended to be made only if loans are not available from private lenders or from other Federal agencies on reasonable terms.

As I have tried to point out time and time again today, and as I tried to point out yesterday, the loans for commercial facilities as well as for the industrial and rural areas will only be made if loans cannot be obtained from private lenders or other Federal agencies. The loans are intended to back up, not to replace, loans from private banks or from the Community Facilities Division of the Housing and Home Finance Corporation, the Small Business Administration, and so on.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, which would certainly cripple the efforts of localities in West Virginia, eastern Kentucky, southern Illinois, northern Wisconsin, northern Michigan, northern Minnesota, southwestern Pennsylvania, east Tennessee, and many of the areas of the Appalachian Highlands, both north and south, will be defeated by a voice vote.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me so that I may ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BUSH. The time can be taken for the call of the roll from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator control the time?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I make the request.

Mr. BUSH. It can be done either way. The majority leader asked me to yield time if he were away from the Chamber. He is not in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected. I had hoped we could expedite passage of the bill by having a voice vote, but since the Senator from Connecticut is so insistent that we should have a yea-and-nay vote, I am ready to have a trial of strength. I yield back the remainder of my time, and ask that we immediately have the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second to the request?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator for his consideration. We are trying to save time, but we consider the amendment to be very important, and therefore a yea-and-nay vote appears to be in order. I thank the Senator for his consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the time yielded back?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL and Mr. CARLSON] are detained on official business. If present and voting the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 55, as follows:

[No. 13]

YEAS—36

Bennett	Eastland	Miller
Boggs	Ervin	Mundt
Bridges	Fong	Robertson
Bush	Goldwater	Russell
Butler	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Smathers
Capehart	Hruska	Stennis
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Talmadge
Cotton	Keating	Thurmond
Curtis	Kuchel	Wiley
Dirksen	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—55

Aiken	Hartke	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Morton
Beall	Hickey	Moss
Bible	Hill	Muskie
Burdick	Humphrey	Neuberger
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Pastore
Cannon	Javits	Pell
Carroll	Johnston	Proxmire
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Randolph
Church	Kerr	Scott
Clark	Long, Mo.	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Long, Hawaii	Smith, Mass.
Dodd	Long, La.	Sparkman
Douglas	McGee	Symington
Ellender	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Engle	Magnuson	Yarborough
Gore	Mansfield	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Metcalf	
Hart	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—9

Allott	Carlson	McCarthy
Bartlett	Chavez	Prouty
Blakley	Fulbright	Schoeppel

So Mr. LAUSCHE's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I have followed closely the shaping of S. 1 during the past several months. I have corresponded with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who has labored so long and hard over this bill. A few

weeks ago I proposed an amendment to S. 1 which would include, in the criteria for eligibility, the factor of distance traveled to and from work. This was designed to permit the Administrator of the program to take into account the areas where raw unemployment statistics do not fully tell the story; in my own State of Colorado, and in others, there are areas where a large percentage of those able to find employment must commute 40 or 50 miles a day from their homes to their place of work and home again. There just are not enough jobs near their homes.

The committee did not see fit to adopt my proposed amendment. I do not quarrel with the committee's judgment. Its problem is a difficult one and the funds are limited. However, I am happy to be able to say that as I read the bill, the criteria adopted by the committee unquestionably will help at least one depressed area in Colorado; and likely two.

I am referring to the once-thriving coal mining areas in south central Colorado, centered around the cities of Walsenburg and Trinidad. With the replacement of coal by natural gas for domestic and industrial fuel, these regions have been suffering chronic unemployment for decades. Their plight has been made worse by the inescapable advance of automation in those mines that remain in operation. And in recent months, their woes have multiplied because of layoffs in the steel mills at Pueblo, which have further curtailed the demand for coal.

Both these cities are amply endowed with fine climate, scenery, recreational advantages, water, power, natural resources and alert aggressive citizenry. All they need is a bit of help to get started in full swing.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that Walsenburg and surrounding Huerfano County will benefit under S. 1. Section 5(a) of the bill states that the Administrator shall designate as redevelopment areas those areas where unemployment is currently 6 percent or more; and where the annual rate of unemployment has been at least 50 percent above the national average for 3 of the preceding 4 calendar years.

In Walsenburg, unemployment has been over 6 percent for the last 5 years, 1956 through 1960; and in Walsenburg, unemployment has been more than 50 percent above the national average in 1957, in 1959 and in 1960. The following table shows this in specific detail:

Year	National average (percentage)	National average plus 50 percent	Walsenburg unemployment
1957	4.3	6.4	6.9
1958	6.8	10.2	8.3
1959	5.5	8.2	9.2
1960	5.6	8.4	9.8

Under a reasonable application of these criteria, the city of Trinidad, and neighboring portions of Las Animas County, most probably will qualify under S. 1. Unemployment there has been above the national average and above 6 percent for 3 of the last 4 years; but it has not been 50 percent above the national average for 3 of the last 4 years.

However, the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency on page 15 says this:

> The Administrator may also, at his discretion, designate other areas as eligible for assistance where substantial and persistent unemployment has existed and which have unemployment conditions generally comparable to those of the areas of mandatory designation.
>
> For example, this is intended to give the Administrator the necessary discretion to designate as a redevelopment area * * * an area which has suffered from a sudden, severe or catastrophic loss of employment opportunity and which might not otherwise become eligible for assistance until at least a year had passed.

This language, Mr. President, is based on the wording of lines 6 and 7 on page 42 of the bill: "* * * on the basis of standards generally comparable."

There has been a sudden and catastrophic loss of employment opportunity in and around Trinidad. The Frederick mine closed down tight just before Christmas, 1960, and the Allen mine has undergone a drastic reduction in force. Last May, these 2 mines were hiring 1,000 men. They now hire only about 200 men. Does this layoff sound small? Only if we fail to remember that the entire work force in the Trinidad area consists of 5,780 people. I submit that this loss of employment, Mr. President, is as sudden and catastrophic as anything short of an earthquake, tidal wave or major conflagration can be. I want to say now that I will take this up with the Administrator of this new program as soon as he is able to function. I am confident that a fairminded Administrator will agree wholeheartedly with me.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a letter from Senator DOUGLAS which bears directly on the subject under discussion.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
January 30, 1961.

Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: During the current hearings on S. 1, it has become increasingly evident that some provision ought to be made for areas, such as those you refer to in Colorado, which although they do not now qualify as areas of persistent labor surplus, the prospects for employment are not very good. Several witnesses have pointed out that we ought to recognize areas in which it is just a matter of time before they would qualify for assistance under S. 1.

I am inclined to agree that under special circumstances—Trinidad and Walsenburg appear to be areas where these circumstances exist—the area redevelopment program should be flexible enough to include them.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, the people of a third area bordering these two in south central Colorado have been undergoing great economic hardship over the years. This is predominantly rural Costilla County, whose economy depends chiefly on ranching, irrigated farming and—sad to say—State welfare department assistance.

Under section 5(b) of S. 1, the Administrator may designate as redevelopment areas those areas which have a large percentage of low-income farm families, relative to the Nation as a whole. Among the seven criteria are current and prospective employment opportunities; the extent of migration out of the area; and the proportion of the population receiving public assistance.

As I read the section I think it entirely possible that Costilla County can qualify.

Migration out of this historic and scenic area, where Kit Carson once commanded old Fort Garland, has been appalling. It is a direct result of lack of job opportunities. During the decade 1950–60, the population of the State of Colorado rose by 32.4 percent; but Costilla County population dropped by 30.5 percent. In the preceding decade, while Colorado population was rising by 18 percent, Costilla County population fell off by 19.5 percent.

The proportion of persons receiving public assistance is very high. An average of 570 persons per month received public assistance in fiscal 1960. That is 13.5 percent of the county population.

Unemployment is high but can only be estimated. There is no State employment department office in Costilla County. But the county figures are included in the report from the Alamosa office, which is currently 10.1 percent—far above the national average.

The most recent definitive report on Costilla County's income per capita is several years old, but conditions have not improved materially. Per capita income in Costilla County in 1956 was $576 compared with a Colorado average of $1,853 and a national average of $1,944. Thus, Costilla County income was only 31 percent of the State income per capita and only 29 percent of the national per capita income.

Farm income figures are more recent. In 1959, only 24 percent of all Colorado commercial farms showed gross sales of less than $5,000—but in Costilla County, 51 percent of all commercial farms grossed less than $5,000.

The value of farmland and buildings for Costilla County at last tabulation was only half of the statewide average. A "level of living index" compiled by the U.S. Department of Agriculture midway through the last decade put Costilla County among the lowest one-third of all counties in the Nation in such conveniences as running water, telephones and electricity. This was years ago, and while the rest of the Nation generally has raised itself since then, Costilla County has not kept pace.

Nor can these conditions be attributed to a few bad crop years or to exhausted soils or to a ne'er-do-well attitude. The soil produces wonderfully when it has water. The original settlers of Costilla County held land grants from the Kings of Spain; they were the first people of European origin to form a permanent settlement in what is now Colorado, and their first water decree dates back to 1852. Augmenting these pioneers have

been hardworking farmers, ranchers, and townspeople of both Anglo-American and Japanese-American ancestry. But the people of this county for too long have had to watch some of their most promising children migrate elsewhere. They need and deserve help, and I think S. 1 holds out hope of assistance to them.

Mr. SCOTT obtained the floor.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wonder if it would be possible to obtain both a time limitation and the ordering of the yeas and nays on the amendment to be proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania? I ask unanimous consent that the time may be limited to 40 minutes, with 20 minutes on each side.

Mr. SCOTT. That is acceptable to me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I promise that our side will not take more than 5 minutes.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I now demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, in the nature of a substitute, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be not read but printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this Act be cited as the 'Area Redevelopment Act'.

"DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 2. The Congress declares that the maintenance of the national economy at a high level is vital to the best interests of the United States, but that some of our communities are suffering substantial and persistent unemployment which causes hardship to many individuals and their families and detracts from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic development; that Federal assistance should enable communities to achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies; and that new employment opportunities should be created rather than merely transferred from one community to another.

"AREA ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 3. To assist areas in the United States designated hereinafter as redevelopment areas, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to take such action as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. To assist the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary'), there is hereby established within the Department of Commerce an Area Economic Redevelopment Administration which shall be headed by an Administrator who shall be appointed by the Secretary and who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to that received by Assistant Secretaries of Commerce. The Administrator shall perform such duties in the execution of this Act as the Secretary may assign.

"ADVISORY BOARD

"SEC. 4. (a) To advise the Secretary in the performance of functions authorized by this Act, there is authorized to be created an Area Economic Redevelopment Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'), which shall consist of the following members, all ex officio: The Secretary, as Chairman; the Secretaries of Agriculture; Health, Education, and Welfare; Labor; and Treasury; the Administrators of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and of the Small Business Administration. The Chairman may from time to time invite the participation of officials of other agencies of the executive branch interested in the functions herein authorized. Each member of the Board may designate an officer of his agency to act for him as a member of the Board with respect to any matter there considered.

"(b) The Secretary shall appoint a National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment which shall consist of twenty-five members and which shall be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and the public in general. From the members appointed to such Committee the Secretary shall designate a Chairman. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Secretary relative to the carrying out of his duties under this Act. Such Committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized from time to time to call together and confer with representatives of the various parties in interest from any industry in which employment has dropped substantially over an extended period of years and which in consequence has been a primary source of high levels of unemployment in several areas designated by the Secretary as redevelopment areas. Conferences convened under authority of this subsection shall consider with and recommend to the Secretary plans and programs with special reference to any such industry to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

"SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary shall designate as 'industrial redevelopment areas' those industrial areas within the United States in which he determines that there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time. There shall be included among the areas so designated any industrial area—

"(1) where the rate of unemployment, excluding unemployment due primarily to temporary or seasonal factors, is currently 6 per centum or more and less averaged at least 6 per centum for the qualifying time periods specified in (2) below; and

"(2) where the annual average rate of unemployment has been at least—

"(A) 50 per centum above the national average for three of the preceding four calendar years, or

"(B) 75 per centum above the national average for two of the preceding three calendar years, or

"(C) 100 per centum above the national average for one of the preceding two calendar years.

"(b) The Secretary shall also designate as 'rural redevelopment areas' those rural areas within the United States in which he determines that there exist the largest number and percentage of low-income families, and a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment. In making the designations under this subsection, the Secretary shall consider, among other relevant factors, the number of low-income farm families in the various rural areas of the United States, the proportion that such low-income families are to the total farm families of each of such areas, the relationship of the income levels of the families in each such area to the general levels of income in the United States, the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, and the availability of manpower in each such area for supplemental employment.

"(c) In making the determinations provided for in this section, the Secretary shall be guided, but not conclusively governed, by pertinent studies made, and information and data collected or compiled, by (1) departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, (2) State and local governments, (3) universities and land-grant colleges, and (4) private organizations.

"(d) Upon the request of the Secretary, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Bureau of the Census are respectively authorized to conduct such special studies, obtain such information and compile and furnish to the Secretary such data as the Secretary may deem necessary or proper to enable him to make the determinations provided for in this section. The Secretary shall reimburse, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act, the foregoing officers for any expenditures incurred by them under this section.

"(e) As used in this Act, the term 'redevelopment area' refers to any area within the United States which has been designated by the Secretary as an industrial redevelopment area or a rural redevelopment area, and may include one or more counties, or one or more municipalities, or a part of a county or municipality.

"LOANS AND PARTICIPATIONS

"SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans (including immediate participations therein) to aid in financing any project for the purchase or development of land and facilities for industrial usage, for the construction of new factory buildings, for rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied factory buildings, or for the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of any existing buildings for industrial use. Such financial assistance shall not be extended for working capital, for purchases of machinery or equipment, or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment.

"(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

"(1) The total amount of loans and loan participations (including purchased evidences of indebtedness) outstanding at any one time under this section (A) with respect to projects in industrial redevelopment areas shall not exceed $100,000,000, and (B) with respect to projects in rural redevelopment areas shall not exceed $50,000,000;

"(2) Such assistance shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public, approved by the State (or any agency or instrumentality thereof concerned with problems of economic development) in which the project to be financed shall be located;

"(3) No such assistance shall be extended hereunder unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders or other Federal agencies on reasonable terms;

"(4) No loan shall be made unless it is determined that an immediate participation is not available;

"(5) No evidences of indebtedness shall be purchased and no loans shall be made unless it is determined that there is a reasonable assurance of repayment;

"(6) Subject to section 11(5) of this Act, no loan, including renewals or extension thereof may be made hereunder for a period exceeding thirty years and no evidences of indebtedness maturing more than thirty years from date of purchase may be purchased hereunder: *Provided*, That the foregoing restrictions on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Secretary as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in other proceedings attendant upon insolvency of the obligor, or if extension or renewal for additional periods, not to exceed, however, a total of ten years, will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan or of such evidence of indebtedness;

"(7) Such assistance shall not exceed 50 per centum of the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities, and of constructing, altering, converting, rehabilitating, or enlarging the building or buildings of the particular project and shall among others, be on the following conditions:

"(A) That other funds are available in an amount which, together with the assistance provided hereunder, shall be sufficient to pay such aggregate cost;

"(B) That not less than 10 per centum of such aggregate cost be supplied by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof, or by a community or area organization, as equity capital or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance hereunder has been repaid in full according to the terms thereof and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance hereunder; and

"(C) That in making any loan under this section with respect to an industrial redevelopment area, the Secretary shall require that not less than 5 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied by nongovernmental sources.

"(8) No such assistance shall be extended unless there shall be submitted and approved by the Secretary an overall program for the economic development of the area, and a finding by the State, or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof, that the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall authorize financial assistance for any project prohibited by laws of the State or local political subdivision in which the project would be located.

"(c) Of the funds authorized to be appropriated under section 8 of this Act, not more than $100,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section with respect to projects in industrial redevelopment areas, and not more than $50,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section with respect to projects in rural redevelopment areas.

"LOANS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

"SEC. 7. (a) Upon the application of any State, or political subdivision thereof, or private or public organization or association representing any redevelopment area or part thereof, the Secretary is authorized to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, improvement of public facilities within any redevelopment area, if he finds that—

"(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the redevelopment area wherein such project is, or will be, located, and will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

"(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available on reasonable terms;

"(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of other available funds for such projects are adequate to insure the completion thereof; and

"(4) there is a reasonable expectation of repayment.

"(b) No loan under this section shall be for an amount in excess of 50 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made. Subject to section 11 (5), the maturity date of any such loan shall be not later than thirty years after the date such loan is made.

"(c) In making any loan under this section, the Secretary shall require that not less than 10 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied by the State (including any political subdivision thereof) within which such project is to be located as equity capital, or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance provided under this section has been repaid in full, and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance provided under this section. In determining the amount of participation required under this subsection with respect to any particular project, the Secretary shall give consideration to the financial condition of the State or local government and to the per capita income of the residents of the redevelopment area, within which such project is to be located.

"(d) Of the funds authorized to be appropriated under section 8 of this Act not more than $50,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section.

"APPROPRIATION FOR LOANS

"SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $200,000,000 to provide funds for loans under this Act.

"INFORMATION

"SEC. 9. The Secretary shall aid redevelopment areas by furnishing to interested individuals, communities, industries, and enterprises within such areas any assistance, technical information, market research, or other forms of assistance, information, or advice which are obtainable from the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government and which would be useful in alleviating conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment within such areas. The Secretary shall furnish the procurement divisions of the various departments, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the Federal Government with a list containing the names and addresses of business firms which are located in redevelopment areas and which are desirous of obtaining Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies or services, and designating the supplies and services such firms are engaged in providing.

"TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 10. In carrying out his duties under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to provide technical assistance to areas which he has designated as redevelopment areas under this Act. Such assistance shall include studies evaluating the needs of, and development potentialities for, economic growth of such areas. Such assistance may be provided by the Secretary through members of his staff or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purpose. Appropriations are hereby authorized for the purposes of this section in an amount not to exceed $4,000,000 annually.

"POWERS OF SECRETARY

"SEC. 11. In performing his duties under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to—

"(1) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed; and subject to the civil service and classification laws, select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and define their authority and duties, provide bonds for them in such amounts as the Secretary shall determine, and pay the costs of qualification of certain of them as notaries public;

"(2) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

"(3) request directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this Act; and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Secretary;

"(4) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans made under this Act, and collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

"(5) further extend the maturity of or renew any loan made under this Act, beyond the periods stated in such loan or in this Act, for additional periods not to exceed ten years, if such extension or renewal will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan;

"(6) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any real or personal property conveyed to, or otherwise acquired by him in connection with the payment of loans made under this Act;

"(7) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or other administrative action, prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to him in connection with loans made under this Act. This shall include authority to obtain deficiency judgments or otherwise as in the case of mortgages assigned to the Secretary. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), shall not apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Secretary as a result of loans made under this Act if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute in the name of the Secretary deeds of conveyance, deed of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real or personal property or any interest therein acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this Act may be exercised by the Secretary or by

any officer or agent appointed by him for that purpose without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney;

"(8) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in sections 6 and 7 of this Act;

"(9) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made under this Act;

"(10) to such an extent as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, procure the temporary (not in excess of six months) service of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract or appointment, and in such cases such service shall be without regard to the civil service and classifications law, and, except in the case of stenographic reporting services by organizations, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5); any individual so employed may be compensated at a rate not in excess of $75 per diem, and, while such individual is away from his home or regular place of business, he may be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses; and

"(11) establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

"TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 12. Whenever the Secretary shall determine that employment conditions within any area previously designated by him as a redevelopment area have changed to such an extent that such area is no longer eligible for such designation under section 5 of this Act, no further assistance shall be granted under this Act with respect to such area and, for the purposes of this Act, such area shall not be considered a redevelopment area: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall (1) prevent any such area from again being designated a redevelopment area under section 5 of this Act if the Secretary determines it to be eligible under such section, or (2) affect the validity of any contracts or undertakings with respect to such area which were entered into pursuant to this Act prior to a determination by the Secretary that such area no longer qualifies as a redevelopment area. The Secretary shall keep the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and interested State or local agencies, advised at all times of any changes made hereunder with respect to the designation of any area.

"PROCUREMENT BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

"SEC. 13. Each department, agency, or other instrumentality of the Federal Government engaged in the procurement of any supplies or services for use by or on behalf of the United States shall—

"(1) use its best efforts to award negotiated procurement contracts to contractors located within redevelopment areas to the extent procurement objectives will permit;

"(2) where deemed appropriate, set aside portions of procurements for negotiation exclusively with firms located in redevelopment areas, if a substantial proportion of production on such negotiated contracts will be performed within redevelopment areas and if such firms will contract for such portions of the procurement at prices no higher than those paid on the balance of such procurements;

"(3) where deemed appropriate and consistent with procurement objectives, after the expiration of the period during which bids for any procurement are permitted to be submitted and if the lowest of such bids was submitted by a firm in an area other than a redevelopment area, negotiate with firms in redevelopment areas with a view to ascertaining whether any such firm will furnish the services or supplies with respect to which bids were theretofore submitted for an amount equal to, or less than, the amount of the lowest bid theretofore submitted for the furnishing of such services or supplies, and if such firm can be found, award the contract for the furnishing of such services or supplies to such firm;

"(4) assure that firms in redevelopment areas which are on appropriate bidders' lists will be given the opportunity to submit bids or proposals on all procurements for which they are qualified and on which small business joint determinations have not been made, but whenever the number of firms on a bidders' list is exclusive, there shall be included a representative number of firms from redevelopment areas;

"(5) in the event of tie bids on offers on any procurement, award the contract to the firm located in a redevelopment area, other things being equal;

"(6) encourage prime contractors to award subcontracts to firms in redevelopment areas; and

"(7) cooperate with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government in achieving the objectives set out in this subsection.

"URBAN RENEWAL

"SEC. 14. Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'INDUSTRIAL REDEVELOPMENT AREAS UNDER THE AREA ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT ACT

"'SEC. 113. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Commerce certifies to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (1) that any county, city, or other municipality (in this section referred to as a "municipality") is situated in an area designated under section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act as an industrial redevelopment area, and (2) that there is a reasonable probability that with assistance provided under such Act and other undertakings the area will be able to achieve more than temporary improvement in its economic development, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to provide financial assistance to a local public agency in any such municipality under this title and the provisions of this section.

"'(b) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator may provide such financial assistance under this section without regard to the requirements or limitations of section 110(c) that the project area be clearly predominantly residential in character or that it be redeveloped for predominantly residential uses; but no such assistance shall be provided in any area if such Administrator determines that it will assist in relocating business operations from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment.

"'(c) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for any project involving a project area including primarily industrial or commercial structure suitable for rehabilitation under the urban renewal plan for the area.

"'(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a contract for financial assistance under this section may include provisions permitting the disposition of any land in the project area designated under the urban renewal plan for industrial or commercial uses to any public agency or nonprofit corporation for subsequent disposition as promptly as practicable by such public agency or corporation for the redevelopment of the land in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *Provided*, That any disposition of such land under this section shall be made at not less than its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *And provided further*, That the purchasers from or lessees of such public agency or corporation, and their assignees, shall be required to assume the obligations imposed under section 105(b).

"'(e) Following the execution of any contract for financial assistance under this section with respect to any project, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may exercise the authority vested in him under this section for the completion of such project, notwithstanding any detemination made after the execution of such contract that the area in which the project is located may no longer be an industrial redevelopment area under the Area Redevelopment Act.

"'(f) Not more than 10 per centum of the funds authorized for loans under section 102 or for capital grants under section 103 shall be available to provide financial assistance under this section.'

"URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

"SEC. 15. Paragraph (3) of section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after 'counties which' the following: '(A) are situated in areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce under section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act as industrial redevelopment areas, or (B)'.

"VOCATIONAL TRAINING

"SEC. 16. (a) The Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall determine the vocational training or retraining needs of unemployed individuals residing in redevelopment areas and shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and with existing State and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to vocational training and retraining for the purpose of assuring that the facilities and services of such agencies are made fully available to such individuals.

"(b) Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds that additional facilities or services are needed in the area to meet the vocational training or retraining needs of such individuals, he shall so advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Commissioner of Education, shall provide assistance, including financial assistance when necessary, to the appropriate State vocational educational agency in the provision of such additional facilities or services. If the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds that the State vocational educational agency is unable to provide the facilities and services needed, he may, after consultation with such agency, provide for the same by agreement or contract with public or private educational institutions: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor shall arrange to provide any necessary technical assistance for setting up apprenticeship, journeyman, and other job training needed in the locality.

"RETRAINING SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS

"SEC. 17. (a) The Secretary of Labor in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce shall, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States in which redevelopment areas are located, under which the Secretary of Labor shall make payments to such States for the purpose of enabling such States, as agents of the United States, to make weekly retraining payments to unemployed individuals residing within such redevelopment areas who are not entitled to unemployment compensation (either because their unemployment compensation benefits have been exhausted or because they were not insured for such compensation) and who have been certified by the Secretary of Labor

to be undergoing vocational training or retraining under section 16 of this Act. Such payments shall be made only during the period the individual is receiving vocational training or retraining under section 16 of this Act, but not in any event to exceed sixteen weeks, and the amounts of such payments shall be equal to the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment payable in the State making such payments.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce shall jointly prescribe such rules and regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not in excess of $10,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"PREVAILING RATE OF WAGE AND FORTY-HOUR WEEK

"SEC. 18. The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects undertaken by public applicants assisted under this Act (1) shall be paid wages at rates no less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Act of August 30, 1935 (Davis-Bacon Act), and (2) shall be employed not more than forty hours in any one week unless the employee receives wages for his employment in excess of the hours specified above at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 19. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal, deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security thereof, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Secretary, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this title, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Secretary (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or (2) with intent to defraud the Secretary or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Secretary makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Secretary, or without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or (3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Secretary, or (4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Secretary which might affect the value of securities, or having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Secretary shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"EMPLOYMENT OF EXPEDITERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 20. No loan shall be made by the Secretary under this Act to any business enterprise unless the owners, partners, or officers of such business enterprise (1) certify to the Secretary the names of any attorneys, agents, or other persons engaged by or on behalf of such business enterprise for the purpose of expediting applications made to the Secretary for assistance of any sort, and the fees paid or to be paid to any such person; and (2) execute an agreement binding any such business enterprise for a period of two years after any assistance is rendered by the Secretary to such business enterprise, to refrain from employing, tendering any office or employment to, or retaining for professional services, any person who, on the date such assistance or any part thereof was rendered, or within one year prior thereto, shall have served as an officer, attorney, agent or employee of the Secretary occupying a position or engaging in activities with which the Secretary shall have determined involve discretion with respect to the granting of assistance under this Act.

"ANNUAL REPORT

"SEC. 21. The Secretary shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this Act for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962. Such report shall be printed, and shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3 of the year following the fiscal year with respect to which such report is made. Such report shall show, among other things, (1) the number and size of Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies and services placed with business firms located in redevelopment areas, and (2) the amount and duration of employment resulting from such contracts. Upon the request of the Secretary, the various departments and agencies of the Government engaged in the procurement of supplies and services shall furnish to the Secretary such information as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

"APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 22. In addition to appropriations hereinbefore specifically authorized, there are further authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

"USE OF OTHER FACILITIES

"SEC. 23. (a) To avoid duplication of activities and minimize expense in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable and with their consent, use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis.

"(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. This Act shall be supplemental to any existing authority, and nothing herein shall be deemed to be restrictive of any existing powers, duties, and functions of any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

"RECORDS AND AUDIT

"SEC. 24. (a) Each recipient of assistance under section 6 or 7 of this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under section 6 or 7 of this Act."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, my amendment was introduced originally in the form of a bill. Its purpose is to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas. My bill is similar to the administration bill, referred to as the Douglas bill, in its criteria and in a number of other features.

It differs in several features which I shall mention. I shall address myself first to the fact that my bill, originally introduced as S. 6, on the first day of the session, shortly after the introduction of S. 1, contained the provision that this program should be administered under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce.

While there has been much discussion since then with respect to separate agencies, with an administrator whose nomination would be confirmed by the Senate, and so forth, I am very happy that S. 1, the pending bill, now contains a provision which was originally suggested by me on the first day of the session, for administration under the Secretary of Commerce. The bill varies in several particulars. I shall mention the major ones now.

The private projects authorized in the bill as loans are the same in amount, although there is no limitation in my amendment as to the amount to be used in the first year. The private projects for rural areas under S. 1 are $100 million; under my bill, one-half of that. For public facilities, under S. 1, $100 million; under my bill, one-half of that. Grants for public facilities, $4 million, as distinguished from $10 million in the first year and a $75 million total in S. 1.

Technical assistance, $10 million. Retraining and subsistence payments, $10 million.

The loans for public facilities under S. 1 are $100 million on the first year's limitation; under my bill, the amount would be $50 million.

The maximum Federal participation under S. 1, 65 percent subordinate to other loans; under my bill, 50 percent.

The minimum State and local participation is the same in both bills—10 percent.

The maximum period of loan is 40 years, or 50 years, if extended, under S. 1; 30 years, or 40 years, if extended, under my bill.

There is very little difference in the amount of technical assistance. S. 1 provides $4,500,000 annually; my bill provides $4 million.

The provision for financing in my bill is by direct appropriations rather than through Treasury financing or so-called back-door financing.

I believe that substantially states the major differences. My thought in introducing my bill in these amounts and in these terms is that it is more adequate than the bill proposed by the former administration. On that bill, as is well known, I voted to override the veto of the then President. I believe the amount

contained in that bill was and is inadequate.

I believe, furthermore, that the approach contained in my bill presents a middle approach; namely, that the amount involved should be reasonable as to each item. It is an amount which might reasonably be expected to be used. It is an amount which has been calculated after much consultation with persons or representatives of agencies located in areas of chronic unemployment. Such areas exist in my State, particularly in the anthracite and bituminous regions, as well as in other areas, such as Erie and including parts of southeastern and southwestern Pennsylvania.

It will be recalled that the bill passed by the other body in the last session was in the amount of $253 million, and that amount, approximately, was, I believe, accepted by this body. That is the bill which was sent to the President and vetoed by him, and the veto was not overridden. That amount is considerably closer to the amount proposed by my amendment than the amount represented in S. 1.

I submit the reasonable possibility that the other body is much more likely to come within shooting distance of my proposal than it is of the full amount requested under S. 1.

In any event, aid to areas of chronic labor distress is greatly needed. It is important to put people back to work. It is important to get a bill to help communities which have tried for so long and with such difficulty to lift themselves by their own bootstraps; which have raised money out of the pockets of individuals still working; out of their employers; and from civic bodies which have provided, and are continuing to provide, as much as they can through individual and group initiative. These communities have received some help from the State, even though the State has not complied with all the promises made by the present and previous State administrations as to what would be done by them.

In some communities in Pennsylvania, the actual rate of unemployment is deceptive because a high percentage of women are working in the small clothing factories and in small business enterprises, while the percentage of unemployment among the men of those communities is at times well over 50 percent. The result is that we see in those communities men standing around in the village squares, disconsolate, or doing the shopping or babysitting, while the women support the families as the sole breadwinners. This is shameful and shocking to the dignity and pride of our people. It is something which contributes greatly to the difficulties with which these communities are faced. Among other considerations, it is something which tends to discourage industry from locating in those communities.

Mr. President, it is my honest belief that the passage of the proposed legislation will greatly help to alleviate such conditions. If my own amendment shall not be agreed to, I intend to support S. 1, although I believe my amendment is a better approach to solving the problem.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Would the Senator consider modifying his amendment to include therein the section at the end of the bill, which was adopted on S. 1, and which was my amendment providing for the termination of the proposed legislation as of June 30, 1965?

Mr. SCOTT. I will accept such an amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be considered as being modified in that manner.

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

Mr. BUSH. Second, I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if he will accept the so-called antipirating amendment which appears in S. 1 at the top of page 46, lines 1 through 8. This is an amendment which is also adopted on S. 1 and has been generally agreed to by almost all Senators who have considered it.

Mr. SCOTT. We in the affected areas do not want to take bread out of the mouths of any employee or any family in the United States. We do not want to transfer employment merely to create unemployment. We want to create new jobs and to keep them filled. Therefore, I will accept the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment referred to by the Senator from Connecticut may be incorporated as a part of my amendment offered in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Reserving the right to object, I should like the Senator from Connecticut to know that I am according him a privilege which he accorded me after considerable deliberation on yesterday, but I ask that I be given unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. BUSH. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy very much, indeed. I was glad to accord him that courtesy yesterday. I appreciate his reciprocal interest in that respect.

Mr. President, I was about to say that the language of the antipirating amendment should appear in the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania on page 7, after line 11. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I accept the suggestion, and I ask unanimous consent that the modification may so appear in my amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I intend to support the Scott amendment in the nature of a substitute because I think it does everything that S. 1 does, and I think it has one additional strength which commends itself to me very much: It cuts the provision for the so-called rural areas from $100 million to $50 million. I had intended to offer such an amendment, but I think it is just as well incorporated in, and it is in essence, the Scott substitute. So I think that by supporting the Scott amendment in the nature of a substitute, that purpose is adequately served by laying it before the Senate.

The reason why I say that the agricultural or rural area appropriation is twice as great as it really ought to be is that a rural development program is now working in the Department of Agriculture. The most intelligent thing to do would be simply to extend and continue that; that is, to secure more money, if we wish, by appropriation and to let it go on. It is doing very well. Perhaps its only "curse" is that it was developed under the preceding administration. That commends it to me, and I think would commend it to many Senators on this side of the aisle. We have heard about Senators, including myself, being parochial in the course of debate. That is understandable; it is not received invidiously at all.

However, I do not believe anyone else ought to be parochial either, with respect to continuing a good program. This program will be continued in effect because we are allowing the Secretary of Commerce, under the bill, to delegate any part of it to the Secretary of Agriculture. He has already testified that he will delegate this particular aspect of the program to the Department of Agriculture. But what is not cured in S. 1 is the fact that rural areas which are found to be eligible because of their low income have $100 million allocated to them to participate in the program.

But, in addition, if they qualify under other sections of the bill with relation to a continuous period of unemployment, they may qualify under those, as well.

In short, under Senate bill 1, the rural areas, unlike the urban areas, can qualify not only for their own $100 million, but also for the $100 million—which is little enough—allocated to the urban areas. Mr. President, I do not think that is right.

It is for that reason that I discussed the matter in the committee—although I did not see any point in offering the amendment there, because it was obvious what its fate there would be; and it is likewise for that reason that I now support the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], because on that point his amendment is eminently sound.

Much has been said about rural development. Thirty States now have such projects. The authority for the program exists under the Agricultural Service Extension Act of 1955. In addition, the Small Business Administration, in its report, demonstrates that it, too, has helped very materially—having made $95 million of loans, itself, in furtherance of this program, also.

It has been widely hailed as an effective and successful program; and I believe that a sum of $50 million is adequate, considering the fact that these areas can qualify not only as rural areas of low income, but also as areas with persistent underemployment.

Therefore, I hope very much that the Scott substitute, which puts this matter before us in a consolidated way, as a

comprehensive plan, will be adopted. I think it does precisely what Senate bill 1 does, in its practical thrust in this area; and it has the advantage of reducing the size of this rural area fund, which I believe is twice as large as it should be.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to join in the remarks my distinguished colleague has made in regard to preferring the Scott substitute to Senate bill 1, as it now is before us.

I was a cosponsor, with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, of this bill, originally. But I believe he has devised a much sounder program, and I shall certainly support his amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I thank both of the distinguished Senators from New York for their support.

I shall reserve the remainder of the time available to me until I address a question to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]: Does he expect to use any time at this point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to yield my 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. SCOTT. Before doing so, then, let me say—and then I shall defer to the Senator from Illinois—that I desire to point out that my bill, or rather my amendment in the nature of a substitute, contains one provision which it did not contain in the previous session of Congress; namely, there is now in the bill a provision for retaining subsistence payments—a provision which I believe improves the bill, which I have offered as an amendment.

Mr. President, for the moment I reserve the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I oppose, with regret, the amendment of my colleague from Pennsylvania. So does the Governor of Pennsylvania. So do the officials of our State government who are charged with administration of the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Association program and with the handling of the problem of unemployment relief in our Commonwealth.

The pending amendment is a watered-down version of the Douglas bill which we are presently engaged in considering. The pending amendment is a stepped-up version of the Dirksen substitute which the Senate rejected, earlier this afternoon, by a very large vote.

The difficulty with my colleague's amendment is that it is not only too little, but it also comes too late. It comes at a time when I am confident that a majority of the Members of the Senate have determined that they will support the committee bill.

I think it quite unfair to cut in half the loans for rural areas. My State is largely an industrial State, so it will not benefit from the rural area provision. Nevertheless, I believe we should take a national view of this problem; and any one who has studied the record made before the committee must conclude that the need of the rural areas is as great as the need of the urban areas.

The amendment calls for financing by appropriations—a proposal which on yesterday was rejected by the Senate by a vote of 49 to 45; and I do not believe we should now include a provision which the Senate rejected on yesterday.

This amendment would eliminate all grants for public facilities, and would drastically reduce the amount of loans for public utilities.

I wonder what my colleague thinks the effect of his amendment would be on a community such as Barren Hill, Pa., a community with a population of 1,000, a community where all those who formerly had jobs are now on relief. Does my colleague think those persons, now unemployed and on relief, will be able to finance loans in an amount sufficient to bring in the kind of industry which would be able to take those unemployed coal miners out of their misery and return them to payrolls?

I could talk at length in pointing out the inadequacies of the proposed substitute. One can say it is substantially better than the Eisenhower bill. However, certainly it is substantially worse than the administration bill.

Thus, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected by the Senate.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I have no further request for time.

I shall conclude by observing that perhaps the very moderation of the approach I propose is evidenced by the fact that my colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, feels that it is at the same time both stepped up and watered down.

Incidentally, Mr. President, such a remark provides a very good test of whether such an amendment, proposed in a spirit of moderation, is needed. On the other hand, being a realist, and realizing that those of us on this side of the aisle are outnumbered 2 to 1, and in view of the fact that we already have had an indication of what is likely to be the vote on what I regard as a very sagacious solution of the problem, I shall await the vote here in the Senate.

As for Barren Hill, which my senior colleague has said has a population of 1,000, all unemployed, that community has actually experienced worsening conditions under two successive administrations in Pennsylvania, both of which firmly promised the people of Pennsylvania that they would solve the distressed area problem. Both those administrations assured those who were unemployed that something would be done. However, the lives and the fortunes of the people of Barren Hill have become more barren with the passing of each year of unfulfilled promises by two State administrations; and I do not quite understand how either bill would automatically provide much employment to Barren Hill, unless industry goes there.

I have some question as to the ultimate, overall effectiveness of this entire approach. I support it because I believe we must try our best to provide the aid which is needed in these communities, which are so badly stricken.

But we shall better be able to judge the success of this program about a year after it has been in operation; and then I hope my caveat will be noted; namely, that perhaps not all of the things that have been promised by Senators on both sides of the aisle who are in support of the various bills and amendments will then have been achieved, perhaps because they are not possible of achievement, perhaps because they are not well administered, perhaps because industry cannot successfully be lured into these areas.

I sincerely hope that is not correct. I sincerely hope the bill will work effectively. I hope the Administrator who is appointed will be a person experienced in problems of distressed areas and chronic unemployment. I hope such an Administrator will not be plucked from the nightclubs of New York City or from the gay white lights of Broadway, but that the Administrator to be selected will be one who, by reason of his experience, his wisdom, his compassion, and his determination to accomplish the job, will satisfy the people of my Commonwealth and of the other communities that the appointment is indeed in the hands of a man who plans to get things done, to get the unemployed back to work, to relieve chronic unemployment. I certainly wish success to the measure which will ultimately go to the President.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the characteristic speech of the Senator from Pennsylvania in which he demonstrates that, with less money, he will give more relief. And since the Senator from Pennsylvania has been characterizing himself as a moderate, I hope he will forgive me if I say he is a "split the difference" Senator. I have proposed the inadequate sum of $394 million. The administration has proposed $75 million. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] proposes $214 million—splitting the difference between the two.

In other words, this is a "split the difference" proposal. If the bill cannot be defeated entirely, appropriate only $75 million. If the $75 million proposal is defeated, then cut the amount down to $214 million.

The $394 million proposed is in itself inadequate. Let us not cut it by a single cent, and let us vote down the amendment by an overwhelming vote.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, on the Senator's time.

Mr. SCOTT. Since the Senator has characterized me——

Mr. DOUGLAS. As a "split the difference" Senator.

Mr. SCOTT. I heard the Senator quite accurately the first time. I would much rather be a "split the difference"

Senator than a "split the hair" Senator or a "split the Treasury" Senator.

The Senator from Illinois knows quite well that I favor this type of legislation. I am trying to secure the best legislation I can. And if the Senator from Illinois thinks a Senator is in error in trying to save the people of this country a little money, I suggest to the Senator from Illinois that it is an error which the Senator from Illinois has carefully avoided falling into.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator reminds me of what Mr. Dooley said of Theodore Roosevelt's attack on the trusts:

> I am against the trusts; I will smash them; but, on the other hand, not so fast.

[Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back his remaining time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield back my remaining time, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] in the nature of a substitute. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 14]

YEAS—31

Aiken	Eastland	Mundt
Boggs	Fong	Saltonstall
Bridges	Goldwater	Schoeppel
Bush	Hickenlooper	Scott
Butler	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Javits	Stennis
Case, S. Dak.	Keating	Thurmond
Cotton	Kuchel	Wiley
Curtis	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Miller	
Dworshak	Morton	

NAYS—57

Anderson	Hartke	Metcalf
Beall	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hickey	Morse
Bible	Hill	Moss
Burdick	Holland	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Neuberger
Cannon	Jackson	Pastore
Carroll	Johnston	Pell
Case, N.J.	Jordan	Proxmire
Church	Kefauver	Randolph
Clark	Kerr	Russell
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Smith, Mass.
Douglas	Long, La.	Sparkman
Engle	Magnuson	Symington
Ervin	Mansfield	Talmadge
Gore	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	McGee	Yarborough
Hart	McNamara	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—12

Allott	Capehart	McCarthy
Bartlett	Chavez	Prouty
Blakley	Ellender	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Fulbright	Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. SCOTT's amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that that motion be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe this is a good time to ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me 2 minutes in order that I may present two amendments?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah is happy to accommodate the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk, and I ask that the acting majority leader give his attention as it is read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 44, line 4, in the committee amendment, after the comma it is proposed to insert the following: "the extent to which rural development projects have previously been located in any such area under programs administered by the Department of Agriculture."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut to the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am very happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. BUSH. With that assurance, may the amendment be put to a vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do all Senators yield back their time?

Mr. BUSH. I yield back my time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield back my time.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 44, line 16, in the committee amendment, before the period it is proposed to insert a colon and the following:

> *Provided,* That not more than one such project shall be located in any one State unless the Secretary has considered such applications for assistance under this Act as may have come from the several States which apply for such assistance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment is in much better form than its progenitor, which was proposed in the committee, and which was then what I called the "Rhode Island red" amendment, because it provided aid to the farming industry of the State of Rhode Island. It did not seem to me there were many farms in Rhode Island which required such care. As I said on a previous occasion, when the present Presiding Officer was in the chair, I do not think there are many "reds" in Rhode Island anyway, and, in the second place, I do not think they need aid. But in its present form I believe the amendment is innocuous and therefore I accept it.

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I merely wish to make the observation that if the amendment is such a boon to the State of Rhode Island, I congratulate the manager of the bill for accepting it.

Mr. BUSH. I hope the Senator will not exclude me, the offerer of the amendment in behalf of his State, in his congratulations.

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. If such was the intent and motive of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, I congratulate him also.

Mr. BUSH. I shall also accept the applause of the distinguished Senator from Illinois for the improvement of the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the amendment was originally proposed, in a form that assured there must be one for every State, no matter whether it needed aid or not, I referred to the amendment as the "pass the biscuits pappy" amendment. In view of the changes that have been made I withdraw the statement, and if it was uttered, it was uttered in the Pickwickian sense.

Mr. BUSH. I am sure the Senator from Illinois is full of that kind of sense, and I thank him for accepting the amendments.

I yield back my time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield back my time.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 3-13-61, which I ask the clerk to state.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 43, line 1, beginning with the word "Any" it is proposed to strike out all through line 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have called up the amendment, and I wish to discuss it briefly. I shall not ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment. The record on amendments has not been too good in the past few days. However, I do have a 30-minute statement in opposition to the bill, and it seems to me I would probably save time if I attempted to cover both points while I am on my feet. So it is my intention to talk about 30 minutes on the bill itself and if my colleagues need to return to their offices in order to sign their mail, shave, or obtain some other service, I shall try to see that the vote on final passage is delayed for at least 30 minutes.

Before I begin my formal statement I should like to take a minute to comment on my personal vote on the Dirksen amendment and the Scott amendment. I voted "nay" on both amendments. I think each of them proposed an improvement in the present bill, but I think each of them contains the seeds of the faults to which, in my forthcoming statement, I will ascribe to the bill itself. So in order to be consistent, I had to vote against both proposed amendments because in effect they were simply variations of the bill.

I oppose S. 1, as I opposed S. 722 last year, and welcome the opportunity to explain why.

I do not oppose the objective of the bill, which is to solve the problem of chronic unemployment. I do not deny that the problem exists—and cries out for a solution.

I differ with the bill's supporters in a way that I think is significant. With tears and charts, they seek to prove the existence of the problem, and then take it for granted that this bill will solve it. I admit the existence of the problem, and having put this bill to the test of reason and experience, have come to the conclusion that the bill will not solve it. Because of this difference, they say I am heartless, but in return I may say they are cruel, because they raise false hopes.

Because it is easier to be emotional than to face facts, I am sure the bill will pass, but I am equally sure that it will fail, and I want the record to show why I believe this.

The problem of chronic and persistent unemployment is one of our most serious national problems, not only in terms of its bad economic effects, but particularly in terms of human suffering, and the deterioration of human values and resources. Therefore, my chief objection to the bill is that it will not produce the results its advocates anticipate, and that having passed it under the illusion that it will, we will not look further for the real answer.

The main programs in the bill will require more than a year to bring forth even the most meager results that might follow under even the most hopeful circumstances. And this delay will add frustration to the existing misery. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], acknowledging that the bill's effects will be small, likes to quote the Chinese philosopher, Lao-tse, to the effect that a journey of a thousand miles begins with one step, and says this bill is that step. I am neither Chinese nor a philosopher, but I know that if that first step starts out in the wrong direction, we must travel more than the original thousand miles to reach our goal—if we ever do.

I think the step this bill takes is leading us in the wrong direction. Here are some of my reasons:

First, it fails to implement its basic objective, which in itself is inadequate, being merely to alleviate conditions of chronic and persistent unemployment and underemployment of certain economically depressed areas.

What should our basic objective be? We are not interested in alleviating unemployment. Rather, we should seek to discover the range of situations and conditions that have contributed to this chronic unemployment in order that we can develop cooperative efforts to cure them. If that is our goal, we must look at the specific problems of each community. If we do this, we may find many broad, common problems that run through the whole pattern, but in each community there will probably be a different mix and each will require a different program for a cure.

If the cure is our objective, we ought to start at the community level and reach out from there for cooperative assistance from community leaders, entrepreneurs, investors, labor leaders, educators, State and local governments, and finally, perhaps, specific existing services of the Federal Government.

But the pending bill starts with the Federal Government and reaches down. It assumes that all unemployment is alike, and can be cured with a general Federal program, regardless of the local situation or the specific cause of the distress.

It prescribes a painkiller—like aspirin—without being concerned whether the pain is caused by an incurable cancer or a hangover. And finally, the programs it offers, the painkillers it prescribes, are for the most part already available and have already been used for years. Instead of offering a great new program, we are in fact injecting Federal power and Federal taxpayers' money into programs that have been available for a long time—either from private sources or through local units of Government. And, since the problem of chronic and persistent unemployment continues, there is no reason to believe that the pending bill, which really takes no new step, will solve them now.

In fact—and this is the second proof of the wrong direction—rather than helping the situation, Federal intervention will interject new problems. What are some of these?

First, it sets up new forms of discrimination. It will increase the burden on all Federal taxpayers for the benefit of a few communities. The bill itself authorizes an expenditure of approximately $400 million, but its administrative cost under the Department of Commerce, so far as I know, has never been estimated.

Furthermore, the benefits available to depressed industrial areas under the definitions of the bill will be limited to a few States. The remaining States must contribute without sharing, and my State of Utah is one of these.

Since the criteria for rural development are not clearly spelled out, no one knows how this money will be divided.

The bill will discriminate among the unemployed themselves. This I have discussed in detail on page 57 of the committee report. Here I shall just summarize by saying that of 648,000 unemployed in the depressed areas which qualify under the bill, only about 38,500, or 1 out of 17, could get a job if this bill were completely successful. Of course, there is the further obvious discrimination that even these potential beneficiaries represent only 1 out of 136 unemployed persons in the United States.

This bill threatens our free enterprise system. It runs counter to the precepts of what is still essentially a private market mechanism, operating within a dynamic and growing economy.

The strength of the United States to a great degree is attributable to the fluidity of its resources among areas that can use them most efficiently. This has always been an essential strength of our political system—that it permitted these adjustments. And the pending bill would threaten to destroy that adjustment mechanism.

Our economy has grown strong because throughout our history the location of industrial establishments has been related to the basic economic considerations involved—good markets, availability of transportation, the labor supply, the accessibility to raw materials in the area, and the existence of a healthy business climate, and so forth. To substitute an artificially created, Government-sponsored program to induce industries to locate in areas which are intrinsically unsuited for them, purely on the ground that these areas are unable to compete on purely economic grounds, is to throw a monkey wrench into the economic machine.

Once Congress establishes the principle that the Federal Government should direct industrial expansion into selected areas, there will be powerful political pressures to fulfill the commitment to these areas.

If initial plant-location inducements do not prove adequate to carry out the commitment, greater inducements will undoubtedly be proposed to Congress. And political pressures to provide them may well be irresistible.

The bill is unnecessary because all the services it provides are already available through private sources, local governments, or existing Federal agencies in ways which are equally effective or can be made so by slight modifications.

The bill sets up four major programs:

First. Commercial and industrial loans for buildings in urban depressed areas.

Second. Commercial and industrial loans for rural areas.

Third. Public facility loans and grants.

Fourth. Vocational training and retraining.

In each case, either the program is essentially a duplication of an existing program, or it will not solve the problem which created the unemployment in the first place.

Sections 5 and 6 of the bill describe the so-called "redevelopment areas" and set forth a program under which the Federal Government will lend up to 65 percent of the capital needed to build buildings and "in case of demonstrated need" purchase machinery to aid in providing employment opportunities in the areas.

Looking at the specific provisions of the bill, I should like to comment on some of its obvious weaknesses in these programs.

1. THE CRITERIA

Criteria under the bill are set up statistically and while the bill says they must exclude "unemployment due primarily to temporary or seasonal factors," they do not do so, because they are based on a sampling statistical technique and make no attempt to analyze the kind or duration of unemployment involved. This failure is made obvious by the monthly fluctuations of the numbers, as a result of which some cities near the breaking point move in and out of eligibility.

After setting up the criteria, the bill in section 5(b) gives the Administrator the right to ignore them on a very general finding of need—which might turn out to be a political need. Section 5(b) is generally considered to be the section relating to rural areas. We do not find the word "rural" until we reach the bottom of page 43. However, section 5(b) begins:

> The Administrator shall also designate as "redevelopment areas" those areas (including Indian reservations) within the United States which do not meet the requirements set forth in subsection (a) but which he determines are among the highest in numbers and percentages of low-income families, and in which there exists a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment.

In my opinion, this opens the door wide to the Administrator to ignore the criteria contained in section 5(a), and permits him to include in the program almost any area.

There is another subsection of section 5 which affects this situation, and I shall comment on that a little later.

Now I should like to talk about the program.

2. THE PROGRAM

The program which the bill creates by these sections is in fact a financial subsidy or inducement to business to locate in an eligible community. The extent of this subsidy, when it is boiled down, is the possible difference between the interest rate on loans, under this bill, roughly 4⅜ percent, and the cost of money through other means. On this phase of the program I have these comments:

(a) It will not create jobs. If merely building buildings would do so, we need never have any unemployment. Rather the reverse is true. Job-generating new ideas, new products, new services, and new markets come first and then the factory buildings will be built, or empty ones filled, or full ones expanded. But it is necessary, first, to have the jobs before the buildings.

(b) The program is not necessary. There was no positive testimony in the hearings to the effect that money is not available in depressed areas to finance the location of good prospects; indeed, there was much evidence to the contrary.

(c) As an economic incentive, this proposal is very weak. Money can be and has been raised by the sale of tax-free community revenue bonds at interest rates equal to or lower than those available under this bill, and there is a ready market for these bonds which can now be issued in 15 States; and, by changes in State laws, could be available everywhere. Even if we look to other private sources without the tax-exempt advantages of revenue bonds, this subsidy would be worth considerably less than 1 percent of the cost of production in manufacturing, since you are only reducing building financing cost by only one-third and these represent only 2 percent of the costs of production in manufacturing.

(d) There are between 10,000 and 15,000 private and local public agencies already working to persuade business to locate in their communities, and in 1957 they spent an estimated $30 million just on sales efforts alone.

To show how widespread this practice is, I have some samples of the literature which is now being produced to try to persuade businessmen to move into specific States or communities. So far as I know, the bill would not provide a single dollar which could be used for this purpose.

I have before me a Massachusetts book, a Pennsylvania book, and an Illinois book.

Another example is a very beautiful book prepared by the State of Kentucky, which has distressed areas.

Another magnificent book is entitled "The Immutable Images of Oklahoma." This is the kind of material which is now being prepared and distributed at a cost, including the sales effort to support it, of some $30 million a year. Yet such promotional methods have not been successful in locating industries in depressed areas in many of the States which are now spending that money.

I listened to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania argue with his junior colleague. Pennsylvania has a very excellent program, probably as good as any in the United States. The man in charge of that program testified that it was possible to persuade only 28 percent of the prospects to go into depressed areas; the other 72 percent preferred to go into areas where there was no problem of great unemployment.

The bill provides no funds for sales promotion of communities, unless the funds set up for technical assistance under section 22 can be so used. But these funds total only $4½ million for all technical assistance of all types, including sales promotion, if such does qualify. The bill is not clear on this. This is a far cry from the $30 million spent by existing development groups exclusively for this function.

(e) The $200 million for industrial loans in urban and rural areas set up by the bill is a drop in the bucket compared with what private business spends for plant and equipment without such a bill. In the recession year of 1958, this was $9 billion in manufacturing industries, and $29 billion in all industries—145 times greater than the bill proposes. Six billion dollars of this went for buildings alone in 1958, 30 times the amount proposed by the bill for this restricted purpose.

(f) But even if the $200 million were spent, it would probably be ineffectual for two reasons:

First. Several States are already offering greater inducements than this bill could create, including local tax and other concessions.

Second. Those people who work professionally in the field of selling communities as locations to industry generally agree that there are other values which are much more persuasive than subsidized rent. I obtained specific lists from 47 of the 50 States, and they are summarized on page 55 of the committee report. With respect to the cost of rent, only one placed it as high as fourth. Nearly all of the replies placed it at or near the bottom of the list and added the comment that rent was of relatively minor importance.

Yet all the bill would do would be to provide subsidized loans equal to approximately 1 percent of the total cost of manufacturing.

(g) The bill fails as an immediate program to alleviate unemployment because it takes from 9 to 18 months to locate and persuade a prospect, in addition to the time to construct the building. Many persons are hoping that as soon as the bill is passed, jobs will begin to spring up in the depressed areas. A year, perhaps 2 years, under the most favorable circumstances, will have passed before the meager effects of the bill can be felt.

(h) Because of the other programs now operating, interjection of this Federal program may have three undesirable effects:

First. It may attract only the less-desirable and more risky enterprises which have a low survival rate and create only temporary jobs. Some such mortality has happened in many depressed communities already.

Second. Since the program cannot create new jobs or increase the number of prospects, it will simply replace money which would have come from other sources without having changed a single management decision or location, and thus, taxpayers' money will be down the drain, so to speak. I feel certain that much of the support from the people in the States which already have active programs for this purpose is that they hope Federal money will come in and enable them to save some of the money which is now being spent at the State level.

But, Mr. President, even more serious than that, this measure is a first, faint

step into Federalized manufacturing facilities.

Third. Since the bill sets up a new bureaucracy, the cost per job located will be very high.

(i) Section 20 of the bill requires the revelation to the public of certain basic facts about a company which applies for a loan under this bill—including the amount of the loan, its purpose, and the security offered. In the case of private loans, made from private sources, this information is kept in confidence. Few businesses with good credit would want to make their program public, just to save a fraction of the interest cost.

Turning now to the application of this proposed law to rural redevelopment areas, as found in subsection 5(b), all of the above objections apply, plus these additional criticisms.

The criteria under subsection 5(b) are so loose as to invite political pressures. Every rural community in the United States that dreams of becoming an industrial center can apply; and this is particularly true for low-income, low-cost-of-living areas in the South and in the Southwest.

Except for the loan feature, which, as I have indicated, is not very significant, the provisions of this section are closely related to the rural development program started under the Eisenhower administration in the Department of Agriculture. If that program needs beefing up, why not do so? If we have both, Gresham's law will operate, and one will be ignored.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has made the point that if we have two programs, one for general redevelopment areas meeting certain specified unemployment ratios, and another specifically for rural communities, the rural communities can probably claim under both, and thus have an advantage over the larger cities. This is worth considering as another weakness of this subsection.

Now we come to the third phase of the bill. Section 7 provides for $100 million in loans for public facilities for commercial and industrial purposes, and section 8 for $75 million of Federal grants for the same purposes.

The reasons why the public facility loan provisions are not necessary are, to me, obvious:

First. Most communities can issue tax-exempt bonds, general or revenue, at lower interest rates.

Second. Those who wish to do so can use the existing law under which such loans are available through the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which already has a staff set up to provide this service.

Third. If it is agreed that loans under this section would be turned over to the Housing and Home Finance Agency to administer, I would observe that if an agency has two loan programs of different values, then the most advantageous and the cheapest one will be used, and the other will be neglected. Therefore, Mr. President, why not have only one, in the first place?

Fourth. If it is argued that the bill would authorize a type of loan that the Housing and Home Finance Agency cannot now provide, then certainly it would be simpler to amend the Housing and Home Finance Agency law, rather than to make a new one.

Section 8 provides for grants for public facility projects. This breaks through into a new area of Federal handouts. Under the present law, grants are available for planning community facilities. This proposed law would make them available for actual construction of such projects, on the weak and general criterion that "there is little probability that such a project can be undertaken without the grant." Can one think of any community which could not develop a real case, under this rule—in short, that without this grant, it could not provide the service? If we ever begin on grants for public facilities, who will apply for loans? This is another serious breach in the wall that separates Washington from the local community.

This brings us to the fourth general phase, represented by sections 16 and 17. These sections involve training and retraining for new jobs, either after an industry relocates, or before. This is one area on which I think Federal leadership and participation can be helpful. But I think this program is of such great importance that it requires a bill of its own. This is an area in which the Banking and Currency Committee lacks jurisdiction. The problem of developing a program of vocational education for unemployed adults belongs to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It needs very serious study, in which not only the congressional committees, but also the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the U.S. Office of Education, and the several States should participate. Some interesting pilot programs have been operating in West Virginia and Kentucky; and some excellent ideas that have grown out of that experience are contained in a brochure, written by David L. Francis, mayor of Huntington, W. Va., entitled "Solving a Critical Human Problem." I recommend its reading to every Senator, and ask that a certain section which I have marked be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

The excerpts from the article are as follows:

STEPS NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT PROPOSALS FOR VOCATIONAL TRAINING IN REPORT ENTITLED "SOLVING A CRITICAL HUMAN PROBLEM"

The programs outlined by legislation now pending—bringing new industry and jobs into distressed areas—may take many months or years to reach down to the level of the man who is now actually unemployed. Therefore, outmigration on a carefully planned basis is a necessary part of this program to give immediate relief. The following four steps are necessary to fulfill such a program.

1. Counseling by employer or termination of employee's job and reference by employer to the counseling service of the U.S. Employment Service office. If the unemployed person has been without work for an extended period, the U.S. Employment Service counselor should provide aptitude tests and guidance as needed.

2. The U.S. Employment Service counselor should review the applicant's aptitude tests, determine where he is qualified to work, and then review with him the jobs available locally or elsewhere. If employment can be found locally, the problem is solved at that point. If not, the counselor should determine the financial ability of the applicant to travel to an area offering potential employment to him.

3. If the applicant cannot find a job locally or is not qualified for employment outside the area, the counselor should determine whether vocational training will properly retrain him for a job locally or to relocate in another area. If the applicant has sufficient finances to attend training school on his own, the counselor should so recommend. If not, the counselor should work out the financial assistance necessary (new legislation will be required to give this assistance), and the applicant should be encouraged to avail himself to such retraining.

4. On completion of the retraining course, counselor should again consult with applicant and provide detailed assistance in securing employment within the area or without. This may require a loan to the applicant to enable him to travel to an area of potential employment and ultimately relocate his family there.

It is recognized that capital expenditures will be required either to expand existing vocational schools or construct new ones. The pattern for such schools has already been developed in both Kentucky and West Virginia.

Such a program, handled primarily on the evening shift in vocational schools, could process several thousand unemployed workers in West Virginia and eastern Kentucky and, over a 3-year period, could eliminate at least 50 percent of the labor surplus in those States. It is doubtful that the program now in the legislative hopper could give the same results in a 6-year period, if ever.

A secondary aspect of this training program is the fact that neither West Virginia nor Kentucky is currently providing sufficient vocational training to high school students, particularly those who do not plan to attend college. As a result, these young people are graduating from high school without proper training to seek gainful employment. Thus such a program as outlined herein, when it has completed its primary objective, could be merged into an expanded training program for high school students which would better prepare them for gainful employment upon graduation from high school.

CITY OF HUNTINGTON,
Huntington, W. Va., February 9, 1961.

To Interested Parties:

Herewith is final draft of my report "Solving a Critical Human Problem," the previous draft of which was mailed to some 600 educators, legislators, businessmen, and members of the press and communications media. Many favorable editorial comments have been made on this draft, and a number of constructive suggestions received have been incorporated in this final draft.

Vocational training as a solution to unemployment is not a new idea, but has never been used in sufficient volume to more than prove it can be done. The distressed area problem has increased to the extent that corrective measures of equal size are needed.

No mention has been made as to sources of revenue to finance this program, except in one instance, because it is generally beyond the province of this study. The decision as to where financing should originate should be made within the State legislatures as well as in Washington.

If this report is to be of any use, it must be seriously considered and acted upon by

both our National and State legislators. Your active support toward that end is respectfully requested.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID L. FRANCIS.

SOLVING A CRITICAL HUMAN PROBLEM—A PROPOSAL TO IMPROVE JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR DEPRESSED AREA UNEMPLOYED IN WEST VIRGINIA AND IN EASTERN KENTUCKY

(By David L. Francis, mayor, city of Huntington, W. Va.)

INTRODUCTION

The magnitude of the West Virginia-eastern Kentucky unemployment problem is critically large and therefore requires corrective action of equal size.

Number of unemployed

	January 1961	January 1960	Increase since January 1960
West Virginia	85,000	60,000	25,000
Eastern Kentucky	45,000	40,000	5,000

Number receiving unemployment compensation, January 1961

West Virginia	40,000
Eastern Kentucky	13,000

It is to be noted that not included above are several thousand persons who have exhausted the unemployment benefits or who are on direct public assistance. The number of people receiving surplus food on a regular basis totals 300,000 in West Virginia and 175,000 in eastern Kentucky.

Out of a population of 1,860,000 West Virginia's 523,000 work force (excluding agriculture workers) has 16.5 percent unemployed (85,000). Eastern Kentucky, with a 120,000 nonagriculture work force, has 45,000 unemployed (37 percent) out of a total population of 668,000.

There is no one single solution to the distressed area problem in our mountain States and unfortunately, most of the solutions suggested by fact-finding committees and legislators are of a pump-priming nature—such as road or other public works programs, extension of unemployment compensation, and improvement of food distribution. All of these are temporary stimulants which when turned off allow the area to drop back to its original distressed condition. Nor do they always reach down to the person who is unemployed and really needs the help. A second form of solution is the effort to bring new industries into a distressed area by such aids as special subsidies, moratoriums on depreciation rates and taxes. At best, this has proved to be slow and an uncertain process. Now conditions are so critical that it is time for a new type program to be effected.

The only really broad solution that the writer has found to provide both an immediate and long-range cure for the unemployment problem in our distressed areas is through a crash program of vocational training which would annually teach in West Virginia 15,000 and in Eastern Kentucky 10,000 unemployed workers a basic vocation that will enable them to accept jobs either within their local community or in other parts of the country. These unemployed must be made vocationally mobile so that they can properly seek employment in areas where job opportunities are available.

Such training programs are already successfully in effect in West Virginia and in Eastern Kentucky and, if expanded, they can provide a solution. These programs are not now of sufficient size or capacity to meet the problem. To date these schools have only proved that they can be a solution to the unemployment problem. Later, this report will go into detail as to what has been accomplished, and how vocational schools can be developed into a crash program to care for a large portion of our unemployed.

In summary, the vocational training program proposed herein involves four major steps, as follows:

1. In West Virginia, establish a series of major vocational training schools, such as the Huntington East High Training School, which can adequately process 1,600 unemployed students per year. We now have such schools in Parkersburg, Wheeling, Huntington, Charleston, and Welch. But additional schools or expansion of existing schools are needed in Bluefield, Beckley, Weirton, Fairmont, Martinsburg, Keyser, and Elkins.

West Virginia now has 25 satellite vocational training schools surrounding these large schools. These need expanding and still more are needed to operate in conjunction with the local high schools. These schools, because of their size, would not have the facilities and equipment of the central schools, but they would provide the high school student with his first-year familiarization courses and the unemployed with orientation and with the courses not requiring specialized equipment.

In eastern Kentucky, the plan now in operation at the Mayo State Vocational School at Paintsville would be stepped up and this central school plant expanded to process 2,000 unemployed students annually. At the same time the program for development of 10 new vocational training extension centers in strategic counties in eastern Kentucky would be accelerated. The parent schools in Hazard, Harlan, Somerset, and Ashland would, like Paintsville's, be enlarged.

Thus, to get this plan in full bloom, capital expenditures for land, buildings, and equipment would have to be appropriated immediately. The plans for this program have already been developed by the two States. This, in effect, would be a public works program of lasting value by its leaving permanent facilities to carry on this very important training.

2. Provide sufficient funds for teachers' salaries and the operation and maintenance of this crash program.

3. Arrange the curriculum of the schools so that sessions are double-shifted. During the first shift high school students would be trained as they are at present. On the evening shift, as a general practice, the older men and women would be rehabilitated and trained in a vocation. It has been proved that students are more rapidly and easily trained if they are grouped within their own age bracket. Currently the East Huntington High Trades School is training some 350 high school students on the day shift and an equal number of men and women, age 45 or over, on the evening shift.

Over a period of years records show that these vocationally trained groups have a high rate of employment. Their services are usually sought to the extent that placement bureau services are seldom needed. Even now many of these graduates are being absorbed by the labor market.

4. In the case of both the high school and unemployed adult student who cannot afford to attend school because of economic reasons, a system of scholarships, grants, and loans should be established to provide school costs and subsistence while in school. Upon graduation, if it is necessary for the student to leave the area, sufficient funds should be provided for moving and at least 1 month's subsistence in the new area where the student relocates.

THE FREE FLOW OF POPULATION

The gross loss in population for the 1950 decade far exceeds the net losses shown by the 1960 census for West Virginia and eastern Kentucky. When the natural increases are added to the totals, population actually declined 459,000 in West Virginia and 265,000 in eastern Kentucky. If large numbers of people had not been able to relocate themselves in other areas, the distressed situation would have been greatly compounded.

The citizens of these two areas have been solving their own problems by having the initiative to move to another area. Many of these workers saw the evidence of job decline or they found better job opportunities in booming areas. Many were young people who had to move because of lack of opportunities. But now jobs in other areas are more difficult to secure unless one has special qualifications. This movement of population from one area to another is as old as history and is constantly in progress. Several observers believe that the speeding up of this outmigration from the distressed areas is the only rapid solution to labor surpluses.

A careful but rapidly expanded vocational program for both high school students and retrainable unemployed will make larger segments of our population in these areas more mobile in their job seeking and will also have the important effect of making them better trained citizens who can more easily adapt themselves into the living pattern of a new location.

WHAT THE TWO STATES ARE ACCOMPLISHING

West Virginia is currently graduating from vocational schools some 10,000 high school students, 6,000 employed students who are upgrading themselves, and about 1,500 unemployed students per year.

Eastern Kentucky is graduating from vocational schools some 3,000 high school students, 2,000 employed students who are upgrading themselves, and about 800 unemployed students per year.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS EXPECTED FROM CRASH PROGRAM

Educators in West Virginia estimate that if the vocational education expansion program as outlined below is carried out, 15,000 unemployed can be trained annually. In eastern Kentucky, if a similar program is carried out in expansion of vocational schools, 10,000 unemployed can be retrained annually for useful jobs in industry. See appendix C.

Analysis by educators reveals that nearly 50 percent of our unemployed are retrainable in vocational schools. The remainder are not eligible or interested because of such factors as a lack of basic education, physical handicaps, health, or a lack of desire for self-improvement. Existing programs in West Virginia and in eastern Kentucky for the rehabilitation of physically handicapped persons are excellent, but do need larger support to serve the number who need this help. Rehabilitation of these people, however, is not a part of this report.

On the premise of nearly 50 percent of the unemployed there are 35,000 fairly good training prospects in West Virginia and 20,000 in eastern Kentucky to be planned for. Assuming that unemployment does not increase in either State, most of this group within 3 years could be retrained and qualified for relocation, if necessary, in other areas as useful citizens gainfully employed.

An immediate start can be made with the program through the use of existing facilities. By scheduling multiple shifts, present buildings, equipment and classrooms can serve until new and expanded facilities are constructed.

The school facilities that would be constructed to care for this expanded program would continue to be used when unemployment surpluses are eliminated. Normal growth in the number of high school students taking vocational education would easily take up the expanded facilities.

FUNDS REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT PROGRAM

Inasmuch as West Virginia has more available present facilities than does eastern Kentucky to absorb additional student load, the

capital costs are slightly more for eastern Kentucky.

Purpose	West Virginia	Eastern Kentucky
Land and buildings	$2,200,000	$2,800,000
Equipment for new shops	2,750,000	3,500,000
Total capital cost	4,950,000	6,300,000
Annual operating costs	8,250,000	5,500,000

These funds are over and above that already appropriated for normal growth requirements.

West Virginia has had no recent capital funds from State money for building construction. Some growth needs and new facilities have been paid for by the counties. Equipment has been provided by diverting a small percentage of operating funds. Kentucky has a program for the next 2 years to erect new buildings throughout the State at a cost of 4 to 5 million dollars of State funds plus another half million dollars of county funds to be added to the program. The State will spend $2 million to equip these buildings. These expenditures are for normal growth requirements and do not provide in promptness or size the facilities which would be required to service large additional groups of unemployed now.

THE FINANCING OF THE UNEMPLOYED AND NEEDY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS THROUGH VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

Experience has proved in the past year in West Virginia that no large quantity of unemployed will take advantage of present vocational facilities unless adequate financing is provided for subsistence. It has also been brought to light that many high school students do not have sufficient funds to complete their educational program, whether vocational or high school, and these young people also require careful consideration. A procedure to provide for both of these groups is outlined below.

The area offices of Employment Security should expand their excellent counseling, aptitude testing and referral procedures to assure that all retrainable unemployed are directed to vocations that are needed and that are within the applicant's ability. The counselor would advise the unemployed of the nearest location of vocational schools and the courses available; then work out with him his financial situation. If the person is newly unemployed, a sufficient grant over and above the unemployment insurance would be provided for the duration of the course. He would also be advised of the source of surplus foods. In the case of those unemployed who are no longer drawing compensation, or who have not been eligible for compensation, a larger grant by necessity would have to be made.

There is a need to provide enough additional subsistence to assure that an unemployed family man can be able to begin and complete a course in vocational training. The unemployment benefit is not quite enough to meet this need. The pattern of the original education plan for World War II veterans appears to be applicable. School costs are paid direct to the institution and the student receives a subsistence allowance. A maximum period of 22 weeks of training is sufficient for the adult unemployed.

A maximum of $50 per week subsistence (including unemployment pay benefits) will better enable a student to complete his training. Unemployment weekly maximum payments are $30 and $37, respectively, in West Virginia and Kentucky.

The annual number of 15,000 West Virginia unemployed prospects for training, visualized in this report, would receive maximum supplemental subsistence funds as follows:

Unemployment benefit pay now averages $22 per week in West Virginia.

If all 15,000 trainess received an additional $28 per week for 22 weeks, a total of $9.2 million would be required.

For eastern Kentucky the maximum supplemental payments for 10,000 trainees would be $4.8 million annually.

In the case of the student of high school age who is without means to continue on with vocational training, a counseling service within the school system itself should be established and funds up to $550 per student provided for these people to continue with their education.

Upon graduation from the vocational training school, counseling service both within the school system and the Office of Economic Security should be available to advise the graduates of the availability of jobs in various parts of our country. If prospects of jobs can be located, loans up to $600 should be made where needed to those who do not have adequate finances for them to go and secure the job, and to transport their families to the new location. At least 1 month's subsistence should be made available in a loan form to these people so that they may become settled in the new area.

Almost every analysis of the Appalachian region's unemployed includes a statement of need for elevating the average level of education. Such an improvement, says the consensus, would upgrade an important evaluation point used by prospective industry in making a site selection and would improve the chances of the region's people to obtain employment.

Typical is the comment of Harvey S. Perloff in his article "Lagging Sectors and Regions of the American Economy." "I would put at the top of the list an intensive effort to improve education in the depressed areas, to prepare young persons for a lifetime of skilled, productive work. Compared to other governmental measures that have been proposed, public investment in education promises the greatest relative returns."

None of the previous studies, however, have come to grips with the specifics of this distressed area unemployment. Detailed plans for correction and statements of cost of what would be entailed to train these unemployed have not heretofore been presented. We submit that the current situation is sufficiently critical to demand detailed planning by legislators and action that can effectively bring this unemployment down to a minimum number. It is with this intent that the foregoing is respectfully proposed.

APPENDIX C

The specific vocational courses that would be offered unemployed adults for retraining would be determined through a collaborative plan, functioning between the Department of Vocational Education and the Office of Economic Security.

Initial screening of qualified applicants is done by Economic Security. This Office also states to the vocational educators the type of jobs that offer the best employment prospects at home or elsewhere.

Job skill demands change often. For adults, however, the educators believe that the vocations of automobile mechanics, automobile body repair, electrical repair, building trades, building custodian, stenographic work, and practical nursing offer more regular opportunity. When changes occur in the market demand for job skills, almost any combination of the following courses could be offered by the schools: automobile mechanics; automobile body repair; mine machinery repair; machine tool operator; refrigeration mechanics; power sewing machine operator; carpentry; machine shop; electrical repair; welding; upholstering; building trades; building custodian, janitorial service; shorthand, typing, bookkeeping; practical nursing.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, both this bill and Mayor Francis, in his brochure, raise the question of payments of unemployment compensation during vocational training. This proposed change in the unemployment compensation pattern would affect the laws of all the States, and in itself is in the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee, which today spent most of the time working on a bill in this area.

To summarize my point of view on these training sections, I believe they contain the only really worthwhile ideas in the bill. They deserve and require greater study, in which the States have every right to participate. I think the vocational training proposals in this bill, while worthy in objective, are premature, inadequately conceived, and beyond the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee. If the bill is passed, I hope implementations of these sections can be held up, pending completion of a full study, full consultation with the States, and the introduction of new bills which can be handled by the appropriate committees.

Mr. President, as the final part of this statement against the bill I wish to comment on several miscellaneous proposals it contains.

The bill provides for direct Treasury borrowing up to $300 million.

We have already been over that road. I join Senator ROBERTSON in believing it is unsound in principle. I am sorry that Senator ROBERTSON's amendment was not adopted.

Second. Mr. President, in my opinion the criteria are too general and the power of the administrator too great to avoid political pressures and inevitable political favoritism.

Third. Subsection 5(d) is so general that, under it, the whole United States could be designated as a redevelopment area. I know that is unlikely; but the discussion in the hearings gave evidence that the proponents of the bill were thinking in terms of vast multi-State regions which contain many prosperous communities which could become, by definition, redevelopment areas. This section is simply an amplified restatement of subsection 5(b), which virtually gives the administration even greater right to open the door wide.

Fourth. By including the words "or commercial" on line 22 of subsection 6(a), we abandoned any practical limitation on the use to which the money available under the bill might be put.

Fifth. Mr. President, with a bow to my friend the Senator from Connecticut, I state that in my opinion the anti-pirating language is better than in the original version, but there are no specific penalties that apply here, and it is still unenforcible.

Sixth. The position of the Federal Government as a creditor, as set forth in subsection 6(b) 9(D), is better than it was before the Banking Committee wrestled with it, but it is still very weak, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] pointed out earlier this after-

noon. Uncle Sam may well end up owning a lot of secondhand empty buildings in so-called distressed areas.

Sections 14 and 15, dealing with urban renewal and urban planning grants, make this bill a strange hybrid. I do not think any member of the committee will claim to understand these sections thoroughly. To me, these sections seem to be an attempt to use the benefits under this bill to augment those available under the urban renewal program, and provide funds to those who acquire property for private commercial or industrial development under that program. This is even a greater privilege than is available in the commercial and industrial factory loan programs, where money can only be used for buildings and machinery. So far as I know, there was no testimony on these sections in the hearings and I hope they will be taken out of this bill and considered when we discuss the urban renewal program in connection with housing legislation.

I realize that is not going to be done, but I think this section of the bill should have been handled in that way.

Section 21 puts in the traditional Davis-Bacon feature, which will make it impractical, if not impossible, to use the local unemployed to help build the buildings that are supposed later to bring jobs into the community. The great "untouchable" factor in this whole problem of chronic and persistent unemployment is the role of the policies of organized labor in creating and maintaining this sad condition. I hope the new Secretary of Labor will face up to this realistically in his work with the new advisory committee on unemployment.

To summarize, to me, this is a bad bill—bad because it raises hopes that cannot be realized; bad because it ignores the real causes of trouble at the local level; bad because most of its proposed solutions duplicate existing programs; and bad because it injects the Federal Government into competition with the States, the communities, and with private citizens. The only feature of the bill which does not produce competition or overlapping is the training feature. This feature offers real hope, and I support it, but it needs more careful development through cooperation with State and Federal agencies and with committees of Congress having appropriate jurisdiction. I think this should be handled in a separate bill.

I recognize that the bill has a lot of steam behind it developed by both official administrative policy and by surcharged emotion. But the only jobs we can really count on this bill to create are in the new agency it sets up in the Department of Commerce.

In conclusion, I should like to read a brief editorial from the Wall Street Journal of March 7, 1961, which illustrates the underlying fallacy of this type of legislation:

The Census Bureau has reported that Peacock, Tex., and Eureka and Ophir, Colo., all have one thing in common: A population of zero.

These villages were turned into ghost towns when the local economic mainstay—either mine or mill—was closed down. There was no more work so everybody just packed up and left.

Well, here would seem to be a perfect case for Federal aid to depressed areas. What, after all, could be more depressed than a town without people? One might say that in such a place the standard of living had hit an all-time low.

But it needn't have turned out this way. If the former residents of these hard-hit communities had been resourceful enough to call for help from Washington instead of seeking their own new frontiers, they might still be living in Peacock, Eureka, and Ophir.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point my individual views from pages 50 through 59 of the committee report. This material backs up the statements I have made.

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

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF MR. BENNETT

I do not deny the existence of serious chronic unemployment in certain areas, but I am opposed to S. 1. I have taken this position after a careful study of the hearings and of other materials relating to this problem. I am convinced that this bill is fundamentally wrong in its approach. Briefly, I am opposed to this bill because—

(1) Nothing in this bill will create new jobs. It can only hope to influence the decision to locate jobs in a particular community.

(2) The problem can be met more effectively under existing programs.

(3) This program, if adopted, will not be successful.

A. The economic inducement is too small.

B. Other factors are more appealing.

(4) This program is discriminatory and impractical.

(5) This bill threatens our free enterprise system.

1. THIS BILL WILL NOT CREATE NEW JOBS

Empty buildings will not create job opportunities. If so, why are there often both unemployed workers and empty buildings existing together in the same depressed communities? For example, the Massachusetts Department of Commerce reports the following manufacturing space available for sale or lease in areas now listed by the Labor Department as depressed:

	Square feet
Fall River	2,124,035
Lowell	2,066,483
New Bedford	1,370,056
North Adams	286,029

Though it is true that empty building space is an evidence of depressed conditions, it cannot by the same token be argued that providing buildings will create jobs. The empty buildings in these Massachusetts communities are not creating jobs.

Proponents of this legislation might argue that it is new buildings businessmen want, not old buildings. Yet even available new buildings may not attract business. For example, in the following surplus labor communities in Kentucky, relatively new buildings are presently available:

	Square feet
Paducah (built in 1957)	100,000
Paintsville (built in 1950)	23,000

The following Pennsylvania surplus labor markets have available recently constructed shell buildings, built on speculation:

	Square feet
Erie	20,000
Scranton	100,000
Altoona	50,000
Wilkes-Barre	50,000
Hazleton	60,000

The essence of the major provision of this bill is to provide buildings for commercial and industrial enterprises at subsidized Federal financing rates. The view that this will automatically create jobs is either naive, dishonest, or both. Job opportunities are created by the ingenuity of men and the natural growth in our economy.

The late Joseph Schumpeter, in recent years one of Harvard's most famous economists, discussed in his famous book, "The Theory of Economic Developments," that the underlying cause of broad economic growth in a society and with it job creation, is the ability to bring about innovation and technological change in products, services, and methods of production. Schumpeter took a broad view of our society, but his ideas also have specific application to the concept of job creation.

Regardless of the availability of plant sites, additional people will not be employed unless there are new ideas, new products, new markets, and entrepreneurs who are willing to risk their own personal capital and time and reputation, and that of others, in order to capitalize on these new ideas. Only then will men be hired to apply these new developments. The other alternative to new private job creation comes through normal growth in our population and from the opening up of new markets either at home or abroad.

Assuming that the basic essential conditions are present to create new jobs (and this bill will not provide these), the subsequent prerequisite to make this bill work is to encourage entrepreneurs to locate their operations in particular depressed communities. Can the bill accomplish even this task? In my opinion it cannot, and the reasons for this opinion will become clear in the material that follows.

2. THE PROBLEM CAN BE MET MORE EFFECTIVELY UNDER EXISTING PROGRAMS

Local area development already a vigorous activity: There are currently more than 14,000 State and local public and private agencies and committees engaged in the business of attracting industry to specific localities. In addition, 111 Federal programs render services to aid local economic development. In the hearings on S. 1, I inserted in the record material developed by the Committee for Economic Development in a publication entitled "Developing the 'Little' Economies," which represented a survey of these area development programs now in operation in the United States. I will not burden the report with all of these, but, as examples, included in the list are the following:

	Number of development organizations
Publicly financed programs:	
State planning and development agencies	54
State-supported industrial financing authorities	4
Municipal and county development agencies	299
University bureaus of business research, etc., that have worked in economic development	212
Privately financed programs:	
Railroads conducting area development activities	83
Electric and gas utilities conducting area development activities	330
Banks conducting area development activities	144
Local chambers of commerce and boards of trade	4,842
Local industrial development groups	867
Community development corporations	1,952

	Number of development organizations
Privately financed programs—Con.	
State chambers of commerce	35
Area development associations	135
Private consulting firms and research organizations that have worked on subnational economic development problems	299
All others	4,980
Total, excluding Federal Government	14,125
Federal Government: U.S. Government programs affecting local economic development	111

In 1957, a total of $220 million was spent for area development efforts by the above-listed groups. Of this amount, 59 percent, or $130 million went specifically for industrial development. The objective of these expenditures was to attract new industry to individual communities.

The operations represented by these development groups are intended to get at the heart of the problem by attracting job-making business to a locality. These groups understand the strengths and weaknesses of their communities. They know how to capitalize on these strengths and at the same time are best equipped to solve their weaknesses. The Federal Government can certainly not improve, through the provisions of S. 1, on the good work of these development agencies.

Federal programs now operating to aid local industrial development effort: As already noted, there are presently 111 Federal programs which offer services to aid local development. For example, in the 85th Congress we passed the Small Business Investment Act, which provides for loans based upon private judgment with a minimum of interference from the Small Business Administration. Section 502 of that act authorizes the SBA to make loans to State and local development companies for use in assisting and attracting new business. These loans may be made for plant construction, conversion, or expansion and the construction of commercial establishments. It is true these loans are made to small business concerns throughout the Nation without regard to whether they are located in depressed areas. But by the same token such areas are not denied these funds.

With respect to the loan programs for rural areas, outlined in section 5(b) of S. 1, in the Department of Agriculture (in cooperation with other Government departments and agencies) the rural development program is designed to promote and encourage the economic development of low-income counties. The program operates through the coordinated efforts of the Department of Agriculture and other departments and agencies in the Government. The activities of the program are directed toward providing leadership and guidance to the local communities in solving their own individual problems. The Executive order setting up this program stated that the end in view is "to provide maximum State, local, and private participation and initiative in identifying and meeting local needs."

It is true that this program does not provide for Federal loans. But if lack of money is a problem, there are several existing possible sources for making financial arrangements.

Also I would like to emphasize that each community has a different problem, and a general Federal lending program aimed at a specific type of inducement cannot have equal application in each area. Lack of money is often not the chief difficulty faced by localities. Instead, each community must be analyzed individually for its strengths and weaknesses and needs.

Section 7 of the bill provides for loans for community facilities such as sewer projects, water treatment, and other public needs. There is absolutely no need for this provision of the bill because these exact same types of loans are made by the existing Community Facilities Administration within the HHFA. There is nothing new in the context of this bill which cannot be done by the present community facility program.

The bill does state that such community facilities loans and grants shall be designed to "improve the opportunities in such areas for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities." But there is nothing under the present program which prohibits community facility loans or grants for exactly this same purpose. Even without the enactment of S. 1, every unit mentioned therein, with the exception of a private organization, can obtain a loan for the construction of public facilities under 42 U.S.C. 1492 through the Community Facilities Administration. The proposed program, therefore, would be a direct duplication of a current Government program.

Section 8 of S. 1 provides for grants for financing community facility projects. This may not duplicate the current law which limits grants for urban planning and for advanced planning of public works, rather than for financing actual construction of the project. But again, loans are available under section 7 of S. 1 for this purpose.

Private capital is available: Based on a brief analysis that I have made I can discover no inability to raise money by bonding for public facilities in depressed areas; nor has any real shortage of private capital to finance buildings, or to encourage industries to locate in depressed areas, been demonstrated by any testimony at the hearings.

I am listing below a sampling of a few public facility bond issues which have been made within the last 3 months in depressed areas, all of which were below the 4⅛-percent rate at which Federal money would be made available under the bill for these same programs. There are undoubtedly many other issues which have been made in depressed areas in recent months. This represents only a quick survey:

City	Date	Purpose	Amount	Maturities	Net interest cost
					Percent
Evansville, Ind	Jan. 24, 1961	Waterwork district	$2,400,000	13½-year average	2.9916
New Bedford, Mass	Nov. 10, 1960	Water bonds	160,000	1961–66	2.50
Detroit, Mich	Dec. 6, 1960	General public improvement.	1,280,000	1963–85	3.53
Do	do	Public lighting	1,250,000	do	3.53
Do	do	Sewer	3,000,000	do	3.52
Port Huron, Mich	Oct. 31, 1960	Various purposes	765,000	1961–70	2.89
Johnstown, Pa	Feb. 16, 1961	Municipal authority sewer (revenue).	5,000,000	1963–86	3.9748
Uniontown, Pa	Nov. 1, 1960		100,000	1963–82	3.82
Providence, R.I	Feb. 15, 1961	Redevelopment	5,000,000	13½-year average	3.28
Do	do	Public works	900,000	10½-year average	3.28
South Charleston, W. Va	Feb. 16, 1961	Sewer revenue	8,000,000	1962–2001	3.674

Private capital for industrial or commercial building facilities can be drawn from many sources. The hearings failed to show that any community could not raise necessary capital when it had a real prospect. I am particularly impressed with what can be done with revenue bonds issued to finance industrial or commercial buildings to be leased to industry. At present, 15 States have laws permitting such issues. I have reliable information that insurance companies are anxious to invest in these revenue bonds. These issues can be made at rates comparable to what the Federal Government would charge under this bill, and these issues have the advantage of being tax exempt.

3. THIS PROGRAM, IF ADOPTED, WILL NOT BE SUCCESSFUL

This bill seeks to entice industry to locate in depressed communities by offering Federal financing for buildings at subsidized rates to private companies or development groups. This is its chief inducement: reduced rent. Just how important is this inducement?

A. The economic inducement is too small

The cost of building occupancy for manufacturing concerns averages about 3 percent of the total cost of production. This includes direct rental payments, depreciation on buildings which are owned, taxes on the building, interest payments on debt, and repair and maintenance expenditures. These estimates were developed from corporation income tax returns for fiscal years 1958 and 1959 as summarized by the Treasury Department in its Statistics of Income.

Since this bill would offer no aid for taxes or routine maintenance and repairs, we can eliminate these items, and consider only the total annual cost of a manufacturing building which, taken alone, averages no more than 2 percent of the total cost of production. From another point of view, we may consider that the benefit of this bill is in the financing of such buildings and not in the actual cost of the building itself. How important is this?

The Federal money provided by the bill would be available at rates currently in effect on long-term Government bonds at the equivalent maturity plus one-half of 1 percent. This would be about 4⅜ percent. Private money can be borrowed at least at the rate of 6½ percent. This means that the Federal loans would be at rates one-third less than private rates.

Even if we assume that financing costs over the life of an industrial mortgage equal 100 percent of the original building cost, the inducement is still extremely small. Take the 2-percent figure, which represents the actual building costs and assume this to be the financing cost. Now we divide that by 3 to represent a one-third reduction in financing costs, and we arrive at the final inducement under the bill. We find that the inducement is a net reduction in the costs of production of less than 1 percent, or, to be precise, 0.67 percent.

B. Other factors are more appealing

If we now compare the value of this financial inducement with the appeal of other factors which attract industry to an area, the weakness of this small ratio becomes even more obvious.

In the course of the hearings on S. 1, I asked every State development agency, or equivalent group, organized to attract industry in the respective States, to list in the general order of importance the factors which they consider are effective in attracting business to their State.

I received 47 replies. Of the 47, 4 placed the cost of rent or building occupancy in the middle of the list. Only one placed it as high as fourth. The remaining 42 replies placed cost of rent or building occupancy at or near the bottom of the list and added the comment that this was of lesser importance in comparison with other more vital factors.

It is obvious that the order of the list of factors would vary from business to business and from area to area. But, in general, the following are the factors which command the greatest attention, graded roughly according to priorities given to them by the State development agencies:

1. Markets.
2. Trained and adequate labor force.
3. Availability of raw materials.
4. Good transportation facilities and connections.
5. Low-cost fuel and power.
6. Adequate water.
7. Favorable business "climate" including both Government regulation and worker attitudes.
8. Fair tax structure.
9. Available buildings or good building sites.
10. Adequate financial sources.

The last item—availability of capital—does not necessarily mean at subsidized rates.

Most of the money provided by the bill would go for "windfall" payments: Even the stanchest advocates of this bill admit that the interest advantage for plant construction is not going to be the major factor in determining where a plant is located. Therefore, one fact is readily apparent—of the new plants which go into a depressed area, even if the bill does what it is supposed to do, only a few of those plants will go there because of the Federal interest subsidy. The rest would have gone there anyway—because of the advantages the area has for their industry.

What the percentage would be is anybody's guess. I would think that even assuming a most optimistic claim, only 1 out of every 10 could be said to have located because of the subsidy. But the other nine would qualify for the subsidy, even though it did not influence their decision.

Thus, in perhaps 90 percent of all cases, the Federal money would be nothing but a pure windfall to companies which were going to locate in those areas anyway. In these cases, the taxpayer—and the depressed area—get absolutely no return for this money. Thus, the effective amount of money we have to work with is not $200 million of Federal money for the urban and rural industrial and commercial programs but one-tenth of that, or $20 million. The rest is down the drain.

No matter how much financial inducement the Federal Government offers—even if the Federal Government offered not only to aid the financing of a building, but actually to pay the entire cost of a building and offered it to a company free—I am convinced that the other factors which I have listed would still loom more important in the businessman's eye. Only if all the others of the above factors were equal would his choice of location be significantly influenced by a Federal financial subsidy for building rent.

Even the Federal Government tends to be choosy in locating its operations. The question might be raised as to why the Federal Government did not establish a defense installation at Beckley, W. Va., or Altoona, Pa., both distressed areas. Could it be that there are more important factors to influence such locations than the fact that there is an available surplus labor force in these areas?

If the Federal Government gets into this industrial location business, it will find itself in competition with States and localities offering not only reduced rent, but tax advantages and other special inducements. Without going into the merits of such inducements, it would seem that these far outweigh any financing inducement this bill could offer. In fact, the question might simply be raised, Can the Federal Government under this bill do as much to attract industry as State governments, local governments, and local chambers of commerce and development agencies are already doing?

To the extent the bill seeks to provide commercial and industrial buildings for rural areas, as outlined in sections 5(b) and 6 of S. 1, the same criticisms apply.

4. THE LEGISLATION IS DISCRIMINATORY AND IMPRACTICAL

Just how far will the Federal money go under this legislation? Is there not a serious discrimination in favor of a few unemployed?

Testimony was given in the hearings that it requires an investment of approximately $15,000, on the average, to support one job in manufacturing. This is an average of all industries. I am aware that many jobs can be supported on a relatively small investment, but there are others that take huge investments and I have taken the average.

If we take just the urban depressed areas, of which there are 20 major areas and 83 minor areas currently qualifying under the bill, and a total unemployment of approximately 648,000, we can see just how small a part this legislation would play in reemploying these people, even, if all other arguments were laid aside and we assumed that this bill would put people back to work.

The bill provides $100 million for urban depressed areas. In manufacturing, the actual investment in buildings is 25 percent, on an average, of the total investment. (This is separate and apart from the cost of production, discussed above.) The latter includes labor costs, the cost of raw materials, etc. This bill will aid only in the investment in buildings. Thus, 25 percent of $15,000 required to support one job is a little less than $4,000. If we call it $4,000, and observe that the Federal Government will provide 65 percent of this amount, or $2,600, and divide this into $100 million, this bill would create a job potential of 38,500 workers in the urban depressed areas.

Assuming all other factors were favorable, and assuming that State and local groups would furnish the remaining 35 percent of the $4,000 necessary for investment in buildings, and also assuming that the businessman loan applicant would be willing to take care of the other three-fourths of the investment needs for machinery, equipment, inventories, and miscellaneous investment items, and also would be willing to assume the risks of the business, how much aid would this bill give?

Relating 38,500 workers to approximately 650,000 unemployed in depressed cities, we discover that only 1 out of every 17 unemployed persons in these areas could expect to be benefited by this bill. Thus, we are discriminating against 16 out of every 17 unemployed in these areas.

But this is not all of the discrimination. The approximately 650,000 unemployed in depressed areas represent only 1 out of 8 of our total unemployed in the Nation. Thus, the bill holds out hopes for only 1 out of every 136 unemployed persons in the United States, assuming all other factors were completely favorable. We can now begin to see the false hopes which will result from this bill.

If we were to cast aside all of these practical considerations and attempt to overcome this discrimination argument by spending enough Federal money to put all of the unemployed back to work (again assuming that merely building plant facilities would do the job, and assuming we make no allowance for frictional unemployment) it would cost on the basis of $15,000 per job, a total of $10 billion, of which the Federal Government would be responsible for $6.5 billion to put only the 650,000 workers in urban depressed areas back to work, and a total of $81 billion, for which Federal responsibility would be $53 billion, to put all of our 5.4 million unemployed back to work, assuming that were our ultimate goal. Of course, it is foolish to even think that our Federal budget could stand such a strain.

Besides, when we relate what this bill proposes to do with what private capital is already doing, we can again categorize this approach as being a little "drop in the bucket." For example, in 1958, the last year for which a full survey was taken, manufacturing concerns spent $9 billion in new plants and equipment, and all nonagricultural business spent $29 billion in new plants and equipment. Of this, $6 billion represented new plant investment. If we take the Federal cost of the urban and rural loan programs, totaling $200 million, and relate this to what private business spent in the recession year of 1958 for new plants, we find that private investors spent 30 times as much in 1 recession year for new buildings as this bill proposes to spend over a 2- or 3-year period. If we include private expenditures for machinery and equipment, as well as for buildings, private expenditures during the 1 year, 1958, exceed the proposal of this bill by 145 times.

To examine these private expenditures in the light of the maximum apportionment of funds which certain depressed area States might expect under this bill is to cast further doubts as to the practicality of this approach. If we relate total unemployment in the major and minor urban areas of each State qualifying for aid under this bill to the U.S. total of 648,400 unemployed in all such areas, and distribute funds on that basis, some of the more severely hit States could expect to receive amounts shown in the following tabulation. Also shown are private expenditures for manufacturing plant and equipment and estimated expenditures for all plant and equipment in the recession year 1958:

[In millions]

State	Potential apportionment under S. 1 [1]	Private 1958 capital expenditures for manufacturers only	Private 1958 estimated expenditures for all plant and equipment
Kentucky	$4.1	$110	$356
Massachusetts	2.4	275	729
Michigan	18.3	439	1,422
Pennsylvania	34.9	788	2,553
West Virginia	10.1	164	531

[1] For the urban industrial areas.

5. THE BILL THREATENS OUR FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Finally, assuming that a need could be proven, and assuming this approach were practical, which has not been demonstrated, the approach under this bill would still be undesirable in our free competitive society.

A basic defect of the approach of this bill is that it runs counter to the precepts of what is still essentially a private market mechanism, operating within a dynamic and growing economy.

The strength of the United States to a great degree is attributable to the fluidity of its resources among areas that can use them most efficiently. Unlike the economies of other continents, the economy of the United States has been able to distribute its resources into their most efficient uses without regard to State boundaries or regional areas. This has always been an essential strength of our political system—that it permitted these adjustments. And

this bill would threaten to destroy that adjustment mechanism within our system.

Our economy has grown strong because throughout our history the location of industrial establishments has been related to the basic economic considerations involved—good markets, availability of transportation, the labor supply, the accessibility to raw materials in the area, and the existence of a healthy business climate, etc. To substitute an artificially created, Government-sponsored program to induce industries to locate in areas which are intrinsically unsuited for them, and when these areas are unable to compete on purely economic grounds, is to throw a monkey wrench into the economic machine.

Once Congress establishes the principle that the Federal Government should direct industrial expansion into selected areas, there will be powerful political pressures to fulfill the commitment to these areas.

If initial plant-location inducements do not prove adequate to carry out the commitment, greater inducements will undoubtedly be proposed to Congress. And political pressures to provide them may well be irresistible.

The time to stop a surge of Federal intervention in the field of plant location is before the principle of Federal intervention is established—not after it is established.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In summary, S. 1 will not do the jobs its authors intended.

1. Nothing in this bill will create new jobs. It can only hope to influence the decision to locate jobs in a particular community.

2. The problem can be met more effectively under existing programs.

3. This program, if adopted, will not be successful because (a) the economic inducement is too small and (b) other factors are more appealing.

4. This program is discriminatory and impractical.

5. This bill threatens our free enterprise system.

The problem in each community is individual and different and grows out of a variety of factors which businessmen will consider in deciding whether or not to locate in a specific area. The businessman is interested in the factors I have already listed. Simply to concentrate on the availability of buildings or the financing of those buildings, or on community facilities (aid for which is available in other programs) is to strain at a gnat. There are many more important factors to consider. A Federal subsidy to finance a new building or a community facility, which can very likely be provided through local efforts, is a very unimportant contribution, and will not solve the problem.

It is more important to look at the specific problems of the industry whose failure created the depressed area. And this would call for an individual analysis which can be very adequately handled by local and State organizations or the Office of Area Development of the Department of Commerce, or in the case of rural areas, by the rural development program sponsored by the Department of Agriculture. These Government groups, and those engaged in local area development, can give better hope of finding tailored solutions to the particular problems that created unemployment in the first place. This, in the final analysis, is what will give rise to new employment opportunities in depressed areas.

S. 1 will not solve our problems, and I urge the Congress to reject this legislation.

WALLACE F. BENNETT.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I should like to return now to the amendment whose introduction gave me this right to the floor. On page 43, line 1, are these words:

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 section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to which the President has reported to the Congress under section 4(a) or 7(c) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, and meeting the standards of unemployment set forth in this section shall be entitled on application to special consideration by the Administrator for designation as a redevelopment area.

My reasons for suggesting that this language be removed from the bill include three points of view.

First, many of the industries that have been adversely affected through reduction of trade barriers under the act are very much afraid that now they are going to be told, "we are not going to worry about your trade problems any more; you are going to get special consideration under the depressed areas bill." They are afraid their real problems will be swept under the rug, and that this provision will be offered as a sop, instead of a solution, which could, in fact, increase, rather than decrease, their problems.

They are also afraid that, if the bill becomes law, the Tariff Commission will be in a position to say, "Well, in a borderline case, or a case where the decision is close, let us not worry about them. They can get help under the Area Redevelopment Act."

My next objection to the language is that it establishes another program of discrimination. It provides, for instance, that areas in West Virginia which have problems concerning the coal industry are going to take second place to areas somewhere else because the latter areas have problems created by the lead-zinc trade, as is the case in my State, which problems were created by our tariff and trade policies.

Mr. President, as I said earlier, I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. I shall be satisfied with a voice vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a letter from the National Wool Growers Association directed to me, dated February 27, 1961.

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

NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Salt Lake City, Utah,
February 27, 1961.

DEAR WALLACE: I am writing to you with regard to section 5(a) of the area redevelopment bill (S. 1). This section provides special consideration in area redevelopment assistance to those areas in which employment is adversely affected through closing of industries by import competition caused by reductions in our tariffs.

We are deeply concerned with the philosophy set forth in this section. It is a surrender to the idea that tariffs should be cut regardless of whether they put domestic industries out of business so long as the people thrown out of work by such liquidation are rehabilitated and trained to do some other kind of work.

Our particular concern is for our domestic woolen mills. Imports of woolen fabrics from low-wage countries such as Japan and Italy, as you know, are flooding our markets. In fact, the annual volume of wool fabric imports is over 10 times what it was prior to tariff reductions in 1948 and the volume continues to grow. Many of our woolen mills have gone out of business largely because of imports. If the remainder are liquidated, there will be no customers left for wool grown by our domestic producers. We have no other market.

The Trade Agreements Act contains provisions under the escape clause for protection of domestic industries from the devastating effects of foreign competition caused by tariff reductions. The apparent intent of this section of the bill is to replace the positive protective measure of the Trade Agreements Act with Government assistance to areas adversely affected by unrestricted imports. We are unalterably opposed to this principle and would appreciate your assistance in having it deleted from the bill.

Yours sincerely,
EDWIN E. MARSH, *Executive Secretary.*

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, unless there are questions, I am happy to yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, will he yield for a question?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wonder if the Senator will agree that there are areas in our country where industries have been adversely affected by international trade policies.

Mr. BENNETT. There are many in my State, and I am sure there are many in the State of New Jersey, from which the Senator comes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Will the Senator agree, in view of the fact that the adverse effect is the direct result of a national policy, our Federal Government should show an interest and a concern and try to find ways to relieve the distress?

Mr. BENNETT. But the proposal furnishes only an alleviation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am not referring specifically to this measure, but is such an effort on the part of the Federal Government proper?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah has introduced more bills than he can remember to try to relieve problems of distressed industries in his State which have been adversely affected by trade policies, and I am sure the Senator from New Jersey has introduced bills relating to such problems in his own State.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I should like to offer one statement to the proposal to delete this section of the bill, as one of the authors. This part of the bill would not be, according to my thinking, the final answer to trade impacted areas. It is not a final answer, and we know it. Those of us who have been working to find relief for our impacted industrial areas are not going to pause a bit if this section is maintained in the bill, but will find other ways, independent of this means alone, to try to bring relief to trade impacted areas.

Mr. BENNETT. I am sure the Senator will be working to that end, but I am not quite sure other Senators who have no such problems in their States

will be impressed. I am sure some of them would say, "Let them take care of their problems under the distressed areas bill."

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator for his analysis of the bill. I agree with him, and I expect to vote for the amendment. I voted for a number of substitutes, not because I accepted them as sound solutions, or even suitable solutions, but because they were the lesser of the evils before us. The distinguished Senator is to be commended for the position he has taken.

Mr. BENNETT. I appreciate the kind remarks of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, I am happy to yield the floor.

Mr. BUSH and Mr. JAVITS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. I was about to make a statement with reference to the amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, may I yield for that purpose, without losing the floor?

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I merely wished to follow up what my colleague from New Jersey has said about the particular amendment to which the distinguished Senator from Utah referred. To me, the amendment would represent a real loss in the bill and a great deprivation in terms of effectiveness in trying to reach a solution of a problem which is of grave moment to the country and to our international policy.

I hope very much that the Senate will reject the amendment, notwithstanding my affection and regard for my colleague from Utah.

The national interest demands an expanding trade policy. On the other hand, local interests demand some concern about what imports we must allow if we are to have an expanding trade policy. To various sections of the country this is an overriding consideration in terms of the Nation, which entitles people who are hurt by a national policy to be given help from the Nation. It so directly involves the distressed area concept that I feel strongly that such a provision belongs in the bill.

I wished to make my position clear, and I thank my colleague. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, is time controlled?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, may we have a vote on my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time is controlled.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I shall be happy to yield the floor, so that the Senate may vote on the amendment, and then make my remarks. Would the acting majority leader prefer to have me do so?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should appreciate that very much.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield the floor with the understanding that I shall make my remarks after the vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope very much that the amendment of the Senator from Utah will be rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to keep the record straight, I ask unanimous consent that after the vote is taken on the Bennett amendment to the committee amendment the distinguished Senator from Connecticut may be recognized for 5 minutes, and I will accord him that time from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am happy to yield back my remaining time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I shall vote for S. 1 with some misgivings and in the hope that it can be further improved before it completes the legislative process in the Congress.

As stated in my individual views filed with the committee report, I have grave reservations about the ability of S. 1 to do the things expected of it by the unemployed and by others who have the misfortune to live in the so-called depressed areas of the Nation.

Despite my misgivings, I am willing to try out this program for a limited time on an experimental basis because of my concern for the families who have not shared in the general prosperity enjoyed by the great majority of the people of the United States, and who find themselves destitute as a result of prolonged unemployment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my individual views may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR BUSH

S. 1, as amended by the Committee on Banking and Currency, has been substantially improved from its original version and from previous bills of this kind which have been considered in former years.

THE "INDUSTRY PIRATING" PROBLEM

A major defect has been eliminated by the inclusion of strong, effective language to meet the problem of "industry pirating." Amendments drafted by myself and the junior Senator from Maine, Mr. MUSKIE, and accepted unanimously by the committee, flatly prohibit, without qualification, the use of Federal funds to assist the relocation of a business enterprise from one area to another. They permit such assistance to businesses for purposes of expansion, or for the establishment of a new branch plant, affiliate, or subsidiary only if such assistance will not adversely affect employment in the area of original location. The committee report clearly states an intent to have the Bush-Muskie "antipirating" amendments strictly construed, and cautions the Administrator to guard against any attempts at evasion of their purpose.

GOOD FEATURES OF THE BILL

There are good features which I favor in S. 1. The special provisions for redevelopment areas in the urban renewal section of the bill are commendable. The sections providing for occupational training and retraining, and for retraining subsistence payments, may ultimately prove to be the most valuable aids made available to those who have the misfortune to live in areas of chronic, high unemployment. The loan funds—$200 million for industrial and commercial projects in redevelopment areas designated under section 5 (a) and (b), and $100 million for public facility loans in such areas—have been established with welcome recognition of the general rule that the United States should not lend money at less than it costs the Treasury to borrow it.

S. 1 is in need of further corrective amendments.

RURAL AREAS

Perhaps the most glaring need is in the definition of so-called rural areas eligible for designation as "redevelopment areas" under section 5(b). As introduced, the criteria for designation virtually guaranteed an overconcentration of such areas in one section of the country. The committee adopted an amendment, offered by the junior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. PROXMIRE, which was intended to meet this problem, but fails to fully do so. The Proxmire amendment would require the Administrator to "endeavor to distribute the [redevelopment] projects widely among the several States, so far as is feasible and proper * * *." Under this broad language, no Senator can be assured that at least one such project will be located in a depressed rural area of his own State.

The committee has ignored the fact that even in highly industrialized States there may be depressed rural areas in need of the assistance contemplated by this bill. Such areas may be overlooked because their populations are included in "labor market areas," designated by the Department of Labor, which are ineligible for assistance under either section 5(a) or section 5(b). Yet the farm population of such areas may be in real need of assistance.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT—RURAL AREAS

I have prepared amendments intended to remedy these deficiencies. They would provide that at least one project shall be located in every State in which the Governor thereof certifies to the Administrator a need for such project. Additionally, they would require consideration of the extent to which demonstration "rural development" projects have previously been located in various areas of the United States by the Department of Agriculture, in the formulation of standards for designation of "redevelopment areas" under this subsection.

OTHER NEEDED AMENDMENTS

I share the concern expressed by the senior Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS, about the wisdom of making machinery and equipment eligible for loans under the bill, and the concern of the senior Senator from Utah, Mr. BENNETT, because of what appears to be an intent to substitute a foot-in-the-door trade adjustment palliative for the peril point and escape clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Act. I will support corrective amendments which I understand they intend to propose.

Additionally, I shall support the recommendations of President Kennedy that administration of the proposed program be

placed under the Secretary of Commerce, and that it be financed by appropriations rather than by direct borrowings from the Treasury. Why the New Frontiersmen of our committee have so summarily rejected the counsel of their Chief is beyond my comprehension.

CONCLUSION

Finally, I express grave reservations about the ability of the program contemplated in S. 1 to do the things expected of it by the unemployed and others who live in so-called depressed areas of the Nation. The widespread publicity given S. 1 and its predecessor bills and extravagant statements made by some of the backers of these bills, have aroused false hopes in these unfortunate people that a miracle is about to come to pass. Once S. 1 is enacted, they believe prosperity for their areas is ensured, and their troubles are over. A day of disillusionment is bound to come. It will take months to get the program underway. A relatively few among all the areas which expect it will receive assistance under the bill, and what assistance is given may well prove ineffective in many areas.

This is an experimental program, and should be regarded as such. It must be carefully watched by the Congress, and terminated promptly if the experiment fails. For this reason, I favor a limitation of the authority granted under the bill to a 2-year experimental period, and intend to offer such an amendment on the floor.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, S. 1 has been substantially improved by amendments adopted in committee and on the floor of the Senate.

We have included an effective anti-pirating provision which was essential to protect the jobs of workers in Connecticut and in other highly industrialized States against the use of Federal funds to relocate to other States the factories which give them employment.

We have given administration of the proposed program to the Secretary of Commerce, instead of expanding the bureaucracy by creation of a new, independent agency.

We have placed a definite termination date in the bill, insuring a close congressional review after a reasonable period in which the experimental program can prove whether it is a success or failure.

We have made it clear that the Senate desires that demonstration rural development projects be distributed widely among the several States rather than being concentrated in limited areas.

The bill remains in need of further amendment, but it has been sufficiently improved to warrant my vote in support of sending it to the other body. I hope the remaining defects in the bill can then be removed, and that we will be able to go forward on a sound basis with the limited, experimental program for assistance to distressed areas it will provide.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield some time to me from the time on the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending bill.

Six years ago I took office as Governor of the State of Maine. Maine was at that time suffering from a recession. Our textile mills had been in trouble, and some had closed. Unemployment dogged other areas of the State. The major task of my first administration as Governor was to mobilize the resources of State Government to help communities help themselves. We reorganized our department of economic development and made a determined effort to attract new industry to our State. We gave assistance to communities endeavoring to rebuild themselves to provide an attractive climate for economic growth. Later we established the Maine Industrial Building Authority to provide capital for the construction of new plants and facilities.

Much of this work has been successful. We have been rewarded by new industries and new jobs. But in spite of this, Maine is still in trouble in unemployment and underemployment. Unless we use the additional resources of the Federal Government, acting for the Nation, we will condemn these communities to painful years of readjustment. There may be those who consider such hardship good for the character of those who struggle against adversity. I disagree. There is nothing to strengthen the character in hungry children, fathers without jobs, plants without tenants, communities without adequate tax revenues. There is nothing of the American dream in areas where the investment of a lifetime of work is swept away by conditions beyond the control of those involved while others stand by in comfortable apathy.

Consider the plight of cities like Lewiston and Auburn, Maine, once buzzing centers of textile manufacturing. Today over 7 percent of the labor force in these twin cities is unemployed—this in an area where one of the most aggressive economic development efforts has been carried out. These efforts have paid off in terms of 1,300 new jobs during the last 5 years. But at the same time, 2,800 jobs have been lost—1,900 of them in textiles. There has been a net loss of 1,500 jobs in half a decade.

The State of Maine has serious economic problems, despite its great natural resources, the skill of its workers, and the efforts of its citizens. At the end of the year our rate of unemployment was 10.3 percent, the ninth highest in the country. As a seasoned observer wrote me recently:

The economic situation in this area has been dubbed with many fancy names, but from where I sit it has all the earmarks of a full-fledged recession.

At the present time we have three areas qualifying for assistance under the provisions of the area redevelopment bill: Lewiston-Auburn, as I have mentioned, has an unemployment rate of 7.6 percent; Biddeford-Saco-Sanford's rate of unemployment is 8.8 percent; Calais-Eastport, our most distressed area, has an unemployment rate of 25.4 percent. Within the last 3 years it has ranged as high as 38 percent. In addition, the Portland area, which includes our largest city, has an unemployment rate of 6.2 percent.

Obviously, these communities need help. The area redevelopment bill would provide the tools and the resources of the country to aid these distressed areas.

Some of my colleagues have raised objections to this proposed legislation. I am sure the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization has answered most of the questions. I wish to make several observations on specific points.

The bill provides no magic answers. It contains no panaceas. It guarantees nothing by way of results in any specific community or area. Its purpose is to provide tools for the use of local people, local initiative, and local ingenuity in redeveloping the economic resources of their communities. There is no suggestion that prosperity can be created by law, or that jobs can be brought into existence by a stroke of the legislative pen.

We who support the bill fully realize that economic activity and employment are generated by private enterprise. We realize that a community which will not help itself cannot be helped. We realize that, unless a community or area contains useful economic resources, it cannot be made a job-producing, wealth-creating section of the country.

There are, undoubtedly, once-prosperous areas in the country whose economic resources have been completely exhausted beyond any hope of restoration.

On the other hand, there are areas which have been by-passed by rising economic tides; or, whose industrial bases have been undercut by technological changes; or, whose production of industrial agricultural, or fisheries products has been bypassed by changing consumer tastes or new products; and which still contain elements of economic strength and vitality worth saving and using.

It is the assumption of the bill that such opportunities can be developed by human will and ingenuity. The bill recognizes, however, that in too many instances such an effort may fail because local resources do not include the necessary capital, the technical know-how, the industrial skills.

Community facilities may not be such as to attract new industry. Community resources may be inadequate because of a deteriorated tax base and chronic low income of its citizenry.

And so, the bill would provide:

First. A revolving fund from which businessmen could borrow part of the funds needed for expansion or for new enterprises.

Second. Loans and grants for community facilities.

Third. Occupational training and retraining.

Fourth. Subsistence payments to unemployed workers undergoing training.

Fifth. Technical assistance.

Do these tools duplicate others already in existence? To a certain extent, yes; but this fact, rather than constituting a source of criticism, suggests a very desirable flexibility. Moreover, the bill would provide an integrated approach

toward this problem which is not now possible.

Are there other tools which would be useful? Probably; and there is nothing to prevent our adding them whenever experience under the program demonstrates their need.

We have an opportunity, through the proposed legislation, to build on our experience in other programs. We have the urban renewal program, the Small Business Administration, and the Small Business Investment Act at the Federal level. In our States, we have development agencies, planning agencies and credit facilities which have developed techniques of redevelopment, in urban and rural areas. What we seek to do is to apply these techniques, with the resources of the Nation, to situations in which local resources cannot do the job alone.

We have heard complaints that the rural development sections of the bill are oriented toward the South. There is no evidence in the bill that this is so. If there are more rural areas in any section of the country which qualify for assistance under objective criteria, I fail to see the logic of opposing aid to such sections simply because they are not in our own backyard. If there is a need, then we should meet it, and not let our vision be narrowed by selfish and shortsighted consideration. This proposed legislation should not serve as an excuse for regional bickering.

Another objection I have heard has been directed at the alleged reduction in initiative which will stem from passage of the bill. On this point, I suggest that the critics examine the bill and note the requirements for local planning, contributions, and participation.

We are not taking anything away from anybody. We are saying to the depressed areas, "We are aware of your troubles. We know that industrial or agricultural losses have drained away your resources. Here are the tools to help you do the job. We are willing to work with you as you rebuild your communities. We have confidence in your ability and we are willing to invest in your future."

In conclusion, I wish to take note of complaints on possible pirating under the bill. As originally written, the bill prohibited the use of Federal funds for relocation of industries when such would result in substantial damage to the area of original employment. Some felt this language was not strong enough. I was pleased to work out language on this point and to submit it to the committee in cooperation with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. Page 35 of the committee report contains an explanation of this provision.

I point out, in addition, that under the Small Business Investment Act we have a precedent for preventing the pirating of industry through the use of Federal funds. The act prohibits such use of funds, the Small Business Administration regulations under the act spell out these prohibitions, and the contract forms used under the program effectively prevent evasion of the act and regulations and provide penalties for noncompliance. I see no reasonable cause for fear on this question.

Mr. President, my experience as Governor, my service on the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and the continued conditions of economic distress in many areas of our country convince me that this proposed legislation is needed, and needed now. I urge passage of S. 1, as reported by the committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 56, beginning in the committee amendment, with line 22, it is proposed to strike out all through line 2 on page 57 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> Secretary of the Treasury. Any such notes or other obligations which are issued by the Secretary to raise funds for loans under section 6 shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, but such rate shall not be greater than the current average yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. Any such notes or other obligations which are issued by the Secretary to raise funds for loans under section 7 shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be not more than the higher of (1) 2½ per centum per annum, or (2) the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance by the Secretary and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum. The Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the proposed amendment would simply change the interest rate formula to make it comply with the rate that is now available on college housing loans so far as public facility projects are concerned in redevelopment areas.

S. 1, as reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, would provide that all funds borrowed from the Treasury with which to carry out the loan programs provided by the bill, that is, loans for qualified public facilities projects in redevelopment areas, and loans for private industrial and commercial redevelopment in nonrural and rural areas, would be obtained from the Treasury under the same interest rate formula.

The formula in the bill at present provides that—

> The rate paid to the Treasury for such loans shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, but such rate shall not be greater than the current average yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations.

This formula would produce a rate for Treasury borrowing of roughly 3⅞ percent. Thus, the lending rate to the qualified borrower at one-quarter of 1 percent higher as provided by the bill would be approximately 4⅛ percent at the present time.

My amendment would change the formula in order to provide a lower interest rate for loans to States and their political subdivisions for qualified public facilities projects in redevelopment areas. My amendment would not disturb the formula as it applies to borrowings with which to make loans for private industrial and commercial projects in redevelopment areas.

The formula in my amendment proposes that the rate to the Treasury for loans under section 7 of the bill "shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall not be more than the higher of, first, 2½ percent per annum; or second, the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance by the Secretary of Commerce and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent."

Under my amendment, the formula would produce a rate for Treasury borrowings of 3¼ percent. Thus the lending rate to the States and their political subdivisions making a loan for qualified public facility projects at one-quarter percent higher as provided by my amendment would be 3½ percent at the present time.

It seems to me rather obvious that loans to communities for development of their public facilities should be on more reasonable terms than loans made for development of private industrial and commercial purposes. My amendment would accomplish this purpose.

I earnestly hope that the Senator from Illinois, who has so well managed the bill, will accept the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I accept the amendment. As I understand, the amendment would merely provide that the same rates of interest shall apply on loans of public facilities as now apply in the case of college housing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct, and it is a compensatory rate, so far as the Government is concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am proud to have joined the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois as a cosponsor of this legislation. At the outset I would like to pay tribute to the persistence of my colleague in pressing for congressional action to alleviate unemployment in distressed areas of our Nation.

The able Senator from Illinois has described S. 1 as "an old and cherished friend," as well he might. On three occasions in recent years the Senate has passed area redevelopment legislation sponsored by our esteemed colleague. On one occasion the measure died in the House Rules Committee, and in the next two instances the legislation failed because of the Presidential veto.

This year, with the problem even greater and with a President who has

called for vigorous and positive action, I am hopeful that this bill will be enacted into law.

The time has come when we must face up to the economic realities, grim as they may be. By establishing a program to assist currently depressed areas and simultaneously develop a warning system on threatened unemployment, we will be waging a frontal attack on one of our country's major problems.

As I pointed out earlier this year before a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee holding hearings on this bill, my State of Nevada is not listed as a distressed area. Encouraging as that may sound, however, the hard fact remains that there are areas in my State that are now, and have been, suffering from the effects of a depressed economy.

In Lincoln County, for example, the rate of insured unemployment has risen from six-tenths of 1 percent in 1957 to the alarming high of 23.9 percent last January. This once flourishing section has been doubly hit because of the depressed metals market and the fact that railroad operations have greatly declined.

In the city of Babbitt, site of a naval ammunition depot, continual cutbacks in personnel have reduced the working force from a total of 1,462 in 1957 to a total of 925 today—a drop of more than 36 percent. And in the nearby city of Hawthorne, insured unemployment has increased from 1.2 percent in 1957 to 8.6 percent for last January.

These are constant problems, and they will not go away by ignoring them. The time for action is overdue. In my opinion, this legislation offers an opportunity for these distressed areas to help themselves to regain their rightful place in a free and sound economy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Nevada not only for his succinct and able statement, but for the constant support which he has given to the bill throughout its progress through the Senate. We are deeply indebted to him.

As a boy I used to follow the prize fights. I can remember the historic prize fights which took place in Tonopah and Goldfield, Nev. I thought such fights were permanently established. I am now told that in spite of the efforts of the late Tex Rickard, those towns are ghost towns.

Mr. BIBLE. Goldfield certainly is; Tonopah is in a slightly better condition. However, we consider them depressed areas, and the bill would assist them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In a year or a few years from now they may be in a state of depression.

Mr. BIBLE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Nevada realizes that prosperity is not merely for a day. It is tenuous, and we should guard against the future. I wish to thank the Senator from Nevada. I also express my personal obligations to him for his unfailing courtesy and gentlemanly conduct, so that even when upon occasion he votes against us, we love him. When he votes with us, we love him even more.

Mr. BIBLE. In view of the statement of the Senator from Illinois, I might even be privileged to vote favorably on final passage of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield now to the able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], who I believe is making his first address to the Senate, but whose quiet and effective influence has already been felt for the good in this body.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I would like to ask my fellow Members of the Senate today to give their whole-hearted support to the area redevelopment bill.

In my own State of Massachusetts, the jobless total hit the highest February total for 10 years. One hundred and fifty-nine thousand workers, or 7.3 percent of the working force, were unemployed last month.

Many of these workers were in industries such as apparel, electrical machinery, services, food, and paper that are normally not affected by the seasons of the year. Unless there is a general upturn for all these industries, the economy of the State will remain distressed.

Some Massachusetts workers have joined the ranks of the jobless for the first time this winter. But for many others, unemployment is a long, sad story. Some of our areas, such as Fall River and New Bedford, have had severe unemployment for almost 10 years while three others have had steady jobless quotas of over 6 percent for between 3 and 4 years. Nine employment areas in the State are distressed enough to be eligible for help under this bill.

Thus, unemployment is not a new problem for the State of Massachusetts. It is a problem that has been with us in a serious form for many years. And it has left its mark throughout the economic fabric of the entire State—in substandard housing, inadequate education for those blue-collar workers who need it the most, and rundown cities and towns.

A large number of the State's municipalities have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on private or public plans of their own designed to attract new industry. Individual manufacturers have done a great deal to diversify and strengthen their industries so that a severe decline in one such as textiles would not undermine the economy of an entire sector of the State.

But these communities have pretty well exhausted their resources in the fight to attain a level of economic well-being. Those that have been hit the hardest have watched their assets deteriorate over a long period of time and have little left now with which to continue the fight for economic survival.

The bill will provide those industrial communities that have suffered the most with the loans they need to attract new industry through land acquisition, plant buildings, and the construction of community facilities such as parks, and sewage treatment plants.

They will also receive badly needed funds for retraining workers in the skills needed for working in new industries.

I have discussed the area redevelopment bill in terms of my own State, but I know well that it is a truly national piece of legislation. There are few parts of this country that have not felt the pinch of this recession and the 103 areas which will be immediately eligible for its benefits can be found in every part of the Nation. Rural and industrial communities alike will gain through its provisions.

Some critics say that the bill will encourage some areas to pirate industry from others. I am strongly against any reshuffling of industries of this kind as it can do little more than create more economic problems and regional distress than it raises. The antipirating amendment in the committee bill has my full support.

Some critics have also said that money invested in long-term depressed areas is money poorly spent: that these areas are the victims of a changing technology and that to try and help them would be to invest in obsolescence.

I say that there has not been an industry yet that could do without the assets that a community brings with it—the people, the schools, the churches, the parks, and the local government. Actual dollars estimates have been quoted during debate on the bill on the costs of creating communities around a new industry. It is not cheap.

Yet, there are many communities in my State and across the country which, for a modest investment in plant and vocational retraining will provide a new industry with all the real and intangible assets of a long-established town.

Finally, there are those who label this another spending measure designed to take initiative from the local communities and to give it to the Federal Government. I say that this money is an investment, a blue-chip investment for the world's wealthiest country in its own economic well-being.

The bill provides a badly needed answer to long-term economic problems confronting far too many communities in this country. I hope my distinguished colleagues here will see fit to give it favorable consideration.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the fact that the Area Redevelopment Act, as introduced by Senator DOUGLAS, bears the title S. 1 is enough to show me that there is a sense of urgency about this bill that makes it mandatory for us to move as quickly as possible for its passage.

Senator DOUGLAS headed up the Task Force on Area Redevelopment and probably knows more about the chronic unemployment problem from firsthand information than any of us here in this Chamber. I considered it a privilege to join with him as cosponsor of S. 1.

Furthermore, the fact that the Area Redevelopment Act has passed the Congress twice is evidence in itself that our people want action. For years, as this measure has been under debate either in the legislative or the executive branch, conditions have become steadily worse.

Department of Labor statistics show total unemployment exceeded 5.7 million in February. There are approximately 100 areas of substantial and persistent unemployment, where there are at least

15 million people and over 600,000 unemployed.

Conditions in Missouri are bad enough to warrant the passage of this bill, but from what I can learn, some States are even worse off than we are. As the senior Senator from my State pointed out yesterday, Missouri has 180 community development organizations already in existence—the second highest number in the Nation.

It must be emphasized that the passage of the Area Redevelopment Act is not an open invitation for local communities and private groups to dip their fingers in the Federal Treasury and come up with a handout. Of the approximate $390 million provided under the bill, $300 million is earmarked for loans—loans that must be repaid.

Local communities and private groups must take the initiative in area redevelopment to alleviate chronic unemployment. Our President has promised a faster rate of national growth and committed himself to a goal of 82 million jobs. If we can achieve that goal, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch says that America's standard of living will rise 25 percent in a decade. To cross the first obstacle that prevents us from reaching this higher standard of living, Mr. President, I urge Senate passage of the Area Redevelopment Act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who has so ably managed the pending bill, to express my thanks to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] for his statement and for his effective cooperation.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts has made a splendid statement on the bill. I am sure that Senators are aware of the fact that the junior Senator from Massachusetts has presided over the Senate a great many times during these debates. It is only fitting and proper that we should express our appreciation to him. I wish to commend the Senator from Massachusetts on his excellent statement. I am sure that he will have the privilege this time not only of voting right, as he always does, but of voting on the winning side. I compliment the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 79, between lines 13 and 14, insert a new section as follows:

MILITARY INSTALLATIONS IN REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

SEC. 27. Whenever economy, as distinguished from obsolescence, changing defense requirements, and other essentially military considerations, has been or is hereafter given by the Department of Defense as the principal reason for the deactivation of a permanent military installation and such installation was or is situated in an area determined under this Act to be a redevelopment area, the Secretary of Commerce shall, upon the request of a local governing body in the area, institute a study to determine the economic effects of the action which has been or is to be taken: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall apply to any military installation which was deactivated prior to 1954. In determining the economic effects of any such action, the Secretary of Commerce shall, among other relevant matters, consider and make findings with respect to the approximate amount of money which has been, or may reasonably be expected to be, saved by any department or agency of the Government as a result of such action, compared with—

(1) the approximate costs or losses which have been, or may reasonably be expected to be, incurred by other departments or agencies of the Government, or by State and local governmental units, as a result of such action;

(2) the approximate losses which have been, or may reasonably be expected to be, incurred by private interests as a result of such action in connection with any facilities which they have provided to serve the needs of any such installation and which would otherwise have to be provided in whole or in part by the Government;

(3) the approximate cost to the Government of relocating any such installation in the event that such installation has been, or will be, relocated; and

(4) the approximate cost to the Government of reactivating, in a national emergency or other contingency, any such installation with respect to which any such action has been, or is proposed to be, taken.

Any such study shall be conducted as expeditiously as practicable, and the findings resulting therefrom shall be transmitted by the Secretary of Commerce to the Secretary of Defense and to the Congress. The Secretary of Defense shall consider these findings in making his decision as to whether the installations should be deactivated, or, if the installation has been deactivated, as to whether it should be reactivated.

Renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, how much time do I have available?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 hour.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not plan to use the whole hour. I wish to explain the amendment and shall use only as much time as is necessary to do so, unless it runs into considerable opposition.

After offering an amendment yesterday, which went further than the proposal I am now offering, and seeking to profit by the words of wisdom uttered by those in opposition to the amendment, as well as by those who supported it, I am offering the pending amendment because I believe it may be of some value to areas where permanent military installations have been closed or will be closed.

I make the point that the amendment applies only when a permanent military installation is closed for reasons of economy. The amendment spells out the fact that if an installation is closed because of changing military requirements, or because of obsolescence, or because the installation should be moved to another area for the defense of that latter area, because of an international agreement, for instance, or because of a rearrangement of our defense plans to make them more realistic in the light of modern day problems, the amendment would not apply.

All that the amendment requires is that a study be made. A study would take place when requested by the local authorities in the community affected, and such community would have to be a distressed area.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator and I have discussed the amendment. I have called several points to his attention, and I believe he felt there was some merit to what I said. I suggested that, instead of having the amendment specify a local governing body in an area, because an area may not have more than a thousand people in it, that the authority should be the Governor of the State. In other words, in Louisiana, if it was felt necessary to close a permanent military installation for reasons of economy, the Governor could make the request of the Secretary of Commerce.

I have another suggestion, which I have also discussed with the Senator. I would suggest that, instead of making the year 1954, which is 7 years back, and in that time a permanent military installation may pretty well have gone to pieces, it would be better to bring the date up, and in that connection I made the suggestion that the year be made 1957, instead of 1954.

I have one other suggestion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would be willing to so modify my amendment, unless there is objection elsewhere to the changes, if it would make the amendment more attractive to the senior Senator from Massachusetts, who is the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and the distinguished former chairman of that subcommittee. I hope that if the amendment is so modified the Senator from Massachusetts will find he can support the amendment I am offering.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. While I am not fully aware of what the effect of the amendment would be, I understand that it would apply where economy is the criterion, as opposed to any other consideration, such as obsolescence, a change in defense requirements, or other essential military consideration. In other words economy would be the only consideration, and the amendment would apply only in the case of economy. Furthermore, as I understand, it would apply only to a permanent military installation, such as, in Massachusetts, Fort Devens, or the Otis Air Base, or any other permanent installation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I dispose of that point first? So far as I am concerned, as the sponsor of the amendment, I have no objection whatever to the modification the Senator from Massachusetts is suggesting. As a matter of fact, I have no doubt whatever that where a State is concerned, the Governor of the State should certainly make the request, if the local citizens have substantial support in asking that the study be made.

So I should be glad to modify the amendment by using the word "Governor," and I do so.

The year 1954 is placed in the amendment only because that was the first year after the Korean war. It was the year in which there were cutbacks in military strength, and large-scale reductions in force began to occur as a

result of the closing of installations. I am not certain that a single permanent installation was closed in 1954, although I do not have those facts fully before me, because, as the Senator knows, the policy of the services in most cases is to close the temporary facilities before they undertake to close the permanent installations. The permanent installations are, in most instances, those about which a service went to a local town or a local citizenry and required it to make major commitments, in some cases costing tens of millions of dollars, or to spend large amounts of money to provide schools and various other facilities. In some cases, the communities were required to provide drainage. Sometimes the service even required the community to provide the land on which the bases were situated. In many instances, tremendous investments were made by the community which constituted a saving to the military, the assumption being that it was a permanent asset to the community and would not be taken away.

The service owes those people some consideration in return.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana has considerable merit, but I suggest this thought—whether the thought is practical, I do not know—if the amendment is taken to conference. I think it ought to be very clear that it ought to be the Governor of a State, and not a local body, who must make the request.

Also, I should like to see the date made 1957, because both the Senator from Louisiana and I know that many buildings which have been left vacant for several years are in bad shape. I should like to see the date made 1960, but if the Senator says 1957, so far as I am concerned, as one Senator, that is all right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am willing to accept that modification, and I do accept it.

I point out to the Senator from Massachusetts that the amendment does not affect Louisiana, so far as I know. It might affect some other States. If the State of some other Senator is affected, I believe he can speak now or forever hold his peace, as the saying is.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield? He said something about Senators holding their peace.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator's comment relate to the amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. It relates precisely to the Senator's amendment and precisely to the Senator's point.

It is evident that the Senator has now developed an idea, and I thoroughly agree with him. My colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] will speak for himself. However, in our State, we have a problem on exactly this point.

The Senator's proposal would give some economic appraisal apart from the strictly defense appraisal, which is what the Senator is seeking. We have talked about this problem in advance. I think the proposal is sound.

The Senator from Louisiana has accepted some suggestions from the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I do not believe any Senator would doubt the preeminent skill of the Senator from Massachusetts in the field of military affairs. However, we have not had the opportunity to ascertain whether the proposal would or would not adversely affect our installations, and we may have a real equity.

I should like to make this suggestion, therefore, because the Senator ought to have his amendment in the best shape possible. I hope that in conference we may have an opportunity, if it should develop that there is some particular factual equity which is not met by the amendment which the Senator has suggested, to lay the problem before the conference, in the hope that what we are accepting here now is an idea, and that if the specifics turn out to be unfair, we can do something about them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think there is no question about that. That is an idea which appeals to me, and in its present form it appeals to me much more than it did before.

I should like to call one other possible suggestion to the attention of the Senator from Louisiana. On line 6, the language would be, as the amendment is now written:

> The Secretary of Commerce shall, upon the request of the Governor of a State, institute a study.

That means that the Secretary of Commerce must make the inquiry if the Governor of a State asks him to do so.

What I propose is to let the word "shall" remain, rather than the word "may," but I call the Senator's attention to page 40 of the bill, under the heading "Advisory Policy Board." The Advisory Policy Board consists of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Administrators of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Small Business Administration, or whomever they may designate.

Would the Senator consider an amendment which would allow the word "shall" to remain but provide that the Secretary of Commerce shall, upon the approval of the Advisory Policy Board, enter into this investigation? In other words, that would leave the top Federal officers having the responsibility to order the Secretary of Commerce, if this clause should be adopted, to make the inquiry for economy reasons with respect to a permanent military installation. If that Board agrees and says that the Secretary of Commerce shall do it, then I think the amendment has even more merit.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am reluctant to accept the amendment because it is something more than I might be willing to agree with.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Louisiana objected to the word "may." I can see why. That might eliminate the whole program. But if we allowed the word "shall" to remain and then provided that the top officials of the Federal Government having responsibility for the Department of Defense, should say whether the inquiry should be made, and approve it upon the request of a Governor, I should think the amendment would be very much stronger.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator from Massachusetts would start from the other end, I would be willing to go with him, for it would achieve the same purpose. If the Senator would say that the Secretary shall conduct the study unless he is requested by the Board not to do so, I would be willing to accept that amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In order to get the bill to conference, and if the Senator from Illinois will accept such a proposal, I, as one Senator, would agree to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I think this is a very constructive amendment. It is even better in its present form. I congratulate the Senator from Louisiana. I assure him that we will not only take the amendment to conference; we will fight for it in conference.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I regret that at this moment I do not have the precise language developed by the Senator from Massachusetts and me relating to the proposal that the Secretary shall take this action unless he is requested by the Advisory Policy Board not to do so. If the Senator from Massachusetts will offer his proposed language at the proper place, I shall be glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On line 6, I would say:

> The Secretary of Commerce shall, upon the request of the Governor of the State, and unless the Advisory Policy Board of the Area Redevelopment Administration shall find otherwise, institute a study.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I so modify my amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. As has been pointed out by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], there are installations in the State of New York which might be affected by this proposal. For example, we know that the Utica-Rome area has been classified as an area of substantial labor surplus since 1958—longer than any other area of New York State. Yet there the Department of the Air Force has underway plans to transfer an important procurement facility away from Rome. That facility, if transferred, would eliminate 6,240 civilian jobs, more than all the existing industrial jobs in Rome.

The payroll loss, including losses from payrolls of firms which are 100 percent dependent on the procurement activities now going on in Rome, N.Y., would be about $100 million, or nearly one-third of the money proposed to be expended on the program of economic development; and such a situation would make Rome, N.Y., not only a distressed area, but actually a disaster area. The plan

under consideration is simply to remove a substantial facility from the Rome Air Force Base.

Therefore, I ask the Senator from Louisiana whether he would be willing to accept a modification in line 4, after the words "permanent military installation" by inserting the words "or any substantial part thereof"; and in the next line, after the word "installation," insert the words "or part"; and farther down in the amendment—without now going into any detail—insert other language to carry out that purpose, so the amendment would cover the removal of a substantial facility from an installation, as well as the removal of the entire installation itself.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I had an opportunity to discuss with him both my proposed amendment and, subsequently, the modification suggested by the Senator from New York. I would be willing to modify my amendment so as to make it broad enough to cover the situation at Rome, N.Y., which I understand is already a depressed area.

Mr. KEATING. We do not like to use the term "depressed." It is a distressed area. The people there are not depressed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well, it is an area with a high degree of unemployment.

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And it is an area of the type which we seek to aid; and I believe it should be entitled to a study of the type the Senator has referred to, and which I seek, by means of this amendment, to have conducted.

But I do not want to make the language so broad that almost any shift of a facility at a military installation could, upon the request of someone, be made the subject of such a study.

Rather than include the word "substantial," would the Senator from New York be willing to use the word "major"—"or a major part thereof"? I think that would be broad enough to cover such a situation.

Mr. KEATING. I think this particular situation certainly would be covered by the words "or a major part thereof." It consists of approximately 6,200-odd civilian jobs, out of 12,000 or 13,000.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the Senator accept the word "unit"—"a major unit"?

Mr. KEATING. With this legislative history established, I believe the language would take care of that situation; and I would be glad to have the amendment modified in that regard. I would like to ask unanimous consent—because if this proposed modification is accepted, it will require several changes later on in the measure——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, changes of a technical nature.

Mr. KEATING. So I would ask unanimous consent a little later to send them to the desk, for consideration.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would not object to the proposed modification, with the understanding that the legislative history reflects that what we have in mind by the use of the word "major" is a large unit which is a dominant part of the overall installation; and I believe that the legislative history makes it clear that it is anticipated that the amendment would be broad enough to cover a situation of the kind the Senator from New York has described, in the State of New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield briefly to me?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I suggested to my colleague the inclusion of the word "unit," because we are dealing with an entity. That does not mean it is a major part of the entire installation; but it means that in and of itself it is a major unit which is a part of the installation. That language certainly would cover the installation at Rome, N.Y., and would be fair, because some of the installations are so extensive that, as has properly been stated, if 7,000 jobs were dropped out at the installation at Rome—because of the dropping of a unit which is a major one in that connection—it might not be a major part of the installation, taken as a whole. So the legislative history should show that by using the word "unit," we mean a functional organization of a major character.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the Senator will find that such a distinction is not necessary. The situation I have heard described is one in which approximately 6,200 or 6,800 jobs are involved, out of approximately 18,000. So what we are talking about is both a major unit and a major part of the whole. With that understanding, I would be willing to accept that modification of the amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. As I have listened to the debate, it has seemed to be built around the situation in the city of Rome, N.Y. I wish to be sure that the amendment is general in application, when it comes to dealing with units within a unit. For example, I have in mind the naval air installation at Olathe, Kans.; and I want to be sure that the amendment will be general in application, and will not be confined to one city.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This amendment applies only to permanent military installations. But as among permanent installations, the amendment applies generally. It relates only to a situation in which a principal reason for the closing is economy. Many times the economy has been dictated by a decision to reduce the overall strength in terms of the numbers in the service; and when the numbers are considered, it is said, "Economy now requires the closing of the installation." But such a closing may result in the creation of depressed areas.

Mr. CARLSON. I think the Senator from Louisiana has a very worthwhile amendment; and I think that with this addition, so that the amendment will be applicable generally, it is a very good one.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There occurs to me the thought that it would be well if we could get some action taken by the military, so that in making the decisions in regard to what to close and what to keep open, the military would consider that in the case of one area, if the installation were closed, the result would be that the land there would quickly be subdivided into lots for the construction of private residences, whereas in another case, if the installation were closed, the facilities already in existence there would soon become a ghost town, and the people who had invested in those properties would lose their investments.

I hope such a study will be made; and I hope that on the basis of the study we shall be able to obtain action based on much more consideration by those in the Defense Department of the persons who have made such enormous investments—with the result that they will not hesitate to make such investments in areas which are subject to the jurisdiction of the Defense Department, knowing that the installations will not later be closed.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the Senator from Louisiana has served all of us and also the entire country well in providing by this means opportunity for an economic review, which is as greatly needed in connection with other cases about which there is great economic complaint as it is needed in connection with the situation at Rome, N.Y.

Let me ask whether unanimous consent was obtained to make the changes suggested by my colleague, which the Senator from Louisiana has agreed to accept?

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I now send to the desk certain technical modifications. For the most part they relate to the words "a part," which I would change to the words "a unit," so as to make the entire amendment conform to the modifications suggested by the Senator from New York.

The amendment as modified is as follows:

On page 79, between lines 13 and 14, insert a new section as follows:

"MILITARY INSTALLATIONS IN REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

"SEC. 27. Whenever economy, as distinguished from obsolescence, changing defense requirements, and other essentially military considerations, has been or is hereafter given by the Department of Defense as the principal reason for the deactivation of a permanent military installation or major unit thereof and such installation or unit was or is situated in an area determined under this Act to be a redevelopment area, the Secretary of Commerce shall, upon the request of the Governor or Governors of the State or States in which the area is located unless there is a request by the Board heretofore referred to in Sec. 4(a) hereof to the contrary, institute a study to determine the economic effects of the action which has been or is to be taken: *Provided*, that nothing herein shall apply to any military installation or major unit thereof which was deactivated prior to 1957. In determining the economic effects of any such action, the Secretary of Commerce shall, among other relevant matters, consider and make findings with respect to the approximate amount

of money which has been, or may reasonably be expected to be, saved by any department or agency of the Government as a result of such action, compared with—

"(1) the approximate costs or losses which have been, or may reasonably be expected to be, incurred by other departments or agencies of the Government, or by State and local governmental units, as a result of such action;

"(2) the approximate losses which have been, or may reasonably be expected to be, incurred by private interests as a result of such action in connection with any facilities which they have provided to serve the needs of any such installation and which would otherwise have to be provided in whole or in part by the Government;

"(3) the approximate cost to the Government of reactivating, in a national emer- or unit in the event that such installation or unit has been, or will be, relocated; and

"(4) the approximate cost to the Government of relocating any such installation gency or other contingency, any such installation or unit with respect to which any such action has been, or is proposed to be, taken.

Any such study shall be conducted as expeditiously as practicable, and the findings resulting therefrom shall be transmitted by the Secretary of Commerce to the Secretary of Defense and to the Congress. The Secretary of Defense shall consider these findings in making his decision as to whether any such installation or unit should be deactivated, or, if such installation or unit has been deactivated, as to whether it should be reactivated."

Renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I am concerned a little about the timing of all this. For example, in reference to the words "whenever economy" is hereafter given by the Department of Defense as the reason, let me ask, To whom is it to be given?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is something the Department of Defense itself can judge. In most instances it is given to the local people or to the State government or to the local government, when they are notified that the Department of Defense is about to close a base, and the Department explains the reasons for doing so.

Mr. MILLER. That is just the point. My problem is that the local people who make this request to the Governor will probably—unless something is done about the timing, in line 3—take such action after the decision has been made.

Furthermore, in the third line from the bottom, mention is made of how he will have to consider the findings arrived at in the study, before he makes the decision.

It seems that some provision should be made, in order to make clear that whenever there is a proposed deactivation, notification must be made prior to the decision to close it—for example, must be made to the Governor of the State; and, in turn, that would then generate the taking of the action which I think the Senator is requesting. But without that provision, it seems to me that much room would be left open to the Secretary of Defense as to how he would notify, and whom he would notify, and when he would notify.

Does the Senator from Louisiana agree with me about that point?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe I understand what the Senator from Iowa is striving to achieve. I am not at all out of sympathy with what he has in mind. If he will prepare an amendment which will seek to reach that objective, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. MILLER. I shall be happy to do so. If some other Senator wishes to address the Senate for a moment on this point, I shall proceed to prepare the necessary amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, if my amendment is agreed to, it may remain subject to an amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, what is the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is whether an amendment by the Senator from Iowa can be offered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection, but——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The suggestion is that the Senator from Iowa would like to offer an amendment to my amendment. He does not have the amendment prepared. I asked unanimous consent that, in the event my amendment is agreed to, the Senator from Iowa may, nevertheless, have the opportunity of offering the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection.

Mr. President, what is pending? Has there been a disposition of the amendment or the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], as modified.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is that the business pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina has the floor, and if he will yield, I should like to say I am opposed to the amendment——

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry.

Mr. THURMOND. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator, but I merely wanted to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question or two. Then I shall be glad to hear what the Senator has to say about it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well.

Mr. THURMOND. We have in our State an airbase that has been scheduled for deactivation. Local people are bringing great pressure to retain it. It is a fine airbase. We think possibly another one could have been closed in an area where the weather is not as good as it is in our State. Nevertheless, the plan is to close it. It is not in a depressed area, and that area probably never will be a depressed area.

I ask the Senator from Louisiana, under his amendment would that kind of military installation go by the board, and yet one in a depressed area, which may not have as many advantages as bases such as this one, be retained?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the closing of the installation would result in a depressed area, and if it were a permanent installation, then, of course, it would be subject to a study as provided by the amendment.

Mr. THURMOND. Under the Senator's amendment, does the Defense Department have the clear-cut right to make the decision as to whether a military installation should be retained or should be closed?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; the decision remains unfettered in the Defense Department. The only way in which the amendment would affect it would be that the Department would have to consider the fact that the situation was such that, if the installation was closed, it would result in a depressed area; or, if it were closing an installation in a depressed area, that the area would be further depressed and would result in a serious economic condition in the area. The Department would have to consider the fact that the State and the Federal Government had spent much money to support the activity.

The Department would have to consider the private investment without which the Federal Government would have been required to spend as much money, or almost as much. The Department would be required to consider what the cost would be of relocating the installation or reopening it, in the event there was a probability it would be reopened sooner or later.

Mr. THURMOND. Is the proposal intended to apply to installations which might be closed and then reopened or to bases which are to be permanently deactivated?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Either way.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator would not, of course, offer an amendment which would attempt to keep a military installation open if it would be economical to close it and to the advantage of the taxpayers to close it, I am sure, even in his own State.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No; but the amendment certainly gets at the kind of situation where the Army goes into a certain area and calls upon the local people to build housing, on which the Government is guaranteeing mortgages. Local investors build $100 million worth of housing, and then the Department comes to the conclusion that it is going to save $2 million a year or $5 million a year by closing the installation, and puts blinders on its eyes and is not able to see that $100 million is going to be lost in the way of guarantees on mortgages for the housing the servicemen occupy.

The amendment would make the Department take a look at the situation, and also what other agencies of the Government, such as the Small Business Administration, had expended, and the cost of hospitals and schools, and the fact that a lot of money would be lost for unnecessary schools and other facilities. The Department would also have to consider the fact that taxes are being paid to the State and local governments, and that the Federal Government would not

be gaining anything by increasing the tax for the State government. The Department would have to consider whether, in the name of economy, if one service, whether it be the Navy, Army, or Air Corps, were to save money, the Federal Government might lose much more through other agencies, or lose the State money by completely disturbing the economy and the investment made, which would have to be reproduced elsewhere. It might then reach the conclusion that there was no real economy being arrived at, and that, rather than save money, the Government would lose money.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I read the amendment, it calls for a study. The decision is to be made by the Secretary of Defense. The study is to be sent to the Governor of the State where the installation is located. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is permissive. It permits a study to be made, but the Defense Department will make the decision, after the report is received.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. Some persons do not seem to recognize that when local citizens have been told that the base is to be permanent and is going to be there forever, they invest $50 million or $150 million of their money to support the military installation, on the assumption that it will remain until the end of time. Then, within a year or 2, the installation closes, and a depressed area results, with half the people in the area out of work.

Otherwise the Department may open another installation where it is not needed any more badly, where no one has made any sacrifice to support the installation, because in that area people would have bought the land, subdivided it into lots, and made good use of it, anyway.

Mr. THURMOND. No one wishes to see a military installation closed unless it is necessary. We are now moving from airplanes to missiles. Certain airbases may not be needed, or they may have to be transformed into missile bases. The airbase may or may not be suitable for that purpose.

Suppose that the Defense Department decided it could close a large number of airbases and save the taxpayers millions of dollars in the support of those bases because they were not needed. Under those conditions what effect would the Senator's amendment have, and would the Defense Department be handicapped in making a decision that it did not need those bases?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me read the first two lines of the amendment:

> Whenever economy, as distinguished from obsolescence, changing defense requirements, and other essentially military considerations, has been or is hereafter given by the Department of Defense as the principal reason for the deactivation of a permanent military installation or major unit thereof.

In other words, if an airbase was to be closed because the Air Force is to change from airplanes to missiles, that would be the end of the discussion. The people would not be entitled to a study even if they had invested $50 million to support the activity on the assumption that it would be permanent.

However, if an airbase were to be closed on the theory that the Federal Government might save some money, and that were the main reason for the closing, the people would be entitled to a study. First it should be determined whether the closing would represent an economy. Such a study cannot be made within the Department of the Army, or the Navy, or the Air Force. Someone must determine how much money the local citizens have invested.

Recently I had a discussion with the representatives of one of the services in regard to an installation. The local people had undertaken to show the tens of millions of dollars they had invested to meet service requirements on the theory there was to be a permanent military installation. The service did not have the information, even though it required the people to spend hundreds of millions of dollars. I assume that many billions of dollars have been spent by local governments and local people for these purposes.

An inquiry should be made. The services have made the local people do these things. At least the service should take a look at the problem, to see what they have made the people do, before the word is broken and the military installation is closed down.

That is all the amendment would require. It would be necessary to take a look at the proposal, and there would be limited circumstances. The installation would have to be permanent. The closing would have to be for the principal reason of economy.

A mere study is the least the people should have. I would hope that a study could be obtained without the amendment in the law, but that is the least the people have a right to expect, after they have made such great sacrifices.

Mr. THURMOND. Then I understand that the purpose of the Senator's amendment is not to prevent the Department of Defense from acting if it deems it advisable to act in the interest of the country and of national defense.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No; it is not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate. I regret now that we did not kill the amendment last night. To be sure, the amendment has been radically changed. It is supposed to call for a study.

There is not a shred of military opinion before the Senate tonight, yet the amendment would affect the Defense Establishment of the country.

It is argued that these are permanent installations and that they are a part of our defense. What the amendment would provide is that the local people, who do not wish to lose a military installation—which might be closed for various reasons, including economy—could go to the Governor. How could a Governor resist a group from a town, the board of trustees or the city council? He would make a request to the Secretary of Commerce. What would the Secretary do? With the consent of the Advisory Council, the Secretary would cause a study to be made.

What would the study be? It would be the result of a monumental amount of work to determine the facts as to transfers, as to a change from one installation to another, and everything which goes with it. The study would include all aspects of the problem of whether the move would save money or lose money, and how the Government agencies would be affected.

What a burden would be put upon the Military Establishment of the country. There is not a shred of testimony before the Senate in this regard.

I am not going to ask for a yea-and-nay vote. I am sorry we did not kill the amendment last night, but I could not get a commitment from the Senator from Louisiana.

I know, of course, when there is a permanent establishment in a State, what will happen. The people will go to the Governor. The Governor will telephone to Luther Hodges and ask Mr. Hodges to submit the problem to the Advisory Council. We will burden the Secretary of Commerce with no end of detail and studies, and then ride herd on him to make sure it is expeditiously done, because it is provided that the study shall be conducted as expeditiously as practicable.

There are questions of obsolescence, of economy, of changes in posture, of changes in defense conditions. The sky is the limit as to the amount of work to be done.

We should not kid ourselves. Even though the amendment has been transformed into nothing more than a request for a study, it is a great compulsive weapon we are asked to put into the hands of people, and it could have an impact upon the defense structure of the country.

I am ready to vote, and I ask for a division on the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I shall take only 1 or 2 minutes to respond to the distinguished minority leader.

I make no apologies for offering an amendment yesterday nor for fighting for my people. I would hope that a study would be made with regard to one community in my State which I believe is nearly as depressed as any we seek to aid. The people understood the Army was to pay $50 million a year to obtain a maneuver area. The people said, "We will get it for you for nothing." The people did so, on the assumption that the installation would be a permanent military installation.

The people were told a few years later that the Army intended to close the installation. Vast investments had been made by the people.

I hope other Senators have had the experience I have. I hope any Senator who votes against the amendment will

have the experience, because he will learn to understand what I am talking about now.

Tens of millions of dollars have been invested. Half of the stores on the main street of the town are closed. One can hardly even talk to the service about it. The decision has been made. When the homefolks come to Washington, it is impossible to explain to them why they should go broke and be put out of business. The people bonded themselves head over heels into debt, and the service has broken its word to them, yet the service will not even consider all of the obligations which have been made, and did not even know what the people invested when the decision was made.

I know how the services make these decisions. The services know there will be a protest. There are specialists in the Department of Defense who listen to people, who smile, who give a kind word—and that is the end of it. The decision is made, and it will not be changed.

I am saying that the people are entitled at least to some study, to consider all of the things which are involved, when an area is to be made a depressed area.

Mr. President, there would be no burden imposed on the Secretary of Defense. He would not be required to do anything other than to consider the report when it reached him.

Great investments have been made by the people, and the people are entitled to some consideration, at least. The facts should be made known, and they are not being made known now, although people are losing their investments.

I think these things should be considered in such circumstances.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] to the committee amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time. I ask for a division on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], as modified.

On a division, the modified amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, as amended, is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let us vote on the committee amendment. Let us pass the bill with a large majority, to show that we are behind the program of the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, as amended, being in the nature of a substitute, is not open to further amendment.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time on the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay"; I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay" and the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 27, as follows:

[No. 15]

YEAS—63

Anderson	Cannon	Dodd
Beall	Carlson	Douglas
Bible	Carroll	Engle
Boggs	Case, N.J.	Ervin
Burdick	Church	Fong
Bush	Clark	Gore
Byrd, W. Va.	Cooper	Gruening
Hart	Long, La.	Proxmire
Hartke	Magnuson	Randolph
Hickey	Mansfield	Saltonstall
Hill	McGee	Scott
Humphrey	McNamara	Smith, Mass.
Jackson	Metcalf	Smith, Maine
Javits	Monroney	Sparkman
Johnston	Morse	Symington
Jordan	Morton	Talmadge
Keating	Moss	Wiley
Kefauver	Muskie	Williams, N.J.
Kerr	Neuberger	Yarborough
Long, Mo.	Pastore	Young, N. Dak.
Long, Hawaii	Pell	Young, Ohio

NAYS—27

Aiken	Dirksen	Miller
Bennett	Dworshak	Mundt
Bridges	Eastland	Robertson
Butler	Ellender	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Schoeppel
Capehart	Hruska	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Stennis
Cotton	Lausche	Thurmond
Curtis	McClellan	Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—10

Allott	Fulbright	McCarthy
Bartlett	Goldwater	Prouty
Blakley	Hayden	
Chavez	Hickenlooper	

So the bill (S. 1) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Area Redevelopment Act".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress declares that the maintenance of the national economy at a high level is vital to the best interests of the United States, but that some of our communities are suffering substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment; that such unemployment and underemployment cause hardship to many individuals and their families and detract from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic redevelopment; that Federal assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing redevelopment should enable such areas to achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies and improved local living conditions; and that under the provisions of this Act new employment opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing facilities and resources rather than merely transferring jobs from one community to another.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3. There shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an Area Redevelopment Administrator in the Department of Commerce who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to that received by Assistant Secretaries of Commerce. The Administrator shall perform such duties in the execution of this Act as the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") may assign.

ADVISORY POLICY BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) To advise the Secretary in the performance of functions authorized by this Act, there is authorized to be created an Area Redevelopment Advisory Policy Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), which shall consist of the following members, all ex officio: the Secretary as Chairman; the Secretaries of Agriculture; Health, Education, and Welfare; Interior; Labor; and Treasury; and the Administrators of the

Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Small Business Administration.

The Chairman may from time to time invite the participation of officials of other agencies of the executive branch interested in the functions herein authorized. Each member of the Board may designate an officer of his agency to act for him as a member of the Board with respect to any matter there considered.

(b) The Secretary shall appoint a National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment which shall consist of twenty-five members and shall be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, State and local governments, and the public in general. From the members appointed to such Committee the Secretary shall designate a Chairman. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Secretary relative to the carrying out of his duties under this Act. Such Committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

(c) The Secretary is authorized from time to time to call together and confer with any persons, including representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and government, who can assist in meeting the problems of unemployment or underemployment in the several areas designated by the Secretary as redevelopment areas.

REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary shall designate as "redevelopment areas" those areas within the United States in which he determines, upon the basis of standards generally comparable with those set forth in subparagraphs (1) and (2) below, that there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time. There shall be included among the areas so designated any area—

(1) where the rate of unemployment, excluding unemployment due primarily to temporary or seasonal factors, is currently 6 per centum or more and has averaged at least 6 per centum for the qualifying time periods specified in subparagraph (2) below; and

(2) where the annual average rate of unemployment has been at least—

(A) 50 per centum above the national average for three of the preceding four calendar years, or

(B) 75 per centum above the national average for two of the preceding three calendar years, or

(C) 100 per centum above the national average for one of the preceding two years.

The Secretary of Labor shall find the facts and provide the data to be used by the Secretary in making the determinations required by this subsection. 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 section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to which the President has reported to the Congress under section 4(a) or 7(c) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, and meeting the standards of unemployment set forth in this section shall be entitled on application to special consideration by the Secretary for designation as a redevelopment area.

(b) The Secretary shall also designate as "redevelopment areas" those areas (including Indian reservations) within the United States which do not meet the requirements set forth in subsection (a) but which he determines are among the highest in numbers and percentages of low-income families, and in which there exists a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment. In making the designations under this subsection and before making any loans as the result of designations under this subsection, the Secretary shall, by regulation, prescribe detailed standards upon which the designations under this subsection shall be based. In the formulation of such standards the Secretary shall consider, among other relevant factors, the number of low-income farm families in the various rural areas of the United States, the proportion that such low-income families are to the total farm families of each of such areas, the relationship of the income levels of the families in each such area to the general levels of income in the United States, the extent to which "rural development" projects have previously been located in any such area under programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, the availability of manpower in each such area for supplemental employment, the extent of migration out of the area, and the proportion of the population of each area which has been receiving public assistance from the Federal Government and/or from the State or States in which such area is located or from any municipality therein. In making the designations under this subsection, the Secretary shall endeavor to distribute the projects widely among the several States, so far as is feasible and proper, in order that actual experience with this program may be had in as many States and in as many areas and under as many different circumstances as possible: *Provided,* That not more than one such project shall be located in any one State unless the Secretary has considered such applications for assistance under this Act as may have come from the several States which apply for such assistance. In making these determinations, the Secretary shall be guided, but not conclusively governed, by pertinent studies made, and information and data collected or compiled, by (1) departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, (2) State and local governments, (3) universities and land-grant colleges, and (4) private organizations.

(c) Upon the request of the Secretary, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and such other heads of agencies as may be appropriate, are authorized to conduct such special studies, obtain such information, and compile and furnish to the Secretary such data as the Secretary may deem necessary or proper to enable him to make the determinations provided for in subsection (b) of this section. The Secretary shall reimburse when appropriate, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act, the foregoing officers for any expenditures incurred by them under this section.

(d) As used in this Act, the term "redevelopment area" refers to any area within the United States which has been designated by the Secretary as a redevelopment area and may include one or more States, one or more counties, or one or more municipalities, or a part of a county or municipality.

LOANS AND PARTICIPATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans (including participations therein) to aid in financing any project within a redevelopment area for the purchase or development of land and facilities (including machinery and equipment in cases of demonstrated need) for industrial or commercial usage, including the construction of new buildings, the rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied buildings, and the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of existing buildings. Such financial assistance shall not be extended (1) for working capital, or (2) to assist establishments relocating from one area to another. The limitation set forth in clause (2) above shall not be construed to prohibit assistance for the expansion of an existing business operation from its original location or for the establishment of a new branch affiliate, or subsidiary: *Provided,* That such assistance will not substantially decrease employment in the area of original location.

(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

(1) The total amount of loans and loan participations (including purchased evidences of indebtedness) outstanding at any one time under this section (A) with respect to projects in redevelopment areas designated under section 5(a) shall not exceed $100,000,000 and (B) with respect to projects in redevelopment areas designated under section 5(b) shall not exceed $100,000,000;

(2) Such assistance shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public (including Indian tribes), which have been approved for such assistance by an agency or instrumentality of the State or political subdivision thereof in which the project to be financed is located, and which agency or instrumentality is directly concerned with problems of economic development in such State or subdivision;

(3) The project for which financial assistance is sought is reasonably calculated to provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment within the redevelopment area wherein it is, or will be, located;

(4) No such assistance shall be extended hereunder unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders or other Federal agencies on reasonable terms;

(5) The Secretary shall not make any loan without a participation unless he determines that the loan cannot be made on a participation basis;

(6) No evidences of indebtedness shall be purchased and no loans shall be made unless it is determined that there is a reasonable assurance of repayment;

(7) Subject to section 12(5) of this Act, no loan, including renewals or extension thereof, may be made hereunder for a period exceeding twenty-five years and no evidences of indebtedness maturing more than twenty-five years from date of purchase may be purchased hereunder: *Provided,* That the foregoing restrictions on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Secretary as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in other proceedings attendant upon insolvency of the obligor;

(8) Such loans shall bear interest at a rate equal to the rate of interest paid by the Secretary on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in section 9 of this Act, plus one-half of 1 per centum per annum to cover administrative expenses and to provide for losses on loans under this section;

(9) Such assistance shall not exceed 65 per centum of the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities (including, in cases of demonstrated need, machinery and equipment), and of constructing, altering, converting, rehabilitating, or enlarging the building or buildings of the particular project and shall, among others, be on the following conditions:

(A) That other funds are available in an amount which, together with the assistance provided hereunder, shall be sufficient to pay such aggregate cost;

(B) That not less than 10 per centum of such aggregate cost be supplied by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or political

subdivision thereof, or by an Indian tribe or a community or area organization which is nongovernmental in character, as equity capital or as a loan;

(C) That in extending financial assistance under this section with respect to a redevelopment area, the Secretary shall require that not less than 5 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied by nongovernmental sources; and

(D) That to the extent the Secretary finds such action necessary to encourage financial participation in a particular project by other lenders and investors any Federal financial assistance extended under this section may be repayable only after other loans made in connection with such project and in accordance with this section have been repaid in full, and the security, if any, for such Federal financial assistance may be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing other loans made in connection with the same project;

(10) No such assistance shall be extended unless there shall be submitted to and approved by the Secretary an overall program for the economic development of the area and a finding by the State, or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof, that the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall authorize financial assistance for any project prohibited by laws of the State or local political subdivision in which the project would be located.

(c) Of the funds authorized to be raised under section 9 of this Act, not more than $100,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section with respect to projects in redevelopment areas designated under section 5(a), and not more than $100,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section with respect to projects in redevelopment areas designated under section 5(b).

PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS FOR INDUSTRIAL OR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES

SEC. 7. (a) Upon the application of any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or public or private nonprofit organization or association representing any redevelopment area or part thereof, the Secretary is authorized to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within any redevelopment area, if he finds that such facilities will serve primarily industrial or commercial needs and that—

(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the redevelopment area wherein such project is, or will be, located, and will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available on reasonable terms;

(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of other available funds for such projects are adequate to insure the completion thereof;

(4) there is a reasonable expectation of repayment; and

(5) such area has an approved economic development program as provided in section 6(b)(10) and the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program.

(b) No loan under this section shall be for an amount in excess of 65 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made. Subject to section 12(5), the maturity date of any such loan shall be not later than forty years after the date such loan is made. Any such loan shall bear interest at a rate equal to the rate of interest paid by the Secretary on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in section 9 of this Act, plus one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum.

(c) In making any loan under this section, the Secretary shall require that not less than 10 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied by the State (including any political subdivision thereof) within which such project is located or by the Indian tribe on whose reservation such project is located as equity capital or as a loan. In determining the amount of participation required under this subsection with respect to any particular project, the Secretary shall give consideration to the financial condition of the State or local government, and to the per capita income of the residents of the redevelopment area, within which such project is to be located.

(d) To the extent the Secretary finds such action necessary to encourage financial participation in a particular project by other lenders and investors, any Federal financial assistance extended under this section may be repayable only after other loans made in connection with such project and in accordance with this section have been repaid in full, and the security, if any, for such Federal financial assistance may be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing other loans made in connection with the same project.

(e) No financial assistance shall be extended under this section with respect to any public facility which would compete with an existing privately owned public utility rendering a service to the public at rates or charges subject to regulation by a State regulatory body, unless the State regulatory body determines that in the area to be served by the public facility for which the financial assistance is to be extended there is a need for an increase in such service (taking into consideration reasonably foreseeable future needs) which the existing public utility is not able to meet through its existing facilities or through an expansion which it agrees to undertake.

(f) Of the funds authorized to be raised under section 9 of this Act, not more than $100,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section.

PUBLIC FACILITY GRANTS FOR INDUSTRIAL OR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES

SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary may conduct studies of needs in the various redevelopment areas throughout the United States for, and the probable cost of, land acquisition or development for public facility usage in serving industrial or commercial needs, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of useful public facilities to serve such needs within such areas, and may receive proposals from any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or public or private nonprofit organization or association representing any redevelopment area, or part thereof, relating to land acquisition or development for such public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of such public facilities within any such area. Any such proposal shall contain plans showing the project proposed to be undertaken, the cost thereof, and the contributions proposed to be made to such cost by the entity making the proposal. The Secretary, in consultation with such entity, is authorized to modify all or any part of such proposal.

(b) The Secretary, pursuant to a proposal received by him under this section, may make grants to any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or public or private nonprofit organization or association representing any redevelopment area, or part thereof, for land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within a redevelopment area, if he finds that such facilities will serve primarily industrial or commercial needs and that—

(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the redevelopment area wherein such project is, or will be, located, and will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

(2) the entity requesting the grant proposes to contribute to the cost of the project for which such grant is requested in proportion to its ability so to contribute;

(3) the project for which a grant is requested will fulfill a pressing need of the area, or part thereof, in which it is, or will be, located, and there is little probability that such project can be undertaken without the assistance of a grant under this section; and

(4) the area for which a project is to be undertaken has an approved economic development program as provided in section 6(b)(10) and such project is consistent with such program.

The amount of any grant under this section for any such project shall not exceed the difference between the funds which can be practicably obtained from other sources (including a loan under section 7 of this Act) for such project, and the amount which is necessary to insure the completion thereof.

(c) The Secretary shall by regulation provide for the supervision of projects with respect to which grants are made under this section so as to insure that Federal funds are not wasted or dissipated.

(d) No financial assistance shall be extended under this section with respect to any public facility which would compete with an existing privately owned public utility rendering a service to the public at rates or charges subject to regulation by a State regulatory body, unless the State regulatory body determines that in the area to be served by the public facility for which the financial assistance is to be extended there is a need for an increase in such service (taking into consideration reasonably foreseeable future needs) which the existing public utility is not able to meet through its existing facilities or through an expansion which it agrees to undertake.

(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $75,000,000 for the purpose of making grants under this section.

FUNDS FOR LOANS

SEC. 9. (a) To obtain funds for loans under this Act, the Secretary may, with the approval of the President, issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $300,000,000. Such notes or other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Any such notes or other obligations which are issued by the Secretary to raise funds for loans under section 6 shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the

Treasury, but such rate shall not be greater than the current average yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. Any such notes or other obligations which are issued by the Secretary to raise funds for loans under section 7 shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be not more than the higher of (1) 2½ per centum per annum, or (2) the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance by the Secretary and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include any purchase of such notes and other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated in every respect as public debt transactions of the United States.

(b) In the performance of and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by sections 6 and 7 of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program in accordance with the provisions of sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended; and

(2) determine the character of and the necessity for obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to provisions of law specifically applicable to Government corporations.

INFORMATION

SEC. 10. Subject to section 24, the Secretary shall aid redevelopment areas and other areas by furnishing to interested individuals, communities, industries, and enterprises within such areas any assistance, technical information, market research, or other forms of assistance, information, or advice which are obtainable from the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government and which would be useful in alleviating or preventing conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment within such areas. The Secretary shall furnish the procurement divisions of the various departments, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the Federal Government with a list containing the names and addresses of business firms which are located in redevelopment areas and which are desirous of obtaining Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies or services, and designating the supplies and services such firms are engaged in providing.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 11. Subject to section 24, in carrying out his duties under this Act the Secretary is authorized to provide technical assistance which would be useful in alleviating or preventing conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment (1) to areas which he has designated as redevelopment areas under this Act, and (2) to other areas which he finds have substantial need for such assistance. Such assistance shall include studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such areas. Such assistance may be provided by the Secretary through members of his staff or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purposes. Appropriations are hereby authorized for the purposes of this section in an amount not to exceed $4,500,000 annually.

POWERS OF SECRETARY

SEC. 12. In performing his duties under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to—

(1) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed; and subject to the civil service and classification laws, select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and define their authority and duties, provide bonds for them in such amounts as the Secretary shall determine, and pay the costs of qualifications of certain of them as notaries public;

(2) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

(3) request directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this Act; and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Secretary;

(4) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans made under this Act, and collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(5) further extend the maturity of or renew any loan made under this Act, beyond the periods stated in such loan or in this Act, for additional periods not to exceed ten years, if such extension or renewal will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan;

(6) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any real or personal property conveyed to, or otherwise acquired by, him in connection with the payment of loans made under this Act;

(7) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or other administrative action, prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to him in connection with loans made under this Act. This shall include authority to obtain deficiency judgments or otherwise in the case of mortgages assigned to the Secretary. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), shall not apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Secretary as a result of loans made under this Act if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute, in the name of the Secretary, deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real or personal property or any interest therein acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this Act may be exercised by the Secretary or by any officer or agent appointed by him for that purpose without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney;

(8) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in sections 6 and 7 of this Act;

(9) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made under this Act;

(10) to such an extent as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, procure the temporary (not in excess of six months) service of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract or appointment, and in such cases such service shall be without regard to the civil service and classification laws, and, except in the case of stenographic reporting services by organizations, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5); any individual so employed may be compensated at a rate not in excess of $75 per diem, and, while such individual is away from his home or regular place of business, he may be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses;

(11) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any United States district court, and jurisdiction is conferred upon such district court to determine such controversies without regard to the amount in controversy; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Secretary or his property. Nothing herein shall be construed to except the activities under this Act from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28, United States Code, and of section 367 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316); and

(12) establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE

SEC. 13. Whenever the Secretary shall determine that employment conditions within any area previously designated by him as a redevelopment area have changed to such an extent that such area is no longer eligible for such designation under section 5 of this Act, no further assistance shall be granted under this Act with respect to such area and, for the purposes of this Act, such area shall not be considered a redevelopment area: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall (1) prevent any such area from again being designated a redevelopment area under section 5 of this Act if the Secretary determines it to be eligible under such section, or (2) affect the validity of any contracts or undertakings with respect to such area which were entered into pursuant to this Act prior to a determination by the Secretary that such area no longer qualifies as a redevelopment area. The Secretary shall keep the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and interested State or local agencies, advised at all times of any changes made hereunder with respect to the designation of any area.

URBAN RENEWAL

SEC. 14. Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"REDEVELOPMENT AREAS UNDER THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

"SEC. 113. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Commerce certifies to the Administrator (1) that any county, city, or other municipality (in this section referred to as a 'municipality') is situated in an area designated under section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act as a redevelopment area, and (2) that there is a *reasonable* probability that with assistance provided under such Act and other undertakings the area will be able to achieve more than temporary improvement in its economy, the Administrator is authorized to provide financial assistance to a local public agency in any such municipality under this title and the provisions of this section.

"(b) Subject to the provisions of subsection (e) of this section, the Secretary may provide such financial assistance under this section without regard to the requirement or limitations of section 110(c) that the project area be predominantly residential in character or be redeveloped for predominantly residential uses under the urban renewal plan, and without regard to any of the limitations of that section on the undertaking of projects for predominantly nonresidential uses.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a contract for financial assistance under this section may include provisions permitting the disposition of any land in the project area designated under the urban renewal plan for industrial or commercial uses to any public agency or nonprofit corporation for subsequent disposition as promptly as practicable by such public agency or corporation for the redevelopment of the land in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *Provided,* That any disposition of such land to such public agency or corporation under this section shall be made at its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *And provided further,* That only the purchasers from or lessees of such public agency or corporation, and their assignees, shall be required to assume the obligations relating to the commencement of improvements imposed under section 105(b) hereof.

"(d) Following the execution of any contract for financial assistance under this section with respect to any project, the Administrator may exercise the authority vested in him under this section as well as other provisions of this title for the completion of such projects, notwithstanding any determination made after the execution of such contract that the area in which the project is located is no longer a redevelopment area under the Area Redevelopment Act.

"(e) The aggregate amount of capital grants which may be contracted for under this title with respect to projects for the redevelopment of urban renewal areas for predominantly nonresidential uses, under the second proviso of the fifth sentence of section 110(c), may be increased by an amount not to exceed 10 per centum of the aggregate amount of new grant contract authority provided after September 23, 1959, whenever the Administrator determines (1) that an increase in such amount is necessary in order to provide financial assistance under this section, and (2) that such assistance is not otherwise available because of the limitation contained in such proviso."

URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

SEC. 15. (a) Paragraph (3) of section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after "counties which" the following: "(A) are situated in areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce under section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act as redevelopment areas or (B)".

(b) Section 701(b) of such Act is amended by adding before the period at the end of the first sentence a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That a grant may be made under clause (A) of paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of this section for not more than 75 per centum of such estimated cost".

OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING

SEC. 16. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized, upon request and whenever he determines such studies are needed, to undertake, or to provide assistance to others for studies of the size, characteristics, skills, adaptability, occupational potentialities, and related aspects of the labor force of any redevelopment area.

(b) When a redevelopment area has an approved economic development program as provided in section 6(b)(10), the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary, shall determine the occupational training or retraining needs of unemployed and underemployed individuals residing in the redevelopment area. The Secretary of Labor shall notify the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the occupational training or retraining requirements of the area, and shall provide for the orderly selection and referral of those unemployed or underemployed individuals residing in the area who can reasonably be expected to obtain employment as a result of the skill they will acquire in the training which is to be available, and shall make appropriate provision for such supervision by the appropriate agency as is necessary to the successful operation of any training program established under this section. The Secretary of Labor shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and with existing State and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to vocational training and retraining for the purpose of assuring that the facilities and services of such agencies are made fully available to such individuals.

(c) Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds that additional facilities or services are needed in the area to meet the occupational training or retraining needs of such individuals, he shall so advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall provide assistance, including financial assistance when necessary, to the appropriate State vocational educational agency in the provision of such additional facilities or services. If the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds that the State vocational educational agency is unable to provide the facilities and services needed, he may, after consultation with such agency, provide for the same by agreement or contract with public or private educational institutions.

(d) The Secretary of Labor shall arrange to provide any necessary technical assistance for setting up apprenticeships, and to promote journeyman and other on-the-job training.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not in excess of $4,500,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

RETRAINING SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS

SEC. 17. (a) The Secretary of Labor in consultation with the Secretary may, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States in which redevelopment areas are located, under which the Secretary of Labor shall make payments to such States either in advance or by way of reimbursement for the purpose of enabling such States, as agents of the United States, to make weekly retraining payments to unemployed or underemployed individuals residing within such redevelopment areas who are certified by the Secretary of Labor to be undergoing occupational training or retraining under section 16 of this Act. Such payments shall be made only for the period the individual is receiving occupational training or retraining under section 16 of this Act, but not in any event to exceed sixteen weeks, and the amounts of such payments shall be equal to the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment payable in the State making such payments.

(b) No weekly retraining payment shall be made to any person otherwise eligible who, with respect to the week for which such payment would be made, has received or is seeking unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or any State unemployment compensation law, but if the appropriate State or Federal agency finally determines that a person denied weekly training benefits because of this paragraph is not entitled to unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or such Federal or State law, this paragraph shall not apply.

(c) Any agreement under this section may contain provisions (including, so far as may be appropriate, provisions authorized or made applicable with respect to agreements concluded by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to title XV of the Social Security Act) as will promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss, and insure the proper application of payments made to the State under such agreement. Except as may be provided in such agreements, or in the rules and regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (d) of this section, determinations by any duly designated officer or agency as to the eligibility of individuals for weekly retraining payments under this section shall be final and conclusive for any purposes and not subject to review by any court or any other officer.

(d) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary shall jointly prescribe such rules and regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not in excess of $10,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

PENALTIES

SEC. 18. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal, deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Secretary, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Secretary in the administration of this Act, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or (2) with intent to defraud the Secretary or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Secretary, or without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or (3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Secretary, or (4) gives any unauthorized in-

formation concerning any future action or plan of the Secretary which might affect the value of securities, or having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Secretary, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

EMPLOYMENT OF EXPEDITERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE EMPLOYEES

SEC. 19. No loan shall be made by the Secretary under this Act to any business enterprise unless the owners, partners, or officers of such business enterprise (1) certify to the Secretary the names of any attorneys, agents, or other persons engaged by or on behalf of such business enterprise for the purpose of expediting applications made to the Secretary for assistance of any sort, and the fees paid or to be paid to any such person; and (2) execute an agreement binding any such business enterprise, for a period of two years after any assistance is rendered by the Secretary to such business enterprise, to refrain from employing, tendering any office or employment to, or retaining for professional services, any person who, on the date such assistance or any part thereof was rendered, or within one year prior thereto, shall have served as an officer, attorney, agent or employee, occupying a position or engaging in activities which the Secretary shall have determined involve discretion with respect to the granting of assistance under this Act.

RECORD OF APPLICATIONS

SEC. 20. The Secretary shall maintain as a permanent part of the records of the Department of Commerce a list of approved applications for loans which shall be kept available for public inspection during the regular business hours of the Department of Commerce. The following information shall be posted in such list as soon as each application is approved: (1) the name of the applicant and, in the case of corporate applications, the names of the officers and directors thereof, (2) the amount and duration of the loan for which application is made, (3) the purposes for which the proceeds of the loan are to be used, and (4) a general description of the security offered.

PREVAILING RATE OF WAGE AND FORTY-HOUR WEEK

SEC. 21. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects assisted by the Secretary under this Act and undertaken by public applicants 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 Numbered 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 (40 U.S.C. 276c).

REPORTS

SEC. 22. The Secretary shall make comprehensive and detailed semiannual reports to the Congress of his operations under this Act for each six-month period of each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962. Such reports shall be printed and shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3 and June 30 of each year following the fiscal year with respect to which such reports are made. Such reports shall show, among other things, (1) the total number of unemployed persons in redevelopment areas, (2) the total principal amount of loans under this Act which are outstanding, the aggregate expenditures incurred by the Government in providing grants and other forms of assistance under this Act, and the administrative expenses incurred by the Government in providing assistance under this Act, (3) the number of applications for assistance under this Act which are pending and the total amount of assistance requested in such applications, (4) the number of industrial or commercial enterprises which have commenced or expanded operations in redevelopment areas as a result of assistance under this Act, the total asset value of such enterprises, and a description of each such enterprise in terms of whether it is a wholly new business enterprise, an enterprise which has moved from another area, or a branch of an existing business enterprise located elsewhere, (5) the total number of jobs created in each economically distressed area as a result of assistance extended under this Act, (6) the sum obtained by dividing the total amount of Federal assistance extended under this Act (including the administrative expenses incurred by the Government in extending such assistance) by the number of jobs created as a result of such assistance, (7) the number and size of Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies and services placed with business enterprises located in redevelopment areas, and (8) the amount and duration of employment resulting from such contracts. Upon the request of the Secretary, the various departments and agencies of the Government engaged in the procurement of supplies and services shall furnish to the Secretary such information as may be necessary for the purposes of clauses (7) and (8) above.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 23. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

USE OF OTHER FACILITIES

SEC. 24. (a) The Secretary may, to the extent practicable and with their consent, use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis. The Secretary shall exercise the authority contained in the preceding sentence whenever such exercise will avoid the duplication of existing staffs and facilities.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. This Act shall be supplemental to any existing authority, and nothing herein shall be deemed to be restrictive of any existing powers, duties, and functions of any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

(c) Funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be transferred, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, between departments and agencies of the Government, if such funds are used for the purposes for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated.

(d) Subject to the standards and procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the head of any agency, for the performance of functions under this Act, including functions delegated pursuant to section 25, may place positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule established by such Act, and such positions shall be in addition to the number of such positions authorized by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to be placed in such grades: *Provided,* That not to exceed one such position may be placed in such grades under this subsection, to be assigned to the agencies by the Secretary, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS

SEC. 25. The Secretary, with the approval of the President, is authorized to delegate to the heads of other departments or agencies of the Government such functions, powers, and duties which are conferred upon him by this Act as he deems appropriate, and to authorize the redelegation of such functions, powers, and duties by the heads of such departments or agencies.

RECORDS AND AUDIT

SEC. 26. (a) Each recipient of assistance under section 6 or 7 of this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United State, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under section 6 or 7 of this Act.

TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 27. (a) This Act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1965.

(b) Notwithstanding the foregoing, effective on July 1, 1965, those assets, funds, contracts, loans, liabilities, commitments, authorizations, allocations, and records of the Secretary under this Act which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine are necessary to the liquidation of the affairs and functions conducted under this Act, are transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury for purposes of liquidation.

(c) The termination of this Act shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, commitment, or other obligation entered into pursuant to this Act prior to the date of such termination, or the taking of any action necessary to preserve or protect the interests of the United States in any amounts advanced or paid out in carrying on operations under this Act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 28. As used in this Act, the term "State" means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and the term "United States" refers to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to take this occasion to express my congratulations to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for

the masterful way in which he has handled the complicated piece of legislation which we have passed. All of us have learned a great deal from the debate. No Member of the Senate is more enlightening and at the same time more exciting and more interesting in his discussion of a complicated issue than is the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois.

I am sure that I speak for all our colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say that this has been a job well done, and that no Senator is more deserving of the honors and plaudits of the administration for bringing this bill before the Senate and then having it passed by the Senate than is the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Minnesota in what he has said. Let us remember that this is the third time the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois has steered this legislation through the Senate. Of course, we know that it fell by the wayside heretofore, because of Presidential vetoes. However, I feel confident that this time the bill will become law and will be a beneficial program for the country. I join in congratulating the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois for the tremendous job he has done.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleagues the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Alabama in what they have had to say about the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, who has once again steered a depressed areas bill through the Senate. He has worked on the site in some of these areas at the direction of the President of the United States. He has introduced other bills and has had other bills passed by the Senate. I am certain that the bill we have passed will not meet the fate which similar bills have met on two previous occasions. I extend my congratulations to him for a job well done.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that once again the Senator from Illinois has demonstrated his statesmanship in the Senate. It does not surprise me, but it does please me. I thank him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the Senator from Illinois is deserving of the medal of New Frontiersman No. 1.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, while I did not see eye to eye with the Senator from Illinois, I wish to commend him for his persistence and valiance in presenting the cause intelligently, so that it was understood by all Senators.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues. I know that their praise is undeserved. The credit for the bill goes in large part to the staff, and also to the devoted members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, whose crucial votes enabled us to bring the bill to the floor, and to the Members of the Senate who supported it on the floor.

No one claims that the bill, if enacted into law, will cure unemployment. It will not cure all the unemployment in the depressed areas. We do not wish to give an exaggerated idea of its importance. We simply say that it will be of help; that is all.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, it is quite refreshing to see the mutual admiration society in operation again, as it has been so often.

THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. PELL in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, relating to the Interstate Highway System.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the communication be printed in the RECORD, and, with the accompanying document, be referred to the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Finance to consider the matters under their respective jurisdictions.

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

The communication from the President is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 14, 1961.

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

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith the draft of a bill which will make it possible to complete our Interstate Highway System by 1972. The program will be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis.

I am convinced that either stretching out or cutting back our highway program would be unwise. It would be particularly unfortunate today, when our economy needs the growth, our people need the safety, and our national defense needs the security that this program helps provide. Unless this legislation is enacted promptly, apportionments to the States will have to be reduced substantially below desired levels.

This is a sound method for resolving the difficulties the program now faces and for meeting our responsibilities to the future.

I am also enclosing a letter from the Secretary of Commerce dealing with the measure.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

AMENDMENT OF BACON-DAVIS ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], I earlier today introduced a bill to amend the so-called Davis-Bacon Act—relating to the payment of prevailing wages on Federal construction work. This law was first enacted in 1931 and was considerably revised in 1935 to represent what was then a comparatively effective instrument for preventing the purchasing power of the Federal Government from undermining existing labor conditions in the construction industry.

Since 1935, however, experience has revealed many drawbacks in the framework for administering the Davis-Bacon Act. In fact, changing conditions in the construction industry have required a new look at the way the act operates today. That is the purpose of this bill—namely, to provide a basis for taking a new and more realistic look at the Davis-Bacon Act.

Since 1935 the Secretary of Labor has confined himself to determine the basic hourly wage rate as the only prevailing rate required by the act. Nowadays, however, this basic hourly wage rate falls far short of reflecting the actual hourly labor costs on construction jobs. Collective agreements throughout the industry now cover many additional payments for the welfare of workers—payments which did not exist in 1935. For example, most agreements in many areas of the country now provide for payments, on an hourly, or payroll basis, to so-called health and welfare funds, so as to provide much needed sick and hospital and medical benefits to construction workers and their families. Payments are also frequently required to be made to pension funds and to supplementary unemployment benefit funds. Many agreements also require payments to various training funds of direct benefit to journeymen and apprentices whose skills are the lifeblood of the construction industry and the mainstay of those who depend upon this great industry for their livelihood.

Recent surveys have shown that the payments to these funds are not only a substitute for direct wage increases which workers would otherwise have received as a part of their basic hourly wage rate but, in addition, that these payments now are a very large part of the hourly wage costs in the construction industry.

In the plumbing and pipefitting branches of the construction industry alone, there are funds in more than 68 of 100 cities surveyed by the U.S. Department of Labor. Payments to these funds run as high as 46½ cents per straight time hour or as high as 12 percent of the basic hourly wage. Other crafts in other cities have negotiated even higher payments.

These payments cannot be ignored or discouraged because they exist to benefit workers for whom they are made. Yet under the interpretation of the present act they are ignored and discouraged. Day after day the law is extending an open invitation to outside contractors to bring low wages and cheap labor into higher wage communities because these lower labor costs give them a successful bidding advantage on Government work.

This type of unfair wage competition was the very reason for the enactment of the Davis-Bacon Act in the first place. It is the purpose of this amendment to upgrade the act so that it will once more carry out its original purpose.

Under my amendment the Secretary of Labor would be required to predetermine and Government contractors would be required to pay not only the

prevailing hourly rate as presently specified in the Davis-Bacon Act but also prevailing contractor payments to:

First. Health and welfare funds.

Second. Retirement funds.

Third. Apprenticeship funds.

Mr. President, I respectfully urge that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare give early and sympathetic consideration to this measure. I believe that anyone who studies this amendment in an objective manner will be convinced of its merits and that it should be enacted in order to correct a shortcoming in the present Davis-Bacon Act. The time to act on this amendment is now, and I hope that this Congress will not adjourn without having taken action on this measure.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is the intention of the leadership to bring up H.R. 4806, the temporary unemployment compensation bill, and H.R. 5075, the railroad unemployment compensation bill, and the OECD and the Columbia River Basin treaties.

PROPOSED 40-FOOT CHANNEL FOR THE COLUMBIA RIVER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Hon. Harry D. Boivin, president of the Senate of the State of Oregon, has called to my attention Senate Joint Memorial 5, adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon. The joint memorial covers a subject of primary importance to the State of Oregon in that it urges early action by the Corps of Engineers, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and the Congress of the United States on the proposed 40-foot depth, 750-foot width ship channel between the mouth of the Columbia River and Portland-Vancouver.

For many years I have been convinced that the presently authorized 35-foot channel between the mouth of the Columbia River and Portland-Vancouver is inadequate from the standpoint of authorized depth. Furthermore, it has been maintained at less than project depth in many stretches in the river. In consequence, ship groundings have occurred too frequently.

In recent years vessels carrying products to and from ports along the Columbia River and its tributaries have been constructed to carry larger loads than those which can be accommodated by a 35-foot channel. In the interest of navigation and river commerce it is important that the 40-foot depth be authorized promptly and that the channel be dredged to this new depth at the earliest possible date.

It is my opinion that the 40-foot channel can be justified fully from an economic standpoint as well as in the interest of national defense. I strongly support the project and commend it to my colleagues for favorable consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 5

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent that:

Whereas the continued welfare and proper economic growth and development of the State of Oregon depend on the unimpeded movement of waterborne commerce along the Columbia River, and particularly upon a ship channel which is adequate for the movement of loaded deep-draft vessels; and

Whereas the Federal Government recognizes that the benefits of trade, commerce, and industry to all of its citizens and the vital national defense features inherent in a system of adequately developed waterways throughout the United States require it to maintain through the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army the present 35-foot-deep and 500-foot-wide Columbia River ship channel from the mouth to Portland, Oreg.; and

Whereas the present Columbia River ship channel project is of insufficient width and depth to allow safe, proper, or unimpeded navigation by deep-draft vessels; and

Whereas the inadequacy of the present Columbia River ship channel limits the movement and size of vessels and cargo upon the Columbia River and results in grounding, serious mishaps, and a continuous threat to the safety of navigation and causes an adverse effect upon welfare of all Columbia River ports; and

Whereas the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District, will complete its study of the proposed 40-foot-deep, 750-foot-wide ship channel in the lower Columbia and Willamette Rivers between Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash., and the sea, in the current fiscal year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring):

(1) The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is urged to expedite in every way review of said study by its Chief of Engineers and Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and to approve a new Columbia River ship channel project from the mouth to the port of Portland of not less than 40-foot depth and 750-foot width.

(2) The Congress of the United States is urged to authorize such new Columbia River ship channel project and to appropriate funds for its construction at the earliest possible date to alleviate the present serious and hazardous condition of navigation in the Columbia River and its detrimental effect upon the trade, commerce, and industry of Oregon and the entire Pacific Northwest and the national defense and general welfare.

(3) Copies of this memorial shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Chief Clerk of the U.S. Senate, the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Secretary of Defense, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Army, the Chief of Engineers of the U.S. Army, to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation, and to each member of the Washington congressional delegation.

RESTORATION OF THE INDIAN CEMETERY NEAR JOSEPH, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, enrolled Senate Joint Memorial 8, adopted by the Legislature of the State of Oregon was brought to my attention by the Honorable Harry D. Boivin, president of the Senate of the State of Oregon.

This memorial discusses an important historical monument located near Joseph, Wallowa County, Oreg. The site includes the burial place of Chief Joseph and approximately 300 Nez Perce and Umatilla Indians. It is in a ruinous and unattractive condition and I agree that prompt action should be taken to restore and maintain the cemetery in an attractive condition. I urge the Secretary of the Interior to give serious and prompt consideration to the statements appearing in this memorial.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point the resolution and an article from the Eugene Register Guard.

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

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8

To the Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, and to the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs and to the Oregon Congressional Delegation:

We, your memorialists, the 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent that:

Whereas the United States of America through the Department of the Interior presently holds as trustee an Indian cemetery near Joseph, Wallowa County, Oreg., wherein approximately 300 Nez Perce and Umatilla Indians, including Chief Joseph, are buried; and

Whereas this cemetery is in a ruinous and unattractive condition due to lack of care and maintenance, indicating a lack of respect for the original American inhabitants buried therein; and

Whereas said cemetery is of great historical importance and is deserving of being maintained in an attractive condition; and

Whereas the present historical monument located thereon is inadequate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring):

The Honorable Secretary of the Interior and the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Oregon congressional delegation are memorialized to take such steps as may be necessary to restore and maintain such cemetery in an attractive condition and to construct thereon a suitable monument indicating the historical importance of the cemetery.

[From the Eugene Register-Guard, Feb. 27, 1961]

TO PROVIDE LEARNING FOR THE MANY—LAND-GRANT SYSTEM WAS "SPARK OF HOPE"

WASHINGTON.—Sixty-eight American colleges and universities are preparing to celebrate a centennial—the establishment of the land-grant system of higher education.

The actual anniversary is July 2, 1962, but a steering committee of educators already has scheduled a series of programs for 1961 and 1962.

At centennial headquarters in Washington, D.C., arrangements have been made for nationwide conferences, seminars, and exhibits to spotlight the institutions' origin and their contributions to the economic, cultural and scientific growth of the United States.

BORN IN CIVIL WAR

The land-grant system was born as a spark of hope for the future in the dark days of the Civil War, recalls the National Geographic Society.

It was based on the concept that learning should be practical as well as academic, and that it should be open, not just to a privileged few, but to any who could use it.

Congressional legislation to that end was fathered by Representative Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont. In final form it provided for a Federal grant of land to each State, apportioned at the rate of 30,000 acres for every Senator and Representative.

With money from sale of the land, each State was to establish and endow "at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts."

Forward-looking men supported the Morrill bill in the belief that widespread knowledge and training were essential to the Nation's agricultural and industrial progress. Opposition was heavy, however. Though passed by a small majority in 1859, the measure was vetoed by President Buchanan on grounds of expense, potential land speculation, competition with existing universities, and infringement on States rights.

A similar bill was passed and signed into law by President Lincoln on July 2, 1862. Its support owed much to provisions for military training, a lack painfully apparent in the North's losses earlier in 1862.

COLLEGES FLOURISH

Today, land-grant institutions flourish in all 50 States and Puerto Rico. They enroll 20 percent of all U.S. college students. The schools confer all doctorate degrees in agriculture, about half those in sciences, engineering, and health professions, and a quarter in arts, languages, business, and education. To them goes much of the credit for extending the teaching of the humanities throughout the United States.

The colleges and universities that grew out of the Morrill legislation now play a vital role in programs providing American technical aid abroad. Through the Reserve Officers Training Corps, they prepare nearly half the civilian-trained Regular and Reserve officers of the Armed Forces. ROTC, said the late Gen. George C. Marshall, who was a life trustee of National Geographic, speeded World War II mobilization by at least 6 months.

Contributions made by land-grant institutions to America and the world include advances in farming methods; new drugs to treat disease; basic studies of raw materials used in industry. Their pioneering research in atomic-age sciences produced the first cyclotron.

Leaders of the Land-Grant Centennial plan to open wide discussions expected to have far-reaching effects on the Nation's academic and practical future.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF MOBILE, ALA.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 64, S. 900.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 900) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of Mobile, Ala.

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, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, on page 1, line 8, after the word "than", to strike out "two" and insert "five"; in line 9, after the word "diameter", to insert "of bronze or silver or both,", and on page 2, line 6, after the word "Corporation", to insert "in quantities of not less than two thousand,"; 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 in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Mobile, Alabama (which anniversary will be celebrated in 1961), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the Mobile Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary Celebration Corporation not more than five thousand medals, one and five-sixteenths inches in diameter, of bronze or silver or both, with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Mobile Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary Celebration Corporation subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the Corporation, in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1961. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture; including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such cost.

(b) Upon authorization from the Mobile Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary Celebration Corporation, the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates of such medal to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof (including labor).

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words on the pending bill. It would permit the striking of 5,000 commemorative medals in connection with the 250th anniversary celebration of the founding of the city of Mobile, Ala., this year. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and it has been approved by the Treasury Department. I hope it may be passed.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION OF 1848

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, March 15 marks the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of 1848.

This day is celebrated throughout the world by Hungarians as a national holiday. In this year of 1961 this day of independence of the Hungarian people has added significance because of the fact that there are pending before the United Nations 12 resolutions which were debated by the General Assembly of the United Nations after the Soviet government viciously and tyrannically put down the Hungarian revolution of 1956.

On the coming Sunday, I venture to say that throughout the United States, in various places, Hungarian choral societies will be meeting and Hungarian civic leaders will be speaking before the statue of Louis Kossuth. They will be reciting poetry written by Petofi, the great national poet of Hungary. In the recitation of that poetry, one will hear uttered words describing the yearning of the Hungarian people for freedom. In those forces will be found the spirit of Hungary protesting against the yoke of foreign domination. Those poems were written practically 75 years ago, but they have a definite relationship to the fight which the Hungarians made in October 1956.

Mr. President, what are some of the items of unfinished business before the United Nations?

Sir Leslie Monro, the special delegate to the United Nations on the question of Hungary, in his report on December 1, 1960, reaffirmed that—

(a) The Soviet Union, in violation of the principles of the United Nations, perpetrated a military invasion of Hungary and subsequently deprived the Hungarian people of their freedom and their economic and political independence.

(b) The present Government of Hungary was created by the Soviet Union and it exists for the singular purpose of serving the Soviet Union.

(c) The Soviet Union and its puppet governors of Hungary have not honored the agreements of the 1949 Geneva Convention nor the Paris Peace Treaties of 1947. The Soviet Union was a signatory of both documents.

What are some of the things which the world can do in connection with the plea of the Hungarian people for freedom? The Hungarians of the free world again turn to the United Nations, its member free nations, and to the representatives of these free nations, and

appeal to the conscience of all men of character and respectfully ask that:

First, all efforts of the Soviet Union to remove the question of Hungary from the agenda should be nullified.

Second, the General Assembly should debate and discuss Sir Leslie Monro's report on Hungary, made in December 1960.

Third, the United Nations should enforce the resolution which it has passed, and has affirmed several times since, concerning the Soviet Union's withdrawal from Hungary.

Fourth, that the United Nations should continue to refuse recognition of the alleged Hungarian representatives at the beginning of the session because they are not representatives of the Hungarian people. This delegation is representative of a government which was placed at the head of the Hungarian nation by a foreign power to obey the desires of that foreign power.

Fifth, the United Nations should recognize the spiritual unity of the Hungarian people and an appropriate delegation whose members do not have or have not had Russian and Communist affiliations, and who have been democratically chosen by Hungarians living in the free world.

Sixth, the United Nations should use whatever influence it has to prevent the execution of Hungarian children for their participation in the 1956 revolt when they reach their 16th birthday.

Mr. President, there is a weird statute in the Communist law which permits the execution of Hungarian children for ex post facto acts against a government which did not exist when the acts were committed.

Mr. President, I believe I express the general feeling of the people of Ohio that we shall forever be grateful for the example set by the Hungarian Freedom Fighters in October 1956. We shall forever remember the great leadership which Louis Kossuth gave to the Hungarian people in the year 1848, and the example which he set for their willingness to fight to the limit for the maintenance and the establishment of liberty in Hungary. They are a noble people; they should not be forgotten. We owe them a debt. We in a measure induced their revolt. We caused them to lift their arms, defenseless, against the tanks and the guns and the mighty power of the Soviet Union. They went down to death. Their memory lives with us. We should not forget them. We should, year after year, call upon the world to remember the great heroism of those Hungarian people.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF MOBILE, ALA.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 900) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of Mobile, Ala.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks I made a few minutes ago, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter addressed to Hon. A. Willis Robertson, Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, by my colleague from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and me with respect to the bill.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
March 9, 1961.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN. We respectfully request that the committee approve S. 900 which would provide for the striking of a medal commemorating the 250th anniversary of the founding of the city of Mobile, Ala., on Mobile Bay in the year 1711.

Technically, Mobile has been under seven flags. The French governed the city from 1702–63, the British from 1763–79, Spain from 1779–1800. Then France, under the leadership of Napoleon, raised the tricolor in 1800 and governed Mobile once again until 1803, when the United States gained jurisdiction. In 1861 the State of Alabama seceded from the Union and Mobile was under the flag of the State of Alabama until the State became a member of the Confederate States. Then, in 1865, Mobile once again was under the jurisdiction of the United States and has been ever since.

Because of the significant historical background of this area, we strongly recommend that a commemorative medal be issued in 1961 honoring Mobile's 250th anniversary.

Mobile's celebration will reach a climax during the week of June 11, 1961. Therefore, it is our hope that all arrangements for striking this medal can be made as soon as possible.

The executive committee of Mobile's 250th anniversary has been in touch with us about this matter. These fine Mobilians who constitute the committee would like to have 5,000 commemorative medals measuring one and five-sixteenth inches in diameter struck as soon as the application for this medal has been approved by the House and Senate.

This celebration is not only a historical landmark for Alabama, but for the entire Nation. It is our genuine hope that the committee will see fit to authorize a medal, thereby materially adding to the significance of the celebration.

With kindest personal regards, we are,
Sincerely,

LISTER HILL.
JOHN SPARKMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 15, 1961, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1173) to authorize the appointment of Dwight David Eisenhower to the active list of the Regular Army, and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the program previously announced for the remainder of the week—and I hope it can be finished this week—includes the two temporary unemployment compensation proposals; the OECD Treaty; and the Columbia River Basin Treaty. The next order of business will be Calendar No. 65, S. 205, a bill to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in public schools, colleges, and adult training programs. That measure will follow the four measures previously announced.

Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn, under the order previously entered, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, March 16, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 15, 1961:

The following-named persons to the offices indicated:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

William H. Tucker, of Massachusetts, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1967, vice John H. Winchell.

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISION

Edward D. Re, of New York, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

William S. Simkin, of Pennsylvania, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Berl I. Bernhard, of Maryland, to be staff director for the Commission on Civil Rights, vice Gordon M. Tiffany.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Robert E. Maxwell, of West Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of West Virginia for a term of 4 years, vice Albert M. Morgan.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

James L. Harrison, of the District of Columbia, to be Public Printer.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 15, 1961:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Neville Miller, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1961.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Edward R. Murrow, of New York, to be Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

Donald M. Wilson, of New Jersey, to be Deputy Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

J. Graham Parsons, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sweden.

Miss Frances E. Willis, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ceylon.

Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Vietnam.

UNITED NATIONS

Avery F. Peterson, of Idaho, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 17th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 15, 1961:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

John H. Winchell, of Colorado, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1967, which was sent to the Senate on January 10, 1961.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Acts 21: 14: *The will of the Lord be done.*

Eternal God, our Father, may we seek during this day to identify and unite our wishes and desires more completely with Thy divine will, pledging ourselves to make it the central and controlling thought of our minds.

Grant that, as we daily pray for our beloved country, we may be motivated by a great concern for its honor and security and the preservation and promotion of the principles of democracy.

We earnestly beseech Thee to deliver us from loss of social conscience and from all feelings of complacency and contentment while distress and poverty, unemployment and inadequate housing affect the lives of so many of our fellow countrymen.

May our leaders and Members of this legislative body perceive clearly what is needful for the health and happiness of our citizens and be blessed with the spirit of wise statesmanship and generous philanthropy.

Hear us in the name of the Master who went about doing good. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

HUNGARIAN FREEDOM DAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the turbulent history of the Hungarian people is literally studded with glorious deeds and great achievements. Their modern history is marked with a long series of daring and dauntless struggles against their oppressors.

During the Middle Ages and in the early years of their modern history Hungarians had been masters of their destiny, and had become a powerful force in East-Central Europe. Then late in the 17th century Hungary was united with the Austrian Empire. In this union the kingdom of Hungary not only became a very junior partner, but the Hungarian people were robbed of their traditional freedom. Against the overwhelming power of the autocratic government in Vienna the Hungarian people fought with all the means at their disposal, but they were unable to restrain Austria's oppressive rule over Hungary. They petitioned for reforms; they protested against injustices; and at times they rebelled against the Austrian authorities, but all these efforts were of no avail, and in the end, until toward the middle of the last century, they submitted to superior force. And then came the revolution of 1848, bringing with it freedom for the Hungarian people.

The revolutionary wave of 1848 spread like a wildfire in many parts of Europe. Its effects and its intensity caused terror in ruling circles, particularly in capitals where autocratic governments were holding their own through suppression and force. In Vienna, where Metternich and his reactionary followers were in power for decades, events moved swiftly. The Government felt unable to cope with disturbances and uprisings in the provinces; nor could it deal with demonstrations in the city. By early March the Government was on the defensive. It was in a very conciliatory mood. Hungarian leaders in Budapest were well aware of the situation, and particularly of the helplessness of the Government. They realized that their turn to deal with the Government was approaching. They were prepared for it: they drew up a list of complaints, presented it to the Austrian authorities in Budapest, and demanded autonomy and freedom. This was done on March 15, and on that day the Government granted the Hungarian demand. The Hungarian leaders were overjoyed with the concessions thus obtained without actual physical struggle. That day became Hungarian Freedom Day, and as such it is celebrated as a national holiday.

In retrospect and with the advantage of 113 years' hindsight one can look at this historic event as a landmark in Hungary's political history. It is true that concessions then made were soon withdrawn, and the freedom thus granted was taken away from the Hungarian people in a ferocious battle in which unfortunate Hungarians were faced with Austria's and Russia's oppressive and overwhelming forces. But the significance of March 15 of 1848 is not lost on the people of Hungary. They will never forget that memorable day of 113 years ago on which they regained their freedom, for which they had fought for more than two centuries. That event brought to the fore one of the most famous European fighters for freedom in the person of Louis Kossuth. His long and arduous life is rightly and closely associated with Hungary's fight for freedom.

After this glorious event of 1848 and the bloody wars of 1849, Hungary once more was submerged in the Austrian Empire. In the 1860's Hungarians finally succeeded in bringing about the dual monarchy. Under the new arrangements they once more regained equal status with the Austrians. They were then content with their status, and in the dual monarchy of Austria-Hungary they lived as long as that monarchy lasted. But the First World War swept away all vestiges of monarchial institutions, both in Austria and Hungary. Hungary was separated, became a republic and as such lasted until the outbreak of the last war. As we all know, that war proved to be fatal to free and independent Hungary.

At the end of that war Hungarians struggled to regain their independence. For a few years it seemed that they were successful in their efforts. But then Soviet Russia intervened. With Russian aid, a Communist government was instituted, and since then, except for a very brief period of a few days in 1956, they have been held down under Communist totalitarian tyranny.

The year 1956 seemed to be a year of trouble for Communist oppressors in Eastern Europe. It began with a demonstration of workers in Poznan, Poland, where things were quelled by making concessions to the workers. But the real trouble began in Hungary in late October, where people were demanding not just improvement in their material well-being, but were clamoring for freedom. The spirit of 1848 was in the air. In the face of resurging popular demands Communist leaders in Budapest, like Austrian authorities of 1848, were in a conciliatory mood. By the end of October the Hungarians had, with very little fighting, extorted from their oppressors most of what they wanted, above all freedom. At the same time the whole free world was

overjoyed with their apparent success. But the Red army, which had held back during the early stages of revolution in Hungary, was preparing to move in. This it did early in November. Hungarians had enjoyed their freedom for only a few days when they were faced with the might of the Soviet's Red army. And the revolution of 1956 ended with the ruthless intervention of Russian forces, just as the fighting of 1848–49 had terminated after effective Russian intervention. In both cases the movements ended in blood baths.

Today Hungarians are being crushed under Communist tyranny, but the spirit of 1848 and of 1956 is very much alive in their hearts; they still cling to their ideals of freedom and independence. On this 113th anniversary of their freedom day we wish them fortitude and strength.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of Hungarian Freedom Day.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the turbulent history of the Hungarian people has had its ups and downs, its glories and its setbacks. One of their happiest moments was March 15, 1848, when they obtained freedom and autonomy in their homeland. In view of the two preceding centuries of Austrian autocracy, during which they had frequently struggled to attain their freedom, this was a very important achievement.

Hungarians were always prepared to make the supreme sacrifice for the attainment of their freedom, but the revolution of 1848 in Europe saved them such sacrifices. As the result of that tumultuous event the government in Vienna was prepared to make almost limitless concessions to the people of Hungary in order to save its shaky authority there. When early in March Hungarian patriots in Budapest demanded freedom and autonomy, the Government acceded to their demands on March 15. Since that historic date that day has become a Hungarian national holiday, their freedom day, and as such it is annually celebrated.

The more recent Hungarian struggle for freedom had far less auspicious consequences. The free world will never forget the terror of the Hungarian blood bath of 1956. The stirring courage of the Hungarian freedom fighters, as well as the brutal suppression of their tormentors, will forever be stamped in our memory.

The people of Hungary today, languishing in the shadow of Soviet tyranny, have only the memory of their earlier freedom to sustain them. It is well that we use this March 15 to pay tribute to their unrelenting aspirations for liberty and independence. It is well, too, that we us this occasion to remind the world that the United Nations has adopted 12 resolutions condemning the Soviet Union for their actions and calling for a free Hungary. Right and justice are on the side of the long-suffering people of Hungary. If we continue to raise our voice in protest, both here in the Congress and in the United States, perhaps we can hope to see their desperate aspirations fulfilled.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, today, March 15, 1961, marks the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolt against their imperial oppressors.

It is fitting, although sad, to note that they now are under the yoke of another more violent form of oppression that reaches even into the personal life of each and every true Hungarian today.

The Communist government of Hungary, which remains in control solely through the might of the Soviet Army, is in direct opposition to the American form of government which holds certain truths to be self-evident—"that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

These words, the very foundation on which the United States of America were founded, prompted me to speak today in support of a people enslaved by tyranny. The spirit of Western freedom to which the Hungarian people have revealed their allegiance by revolution even as late as 1956, must be recognized by the nations of the free world. The resolutions presented in the United Nations for the relief of this great nation must be enforced. The new members of this international organization must be made to realize the terrible fate of a people crushed by a hideous ideology that has world conquest by any means as its main and permanent aim. They must be convinced that if flowery epithets or peaceful means are not successful, Khrushchev and his cohorts will stoop to violence to achieve their aim. They will enslave whole peoples through armed force and will attempt to break the very spirit of their adversaries.

There is no better example in the world today than Hungary to explain this to people fortunate enough, for the time being, to be free to choose their form of government and allegiance.

On this occasion, we must bring to the fore the plight of the Hungarian people, not only as an example to save other peoples from the trap of communism, but to attempt to achieve their long-deserved freedom from the yoke of communism.

The Magyar nation of Hungary deserves a special tribute today on the anniversary of their freedom flight of 1848, and more important a tribute to the spirit of Western freedom which the Soviet Government has been unable to bridle or break.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today we join our neighbors of Hungarian descent in commemorating the 113th anniversary of the valiant efforts of the Hungarian people to gain freedom by the Hungarian revolution of 1848.

Although that revolution was crushed by the czar, the burning aspiration of the Hungarian people to regain freedom was not crushed.

Their spirit of freedom was so deep-rooted that they rose again in 1956, courageously seeking to free themselves from their Communist oppressors. Despite the courageous sacrifice of Hungarian lives, this effort was cruelly suppressed by the overwhelming force of Communist tyranny.

The Hungarians have demonstrated again and again their determination to free their native land and to establish it as an independent nation. The efforts of the freedom fighters of 1948, and of their descendants, the freedom fighters of 1956, stand as irrefutable testimony of their sacrificial courage and undaunted spirits.

As a nation founded upon the principle of securing the "blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity," we join wholeheartedly with the people of Hungary in their pleas for liberation from Soviet tyranny.

President Kennedy in his speech of March 13, 1961, eloquently expressed our belief that the blessings of liberty rightfully belong to all people. He said:

> For our unfilled task is to demonstrate to the entire world that man's unsatisfied aspiration for economic progress and social justice can best be achieved by freemen working within a framework of democratic institutions.

May this anniversary of the Hungarian revolution serve to reassure the people of Hungarian descent that their plight is not forgotten and that their hopes are also our hopes.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, today is the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution against the tyranny of the Hapsburgs.

It is fitting that we take this occasion to consider the present state of Hungary; to pay tribute to her brave people; and to renew our dedication to the fight for freedom everywhere.

The present condition of Hungary is tragic. To the sorrow of the free world, Hungary remains prostrate under a foreign occupation far worse than even the rule of the Hapsburgs. Hungary is governed today by a handful of traitors, backed by Soviet armor and steel, and in accordance with instructions from Moscow.

Following the Soviet suppression of the Hungarian uprising 4 years ago, the United Nations General Assembly, in a total of 12 resolutions, has called upon the Soviets to withdraw their soldiers and permit the Hungarian people to choose their own government in free elections under international supervision.

The Soviets have ignored this call.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, almost daily we hear the Soviet Union demanding the free, self-determination of all peoples.

This is cynicism on a scale unequaled in history.

Mr. Speaker, surely there is in this a terrible warning to every young nation

now struggling through the early stages of independence. Every free nation, young or old, should beware of soft words and appealing propositions from the Soviet Union.

They need only look at Hungary for the truth.

There they will see a country with a thousand-year history of freedom, subjected to a brutal foreign power. Under an iron regime, human rights are brushed aside as if they did not exist. There they will find arrests in the night, secret trials, where there are trials, execution of patriots, forced labor, and collectivized farming.

There they will see a proud and ingenious people compelled by the basic requirements of life itself to bow before a puppet regime and do as they are told by Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, let us salute the brave people of Hungary. They are living in what must seem a never-ending night.

Let us thank Heaven for our own freedom and rededicate ourselves to fight for the day when men everywhere can stand straight and live lives of consequence in peace and freedom.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of March 15, 1848, when the people of Hungary rose against their Hapsburg oppressors, and it is a day which men, women, and children of Hungarian ancestry all over the world celebrate as a national holiday.

It is timely today, therefore, it seems to me, to direct attention to a fateful fact that at a time when underdeveloped nations are being liberated one after another, the people of Hungary, with a background of a thousand years of independence, still are in Soviet bondage despite their freedom fight in 1956 that shook the world.

The General Assembly of the United Nations since 1956 has successively adopted no less than 12 resolutions concerning Hungary, demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops and free elections under international control, while condemning the Soviet Union for the brutal crushing of the victorious Hungarian revolution. Soviet Russia continues to defy these resolutions. This is a menace to the ability of the United Nations to fulfill its objectives as a guardian of the Golden Rule for nations, and to achieve and preserve peace everywhere in the world.

Although the situation is not favorable for a concrete solution of the Hungarian problem, this anniversary of independence seems to be a proper occasion to urge that the Hungarian question be brought up in the United Nations. In so doing, we and peace-loving members of the United Nations have the opportunity to point up the bitter contrast between what Soviet Russia actually has done and is continuing to do in Hungary, and the pose that the same Soviet Russia is putting up, trying to deceive the world into believing that it is the greatest champion of anticolonialism, independence, and self-determination, by its activities in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

Raising the Hungarian question now, and at every appropriate time, would demonstrate the determination of ourselves and our allies not to submit to Communist usurpation of power. This would encourage smaller free nations and even our own allies to resist Communist pressure and subversion.

On this great day in Hungary's glorious history, then, let us raise our voices to urge that in the council of nations, the people of the world join in demanding justice for Hungary.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of 1848, it is proper for all of us in the free world to remember the Hungarian freedom fight of 1956 and to reemphasize in 1961 our support of the U.N. resolutions in behalf of Hungary. The spirit of a courageous people is backed by the conscience of the peace-loving nations of the world.

The United States endorsed the resolutions on Hungary in the United Nations. We have opened our doors to refugees who were forced to flee their native land. We have exhibited to the world our sympathy for the aspirations of these people in bondage.

The Communist masters in Hungary do not rule by the consent of the governed. They do not tolerate the most elementary type of human freedom. They neither respect nor heed the United Nations.

It is my sincere hope that our Government in its conduct of our foreign relations, both unilaterally and through the United Nations and other international agencies, will do all within its power to strengthen the forces of freedom in Hungary and in all the captive nations.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join so many of my colleagues in marking this anniversary, which is both a happy and a sad occasion for the Hungarian people.

It is a happy occasion to mark the independence day of any nation, any people. It is sad to note that the iron rule of the Kremlin still exists in Hungary.

It is ironic that the Soviet Union poses as the friend of the new and independent nations of the world. It is ironic that the Soviet Union poses as an enemy of colonialism. It is ironic that the Soviet Union urges free choice and free elections in all nations. It is more than ironic. It is a lie.

The Soviet Union is one of the few colonial powers left in the world today. But it is not even a colonial power as we know them, working with leaders in the colonies toward eventual self-government and independence. Indeed the Soviet Union's colonies know only the mailed fist and hobnailed boot of Soviet oppression, the virtually complete subjugation of civil liberties and the continual degradation of the individual.

Such a "colony" is Hungary today. On the eve of the United Nations consideration of this thorn in the side of Russia, let us call to the attention of the world the tyranny and ruthlessness which are Russia. Let us not be fooled by the overtures of peace from the Kremlin which greet our new national administration. Let us remember that when the Communists turn their smiling faces our way, it is for their own evil reasons.

Communists never change; they just change their tactics.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution of March 15, 1848, which restored to that freedom-loving nation the liberty it had cherished for nearly 1,000 years.

It also is the 167th anniversary of the arrival in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of that great Hungarian hero, Louis Kossuth, and a band of fellow patriots, seeking political asylum and assistance for their cause. The heart of the Bay State, with its innate love of independence, opened wide to them.

The historic parallel is interesting: many of Kossuth's followers remained in the Boston area. They have contributed immeasurably to our heritage and our culture—and to the progress of my own Fifth District.

A century later, tragic events again sent Hungarian refugees to our shores. Again, numbers of them have chosen to make their homes in Massachusetts. I am proud of the number that reside in my district—useful, productive citizens, making their own fine contributions to their communities.

This year, the celebration of the national holiday of their homeland precedes United Nations debate on the problem of Hungary.

Along with my other colleagues in this Congress, I received a memorandum from former Prime Minister Ferenc Nagy, now chairman of the Washington office of Magyar Bizottsag. I insert this stirring message at this point in my remarks:

MEMORANDUM ON THE HUNGARIAN PROBLEM TO BE PRESENTED TO THE HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. CONGRESS

In his speech delivered in the Ganz factory in Budapest on December 2, 1959, Premier Khrushchev bluntly declared that the Hungarian revolution was crushed because the Soviets wanted to preserve the Communist regime in Hungary. He also openly admitted that the revolution was due to the extreme despair of the Hungarian people as a reaction to Rakosi's terror regime. His third sensational revelation was that even his colleagues in the Party Presidium had misgivings that the Soviet military intervention might be "misconstrued" abroad.

These revelations strikingly confirmed the facts established by the U.N. investigation organ that the nationwide Hungarian revolution of October 23, 1956, was due to the exasperation of the people with the Communist system and foreign domination.

However, although they were ready to sacrifice their lives for freedom and democracy, they very realistically stressed in their political manifestation the necessity of good-neighborly relations with the powerful Soviet Union. The authentic spokesmen of the revolution had many times declared that they were not intent on converting Hungary into an anti-Soviet base. On the contrary,

they emphatically advocated the idea of an internationally recognized neutrality, as it was officially proclaimed by the Imre Nagy government.

The United Nations General Assembly has, since 1956, successively adopted 12 political resolutions on Hungary, demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops and free elections under international control, while condemning the Soviet Union for the brutal crushing of the victorious Hungarian revolution. The consistent Soviet defiance of these resolutions has gravely affected the prestige of the world organization by creating a dangerous precedent for the impunity of members who do not comply with the General Assembly resolutions in critical situations.

Although the political action of the United Nations could not be enforced, the mere discussion of the Hungarian situation during the annual sessions of the General Assembly on Hungary is keeping alive the Hungarian peoples' spirit of resistance under a seemingly quiet apathetic surface.

It is the most revolting injustice in the 20th century that the Hungarian people, with a record of a thousand years of independence is languishing in the most ruthless colonial bondage of the Soviet Union, while even backward peoples are gaining nationhood and independence one after another, thanks to the help of the Western Powers.

The present situation in Hungary may be briefly illustrated as follows: continuation of persecution of patriots, secret trials and executions, a ruthless drive for the collectivization of agriculture, institutional violation of basic human rights, psychological exploitation of the presence of Soviet troops, preservation of the forced labor camps despite official denials and control and persecution of the clergy. It is a strikingly small minority which rules the country, with the help of the presence of the Soviet troops. Although the presence of the Soviet armed forces allegedly serve only the purpose to defend the country against attacks from abroad, this Communist explanation is refuted by the fact that they are encircling Budapest in order to be able to stifle in bud any attempt of a coup d'etat against the regime.

Speeches of the Communist Party leaders delivered at the party congress in 1959, and later on the rare occasions when the so-called National Assembly was convened, clearly indicate that Moscow wants to tighten the regime in Hungary, showing the Soviet determination to present Hungary as a completely socialized state in order to eliminate one of the most outstanding problems in Eastern Europe and to make it, thus, disappear from the U.N. General Assembly forever.

The Hungarian exile leaders are fully aware of the present difficult and complicated military and political world situation. They know that the situation is not favorable at the present time for a concrete solution of the Hungarian problem. They believe, however, that the raising by the Western world of the Hungarian question in the United Nations and at other international conferences, as well as in the parliaments of the free world would be a realistic political move presenting some important, immediate and long-range advantages both for the West and for Hungary.

From the short-range point of view the most evident advantage that the West could derive would be the positive impact on the morale of the Hungarian people. Thus, the deterrent effect of the spirit of resistance of the Hungarian and other captive nations would not only be preserved, but enhanced.

In raising the Hungarian question the West may reap further short-range advantages since it would enable the West to denounce with striking evidence and arguments the true aims of the Soviet effort to pose in Africa, Asia, and Latin America as the greatest champion of anticolonialism, independence and self-determination.

The consistent raising of the Hungarian question would also serve long-term interests, because it would display Western determination not to acquiesce in the Communistic usurpation of power, which would have important significance for the future. Such a Western attitude would encourage smaller free nations and even America's smaller allies to resist Communist pressure and subversion.

The extreme effectiveness of Soviet diplomatic strategy lies in the very fact that the Soviets have a long-range prefixed program which they are realizing step by step with greatest determination and energy. Therefore, only a consistent and bold Western strategy, aimed at an overall settlement in Europe, instead of a piecemeal policy of making peace could counter the Soviet Union's diplomatic offensive in the long run.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, little Hungary, a truly liberty loving nation, whose fertile plains and valleys supply to the larders of the Soviet nation—wheat, rye, barley, oats, corn, potatoes, sugar beets, hemp and flax. She is a nation rich in every productive sense. Her abundant variety of wines and extensive output of coal, oil, iron, steel; industries of machines, tools, chemicals, vehicles, railroad equipment, milling and distilling, make it plain for us to see that the Hungarians, from early times under its earliest settlers, chiefly Slav and Germanic, although overrun by Huns and Magyars from the East, and its civilization under Stephen I—977–1038—with the promulgation of its constitution in 1222, was always productive and contributory to the high standards of continental Europe. She fought against the domination of the Turks, who overwhelmed the country in 1526, but were ousted by the Hungarians and Austrians, who found domination difficult.

In 1844, Magyar became the official language and in 1867 Austria recognized the kingdom of Hungary, with the Emperor of Austria as King of Hungary, in a dual monarchy with a single diplomatic service.

Hungary being defeated in World War I—1918—lost Transylvania, Croatia, Bacska, Slovakia, and Carpatho-Ruthenia. It remained as a republic under Michael Karoly and later, a Bolshevist revolt under Bela Kun, and both were followed by a vote for a monarchy in 1920 with Admiral Horthy regent.

Hungary joined Germany in World War II; Horthy was removed and Nazi supporters put in power in 1944. Russian troops captured most of the country in 1945, and, by terms of the armistice, returned to its borders of 1937. In 1946 Hungary declared for a republic and elected Zoltan Tildy President only to find that, in 1947, the Communists forced Tildy out.

A Soviet-type constitution was adopted on August 18, 1949, which vests power in Parliament and a Presidium. Parliament, since 1953, consists of 308 deputies, one for each 32,000 population. The regime, in single list elections, as of November 16, 1956, was overwhelmingly victorious.

The nationalism of the industries, under Communist rule, has resulted from an intensive campaign to collectivize farms, establish cooperatives and increase farm production. Those who opposed it were deported to Russia. Hungary has, in recent years, confiscated American property and abused officials and citizens. It was admitted to the United Nations on December 14, 1955.

Premier Imre Nagy, in office since mid-1953, was ousted for his moderate policy of favoring agriculture and consumer production, on April 18, 1955; he was succeeded by Andras Hegedus.

Hungary developed into open revolt in 1956, with popular demands for the ouster of Erno Gero, Hungarian Communist Party secretary, and for the formation of a new government by Imre Nagy, which resulted in the latter's appointment on October 23 of that year. The revolt occurred when the security police fired on the people. Gero called in Soviet armed forces to crush the revolt, but revolutionary councils spread throughout the country. The insurrection appeared halted when Premier Nagy announced that the Soviet Union had agreed to withdraw its troops from Hungary; however, by November 1, 1956, Soviet forces again surrounded Budapest and, despite Nagy's protest to the U.S.S.R. and the United Nations, launched a massive surprise attack against the city on November 4, with an estimated 200,000 troops, 2,500 tanks and armored cars. The gallantry of the young patriots, in their bid for free government, was crushed and the casualties were estimated as from 6,500 to 32,000 dead. Many rebels were reported executed and thousands were deported. About 196,000 persons fled the country. The United States received 38,248 under a refugee emergency program.

Premier Nagy was removed in November 1956, and Janor Kadar installed as chief of the Hungarian Communist Party, June 29, 1957.

On June 17, 1958, Moscow announced the trial and execution of Nagy, Gen. Pal Maleter, who led the 1956 revolt, and Miklos Gimesz and Jozsep Szlagy. The executions were condemned by the United States in both Houses of Congress on June 19, and scored by many other nations, including Yugoslavia and neutralistic India.

Hungary refused, on June 27, to provide information on the executions requested by a United Nations special committee on Hungary.

Dr. Ferenc Munich was appointed Premier on January 27, 1958, and Istvan Dobi was appointed president of the Presidential Council on August 14, 1952.

It is unfortunate that a country, whose 1941 census indicated a population that was 65.7 percent Catholic, and where a public school education is compulsory for 8 years; where church schools were nationalized in 1948, and there are six universities maintained by the state,

that a free people, whose many contributions to the civilization of the free world are in the highest tradition of national pride, should be subjected to the domination of a heartless and irreligious leadership, which has enslaved and regimented its citizens and youth to the idolatry of nationalism.

It is the church that keeps alive in the hearts of the religious patriots of Hungary their undying love for freedom. We, of course, in our blunt and awkward way have tried to assuage our own feelings as to our shortcomings in standing up against Russia's slaughter of the innocents, by making it possible to permit political refugees to enter our borders for protection.

It was a kind gesture, but a confession of complete surrender of our national honor in permitting Russia to go unchallenged on its blood-strewn way to power.

The freedom-loving patriots, within these captive nations, are ever alert in the cause of freedom and there is no question that at some time in the near future, they will lead the aroused populace into revolt to recover the long-lost freedoms and independence of their nation and join with us in establishing a new frontier of peace.

We join with the Hungarian Committee, who are instrumental in bestirring the people of Hungarian antecedence in America to celebrate the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of March 15, 1848, which will be celebrated by Hungarians all over the world as a national holiday, commemorating the freedom fight of the Hungarian Nation against the oppressing Hapsburg dynasty.

It is sad that despite the world-shaking freedom fight in 1956, that the ever independent Hungarian people over the thousands of years, are still in bondage. The Hungarian cause is not dead.

There is scarcely a speech for freedom that does not include their valiant effort to throw off the Soviet yoke. It is for us, the greatest nation on earth in the fight for freedoms, to determine that the 12 political resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly, since the Hungarian revolution, be enforced, that Soviet troops be withdrawn, that basic human rights and the right of self-determination be restored to the Hungarian people.

It is for the House of Representatives to lead the way, by following through in its consistent stand for Hungarian independence in their struggle for liberty.

We must never forget that this day of commemoration keeps alive the fires of freedom in the hearts of men, who believe in the independence of all nations in this critical hour. Let us not permit these fires of patriotism to die in enslavement. It is incumbent upon us to redeem our pledge to these liberty loving people.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who love liberty and freedom are taking note that March 15 marks the date of the Hungarian revolution and that this year is the 113th anniversary of that truly great event.

Like all Americans, I take great pleasure in seeing former dependent peoples achieve nationhood and become members of the United Nations. One nation after another is being granted independence in Africa. Yet, at the same time, the Hungarian people, with a record of a thousand years' independence, are still under Communist bondage despite their courageous and valiant fight for freedom in 1956. Our hearts go out toward these poor hapless victims of Russian tyranny and oppression.

In his speech delivered in the Ganz Factory in Budapest on December 2, 1959, Premier Khrushchev bluntly declared that the Hungarian revolution was crushed because the Soviets wanted to preserve the Communist regime in Hungary. He also openly admitted that the revolution was due to the extreme despair of the Hungarian people as a reaction to Rakosi's terror regime. His third sensational revelation was that even his colleagues in the party presidium had misgivings that the Soviet military intervention might be misconstrued abroad.

The United Nations General Assembly has, since 1956, successively adopted 12 political resolutions on Hungary, demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops and free elections under international control, while condemning the Soviet Union for the brutal crushing of the victorious Hungarian revolution. The consistent Soviet defiance of these resolutions has gravely affected the prestige of the world organization by creating a dangerous precedent for the impunity of members who do not comply with the General Assembly resolutions in critical situations.

We, in the Congress, should realize that the Soviet Union is dedicated to the destruction of the free world as we know it, and the erection of a vast empire to be controlled from Moscow. This, with God's will shall not happen and we must do everything in our power to see to it that it does not happen. That is the reason I now speak on behalf of the brave Hungarian people so that no one should ever forget what happens to a nation once it is so unfortunate as to be under the Red tyrant's heel.

A great number of Hungarians have come to the United States and have made invaluable contributions to our country with their industry and native ability in many fields of endeavor. Our country is the richer for the scientists, the professional men and women, the music and literature that they brought to these shores from their native land. Those who emigrated here have become good and loyal citizens of the United States of whom we can be justly proud.

I join those who commemorate this day with the fervent hope that a bright new day will dawn for Hungary when she will become a member of the family of free and independent nations.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, freedom is man's most cherished heritage. It is the spark of his life, and the flame of his very existence. No greater tribute can be paid to the Hungarian people than to say that freedom lives in their hearts and minds. They believe that there is an inherent dignity of man and a significant place for the individual in society. It is tragic that a people so desirous of liberty and independence must suffer, so often in their history, the yoke of foreign oppression and domination. Therefore it is fitting and proper for us to join together in commemorating a very significant birth of freedom in Hungary on March 15, 113 years ago.

The year 1848 was a period of unrest and revolution throughout Europe. The old order was crumbling and a new order was being built on its remains. This was the year the people of Hungary had waited so long and anxiously to see. In its dawn they found their freedom. Over the objections of the arch-conservative, Metternich, and with an exuberance of idealistic aspirations, Hungary gained its independence. It is noteworthy that this early experience in freedom was accomplished without any bloodletting. In contrast, Hungary's most recent attempt at achieving liberty was a time of horrible repression and bloodletting. The victory in 1848, as in 1956, was brief and since 1848 March 15 has served as a symbol, through numerous setbacks, of the constant quest for freedom.

After World War I, the aspirations of these freedom loving people reached a fulfillment, only to be stifled under the army boots of the Soviet Communists. Still the thirst for liberty and freedom remained, for it can never be rooted out of the hearts and minds of a gallant Hungarian people.

In the bloody epoch of the October-November revolution of 1956, no stronger test of the devotion for freedom could be made. For many it meant giving their last full measure of devotion to a cause they so fervently loved. Unfortunately, bravery was not enough and stoning Soviet tanks could not drive them away, so that, once again, the chains of bondage were placed upon the backs of the people of this nation. The outstanding events of the October-November revolution, however, did not go unnoticed by the world, and men everywhere realized that the love of freedom, which has no replacement, cannot be extinguished.

On the Ides of March many centuries ago, the world witnessed the death of a Caesar. Today in commemorating Hungarian Freedom Day, let us hope that Caesarism all over the world will soon be ended. Let us also pray that in their adversity and trial the Hungarian people can persevere in their own desire for self-realization and freedom.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, freedom is a treasure which only the most fortunate of people have possessed. But possession, in itself, is not sufficient. Those who are blessed must remain ever vigilant and alert to combat any hostile force which threatens society, or they too would soon lose their prize.

Today the Hungarian people do not share in our freedom; yet their past is

one of continuous dedication to the struggle against tyranny and oppression. In the year of revolution, 1848, it appeared as if the Hungarians might gain their freedom. The authority of the Vienna Government was threatened by the forces of nationalism and liberalism. Hungarian patriots presented their just demands to the Government, and they were accepted in part on March 15 of that year. The seeds of a democratic state were sown, but as a young sapling needs care, so must democratic institutions be developed and strengthened in order to survive and prosper. This was not to happen.

Today, as we know, a new and more vicious form of tyranny has tried to strangle these roots of Hungarian freedom. The Communists have attempted to make these people entirely subservient to their commands; but they have failed.

We know that they have failed because we have the evidence of 1956. We know that the spirit of liberty, manifested over 100 years ago, and in our own memory, still lives in the people of Hungary. If history has any meaning at all, that spirit will in time reap its just reward.

Mr. LINDSAY. Today, Mr. Speaker, is the 113th anniversary of the patriotic revolution of the Hungarian people in 1848. At that time the Hungarian people were under the autocratic rule of the Hapsburg monarchy of Vienna.

In the year 1848 the spark of democratic revolution spread from Paris throughout central Europe. The Hungarian people, under the leadership of the great patriot Louis Kossuth, rose against their oppressors and would almost certainly have won their freedom from Austria, which was weak and itself in revolution, but for the fact that the Russian Tsar responded to the desperate appeal of his brother autocrat in Vienna. The Russian Imperial Army poured across the Carpathian Mountains and with overwhelming force crushed the Hungarian patriots and restored Hapsburg rule.

Kossuth escaped to Constantinople where he was interned by the Ottoman Sultan until the free nations of the West, Britain and the United States, persuaded the Sultan to release Kossuth. An American warship carried the great patriot to England and then to America, where he lived out his days in freedom.

With incomparable irony, the pattern of patriotic revolution in Hungary and brutal Russian repression was repeated in our own time. In the year 1956 Hungarian patriots rose against the puppet Communist satellite regime that had been imposed upon them by Soviet armed force in violation of solemn treaty obligations. Once again the Russian Army crushed the patriotic rebellion and restored the hated Communist dictatorship.

The United Nations General Assembly has, since 1956, successively adopted 12 political resolutions on Hungary, calling for the withdrawal of Soviet troops and free elections under international auspices, while condemning the Soviet Union for crushing the Hungarian revolution. The deep wrong of Hungary should be kept alive in the forum of the United Nations and before the conscience of the world. In so doing we can keep alive the determination of the free peoples never to acquiesce in the forcible Soviet domination of Hungary. Both in the United Nations and in the parliaments of the free world the plight and hopes of the silenced Hungarian freedom fighters should continue to find expression.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I wish on this occasion to join my voice with those of all Americans of Hungarian descent, and indeed of all free men, in paying tribute to the unquenchable spirit of liberty that prevails among the Hungarian people through all adversity. In commemorating the Hungarian revolutions of 1848 and 1956, let us also express our hope, and confidence, that the Hungarian people will at last win permanent peace and freedom.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today, March 15, marks the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of 1848 which witnessed the rebirth of freedom in Hungary.

The fervor and zeal which characterized the Hungarian revolution of 1848, came again into view in the heroic revolt of 1956. The Hungarian nation's will to be free demonstrated once again in our time that the undaunted human spirit cannot be destroyed by force and tyranny.

The onslaught of Soviet armor, tanks, and artillery, the brutal murder of thousands of Hungarians, which continues even today with the execution of youths who participated in the uprising, by the Soviet henchmen who employed all the means and devices characteristic of totalitarian treachery, could not crush the heroic spirit of the Hungarian people.

The tragic circumstances of the Hungarian nation serve as a constant reminder to the entire world of the ruthless Communist oppression of the captive nations.

Today, on this the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of 1848, the free world should reaffirm its hope that the Hungarian people will soon be able to again assume their rightful place among the free peoples of the world. To this end, that all peoples may live in peace, freedom and dignity, we must continue to devote our earnest effort.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the late 17th century Hungary was made part of the Austrian Empire and the Hungarians became the subjects of the reigning monarch in Vienna.

Under their autocratic masters the Hungarians were always restive. They petitioned and clamored for their freedom, but as the Government in Vienna was confident of its power, it turned a deaf ear to all Hungarian demands and ignored them.

During the years of restoration and reaction—1815–48—the Austrian Government was headed by the most reactionary and powerful Metternich. He felt powerful enough to govern the Austrian Empire with an iron hand, and he was especially harsh toward the Hungarians. But then came the revolutions of 1848, which put an end to the Metternich era in Austria and Hungary.

The European revolution of 1848 had its echoes in nearly all parts of that continent. The mere news of its outbreak caused terror in many capitals, and many autocracies were shaken to their foundations. Vienna, where until then the Government had seemed most secure, felt the impact of the revolutionary wind from France. Uprisings took place in several parts of the provinces. Not all of these were dealt with easily. Hungarian leaders who had been watching all these developments, in and out of Vienna, saw their chance in the weakening of the Government's authority. Instead of staging an uprising and causing violent disturbances, they drew up a list of their just grievances and presented it to the Government, demanding new freedom. The Government, being unwilling to cause any trouble, at once granted autonomy to the Hungarian people. This happened on March 15, 1848, 113 years ago, and since then these people celebrate the event as their national holiday, their freedom day.

As we all know, the autonomy and freedom thus granted to the people of Hungary by the Austrian Government was taken away from them by force in the next year in a veritable bloodbath. But the historic significance of March 15 still lives in the memory and in the hearts of the people of Hungary, for that is their freedom day.

It symbolizes their devotion to freedom and their determination to be truly independent once again.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, today, March 15, is the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of 1848. It is an event which will be celebrated by Hungarians and persons of Hungarian ancestry throughout the world in commemoration of the successful fight for freedom of the Hungarian nation against the oppression of the Hapsburg dynasty.

It is a matter of deep concern to the people of the United States and of the free world that today the people of Hungary are again in bondage and are suffering under the cruel domination of the Soviet Union.

The hearts of the American people and of the free world went out to the people of Hungary in their courageous, though unsuccessful attempt, to overthrow their Soviet oppressors in the revolution of 1956.

The United Nations, since the Hungarian revolution of 1956, has adopted 12 resolutions calling for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary, and for the restoration of basic human rights and the right of self-determination to the Hungarian people so that they may decide the form of government they want by free elections under international control.

It is the hope of the people of the United States that the resolutions

adopted by the United Nations will be carried out, and that appropriate action will be taken to restore freedom and independence to Hungary and to end the oppression of the Hungarian people by the Soviet Union.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Hungary has been a citadel of freedom for centuries, and its stouthearted inhabitants among the most gallant warriors in defense of their independence. Late in the 17th century, however, they lost their freedom and for more than two centuries they lived under the oppressive yoke of Austria. During all those years they cherished their independence and worked for it, but they had no chance until the revolutionary year of 1848.

In that year when the revolutionary wave was sweeping over many parts of Europe, and the autocratic regime in Vienna was tottering, a group of liberty-loving and patriotic Hungarians in Budapest staged a bloodless uprising in the form of a demonstration, and presented their grievances to the Government, demanding reforms and freedom. The Government, aware of the widespread discontent and the dangers threatening its very existence, acquiesced in these demands and allowed the Hungarians freedom and autonomy on March 15. That day is marked in modern Hungarian history as their freedom day, as their national holiday. Even though the freedom thus gained was lost in the next year, to this day the spirit of March 15, 1848, lives in the hearts of the Hungarian people.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, throughout the world the wonderful people of Hungarian heritage celebrate the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of March 15, 1848. It is with heavy and saddened hearts that the people in Hungary celebrate this day. We and the Western Powers must also join in the celebration of this day with sadness, remembering the massacre in 1956 of the freedom-loving people of Hungary in their fight to try to relieve themselves of the yoke of communism. We must show to these great people and all the captive nations of the world that we have not forgotten them and are working and praying for their liberation. The United Nations General Assembly must work for their liberation by the enforcement of the 12 political resolutions previously adopted.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the freedom and autonomy which were granted to the people of Hungary by the Government of Austria in 1848 marked the culmination of a centuries-old struggle. Since late 17th century Hungary had been part of the Austrian Empire and the Hungarians had been subjected to the government in Vienna. For some 200 years they had struggled for freedom, but their attempts had failed. In 1848 in the general revolutionary uprisings all over Europe, peoples suffering under the oppressive regime in Vienna headed by the detested Metternich, were stirred to riots and demonstrations in the capital and in the provinces. Patriotic leaders in Hungary were of course very active. Early in March they staged a demonstration in Budapest. Then they petitioned the authorities there from freedom and autonomy. The Austrian Government, which was in an almost hopeless position, on March 15 granted the Hungarian demands, allowing them freedom and autonomy. Thenceforth that day became their freedom day, and is being celebrated annually as their national holiday.

In the revolution of 1956 the Hungarian people proved that they still were the proud possessors of the spirit of March 15, 1848. Even today, after the ruthless suppression of the Hungarian fight for freedom by the Red army in November of 1956, that spirit still lives in the hearts of the freedom-loving Hungarian people.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the 19th century was the age of imperialism, of the industrial revolution, of nationalism and finally of revolution. The revolution of 1848 stands out as a great landmark in Europe's modern history, for it was a great movement in man's struggle for freedom and independence. That revolution ranks high as an attempt to revive long dormant national aspirations among peoples suffering under alien yokes. As that movement swept from one end of Europe to the other, peoples were stirred and roused by the revolutionary spirit. They were ready to rise and revolt against their autocratic oppressors and free themselves from the clutches of tyranny.

At the time the Hungarian people were subject to Austria's stern and inflexible Government run by the able but ruthless Metternich, the true embodiment of conservatism and reaction in Europe. The Austrian Government under his chancellorship had successfully subdued all uprisings and had crushed revolutionary movements among the Hungarian people. But the year 1848 ushered in a new dawn for them as well as for some other peoples suffering under Austrian autocracy. Early in the year, as the sweeping revolutionary wave reached Vienna, and as liberal elements there raised their cry against the Government, that Government's security was in jeopardy. Metternich himself was seriously apprehensive of the impending danger. In March when this situation became known in Hungary, the leaders of Hungarian revolutionary movement meeting in Budapest drew up a list of complaints against the Government and demanded that they be given freedom. The Austrian Government, acting wisely and none too soon, met their demands and granted freedom. This was done on March 15, 113 years ago today. Since then that historic day has become a Hungarian national holiday. On the observance of this memorable anniversary, let us hope that Hungarians suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny in their homeland will again attain their dearly cherished freedom.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the European revolution of 1848 was a major event for all freedom-seeking peoples in all parts of Europe. Starting from Western Europe, it swept in all directions like a wildfire and all oppressed people were overjoyed, for they all hoped that the autocratic alien regimes ruling over them would soon be overthrown and they would have the chance to regain their freedom. Thus to peoples in Central and Eastern Europe the revolution of 1848 provided the golden opportunity for which they had been waiting for decades and centuries.

The Hungarian people had their kingdom during the middle ages. But early in modern times Hungary was threatened by invaders, first by the Turks and then by the Austrians. By mid-16th century most of the country was conquered by the Turks, but an independent Hungarian nation still remained. Late in the 17th century the Turks were driven out of Hungary, but in the meantime Austrians moved in and they extended their rule over all of Hungary. During the next 200 years Hungarians tried on several occasions to free themselves, but unfortunately none of their attempts was successful, and each time they were ruthlessly suppressed. They hoped to achieve their goal during the Napoleonic wars, but here again they were disappointed. When that war came to its end Austria's sway over Hungary seemed more secure than ever. The reactionary Government in Vienna, headed by the powerful and ruthless Metternich, ruled for more than three decades with an iron hand. While he was in power no revolutionary movement in Hungary was successful. But the events of 1848 ushered in a new era, and the Hungary patriots were well aware of this.

Early in the year there were disturbances and uprisings in many parts of the Austrian Empire, but the Hungarians did not make any rash move. They simply awaited until the Government in Vienna was shaken and weakened, and then they acted wisely. Early in March they organized a peaceful demonstration in Budapest against the Government. They had already drawn up a list of their grievances; they presented this to the Government and demanded freedom. The Government did not lose a moment in conciliating Hungarian patriots; on the 15th of that month Hungarians were granted freedom and autonomy. From that date on, March 15 became a Hungarian national holiday, their freedom day.

Since then the people of Hungary have had their happy days and their misfortunes, but both in times of glad tidings and in the midst of miseries and misfortune, they have celebrated the anniversary of their freedom day. It is sad that on the 113th anniversary of that memorable event they find themselves under the yoke of Communist totalitarian tyranny, but even during these depressing and trying times, they still cling to the spirit of March 15, 1848, the spirit of their freedom day.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, last night's news reports indicated that the Communist government of Hungary is preparing a new and intensified drive to force the Roman Catholic Church in that country into submission so that the church may be used as a tool of the Communist state.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this latest Communist attack on re-

ligious freedom will fail as all past attacks have failed. The people of Hungary were subjected to alien rule by Communist masters only by the overwhelming force of arms. But the spirit of the Hungarian people has not been broken. Their devotion to their church is today stronger than ever, symbolizing both the deep spirituality of the people and their tenacious hold on personal freedom. The world, the church, and Hungarians everywhere can expect renewed brutality, imprisonment, and bloodshed as the Communist government tries again to break the back of the church. We can only pray that God will continue to provide the strength and courage to resist.

I have noted this most recent story of suffering in Hungary because it has come to our attention on the eve of the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of March 15, 1848, and because it precedes the United Nations debate on the situation in that tragic nation.

Today, March 15, is being celebrated by Hungarians and people of Hungarian origin throughout the world as a national holiday, in commemoration of the struggle of the Hungarian people to obtain their freedom from the oppression of the Hapsburg dynasty. This fight for freedom was crushed by the united armies of Russia, and Austria.

Today, too, we are commemorating another Hungarian revolution, the bloody uprising of 1956 which won for the courageous people of Hungary the lasting respect and admiration of the world. But that revolution, too, was crushed—crushed by the armies of a mightier and more tyrannical Russia.

This time, however, the world has not forgotten nor turned away from the ugliness and inhumanity of Soviet oppression. Since 1956, the General Assembly of the United Nations has adopted 12 resolutions demanding that Soviet troops be withdrawn from Hungary and that basic human rights be restored to the Hungarian people.

It is time again for the representatives of freedom-loving nations, gathered together in the great forum of the free world, to insist that these resolutions be enforced, to call attention again to the crimes committed against this small and defenseless nation, and to call to account the nation that perpetrated those crimes.

It is important, too, that we who are privileged to be members of the greatest legislative assembly of the free world reiterate our support of the United Nations resolutions on Hungary. By doing so, we shall be helping to keep alive the spirit of freedom everywhere. We shall be demonstrating our determination never to acquiesce to the use of illegal and oppressive force. And we shall be reminding the world to look beneath the surface of those who pose as champions of anticolonialism and independence—and to see the truth.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are commemorating a sad and important occasion today—the 113th anniversary of Hungarian Independence Day. Today when many formerly backward nations are gaining their independence it is a great tragedy that a nation with a history of a thousand years of freedom is now under a brutal domination which practices such violations of basic human rights as foreign troops, secret trials, and collectivization of agriculture. To most persons the successful effort of the Hungarians to gain freedom on March 15, 1848, is not nearly as well known as their heartbreaking attempt to throw off the iron hand of communism in 1956.

Thinking of the history of Hungary and its battles to hold freedom and to regain it, we realize that the new nations gaining freedom for the first time do not face an easy road. In fact, there seems to be no easy road for anyone or any nation in the world today. With the wicked power of modern weapons and the diametrical split between political systems based on personal freedom and those based on complete domination of the individual, the chances of utter chaos are considerable.

We feel that the key to peace lies in ideas rather than weapons. Somehow we must give to those caught up in powerful ideologies the knowledge of what freedom is—what it really means. Perhaps this is the role which the Hungarians and other captive nations are to play, because they have known the world of freedom and now live under the stultifying ideology behind the Iron Curtain. Perhaps, through Hungary, and other captive nations, we—a nation with nearly 200 years of freedom—can reach the millions who have no real knowledge or concept of freedom.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, today, March 15, commemorates the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution, a day which will be celebrated by Hungarians all over the world as a national holiday, commemorating their freedom fight against the autocratic rule of the Austrian monarchs which they suffered for many years. On this day in 1848, the Hungarian people, after more than 200 years of enduring hardships and sufferings under an alien yoke, revolted. Hungarian patriots, taking full advantage of this situation, staged demonstrations against the existing government. They presented a list of their just grievances and demanded freedom. On March 1 the Hungarians were granted the concessions and freedom they demanded. This should be a day of glad rejoicing rather than a day of sad recollection as it has been made to be by the action of the Soviets in 1956.

Today, as we commemorate an earlier era of Hungarian freedom, we honor all Hungarians for their gallant and tenacious longing for liberty and we pray that the day soon will come when the light of freedom and independence again will be burning brightly in their beloved homeland.

In closing, I quote that great statesman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, in saying that, "Budapest is no longer merely the name of a city: henceforth it is a new and shining symbol of man's yearning to be free."

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, all peoples throughout history have aspired and struggled for their freedom, but no people have fought for so long in modern times and have staked so much for their freedom as have the people of Central and Eastern Europe. And nowhere has national freedom been in such constant jeopardy as in that part of the world. This is true in the case of many peoples there, and certainly it characterizes the modern history of the Hungarian people.

For centuries these sturdy peasants of Hungary maintained their national independence, fighting their enemies on the east and in the southwest. Early in modern times a part of Hungary was overrun by the Turks, but they still maintained their independence until late in the 17th century when they were brought under the Austrian monarchy. Then for about 200 years they lived as unruly subjects of the government in Vienna, and strove to regain their freedom. In this they were not successful until 1848. In that year the European revolution offered them the chance to free themselves. Disturbances and uprisings in many parts of the Austrian empire weakened the government in Vienna, and the Hungarian patriots in Budapest were ready to take advantage of the situation. Early in March they petitioned the government and demand freedom. On the 15th they were granted freedom and autonomy, and that day of victory and jubilation became a Hungarian national holiday, their Freedom Day. Though the freedom thus regained was lost in the following year, to this day the Hungarian people celebrate the anniversary of March 15, the date that marked their freedom 113 years ago.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join in paying tribute to the heroic Hungarian people on the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of 1848. This memorable occasion is celebrated by Hungarians throughout the world as a national holiday.

The revolution of 1848 in Europe constituted a landmark in the history of many nationalities there, for it was that stirring mid-century event which roused and revived the idea of nationalism and the desire of subject peoples to free themselves from the oppressive yoke of alien rulers. This was true in many parts of Europe, but particularly so in the Austrian Empire. The autocratic government in Vienna was successful in holding down a number of nationalities through the ruthlessly efficient despotism in Vienna headed by that sworn enemy of liberalism, Count Metternich.

For more than 200 years Hungarians had been living under Austrian rule, subject to an alien regime in their homeland. Their past attempts to free themselves had not been successful, but the revolutionary events weakened the government in Vienna, and thus assured the Hungarians certain success in 1848. In March of that year they drew up a list of their grievances, presented it to the Austrian authorities in Budapest and demanded freedom. On March 15 the government granted these demands, thus allowing freedom and autonomy to the Hungarian people. That date became a turning point in their struggle for

freedom, and to this day it remains as their national holiday, their Freedom Day.

On the 113th anniversary celebration of that event we recall also the Hungarian revolution of October 1956 and its ruthless suppression by the Reds. But neither the loss of Hungarian freedom in 1849, nor their subsequent sacrifices in the October revolution of 1956, have dimmed the Hungarian spirit for freedom and independence. In that spirit they and their friends celebrate their Freedom Day.

It is fitting that on this glorious date in Hungarian history Americans express their sympathy and concern for the brave Hungarian people.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, today, March 15, 1961, marks the 113th anniversary of the victorious Hungarian revolution of 1848.

The recent history of the brave Hungarian people is full of trials and tribulations. They have certainly had their share of cruelty and misfortune. Notwithstanding the pressure of the Soviet tyrants the people of Hungary expressed their denunciation of the Communist Party and its interference in the nation's affairs in the revolution of October 23, 1956. Unfortunately, their efforts to regain freedom were crushed after great bloodshed. One of the injustices of this century is that these people with their record of many years of independence are forced to languish in the bondage of the Soviet despots.

This is a most appropriate time to raise the Hungarian issue as the observance of this national holiday will precede United Nations debate on the problem of Hungary.

I sincerely hope that something may be accomplished toward withdrawal of Soviet troops and that the human rights and the privilege of self-determination may be restored to the Hungarian people so that they may decide the form of government they want through the establishment of free elections.

I join with other freedom-loving people throughout the world in a prayer that they will soon regain their treasured freedom and liberty.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, Europe has been witness to countless revolutions throughout her long history, but no year saw a greater revolutionary fervor than did 1848. Nationalist ferment kindled by the examples of the American and French Revolutions swept the continent awakening the long-dormant aspirations of the oppressed and shaking to its foundations the long tradition of autocratic tyranny.

On March 15, we commemorate the 113th anniversary of this revolutionary movement in Hungary. On this day in 1848, the Austrian Empire acceded to the Hungarian people's long cherished demand for freedom. That freedom was short lived, however. Russian troops soon moved to help crush the infant state, but the people's love of liberty and their desire for national independence remained unmoved. Their aspirations were again realized after World War I when an independent state with its own constitution was established. Under the heel of Nazi Germany, Hungary once again lost her independence. The Nazi armies were defeated only to be replaced by Soviet troops.

This tragic turn of history did not kill the spirit and courage of the Hungarian people. In 1956, these brave people sought to realize their aspirations for freedom in a revolt so courageous and fervent that the Soviet Union resorted to the cruelest of military suppression. Against overwhelming odds, the immediate battle was lost, but the sacrifices of countless men, women, and children were not in vain. The year 1956, as does 1848, stands in solemn testimony to the Hungarian people's indomitable spirit and their irradicable desire for freedom and independence.

Since 1956, the United Nations General Assembly has adopted 12 resolutions which call for the full restoration of Hungarian independence and speak the conscience of the world in condemnation of Soviet brutality in crushing the 1956 revolution. Today I am happy to join with my Hungarian friends both here and abroad in the firm hope that the time will not be long before the aims of these resolutions are realized and all Hungarians can freely join in an open and joyous celebration of the anniversary of their freedom. Until this happier day, let us look to the record of the Hungarian people as a constant source of inspiration, and let all of us who now enjoy the blessings of liberty mark this day as a time of rededication to the cause of human dignity and freedom.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in these days of world chaos and tribulation, when the struggle between freemen and the forces of tyranny is at its height, it is heartening to rise today to pay tribute to the brave Hungarian people in commemoration of the 113th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of March 15, 1848. This date is a national holiday to Hungarians throughout the world. It commemorates the valiant fight of the Hungarians against another form of tyranny that then existed—the oppressive Hapsburg dynasty. It is ironic that this revolution was finally crushed by the forces of the Austrian and Russian Armies. I say this is indeed ironic for there is still fresh in our minds the terrible cruelties imposed upon the Hungarian people by another Russian Army, the forces of Red communism, when they destroyed the October revolution of 1956.

The Russian Government itself has conceded that armed forces were used in 1956 to put down the free expression of the Hungarian people because they were determined to keep Hungary behind the Iron Curtain and because they knew of the extreme bitterness and despair of the Hungarian people under the puppet regime of terror then in power in Hungary. Since that date the United Nations General Assembly has successfully adopted 12 political resolutions on Hungary, demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops and free elections under international control, while condemning the Soviet Union for the brutal crushing of the victorious Hungarian revolution.

Once again at the 15th session of the United Nations the Hungarian question is on the agenda. Once again I am certain that the sentiment of the free peoples of the world will be vigorously expressed in support of self-determination for the Hungarian people.

It is particularly tragic that in these days when free nations throughout the world are entering the community of the United Nations and increasing it daily—as witness the rapid development of freedom in the African Continent—that a nation such as Hungary which has had such a long tradition of liberty is still forced to live under a tyrannical yoke. However, in the inexorable movement of history I feel certain that liberty, freedom, and peace will once again come to the Hungarian nation.

Until that day arrives the spirit of these people shines forth both as an inspiration to us to continue on our democratic course and as a warning to be eternally vigilant against the forces that would deprive mankind of its fundamental rights.

I salute the people of Hungary and the Hungarian nation and I trust that in the not too distant future the true representatives of the Hungarian people will raise their voice in the free councils of the nations of the world.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the revolutionary events of 1848 raised the hopes and revived the aspirations of all oppressed peoples. These momentous events foreshadowed the overthrow of autocracies, the establishment of democratic governments, and also the return of individual freedoms to the peoples who had been robbed of them under autocratic regimes. The Hungarian people at that time had been suffering under Austria's stern rule for more than 200 years, and their lot had worsened under the ruthless regime headed by arch-reactionary Metternich. The year 1848 offered the Hungarians the chance to regain at least a part of their freedom by forming an autonomous entity within the Austrian Empire.

Early in the year, as the revolutionary wave swept to all parts of Europe, governing leaders in many capitals literally fled for their lives. In Vienna demonstrators nearly overthrew the Government, and the detested Metternich fled the city. Hungarian patriotic leaders in Budapest were following these startling happenings with keen interest. They knew that the Government in Vienna was badly shaken and was on the defensive. The Hungarian leaders proceeded calmly. Without resorting to the use of force, they presented to the Government a petition in which they demanded freedom and autonomy. On March 15 the Government responded by granting freedom and autonomy to the Hungarian people. That memorable day has become Hungarian Liberation Day, their national holiday.

The spirit of March 15, 1848, lives on in the hearts of the Hungarian people and is commemorated annually on the anniversary of that historic day. This spirit, which secured freedom for the Hungarian people 113 years ago, also roused them to fight their Communist oppressors in 1956. Though that gallant fight for freedom was ruthlessly

crushed by the Red army, there is no doubt that the Hungarian people's love of freedom is as strong as ever.

The moral support of the free world for the Hungarian aspirations has been expressed in resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly, just as it is being voiced today in the Congress of the United States. Let us hope that these demonstrations of support will help the Hungarian people sustain their spirit, the spirit of Hungarian Liberation Day, through all adversity.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, March 15, the anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of 1848, is of great significance not only to the valiant people of Hungary, but to all freedom-loving people of the world. This day reminds us of centuries of struggle for freedom and self-determination by a courageous, dauntless, strong spirited and persistent nation, sometimes against the Turks, later against the Hapsburg emperors and the czars, after the First World War against the Fascists and the Nazis, and now against the Kremlin. Their victories have always been short but sweet enough to encourage them to go on fighting and sacrificing for their great cause. Their thirst for liberty has been so strong that not even Soviet machineguns and tanks could discourage their will or dampen their spirit in the dark days of October 1956.

I find this a great opportunity, Mr. Speaker, as an American, to salute the people of Hungary, wherever they may be, for their love of freedom and their long struggle to achieve it. I want to assure those valiant people of Hungary that they are not forgotten by us in the free world today and that we shall keep alive the memory of their constant struggle for freedom, while they, themselves, are unable to celebrate this occasion in their own homeland. Let us today reaffirm our belief in the freedom of Hungary and all other nations who are suffocating under the yoke of Soviet tyranny, whether they be within or outside the Iron Curtain.

This being the 13th year of the 2d century of the anniversary of the Hungarian independence, let us all hope that it will be an unlucky year for all tyrants in the world, and let us hope and pray that the valiant people of Hungary will soon be able to celebrate with us a genuine and lasting life of freedom and of peace.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 4363.

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

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Education be permitted to sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

MEDICAL CARE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, out at Bethesda we have some of the ablest and most remarkable practitioners in general medicine and also in surgery that many of us have ever known. Some of the cures that they have accomplished and some of the benefits which Members of Congress have received over the years are certainly as good, yes, better, than we might expect. What I cannot understand now, however, is why when Congressmen want to go to Bethesda and something is really wrong with them, not just a bad disposition or an upset stomach or a condition due to being out late at night, but something really wrong; why is that Dr. Calver's office is always trying to force us to go down there? Now I love Dr. Calver very much, but sometimes some of us like to go out where we can get real necessary help that is not available here, and I just do not understand why the heat should be put on to deprive us of help that is available only at Bethesda. I wonder if there is anything in back of this new policy that we do not know about that caused the opposition of my dear colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] last year, when he opposed a certain appropriation and if our physician is presently acting as a result of that. I really would like to know about that.

CLERK HIRE ALLOWANCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 219) to increase the basic clerk hire allowance of each Member of the House, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That effective April 1, 1961, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, such sums as may be necessary to increase the basic clerk hire allowance of each Member and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico by an additional $3,000 per annum, and each such Member and Resident Commissioner shall be entitled to one clerk in addition to those to which he is otherwise entitled by law.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution allows an additional $3,000 per annum for clerk hire and an additional clerk for each Member of the House and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. Our subcommittee heard the testimony, and we were convinced of the need for this provision to be made. A few Members are paying out of their own pocket for additional clerk hire. This $3,000 is the minimum amount we felt was necessary to help Members pay the expenses of running their offices. Of course, we know that the mail is not as heavy in some of the districts as it is in others, and, of course, if the Member does not use the money, it remains in the contingent fund.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] for a statement.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this measure. I oppose it first because it is expensive. I further oppose it because it is untimely.

I do not intend to belabor this first contention. We have been presented a budget of about $82 billion. We have had recommended to us a whole series of additional programs or extensions of programs for priming the pump, for depressed areas, for the needy, for unemployed, for river pollution projects, and recreation projects, aid to education, and many more. All are listed as "must" activities. These extensions are not within the budget. Furthermore, if business conditions are as deplorable as the newspapers indicate, the Government's income will not be as high as anticipated. It is not enough to say we are spending so much now, a little more will not hurt. What we spend, we will either have to recover in taxes, or add to the staggering national debt.

The amount of increase does not appear large. I trust, however, there is no one among us who would suggest that the addition of a clerk would not entail allowances for another desk, another typewriter, more materials, and it is not beyond the realm of possibility that the next step would then be request for additional office space, and ultimately new buildings. Some will say, "All the Members will not use their maximum, so the cost will not be great." And this is true. If the exceptions are sufficient in number to constitute a valid argument, then there is no broad general need for this measure. Furthermore, some Members will use these additional funds to raise salaries. Competition will force all salaries upward in all offices and then on committee staffs, and so on. We may even find ourselves in a position of paying more money for fewer clerks and in a tighter bind on per person workload.

This measure proposes to increase the allowance from $17,500 base clerical allowance to $20,500 base salary allowance. No member of this House can tell us what this means in gross salary. That computation is almost impossible. Such a completely absurd system has developed through the years on salary computations for clerical hire that we have under discussion a mathematical monstrosity. We are usually told that the gross allowed is approximately $35,000. This is inaccurate. In one office the total might be less than $35,000 and in another, in complete compliance with the law and without any conscious padding, the amount may be in excess of

$42,000. This is possible because of a weird set of formulae which determines that three clerks at $5,000 cost less than five clerks at $3,000. Five times three might total the same as three times five everywhere else in the world—but not in figuring clerk hire in the House.

This is application of an absurdity. It is a violation of bookkeeping principles, accounting principles, business principles and a violation of commonsense. Listen to the formula:

First, 20 percent increase of first $1,200; 10 percent additional from $1,200 to $4,600; 5 percent further additional from $4,600 to $7,000.

Second, after applying the increases provided in paragraph 1, add an additional 14 percent or a flat $250 whichever is the greater, but this increase must not exceed 25 percent.

Third, after applying the increases provided in both paragraphs 1 and 2, add an additional increase of 10 percent in lieu of overtime.

Fourth, after applying the increases provided in paragraphs 1, 2, and 3, add an additional increase of $330.

Fifth, after applying the increases provided in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 4, add an additional increase of 5 percent.

Sixth, after applying the increases provided in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, add an additional increase of 10 percent but not more than $800 nor less than $300 a year.

Seventh, after applying the increases provided in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, add an additional increase of 7½ percent.

Eighth, after applying the increases provided in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, add an additional increase of 10 percent.

Ninth, after applying the increases provided in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, add an additional increase of 7½ percent.

The Disbursing Office has a set of tables to figure house salaries for office staffs and for about 900 other employees. It contains 45 sheets with 40 entries per sheet. In the Senate, at least, they have simplified the process some by figuring their base in multiples of 60, thus eliminating 11 categories. Committee staffers, incidentally, have an $8,880 base in comparison to the House $7,000 base limitation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have planned to introduce an amendment or a substitute which would grant additional clerk hire where there is a demonstrable need based on heavier than average population or "election at large" and possible other factors. But after becoming involved in this mathematical maze, I realize the folly of proceeding one step until we have corrected this situation. We can offer all kinds of excuses for avoiding a solution. We cannot offer reasonable arguments that it should not be done or that it cannot be done.

Someone has suggested that the Members of this great body prefer to keep the present program because someone back in the home district might object to the gross figures. I know this is not so. When a Representative is busy on minimum wage, or aid to education, or civil rights, such matters of housekeeping seem too picayune to merit attention. The Member simply checks the table and hires what he can hire under the provisions and then forgets the whole business. But I know the Members also want the people back home to realize that what we do here is open and frank and accurate, and that we set an example in businesslike procedures. The more we can demonstrate responsibility the greater will be the faith in Congress.

May I summarize. It is obvious that some Members need more clerical help because of large population and large land area. I have been working for some time with the best help we can get, on a measure which would take these items into consideration. Those Members who are really in need of assistance should realize that this temporary, hastily conceived proposition we debate today will probably obviate their getting a satisfactory total solution.

First, we should await redistricting of the Nation.

Second, we should consider appropriate allowance for oversize districts considering both population and total geographic area.

Finally, I hope we can develop a sound and sensible formula for computing salaries of office clerks and other statutory employees in the same category.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time simply to state my opposition to this bill, opposition straight across the board. I would favor an increase if it were based on the additional work or the additional population in a district; I think that is justified. It could be worked out at a certain allowance for every additional 250,000 population in the district.

I am opposed to this whole scheme as it is set up. I have had a bill before the committee for 4 or 5 years. This House would not permit any department of the Government to operate the way we operate. It is just as sensible and as profitable for a Congressman to build up a big staff as it is for the head of a bureau to build up a big staff; and in many instances big staffs are being built up right here in our own House. I think this House ought to set a determined example for the departments of Government.

I am opposed to this type of legislation.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker I think the RECORD should show that there is definite need for this resolution. I, as a Member of the House as well as majority leader, take my responsibility. I have never apologized to anybody for Members of this House receiving increases in salary throughout the years; as a matter of fact, I think we should further increase our salaries to $25,000. I never apologize for the Members of the House or the Members of the other body having a staff that will enable them to serve the people of their district, of their State, and as Members of Congress the people of the Nation.

Those who object on the grounds some Members raise of the lack of need, do not have to appoint additional help in their offices unless they want to; but certainly those Members should not take the position that because they do not need additional clerk hire that other Members of the House do not either.

This resolution is not for the benefit of any Member of this House; this resolution is for the benefit of the people of America to enable the Members of this House to more effectively and efficiently perform their duties as Members of Congress. So I have no hesitancy in supporting the resolution. I probably will not take advantage of it; I may and I may not. I have not up to date used all of my clerk hire. I may or I may not take advantage of this resolution should it be passed, but I would not want to deny other Members who need additional staff from having it so that they may effectively represent the people of their district here in the Halls of Congress.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I am always glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. In respect to the gentleman's last statement I may say that never in the 8 years I have been in Congress have I used all my clerk hire allowance, and I have no intention of using this additional allowance.

I think that additional allowance for clerk hire should be on the basis of need. I think in this bill we are hoodwinking the public.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the weakness of the gentleman's argument is that it does not take into account the volume of work regardless of the number of people in a district. Some Members with a district of 300,000 might have more interested constituents requiring more attention than another Member having a district with 460,000.

In these matters we must treat all alike. As I say, the question of population is not the determining factor as to the prime responsibility of a Member of Congress. A Member from a smaller district may have tremendous mail from all over his State, in fact, from all over the country.

So I do not think a formula based on steps of population increase is a fair one or a good one.

As to the argument of the gentleman from Wisconsin that this resolution is not based on reason, I shall not enter into that at all.

I will say it is commonsense for us to pass this resolution today.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The formula we are using is involved here. If it is wrong we are compounding a wrong by adding this to the formula that is being used. I think it is wrong. I am opposed to this bill for that reason and many others.

Mr. FRIEDEL. May I answer that in this way: All of the 98 Members who represent districts with a population of over 500,000 do not use it. They use it where they need to. It is the same here. If you do not need it you do not take it.

Mr. GROSS. I have never used all of my clerk hire allowance.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. I want to point out that there have been some questions raised here which do merit study. I am sure that the chairman of the Committee on House Administration will create perhaps a special study committee to consider this broad question which has been raised at this point.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 16]

Auchincloss	Dole	Passman
Avery	Dooley	Powell
Baker	Dwyer	Rabaut
Belcher	Farbstein	Rains
Bennett, Mich.	Harding	Reece
Blatnik	Harrison, Va.	Saund
Broomfield	Holifield	Schadeberg
Buckley	Jarman	Smith, Miss.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kitchin	Smith, Va.
Cahill	Knox	Spence
Celler	Laird	Van Pelt
Clark	Macdonald	Whalley
Conte	Martin, Nebr.	Willis
Daniels	Miller, N.Y.	Wright
Diggs	O'Hara, Mich.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 367 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

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

CLERK HIRE ALLOWANCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the increased staff allowance for Members when it came before the House Administration Committee and I oppose it here on the floor. There is no question that House Resolution 219 has some merit for those Congressmen who represent inordinately large districts because of changes in population since 1952. Unfortunately, however, the increase applies equally to all Congressmen. I cannot countenance wasting the taxpayers money in this manner. It was particularly unfortunate that those who felt this increase necessary were so anxious to avoid having to vote openly by rollcall. Let it be known that I openly oppose both the increased allowance in its present form and the procedure by which it was adopted.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would not oppose adequate funds for clerical hire on the part of any Member who is in need of it. Frankly, I doubt that there are very many in that category. But I am sure there are some in the more heavily populated districts.

Before we increase this allowance for additional clerical hire, it seems to me the subject should be more thoroughly considered. We read that a few people are employed and increases in pay are made, apparently without regard to the actual qualifications or productive capacity of those so employed. I am sure this is the exception rather than the rule. But if that is being done, even in isolated instances, it would seem appropriate for such reports to be investigated. If well founded, consideration should be given to enactment of legislation to prevent such practices.

Therefore, I am constrained to oppose the pending resolution.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 189) and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That in carrying out its duties during the Eighty-seventh Congress, the Committee on the District of Columbia is authorized to incur such expenses (not in excess of $10,000) as it deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 200) and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1961, in carrying out its duties during the Eighty-seventh Congress, the Committee on Banking and Currency is authorized to incur such expenses (not in excess of $5,000) as it deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL LABOR, OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 225) and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, until otherwise provided by law, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives compensation for the employment of one additional laborer, Office of the Postmaster, at a basic annual salary of $1,650.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 204) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1961, the expenses of conducting the studies authorized by Public Law 272 of the Eighty-sixth Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $165,000 including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment.

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$165,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Maryland yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I desired to offer an amendment, but I understand it has to be in writing, otherwise it is out of order. But I wish to make the point of order that these resolutions are not available anywhere that I have been able to find and Members do not know what they are about.

The SPEAKER. The resolution is printed and must be available somewhere.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, but I cannot get a copy over here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can have this copy that I have.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But that kind offer comes too late to do me any good.

Mr. MONAGAN. 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. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to support House Resolution 204 and H.R. 4363.

In my district, as well as in the State of Connecticut as a whole, there are many manufacturing enterprises whose products are sold throughout the country. In recent years, these enterprises have been confronted with an increasing number of demands by State officials for the payment of taxes upon income derived in foreign States, even though their activities in the particular State may be limited to the solicitation of orders.

This situation would be burdensome if it were limited to one State, but it is intolerable when it is met in every State where a manufacturer solicits orders.

The fact that this is a convenient device for State taxing officials and an easy source of revenue does not prevent it from being unfair.

Certainly the commerce of one manufacturing enterprise should not be subjected to this multiplicity of tax burdens.

I am pleased to support the provision of funds to implement the study of this problem which was called for in Public Law 272 of the 86th Congress, and I am most happy that the Judiciary Committee will have the responsibility for making this survey.

I am sure that the committee will reach a fair result and I feel confident that through this study we shall achieve the equitable tax treatment that is highly necessary for the proper functioning of these vital manufacturing enterprises.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I wish to ask the gentleman about this amendment that was just adopted, striking out $15,000. Was there anything before the committee to justify cutting out the $15,000?

Mr. FRIEDEL. We did not know what amount might be needed. The original budget request was for $175,000. The resolution called for $165,000. The committee felt that $150,000 would be enough for the committee to start with and if they needed more money they would come back to us.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I offered the amendment in committee since the gentleman brought it up. I did not think there was much justification for either $165,000, or, for that matter, $150,000. The gentleman had down in the budget seven assorted economists, and so forth. Why can you not get along with six economists?

We figure that if you needed more money you could come to the committee again; and if you justify it you know you will get it, as the chairman said. I do not think you ought to look a gift horse in the mouth.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is the point; I do not think this is a gift horse.

The 86th Congress gave the Committee on the Judiciary the responsibility of studying this problem. We sat down and worked out a budget and submitted it to the committee, and the committee arbitrarily cut it by $15,000. Now, I want to know why, on what basis the cut was made.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. The cut was made on the ground that we thought the committee could get along with one less economist. There is a plethora of economists in this town. It reminds me of the story about my professor of economics at Ohio State. When I was there 20 years after I took the course under him I asked: "Is the old gentleman still here?" They said: "Yes, he is still giving the same 10 questions on final examination that he gave when you were here." I asked: "Aren't the boys wised up on it?" And the answer was "Yes, but he changes the answers every year."

So I do not see why you cannot get along with six economists instead of seven. Then if you find you cannot, come back to the committee and we will review it.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The committee has an open mind. If the gentleman's committee is short, they can come back to our committee and we will review it again and see what should be done.

REAPPOINTMENT OF DR. JEROME C. HUNSAKER AS CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 176.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I would like to know something about the procedure, that is, as to whether these resolutions will be made available before being offered so that we will know what is in them? And the second question is whether we may offer amendments as to amount.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman in charge of the resolution yields for that purpose.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I have available House Joint Resolution 176.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But a copy is available only when the resolution is up for vote and, as amendments and debate are not in order, there is no opportunity for a Member learning prior to a vote whether there is merit in the resolution.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of Doctor Jerome C. Hunsaker, of Cambridge, Massachusetts, on June 3, 1961, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of six years.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PUBLICATION ENTITLED "FACTS ON COMMUNISM"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the publication entitled "Facts on Communism—Volume II, The Soviet Union, From Lenin to Khrushchev" prepared by the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Eighty-Sixth Congress, second session, be printed as a House document; and that there be printed fifty thousand additional copies of said document of which fifteen thousand shall be for the use of said committee and thirty-five thousand copies to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of ninety days after which time the unused balance shall revert to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the House concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF BROCHURE ENTITLED "HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administra-

tion I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 81) and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made", by Doctor Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, as set out in House Document 156 of the Eighty-sixth Congress, be printed as a House document, with emendations by the author and with a foreword by Honorable Edwin E. Willis; and that there be printed one hundred and thirty-two thousand additional copies to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of ninety days after which the unused balance shall revert to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the House concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT "COMMUNIST TARGET—YOUTH—COMMUNIST INFILTRATION AND AGITATION TACTICS"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 142) and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities one hundred thousand additional copies of the report "Communist Target—Youth—Communist Infiltration and Agitation Tactics", Eighty-sixth Congress, second session.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the House concurrent resolution.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF PUBLICATION ENTITLED "OPERATING PRINCIPLES, FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 91) and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a House document the publication entitled "Operating Principles, Fryingpan-Arkansas Project, Adopted by the State of Colorado, April 30, 1959 (as amended December 30, 1959, and December 9, 1960)", and that there be printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs one thousand additional copies.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT NO. 2237, ENTITLED "ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE YEAR 1960"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 104) and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities six thousand additional copies of House Report Numbered 2237, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, entitled "Annual Report for the Year 1960".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, WHAT IT IS—WHAT IT DOES"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 201) and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities thirty-two thousand additional copies of House Document Numbered 118, Eighty-sixth Congress, first session, entitled "The House Committee on Un-American Activities, What It Is—What It Does".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the majority leader at this time if he will advise us as to the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I may say that with disposition of the business before the House today there is no other legislation available to program for the rest of the week. Therefore, there will be no further legislation for the remainder of the week. There may be some unanimous-consent requests where they have to be cleared or screened, but no legislative program for the rest of the week because there is no legislation ready for House consideration. We have cleaned up everything.

May I say also that I will announce the program tomorrow for Monday and next week. There will be some important bills come up on Monday, one or two under suspension of the rules, and there may be other legislation.

I want to announce to the Members that on Monday there will be at least one, if not more, important bill to come up under suspension of the rules.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman will announce that tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, surely.

AUTHORIZING DISTRIBUTION OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD TO FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS REQUESTING COPIES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up the bill (S. 451) to authorize the distribution of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress requesting such copies, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 73 of the Printing Act, approved January 12, 1895, as amended (44 U.S.C. 183), is amended by inserting after the paragraph relating to ex-Presidents and ex-Vice Presidents a new paragraph as follows:

"To each former Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from a territory, or Commissioner from Puerto Rico, upon request to the Public Printer, one copy of the daily."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PRINT AS SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF STUDIES OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 7 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of the studies on United States foreign policy prepared under the direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, pursuant to S. Res. 336, agreed to July 31, 1958, as amended by S. Res. 31, agreed to February 2, 1959, and S. Res. 250, agreed to February 9, 1960.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed five thousand additional copies of such Senate document. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 15 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with illustrations, as a Senate document, a report entitled "A Report on United States Foreign Operations", submitted by Senator Allen J. Ellender to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on February 1, 1961; and that four thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today is celebrated Hungarian Independence Day. In the year 1848, under the leadership of the patriotic and courageous Lajos Kossuth, this brave nation proclaimed its independence from the Hapsburg Empire. A year later, this freedom was extinguished. However, the fire and thirst for liberty was never suppressed.

Years later, we were witness to the great manifestation of this courage and belief in freedom when the oppressed Hungarian nation rose in arms against its slaver masters. Once again, the identical spirit and strength of belief, motivated the Hungarian people to incredible lengths in their attempt to achieve their freedom. The world saw with clarity that freemen, no matter their country, have the common bond and courage to shed their blood for the ideals in which they believe.

So, while I am commemorating this day, a great milestone in the history of Hungary, I cannot forget that this nation is in the bonds of a far greater slavery than she endured 113 years ago. Although the evil use of brutal and overwhelming power would seem to be able to crush even the spirit of her people, I am sure that today, as ever in her long history, Hungary is as strong in the beliefs which have been the ideals and guides of her hopes and actions.

I have faith, as I know have the brave Hungarian people, that someday their desires shall be fulfilled. I know too, that their courage is ready to meet the test, no matter how brutal, to challenge the oppressors and to break the chains which bind them.

We commemorate this day with a feeling of hope and with a tribute to a brave people who merit our respect. I am sure that they shall be free. I pledge that this great Nation will someday join with Hungary in the bond of mutual respect in freedom and liberty.

NEW FEDERAL JUDGESHIPS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I joined with my colleagues in Congress from North Carolina in recommending that three new Federal judgeships be created in our State. Although I assumed that all three new judges would be Democrats, I have never felt that judgeships should be created or rejected on the basis of partisan politics.

My recommendation was based solely upon figures compiled by one of our colleagues on the House Judiciary Committee, which indicated that in 1960 the criminal caseload in the middle district of North Carolina—one judge—was the highest, and in the eastern district—one judge—the second highest of that in the 86 Federal judicial districts in our country. The statistics further indicated that in the eastern and middle districts the criminal caseload during the last 5 years has been running four to six times the national average per judgeship and from two to four times the national average per judgeship in the western district of North Carolina—one judge.

It is my belief that Federal judgeships should not be created on a pork-barrel or logrolling basis regardless of which party controls the White House and will therefore make the appointments. Federal judgeships should be created only after thorough investigation has disclosed a need therefor. Such a need for additional judgeships in certain districts in our country has been apparent for years but Congress refused to create new ones notwithstanding strong recommendations that it do so from the previous administration.

It is worthy of note in this connection that last year the House Judiciary Committee approved H.R. 12552 which created 35 new Federal judgeships; that a rule was granted by the Rules Committee on June 25, 1960, making it in order for the bill to be brought up for consideration in the House; but Congress was allowed to adjourn without the bill ever having been called up for consideration.

This record indicates that partisan political considerations were used to prevent action on a new judgeship bill last year, and if I were inclined to adopt a partisan attitude about the judiciary I could very well have declined to join my North Carolina colleagues in recommending three new judgeships for our State. But because I do not believe that Federal judgeships should be considered as patronage, or that partisan politics should be involved in considering how many and where additional judgeships should be created, I joined the North Carolina delegation in the recommendation previously mentioned.

I think whatever new judgeships are created should be based solely upon a factual study conducted by the Judiciary Committee, including a consideration of recommendations made by the Judicial Conference, to determine the need thereof in every district. The only facts that should determine whether North Carolina needs one, two, or three new Federal judgeships, and the same would apply with respect to the need in every other State, are at least the following: First, caseload—criminal and civil; second, current condition of the court's docket; third, number of days in each year the sitting judge held court or the number of days in which the court was in recess; fourth, median timelag in bringing criminal and civil cases to trial.

Perhaps other facts are equally worthy of consideration but the foregoing are certainly pertinent and I would be glad to have the needs of North Carolina compared with the other States before any final determination is made. If such an impartial study should indicate that North Carolina needs less than three new Federal judgeships to guarantee prompt administration of justice and a reasonably speedy determination of civil cases, then I will oppose creating more than are necessary for these purposes.

If such a study indicates that North Carolina does need three additional Federal judgeships, I will vote for legislation creating them even though there is no assurance that the President will not draw exclusively from his own party in filling the positions. If such a study indicates that we need 73 new judgeships in the United States, I will support a bill to create that number; but if after all of the facts are in such study indicates that we do not need 73 new judgeships, or that North Carolina does not need 3, then I reserve the right to oppose legislation creating any unnecessary judgeships in the other States and in my own. In other words, I do not propose to vote for any bill which would create unnecessary judgeships in North Carolina or elsewhere, and I hope that the Judiciary Committee will not give any consideration to patronage, politics, or logrolling and present legislation based solely and clearly upon recognized need.

THE DAVIS-BACON ACT

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the

RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, three decades have passed since the Davis-Bacon Act was adopted. This act was intended to protect the workingman in the construction industry from having his wages driven down below the prevailing level by contractors who secured the award of Federal construction contracts by reason of their substandard wage scales.

Under this act, as originally conceived, rival contracors could compete against each other in terms of efficiency, management ability and the like but not in terms of their willingness to drive down the prevailing wage scale.

This useful object was accomplished by having the Secretary predetermine the prevailing wage rate which the company receiving the Federal construction contract was required to pay by law.

In recent years it has become clear that the 30-year-old Davis-Bacon Act is not accomplishing effectively its original purpose. When the law was enacted, the construction worker received his wages only in the form of an hourly rate of pay. Today, the construction worker receives his wages in the form of a rate of pay and also fringe benefits such as health and welfare insurance and retirement plans. The cost of such fringe benefits is just as much a part of the employer's labor costs as are the hourly rates of pay The Davis-Bacon Act, however, applies only to the hourly rate; it does not apply to fringe benefits.

Consequently, the fair employer who pays fringe benefits as well as the hourly rate of pay is subjected to unfair competition for Government contracts by the employer who does not give his employees health and welfare protection and retirement benefits.

It is the principal purpose of the bill I am introducing today to equalize competition between employers and thus to protect established and prevailing wage standards in the building and construction industry.

The essential feature of my bill is the requirement that the Secretary of Labor shall include in his wage determinations under the Davis-Bacon Act the prevailing rate of payments for the fringe benefits specified in the bill. Thus, if employers in the area are paying 10 cents an hour—or such other sum as may be found by the Secretary to be prevailing—for the specified fringe benefits—all bidders will have to figure on the basis of the same labor cost. The substandard employer, in the illustration I have given, will not get a 10 cents an hour discount—as is the case under the present language of the law.

There are many other aspects of the Davis-Bacon Act which require modernization. The fringe benefit problem, however, is of urgent character. I have therefore drafted this bill to provide a direct solution for this problem and I shall press vigorously for early and favorable action on the bill in this session of the Congress.

Our economy has become the marvel of the world because it operates on the basis of a high wage structure. It has been the effort of the Congress to protect wage standards—not to destroy them. In the midst of our many legislative problems let us not ignore the needs of the millions of workers and of the numerous fair employers in the giant building and construction industry which operates in every community of our land. The failure to include the prevailing rate of pay for fringe benefits in the Secretary of Labor's wage determinations is a glaring deficiency of the Davis-Bacon Act. Let us put an end quickly to the wage discount system which now exists under that act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KNOX (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) for March 15 through 18, 1961, on account of official business out of city.

Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) for March 15 on account of illness.

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. JONAS for 5 minutes on March 15.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. DWYER.

(At the request of Mr. LANGEN, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CORMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. ANFUSO in two instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1173. An act to authorize the appointment of Dwight David Eisenhower to the active list of the Regular Army, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 16, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

678. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1962 involving proposed new obligational authority in the amount of $20,935,000 and increases in limitations amounting to $25,120,000, all for the Department of Labor (H. Doc. No. 108); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

679. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a supplemental report of conservation accomplishments under the conservation reserve program during calendar year 1960 mentioned in the Department's preliminary report transmitted on January 13, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 540, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

680. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1960, pursuant to the act of March 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 85); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

681. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the final report of the Boston National Historic Sites Commission pertaining in particular to major problems of historical preservation in the municipality of Boston, pursuant to the act of August 4, 1959 (73 Stat. 279) (H. Doc. No. 107); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 219. Resolution to increase the basic clerk hire allowance of each Member of the House, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 126). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 189. Resolution to provide funds for necessary miscellaneous expenses of the Committee on the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 127). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 200. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on Banking and Currency; without amendment (Rept. No. 128). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 225. Resolution authorizing the employment of one additional laborer, Office of the Postmaster of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 129). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 204. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; with amendment (Rept. No. 130). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McFALL: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 176. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen

Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; without amendment (Rept. No. 131). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 51. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the publication "Facts on Communism—Volume II, The Soviet Union From Lenin to Khrushchev" and to provide for the printing of additional copies; without amendment (Rept. No. 132). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 81. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 133). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 142. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report "Communist Target — Youth — Communist Infiltration and Agitation Tactics"; without amendment (Rept. No. 134). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 91. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document certain material relating to the Fryingpan-Arkansas project; without amendment (Rept. No. 135). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 104. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 2237, 86th Congress, 2d session; without amendment (Rept. No. 136). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 201. Resolution providing for additional copies of House Document No. 118, 86th Congress, 1st session, entitled "The House Committee on Un-American Activities, What It Is—What It Does"; without amendment (Rept. No. 137). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. S. 451. An act to authorize the distribution of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress requesting such copies, without amendment (Rept. No. 138). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 7. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies of U.S. foreign policy; without amendment (Rept. No. 139). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 15. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document, with additional copies, "A Report on U.S. Foreign Operations," submitted by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER; without amendment (Rept. No. 140). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 307. An act to authorize certain beach erosion control of the shore in San Diego County, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 32. Joint resolution to designate the first day of May of each year as Law Day, U.S.A.; without amendment (Rept. No. 165). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 143. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the week in May of each year in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week; with amendment (Rept. No. 166). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Report pursuit to section 202 Atomic Energy Act of 1954 as amended (Rept. No. 167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4363. A bill to amend Public Law 86-272 relating to State taxation of interstate commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1368. A bill for the relief of Maurice Devlin; with amendment (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1453. A bill for the relief of Mario Menna; with amendment (Rept. No. 142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1572. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sato Yasuda, Mr. Seiichi Yasuda, and Mrs. Tsuru Yasuda; with amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1578. A bill for the relief of Mah Quock; without amendment (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1704. A bill for the relief of Lee Shee Won; without amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1871. A bill for the relief of Min Ja Lee; without amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Sotiropoulos; with amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1873. A bill for the relief of Anna Stanislawa Ziolo; without amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2101. A bill for the relief of Evelina Scarpa; with amendment (Rept. No. 149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2158. A bill for the relief of Sister Marie Bernard (Miss Nicolina Ossa); with amendment (Rept. No. 150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2331. A bill for the relief of Peggy Loene Morrison; without amendment (Rept. No. 151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2681. A bill for the relief of Terata Kiyoshi Johnston; with amendment (Rept. No. 152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4217. A bill for the relief of David Tao Chung Wang; without amendment (Rept. No. 153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1379. A bill for the relief of the dependents or estate of Carroll O. Switzer; without amendment (Rept. No. 154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1393. A bill for the relief of Mr. Earl H. Pendell; with amendment (Rept. No. 155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1481. A bill for the relief of Rosemary B. Patmour; with amendment (Rept. No. 156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2138. A bill for the relief of Raymond G. Greenhalgh; without amendment (Rept. No. 157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2143. A bill for the relief of Capt. Arnold M. Anderson; with amendment (Rept. No. 158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2179. A bill for the relief of Essie V. Johnson; with amendment (Rept. No. 159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2180. A bill for the relief of Eugene C. Harter; without amendment (Rept. No. 160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2816. A bill for the relief of CWO James M. Cook; without amendment (Rept. No. 161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5179. A bill for the relief of the U.S. Display Corp.; with amendment (Rept. No. 162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5180. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ferenc Domjan and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 5614. A bill to provide for the furnishing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to members of the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5615. A bill to amend section 376 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5616. A bill to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the subsistence and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 5617. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act so as to make it permanent and to provide for a living memorial to past Presidents of the United States including Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Theodore Roosevelt; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 5618. A bill to provide that the Channel Islands off the coast of southern California shall be referred to as the Juan Rodrigues Cabrillo Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 5619. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, to eliminate any discrimination against married female employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5620. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5621. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 5622. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARLAND:

H.R. 5623. 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. GRAY:

H.R. 5624. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease-and-desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5625. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5626. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5627. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 5628. A bill to provide for a study and investigation of the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a National Tropical Botanic Garden; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5629. A bill to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5630. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 5631. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 5632. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that charitable contributions to certain historical societies and agencies by individuals shall be deductible for income tax purposes under the more liberal 30-percent limitation of adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 5633. A bill to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, section 18(d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 5634. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove all limitations upon the amount of the deduction allowed a taxpayer for medical, dental, and related expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 5635. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by providing for fair competition between domestic industries operating under the Fair Labor Standards Act and foreign industries that supplied articles imported into the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 5636. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and certain provisions of title 26, United States Code, relating to taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 5637. A bill to authorize the Department of Defense to extend protection to the public by indemnifying transportation companies against public liability arising from the risks involved in the transportation of nuclear or other unusually hazardous products and materials, to limit the liability of transportation companies so indemnified, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 5638. A bill relating to the application of the manufacturers excise tax on electric light bulbs in the case of sets or strings of such bulbs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.J. Res. 314. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.J. Res. 315. 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. HEMPHILL:

H. Con. Res. 196. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Con. Res. 197. Concurrent resolution to recognize Samuel Wilson, of Troy, N.Y., as the progenitor of America's national symbol "Uncle Sam"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER (by request):

H. Res. 226. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should study and investigate the Santa Cruz plan for the rehabilitation of hospitalized mental patients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona: Memorial of the State of Arizona requesting the Congress of the United States to enact a gold subsidy law for the purpose of stimulating gold production in the United States and thereby maintaining a high employment level for miners; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN: Resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with respect to gainful employment of the people of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations in the textile industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H.R. 5639. A bill for the relief of Miss Ng Low Gene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5640. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marianna Campanella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5641. A bill for the relief of Antonett You Jae Soon Cassar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 5642. A bill for the relief of Delfina Duarte and Anicia Duarte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 5643. A bill for the relief of Stephen A. Clemente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5644. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii to hear, determine and render judgment on the claims of Mrs. Agnes J. Wong against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 5645. A bill for the relief of Boris Edelman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 5646. A bill for the relief of Tung Hui Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 5647. A bill for the relief of David C. Thomas, Robert W. Barber, Milton A. Chace, and Richard F. Turner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.R. 5648. A bill for the relief of George Paraskeropoulous; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 5649. A bill for the relief of Panagiota G. and Paraskevas G. Mitchell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5650. A bill for the relief of Stephanie Jedlicka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5651. A bill for the relief of George Vlasios Manavis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 5652. A bill for the relief of Kevork Toroian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 5653. A bill for the relief of Mariano Carrese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 316. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to confer a medal on Thomas Anthony Dooley III; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

95. By Mr. McCULLOCH: Petition of Mr. Dennis Wita, Local 711, UAW-CIO, Lima, Ohio, and members thereof, for the inclusion of the State of Ohio in the experimental food stamp plan, and for the permanent substitution of the food stamp plan for the present plan of distribution of surplus commodities for poor relief; to the Committee on Agriculture.

96. By Mr. SHRIVER: Petition of Mrs. Walter Litton of Peabody, Kans., and other citizens of the Fourth District of Kansas expressing their opposition to any increase in the appropriation for Government entertainment, especially for the purchase of liquor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the third calendar quarter of 1960 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $246.50. E. (9) $289.39.

A. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Nicholas E. Allen & Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 128 East 14th Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $1.

A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum & Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,210. E. (9) $14.70.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,567.01.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $11,324.77. E. (9) $11,324.77.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $130. E. (9) $4,890.56.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $562.50.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,361.69. E. (9) $5,361.69.

A. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $660.50. E. (9) $9,689.77.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $597.44.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation, Mescalero, N. Mex.

A. Apparel Industry Committee on Imports, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,576.85.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class I railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.
D. (6) $68.20. E. (9) $1,412.95.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation, Mescalero, N. Mex.
E. (9) $3.41.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Commissioner of Baseball, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $679.98.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $4,362.19.

A. Atlantic, Gulf & Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,486.58. E. (9) $21,486.58.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,225.

A. Richard E. Barton, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 404 South Bixel Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $3,500.

A. Roy Battles, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,650.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 1220 Washington Building, Tacoma, Wash.
E. (9) $8.36.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America.
E. (9) $3,268.09.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Marine Underwriters, the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Hull Insurance Syndicate.
E. (9) $22.02.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mollers Sudiah Shipbreakers, Ltd.; Alpha Shipping Co., Ltd.; and Lancashire Shipping Co., Ltd.
E. (9) $12.91.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,903.01.

A. Mrs. Paul Blanshard, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $120.

A. W. G. Blewett, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Peabody Coal Co., 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Joseph Borkin, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Alleghany Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth & Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Charles B. Bowling, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Roland Boyd, 218 East Louisiana Street, McKinney, Tex.
B. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,697.77. E. (9) $41.37.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Claire Hugo Stinnes, Grossenbaumerstrasse 253, Mulheim Ruhr, Germany.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $185.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen, e.v. Contrescarpe 45, Germany.
E. (9) $280.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1122 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $19.95.

A. C. Blake Brown, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Cities Service Petroleum, Inc., 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German & Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. Ben C. Corlett, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $595.15.

A. Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $201.77.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $480.09. E. (9) $480.09.

A. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
E. (9) $454.95.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $458.60. E. (9) $458.60.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 840 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. John T. Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $831.

A. Charles L. Cusumano, 42 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Casinyro Ciurici, 906 East 141st Street, Bronx, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,850. E. (9) $32.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. R. E. Davenport, Jr., Farmville, N.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $561.27.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

A. John W. Edelman, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,001.61. E. (9) $174.72.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $16.80.

A. The Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $47.25.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $640.21.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Forest Farmers Association, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington 6, D.C.

A. Leif Gilstad, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. John A. Gosnell, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association.
D. (6) $900.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Yakima Indian Association of Washington State.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $20.20.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Smelting & Refining Co., New York, N.Y., et al.
D. (6) $6,500. E. (9) $1,944.

A. Rodger S. Gunn, 4618 Highland Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.04. E. (9) $155.59.

A. Gypsum Association, 201 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Louis P. Haffer, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Murray Hanson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $1,028.64.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Chas. H. Heltzel, 606 Commerce Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $930. E. (9) $305.91.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Home Town Free Television Association, 2923 East Lincolnway, Cheyenne, Wyo.
D. (6) $830. E. (9) $1,772.43.

A. John M. Hurley, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $46.66.

A. William J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Harold G. Jacobson, 1476 South Fourth East, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 1066 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Societe Internationale Pour Participations Industrialies Et Commerciales, S.A., Peter Merianstr. 19, Basel, Switzerland.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. W. D. Johnson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $3,843.75. E. (9) $263.80.

A. Tom Killefer, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $141.17. E. (9) $9.34.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributors, Sprinkler Irrigation Association, Aluminum Extruders Council, and Northwestern Lumbermen's Association.
E. (9) $1,406.98.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $650.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,802.

A. A. W. Koehler, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Atlantic Gulf & Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,400. E. (9) $5,485.21.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $125.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $4. E. (9) $4.

A. Jonathan Lindley, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $8.60.

A. Fred Livingston, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Fred Livingston, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Alleghany Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Lobby for Peace (Northern California), 345 Franklin Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,644.62. E. (9) $3,701.87.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $77.25.

A. H. B. Luckett, 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. A. E. Lyon, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $958.96.

A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $597.44.

A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. McClure & McClure, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Coca-Cola Export Corp., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $257.49.

A. McClure & McClure, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia & Reading Relief Association, Reading, Pa.

A. John H. McCormick, Jr.
B. Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $20.

A. John W. MacKay, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,215.45. E. (9) $200.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,600. E. (9) $655.88.

A. Albert E. Maddocks, 1883 South Seventh East, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,052.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Joe G. Matthews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $148.84. E. (9) $84.14.

A. Albert E. May, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $220. E. (9) $24.19.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,205. E. (9) $280.

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Apparel Industry Committee on Imports, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $156.25.

A. Ross A. Messer, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $106.67.

A. M. L. Minzer, Jr., 2631 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Commodity Exchange, Inc., 81 Broad Street, New York City.
D. (6) $1,666.65. E. (9) $252.61.

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. Maryland Railroad Association, 300 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Curtis Morris, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Co-op, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $309.60. E. (9) $544.93.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Agricultural Stabilization & Conservation County Office Employees.
D. (6) $21,177. E. (9) $1,460.

A. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 348 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,114. E. (9) $1,500.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,347.05. E. (9) $1,862.77.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9,255.62.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 95 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,235.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, Chappell, Nebr.
D. (6) $1,224.51. E. (9) $1,224.51.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $34,200. E. (9) $32,769.50.

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,332.73. E. (9) $12,332.73.

A. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8,000.

A. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,915. E. (9) $7,000.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,401.76. E. (9) $10,810.21.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,054.36. E. (9) $735.

A. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $17.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $4,574.62.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,223.99. E. (9) $5,199.06.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 1618 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemical Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $120.55.

A. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $4,377.74.

A. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $2,055.78.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $316.82. E. (9) $674.77.

A. James D. Parriott, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. George F. Parrish, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.

A. Ralph D. Pittman, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $444.

A. Sanford L. Platt, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Raymond E. Plummer, 220 Central Building, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $184.38.

A. Gordon M. Quarnstrom, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. William H. Quealy, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Smith-Corona Marchant, Inc., 410 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. William H. Quealy, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, Standard Oil Building, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Arthur L. Quinn, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute Cubano de Establizacion del Azucar acting as trustee for Asociacion de Colonos de Cuba & Asociacion de Hacendados de Cuba, Agramonte 465, Havana, Cuba.
E. (9) $1,250.

A. Mrs. Richard G. Radue, 3406 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $138. E. (9) $43.68.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Post Office Box 48, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $150.

A. John Arthur Reynolds, 653 Cortland Avenue, Fresno, Calif.
B. Western Cotton Growers Association, 310 Fulton-Fresno Building, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $62.72.

A. William E. Richards, Orleans, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation District, League City, Tex.

A. E. W. Rising, 328 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Sugar Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $345.08.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Kermit B. Rykken, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Mobile Oil Co., Los Angeles; Richfield Oil Corp., Los Angeles; Union Oil Co., Los Angeles; Tidewater Oil Co., Los Angeles; Shell Oil Co., San Francisco; Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $216.51.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange, 79 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200 E. (9) $25.41.

A. Maurice J. Shean, 940 25th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. City and County of San Francisco, Calif
D. (6) $3,850. E. (9) $1,693.57.

A. Paul Sifton, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America Union.
D. (6) $2,418. E. (9) $793.66.

A. David Silvergleid, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,215.45. E. (9) $200.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,187.50. E. (9) $7.80.

A. John A. Smith, Stapleton Airfield, Denver, Colo.
B. Continental Air Lines, Inc., Stapleton Airfield, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $202.50.

A. Thaddeus S. Snell, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Gypsum Association, 201 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $94.47.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,308.94. E. (9) $597.77.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
E. (9) $150.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,622.40. E. (9) $2.91.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $155.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Continental Merchandise Co., 236 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.; Rogers, Inc., 419

Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.; Smokers Articles Division, National Council of American Importers, Inc., New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $578.70.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Nozaki Associates, Inc., 92 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.; Mitsubishi International Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.; and Ajinomoto Co. of N.Y., 30 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $35.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Ada Barnett Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $2,125. E. (9) $230.40.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Surplus Property Importers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Reservation, Browning, Mont.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ben Blumenthal, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 W Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Seneca Nation of Indians, 25 Main Street, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. John S. Stump, Post Office Box 1101, Alexandria, Va.
B. R. E. Davenport, Jr., Farmville, N.C.

A. William L. Taylor, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,799.98. E. (9) $103.03.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $67.70.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,361.69.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,063.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hattie B. Trazenfeld, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Club, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $326,520. E (9) $2,108.63.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,197.50. E. (9) $22.70.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $433. E. (9) $699.40.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington D.C.
D. (6) $445. E. (9) $445.

A. Veterans, World War I, USA, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,550.63. E. (9) $73,976.26.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Merrill A. Watson, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $45.44.

A. Narvin B. Weaver, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cities Service Petroleum, Inc., 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William E. Welsh, Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $63.25.

A. Western Cotton Growers Association of California, 310 Fulton-Fresno Building, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $450.58. E. (9) $2,572.50.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $14,390.49. E. (9) $20.30.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 706 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,195.54. E. (9) $2,195.54.

A. Myron Wiener, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Gulf Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $250.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $2.46.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana.
E. (9) $5.48.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Indians of California, Post Office Box 901, Redding, Calif.
E. (9) $33.76.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.
E. (9) $32.85.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 5053 North Mount View, San Bernardino, Calif.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $2.28.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.
E. (9) $2.28.

A. C. C. Woodard, 7630 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla.

A. Harley Z. Wooden.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. John H. Young, 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,375.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1960:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____ ◄	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATIONS OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER			
			1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D5" (received for services) and "D12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D13" and "D14," since the amount has already been reported under "D5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $_____Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter
12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": _____
14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	(*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E."—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures
9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More
In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. V. J. Adduci, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,384. E. (9) $394.75.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Arthur F. Aebersold, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,186.02.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,648.65. E. (9) $3,648.65.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

A. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $969.22. E. (9) $969.22.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
B. Commercial Telegraphers' Union, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $808.82.

A. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $8,612.51. E. (9) $8,612.51.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,644. E. (9) $25,644.

A. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, AFL-CIO Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $33,354.03.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,284.10. E. (9) $240.95.

A. American Justice Association, Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.

A. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $318.02. E. (9) $23,408.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $9,539.59.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $250.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,999.64. E. (9) $3,750.

A. American Optometric Association, care of Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,267.47.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $494.63. E. (9) $494.63.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $16,415.43. E. (9) $703.47.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $414. E. (9) $63,416.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $66,903.33.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,927.60. E. (9) $1,927.60.

A. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $11,272.05.

A. American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, 500 Sugar Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $25.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $2.59.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $16,128.10.

A. AMVETS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,782.50.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $1,349.98.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Alabama Railroad Association, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. Richard H. Anthony, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc.

A. Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation, Mescalero, N. Mex.

A. W. B. Ardery, General Motors Corp., Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,050. E. (9) $1,078.28.

A. J. Sinclair Armstrong, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. United States Trust Co. of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $31.33.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation, Mescalero, N. Mex.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $375.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,946.86. E. (9) $1,946.86.

A. Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,296.72. E. (9) $2,296.72.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Association of Stock Exchange Firms, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $25.

A. Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Richard W. Averill, National Retail Merchants Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $133.10.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 2, Box 406, Vienna, Va.
B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 325 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $1.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Aeronautical Services Association, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 2035 South Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees.

A. John A. Baker.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,807.04. E. (9) $153.05.

A. Joseph H. Ball, States Marine Lines, 90 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. H. Ballew, Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,600.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $190. E. (9) $37.47.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. John V. Beamer, 625 Valley Brook Lane, Wabash, Ind.
B. Fine Hardwoods Association, 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $48.47.

A. James F. Bell, 730 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $0.75.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,326. E. (9) $377.77.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employes of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hudson Biery, 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, and American Hull Insurance Syndicate.
E. (9) $1,482.13.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mollers Suidah Shipbreakers, Ltd.; Alpha Shipping Co., Ltd., and Lancashire Shipping Co., Ltd.
E. (9) $4.51.

A. David Bishop, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employes of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. W. G. Blewett, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Peabody Coal Co., 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $105. E. (9) $11.40.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Hyman Bookbinder, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $140.60.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joseph Borkin, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Alleghany Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $70.10.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $2.49.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink & Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Frank P. Brennan, Avoca, Iowa.
B. Iowa Power & Light Co., Des Moines, Iowa.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William N. Brinker, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $1.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.03. E. (9) $98.73.

A. W. S. Bromley, American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George Bronz, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amity Fabrics, Inc., 12 West 32d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,185. E. (9) $41.45.

A. Hilton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $567.40.

A. Bryant C. Brown, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Company, Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. George J. Burger, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

A. Robert M. Burr, 105 Mansfield Avenue, Darien, Conn.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7.25. E. (9) $4.09.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,833.20.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $44.60.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $25.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $426.64.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,769.22. E. (9) $376.92.

A. John T. Carlton and M. H. Manchester, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $474.68.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8325 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1717 East Ninth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $640.

A. Albert E. Carter, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $927.50.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers Trade Association.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $520. E. (9) $412.18.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $2.18.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 805 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,345.08. E. (9) $4,158.80.

A. Cities Service Petroleum, Inc., 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $262.48.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph Coakley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building Service Employees International Union, 155 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,800.

A. A. C. Cocke, 821 Gravier Street, New Orleans, La.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $354.75.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $48.25.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $222.68.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $83.06.

A. Committee To Strengthen the Frontiers of Freedom, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,232.87.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5,515.79.

A. Committee To Support U.S. Congress Bill Creating a Commission on Obscene Matters and Materials, Post Office Box 74, Old Bridge, N.J.
E. (9) $3,207.

A. R. T. Compton, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Conference on State Defense, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Orval R. Cook, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1631 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturers' Association of Puerto Rico, San Juan, Puerto Rico.
D. (6) $1,248. E. (9) $440.86.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston Salem, N.C.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $20.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Edsal Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $13.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution 1955 Legislature, Post Office Box 3170, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Copper and Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Cromartie, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $146.49.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Michigan.

A. John T. Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $265.65.

A. Bryce Curry, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

A. Bernard Cushman, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles L. Cusumano, 42 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Casimiro Giurici, 906 East 141st Street, Bronx, N.Y.
E. (9) $32.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. D. C. Daniels, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $687.50. E. (9) $11.77.

A. R. E. Davenport, Jr., Farmville, N.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $200.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $22.78.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $146.49.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., Chicago, Ill.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 831 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of D.C., 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael D. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comision de Defense del Azucar y Fomento de la Cana, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $930.30.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $127.50.

A. Joe T. Dickerson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $179.92.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Yolo Port District, 705 California Fruit Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,723.90. E. (9) $98.90.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,802.65.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,750.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,898.68. E. (9) $14,830.21.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employes of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $52.14.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $1.20.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. California Shipping Co., 320 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $343.33.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,625.01.

A. James G. Donovan, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Customs Brokers and Forewarders Association of America, Inc., 8-10 Bridge Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $127.50.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. and Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,045.64.

A. Fred H. Dressler, Box 188, Gardnerville, Nev.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Ben DuBois.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

A. Stephen M. Du Brul, 11-134 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1.12. E. (9) $78.95.

A. John W. Edelman, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,419.50. E. (9) $419.45.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $15.

A. Harold Edwards, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Health Federation, 709 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $700.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $206. E. (9) $44.70.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $31.25.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $195.83.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Palo Verde Irrigation District, Blythe, Calif.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $5,081.25. E. (9) $11.95.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $5.92.

A. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $80,145.87. E. (9) $19,426.49.

A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La., and United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla., and Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., South Bay, Fla.
D. (6) $6,349.98.

A. First National City Bank of New York, 55 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5,658.85.

A. John B. Fisher, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bangor & Aroostook Railroad, Bangor, Maine.

A. John B. Fisher, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. C. H. Sprague & Son Co., 125 High Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,328.13. E. (9) $59.70.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,800.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Fluorspar Consumers Committee, care of 40 Rector Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $11,446. E. (9) $14,416.41.

A. Forest Farmers Association, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. James W. Foristel, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $200.43.

A. James F. Fort, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $151.35.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street NW., Washington D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. W. E. Fravel, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,802.65.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $27,774.36. E. (9) $7,387.20.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. West Coast Steamship Co., 601 Board of Trade Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Great Northern Railway Co., Great Northern Building, St. Paul, Minn., et al.
D. (6) $500.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $188.94. E. (9) $25.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,954.70. E. (9) $6,232.83.

A. Government Relations Committee of the Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James L. Grahl, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318/418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $15,464.90. E. (9) $15,469.39.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3.65. E. (9) $3.65.

A. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $45. E. (9) $1.53.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 1001 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Yakima Indian Association of Washington State.
E. (9) $15.32.

A. Group Health Association of America, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $217.

A. Rodger S. Gunn, 4618 Highland Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.04. E. (9) $473.91.

A. Gayle Gupton, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $240.18.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Seafarers' Section, MTD, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,470.39.

A. Harlan V. Hadley, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625.

A. Louis P. Haffer, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Hal H. Hale, 423 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Haley, Wollenberg & Bader, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Home Town Free Television Association, 2923 East Lincolnway, Cheyenne, Wyo.
D. (6) $657.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $758.33. E. (9) $10.18.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Charles A. Hamilton, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $102.92.

A. W. C. Hammerle, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. C. L. Hancock, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. L. James Harmansen, Jr., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,187.50. E. (9) $30.08.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 500 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $481.67. E. (9) $4,429.92.

A. John A. Hartman, Jr., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Cable & Radio Corp. et al., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $184.95.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $34.50.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2.55.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $107.54.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $17.60.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Miro Quesada 376, Lima, Peru, S.A.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $449.47.

A. Hedrick and Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Cooperative Advertising, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,419.13. E. (9) $54.61.

A. Hedrick and Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reciprocal Inter Insurers Federal Tax Committee, 400 United Artists Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $525.14.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $810.38.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Belter Building, New Orleans, La.
B. American Association of Small Business, Inc., 431 Belter Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,858.40. E. (9) $733.40.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $236. E. (9) $236.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Buildington, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $53.33.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Buildington, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Football League, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $10.02.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Wool Trade Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station S, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $123.06.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $262.50.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

A. John W. Hight, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AMVETS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,187.50. E. (9) $75.

A. Holabaugh & Jacobs, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Patent Policy Study Committee, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $23.82.

A. Fuller Holloway, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $307.93.

A. A. D. Holmes, Jr., Gallion, Ala.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Home Town Free Television Association, 2923 East Lincolnway, Cheyenne, Wyo.
D. (6) $100.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $318.75.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $146.49.

A. Lawrence W. Horning, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.03.

A. Erma D. Hubbard, 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
B. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
E. (9) $10.

A. W. T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. R. L. Humphrey, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $437.50.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
B. Richard F. Bates, Sacramento, Calif., and Edward S. Cohen, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $503.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10.

A. William J. Hynes, Union Pacific Railroad Co., 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $19,331.88. E. (9) $19,331.88.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H. Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $1.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,355.

A. Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $15. E. (9) $694.35.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,150. E. (9) $279.30.

A. Harold G. Jacobson, 1476 South Fourth East, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. W. Ervin James, 1107 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Houston Sports Association, 1006 Bank of the Southwest Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $331.69.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $225.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,391.23. E. (9) $23.50.

A. Philip F. Jehle, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $35.

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 1066 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Societe Internationale Pour Participations Industrialies Et Commerciales, S.A., Peter Merianstr. 19, Basel, Switzerland.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.; Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky.; Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn.; United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N.J.; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., Cooley Clay Co., Kentucky Clay Mining Co., Mayfield, Ky.; Tennessee Absorbent Co., Southern Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.

A. William T. Jobe, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Ice Association, Inc., 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, 810 Whittington, Hot Springs, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,739.52. E. (9) $61.15.

A. W. D. Johnson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, ORC & B Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. George Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $12.42.

A. Robert F. Jones, 515 Perpetual Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Cable & Radio Corp. et al., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edwin W. Kaler, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $8,750.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,780. E. (9) $801.60.

A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Guatemala Sugar Producers Association, Guatemala City, Guatemala.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. West Coast Life Insurance Co., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. James C. Kelley, 1600 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1600 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $249.80.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,625. E. (9) $388.01.

A. Frank T. Kenner, 38 Niuiki Circle, Honolulu, Hawaii.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $220.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, Transportation Center, Philadelphia 3, Pa.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $2,845.17.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,583.84. E. (9) $1,325.26.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $246.25.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Minot, DeBlois & Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $45,530. E. (9) $15.18.

A. Ludlow King, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $650.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. S. F. Kirby, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $255. E. (9) $33.03.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,802.

A. Robert M. Koch, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,340.17.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,810. E. (9) $6,885.38.

A. James K. Langan, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,122.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $1,000.12.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc., 1001 Grant Street, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $900.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 808 Trans-American Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $375.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,450.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $218.75. E. (9) $16.85.

A. Thomas B. Lawrence, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) $600.

A. Warren Lawrence, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $160. E. (9) $75.

A. Gene Leach, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,212.50. E. (9) $25.33.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $24.38. E. (9) $24.38.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $18,749.97. E. (9) $8,616.09.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $27.39.

A. Roy T. Lester, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $30.69.

A. John R. Lewis, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $23.45. E. (9) $23.45.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,522.45. E. (9) $3,522.45.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5.62.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $63.75. E. (9) $9.60.

A. Fred Livingston, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Fred Livingston, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Alleghany Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines.

A. Leonard Lopez, 400 First Street, Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,308. E. (9) $15.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $138.50.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 24 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $6.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Roadside Business Association, 646 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $6.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $6.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place, South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $6.

A. H. B. Luckett, 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Committee on Conference Studies, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,162.50. E. (9) $27.25.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,125.98.

A. William C. McCamant, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees.
D. (6) $2,650.90. E. (9) $6.60.

A. McClure & McClure, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Coca-Cola Export Corp., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $45,000. E. (9) $177.36.

A. McClure & McClure, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia & Reading Relief Association, Reading, Pa.

A. H. B. McCoy, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc.

A. Angus H. McDonald.
B. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,893.12. E. (9) $84.25.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 West Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. Christian Amendment Movement.
D. (6) $999.99. E. (9) $250.

A. William F. McKenna, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $22.08. E. (9) $8.05.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. C. W. McMillan, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,175. E. (9) $92.47.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Frankel Bros., 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $0.75.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Willi Zietz, Savoy Hotel Hilton, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $0.75.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $1,814.37.

A. Albert E. Maddocks, 1883 South Seventh East, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Jerome J. Madigan, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Arch L. Madsen, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Don Mahon, Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $488.39.

A. Walter E. Maloney, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,370. E. (9) $1,442.94.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $168.30.

A. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,797.84. E. (9) $58.70.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,052.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Drew Martin, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $242.20.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $225.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $369.50.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. P. H. Mathews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $247.22. E. (9) $262.60.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $67.50. E. (9) $13.68.

A. Joe G. Matthews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Vera Mayer.
B. National Consumers League, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Howard W. Mays, Jr., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Lester H. Means, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., Appliance Park, Louisville, Ky.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,055.

A. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mehler, Goldsborough & Ives, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ferro Corp., Glostex Chemicals, Inc., O. Hommel Co., and Pemco Corp.

A. M. Barry Meyer, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $67.08.

A. James G. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,528.54.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

A. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $2,173. E. (9) $1,573.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $2,200.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnum Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnum Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $2,621.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. John R. Minor, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $450.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. Maryland Railroad Association, 300 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $257.12.

A. Cecil Morgan, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Reciprocal Insurance Association, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,500. E (9) $4.24.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. St. Thomas Chamber of Commerce, Virgin Islands, U.S.A.
D. (6) $2,295. E. (9) $16.72.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Curtis Morris, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Giles Morrow, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,625. E. (9) $253.56.

A. Bernard R. Mullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
D. (6) $2,730.

A. Vincent S. Mullaney, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $357.07.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $600.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Paul A. Nagle, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $13,750.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $305.28. E. (9) $4,727.88.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $6,981.24.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $22.08. E. (9) $8.05.

A. National Association of Plumbing Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,550. E. (9) $6,812.73.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 95 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,235.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $417.90. E. (9) $256.12.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1422 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,361. E. (9) $628.50.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $477,625.23. E. (9) $4,453.35.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,150.21. E. (9) $1,150.21.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $600.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $165.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $11.34. E. (9) $11.34.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $85,854.19. E. (9) $9,785.32.

A. National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,420.15. E. (9) $13,420.15.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $133,894.33. E. (9) $13,481.46.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,763.03. E. (9) $17,726.08.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,360.45. E. (9) $1,808.15.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,342.04. E. (9) $1,021.75.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $813.25. E. (9) $813.25.

A. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $481.67. E. (9) $4,429.92.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $143.21. E. (9) $148.06.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,748.97. E. (9) $1,748.97.

A. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Postal Transport Association, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,386.46. E. (9) $10,386.46.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,862.50. E. (9) $11,774.53.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $11,650.70. E. (9) $13,506.11.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $160. E. (9) $7,143.94.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $269.78.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $88,207.84. E. (9) $2,073.82.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $24,715.50. E. (9) $2,750.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture & Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,957.05. E. (9) $14,408.72.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,033.28. E. (9) $3,661.97.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. James W. Rouse & Co., Inc., 14 West Saratoga Street, Baltimore, Md.; Walker & Dunlop, Inc., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; Frederick W. Berens, Inc., 1722 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.; the Carey Winston Co., 1723 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.; B. F. Saul Co., 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,236.63. E. (9) $2,157.73.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 603 Associations Building, 1145 19th Street NW, Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $112.50. E. (9) $6.69.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. M. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Brice O'Brien, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. George J. O'Brien, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 845 Northwestern Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $999.49.

A. John F. O'Connor, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,645.80.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $600.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,595. E. (9) $57.75.

A. Samuel Omasta, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $5,592.92.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $182.

A. John A. Overholt, 10315 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md., and 1131 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,076.97. E. (9) $215.94.

A. Vaux Owen, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,365.39.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $1,625.01.

A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
E. (9) $63.14.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Mrs. Karla V. Parker, 1729 Union Boulevard SE., Grand Rapids, Mich.

A. James D. Parriott, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

A. James G. Patton.
B. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $641.35.

A. William A. Patty, 20 Exchange Place, New York, N.Y.
B. First National City Bank of New York, 55 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $565.50.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, 14 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
B. Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
E. (9) $60.40.

A. Sandford Z. Persons, 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United World Federalists, Inc., 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $288.23. E. (9) $0.40.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $43.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $21.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. C. C. Woodard, 7630 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla., et al.
E. (9) $26.06.

A. Kenneth Peterson, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $72.50.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.

A. Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $55,774.10. E. (9) $1,100.

A. Raymond E. Plummer, 220 Central Building, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $184.38.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $827.94.

A. James K. Polk, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. James K. Polk, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. The Western Pacific Railroad Co., 526 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Frederick T. Poole, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines.

A. Frank M. Porter, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Nelson J. Post, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $260.57.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,508.80. E. (9) $30.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $275.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,800.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $11.19.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Development Bank for Puerto Rico.
E. (9) $1.

A. Purcell & Nelson, Barr Building, 910 17th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd., Managua, Nicaragua.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $16.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. Tobacco Institute, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $43. E. (9) $111.74.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $92.76.

A. J. A. Ransford, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Stanley Rector, 506 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Creameries Association, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $3,781.10.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.

A. J. B. Reeves, 9th and Jackson, Topeka, Kans.
B. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., Ninth and Jackson, Topeka, Kans.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,999.98. E. (9) $31.04.

A. Herbert S. Reid, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $555.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $54,098.15.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,665.94. E. (9) $9,689.95.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $457.06.

A. William E. Richards, Orleans, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.

A. Leon D. Richeson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employes of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Entertainment Law Committee, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The First National City Bank of New York, 55 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $93.35.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., 112 East Washington Street, Bloomington, Ill.
D. (6) $1,440. E. (9) $56.70.

A. Siert F. Riempa, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. John J. Riggle, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

A. George D. Riley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $327.90.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Frank L. Roberts, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $89.63.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $343.75.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $4,550.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $295.84.

A. William H. Ryan, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,769.60. E. (9) $60.

A. Ira Saks, 1370 Ontario Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Kimball Sanborn, 810 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston & Maine Railroad, Boston, Mass., and New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, New Haven, Conn.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,340.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2.92.

A. J. A. Schwab, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Arthur E. Scribner, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Seafarers' Section, MTD, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,375. E. (9) $18,646.18.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry See, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $7.60.

A. Fred G. Seig, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington D.C.
D. (6) $480. E. (9) $42.35.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $32.17.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities, Inc., Washington, D.C., and Airport Operators Council, Inc., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $999.98. E. (9) $492.08.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $650.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $830.34.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $7,600. E. (9) $3,011.95.

A. Harold S. Skinner, Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.
B. Continental Oil Co., Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

A. Harold Slater, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $24.95.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,187.50.

A. T. W. Smiley, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charleton D. Smith, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Radio Corp. of America, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $165.

A. James R. Smith, 1060 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. John A. Smith, Stapleton Airfield, Denver, Colo.
B. Continental Air Lines, Inc., Stapleton Airfield, Denver, Colo.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $4,257.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,494.21.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $437. E. (9) $580.37.

A. Charles B. Sonneborn, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $25,767.29. E. (9) $8,981.60.

A. Southwestern Peanut Sheller's Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
E. (9) $150.

A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co., (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $324.99.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Spring Air Co., 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,619.30.

A. Richard A. Squires, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $3,235.80.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Standard Public Relations, Inc., 45 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Theodore Roosevelt Association, 28 East 20th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $600.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Mrs. C. A. L. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. B. H. Steuerwald, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $1,406.25.

A. Ada Barnett Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,153.84.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Sugar Beet Growers Association, Hereford, Tex.
D. (6) $2,650. E. (9) $36.14.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $625.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 827 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $104.74.

A. John S. Stump, Post Office Box 1101, Alexandria, Va.
B. R. E. Davenport, Jr., Farmville, N.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. E. Sturrock, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $3,325. E. (9) $835.96.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John I. Taylor, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $933.33. E. (9) $3.65.

A. William L. Taylor, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,799.98.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $5,946.27. E. (9) $8,799.70.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $64.95.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

A. William B. Thompson, Jr., 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 2355 Alameda Street, Vallejo, Calif.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.
D. (6) $295. E. (9) $171.56.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,059.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $110.95.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,662.50. E. (9) $58.60

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,197.50.

A. J. T. Trullinger, National Bank of Commerce Building, Olympia, Wash.
B. Mobil Oil Co., 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif., et al.
E. (9) $197.24.

A. Ernest Allen Tupper, 1420 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. John W. Turner, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L.E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots Association, Post Office Box 601, Balboa, Canal Zone.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $79.43.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Range Association, 2438 Tulare Street, Fresno, Calif.
E. (9) $72.15.

A. Lewis H. Ulman, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $14,723.81.

A. United States Trust Co. of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $31.33.

A. United World Federalists, Inc., 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $339.13.

A. Thomas M. Venables, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carl M. Walker, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $74.85.

A. Stephen M. Walker, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $119.50. E. (9) $7.12.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,536.50. E. (9) $1,710.74.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $50.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $0.71.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $31.16.

A. Marvin B. Weaver, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cities Service Petroleum, Inc., 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William H. Webb, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers & Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,490. E. (9) $414.60.

A. E. E. Webster, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $48.05.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $801.08.

A. Don White, 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $3,830.53.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $23.06.

A. Marc A. White, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Richard P. White, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $37.50. E. (9) $101.36.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Scott C. Whitney, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $500.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 501 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) $5.45.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Indians of California, Post Office Box 901, Redding, Calif.
E. (9) $4.10.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.
E. (9) $1.66.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 5053 North Mount View, San Bernardino, Calif.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. Harding deC. Williams, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,417.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,700. E. (9) $252.80.

A. Clark L. Wilson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $569.70.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,597.43.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

A. W. F. Wimberly, Post Office Box 4147, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Pure Oil Co., 200 East Golf Road, Palatine, Ill.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $175.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $210. E. (9) $19.98.

A. John H. Young, 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $27.30.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromfine & Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1960:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____ ◄	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER			
			1st	2d	3d	4th
			(Mark one square only)			

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

A. American Association of Doctors' Nurses, 3636 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. AMVETS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Atlantic, Gulf & Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes, 2133 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insurance Co. of North America, and Life Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Dan Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Paul G. Collins, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1631 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturers' Association of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P.R.

A. I. Irving Davidson, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government of Ecuador, Quito, Ecuador.

A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Finance Conference, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James G. Donovan, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Customs Brokers & Forwarders Association of America, Inc., 8–10 Bridge Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

A. Harlan V. Hadley, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank B. Hand, Jr., 522 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Transportation League.

A. Glen R. Henderson, 215 West 16th Street, Connersville, Ind.

A. J. D. Hittle, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

A. John R. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AMVETS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A., 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul D. Lagomarcino, 513 Perpetual Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

A. William J. McSorley, Jr., 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building & Construction Trades Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jerome J. Madigan, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. D. L. Manion, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Drew Martin, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Kenneth Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John F. O'Connor, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mary Omen & Associates, Inc., 249 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Delegation Ayuda Frente Intreno Dominicano, 145 East 49th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clarke B. Payne, 321 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Edmund E. Pendleton, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.

A. George C. Pendleton, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.

A. Ervin L. Peterson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ralph D. Pittman, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Milton M. Plumb, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard J. Riddick, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Small Business Tax Conference, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

A. John M. Sprague, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Luther C. Steward, Jr., 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. B. Thayn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

A. William R. Veal, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Oliver F. White, 418 Third Street, Stambaugh, Mich.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 501 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Veterans' Direct Loan Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1961, I introduced H.R. 797, to provide for direct housing loans to veterans.

The House Veterans' Affairs Committee is presently conducting hearings on the subject and the following is my testimony in support of H.R. 797:

STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, THE VETERANS' DIRECT LOAN HOUSING PROGRAM, H.R. 797, MARCH 14, 1961

Mr. Chairman, I am most appreciative of the opportunity to appear before this committee today in behalf of my bill, H.R. 797.

I agree with the President's statement made in his special message to the Congress on housing and community development—that we must make more funds available to the American veteran who is seeking to own his home. I believe the Congress will agree that the cost of these loans should not be prohibitive.

There are many thousands of veterans now on the waiting list for both direct loans and for loans of private capital at the 5¼ interest rate. The program of direct loans has never been as large as needed to meet the needs of veterans who are otherwise unable to secure credit. In view of the need to stimulate the activities of the housing industry and out of consideration for the many veterans' families who are not living in the comfortable, standard housing which is their due, we must try to:

1. Encourage the private capital market to make mortgage funds available at the 5¼ interest rate;

2. Liberalize veterans' mortgage terms to allow as many veterans as possible to benefit from the housing loan program, including those in metropolitan areas as well as those in the smaller communities, and

3. Provide a sufficient amount of direct loan funds to meet the urgent needs of veterans to whom normal credit channels are not open.

There is no legitimate reason why the cost of housing loans to veterans must be raised; to do so is to penalize the veterans and to increase the income of the lenders. Let us hope that we will be able, generally, to lower the cost of money to the many American families who are seeking to better themselves.

Building costs have been steadily climbing in recent years, so much so that in most areas you cannot think in terms of a $12,000 or $13,000 house. In fact, in many areas you cannot find a house for less than $17,000 to $20,000. Therefore, I believe that it is necessary and right that the loan entitlement of veterans be raised to meet the higher cost of housing.

My bill, H.R. 797, is concerned with the direct loan program under section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. By it, I seek to make available more direct loan funds. I also propose to increase the amounts of loans to create broader eligibility.

Over the years I have consistently sought to have these proposals written into the law. This year I feel particularly confident that this goal may be achieved. There is a pressing need to put the country's more than 5 million unemployed back on the payrolls. A portion of this need could be met if more veterans were placed in a position to buy their own homes.

You are all fully familiar with the basic importance of the activities of the construction industry to the Nation's economy. However, I do want to emphasize these facts: The more homes we can build and sell, the more furniture we can make and sell; the more electric appliances, other consumer durables, lumber, bricks, mortar, building hardware and numerous other products will be demanded, thereby creating employment opportunities for almost every segment of industry.

I disagree with those who say that the building industry cannot serve as a stimulant to the economy as it has in the past. The major reason advanced by those who take this pessimistic view is that housing demand has been substantially achieved. Higher priced housing demand has been largely met, but there is a tremendous market for homes for the moderate income families and individuals.

The cooperative efforts of builders, lenders, and the Federal Government can assist in meeting the needs of veterans and other moderate income groups, and the building industry can again assist in buoying up the economy. Still another worthwhile purpose could be served—the elimination of substandard living quarters for many thousands of families.

The record of payment by veterans who have secured loans, under the direct loan program as well as the loan guarantee program, has been an excellent one—few losses have been recorded. The entire GI housing loan program has been successful, and it has not been costly.

I hope that this committee will find it possible to include my proposals in the bill it sends to the floor this session. To do so will be to help the families of many deserving men and women who have served this country well. At the same time, some impetus will be given to the lagging housing industry, and thereby to the economy as a whole.

It is essential that the GI home loan program be extended and expanded. Again, I want to thank you for permitting me to appear before this committee to state my views on this important piece of legislation.

Twenty-second Anniversary of Slovak Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday March 15, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, approximately 2 million Americans of Slovak origin are deeply and rightly interested in the fate of the more than 4 million Slovaks who are presently living under the domination of Communist despots in their native land.

The Congress of the United States, too, is interested in their fate, as in the fate of all other victims of Communist tyranny throughout the world. It is fitting and proper that the House of Representatives, which speaks and acts for all the people of our country, in their diversity of origin and in their unity of spirit and purpose, should take public notice of the 22d anniversary of Slovak independence, today, March 15, 1961.

The history of the Slovak people has been a singularly difficult one for many hundreds of years. Victims of persecution, of big power politics, of Fascist and Communist dictatorship, the people of Slovakia have tenaciously held to their goals of personal freedom and national independence. Their continued devotion to these great ideals should inspire us and freedom-loving people everywhere to renewed efforts to help bring closer the day when freedom and justice and peace will reign throughout the world.

North Platte, Nebr., Shrine to Buffalo Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House an accomplishment registered by North Platte, Nebr., one of the many fine cities in the Fourth District of Nebraska.

North Platte is the hometown of William F. Cody, better known to millions throughout the world as "Buffalo Bill" Cody. It was at North Platte that he founded his historic Scouts' Rest Ranch, and here chose to live for more than 30 years. Here Buffalo Bill was host to many celebrities ranging from Indian chiefs to European noblemen, entertaining them in the big, ornate house that still stands at the entrance to the ranch.

Here in the huge red barn with gunstock-carved rafters was wintered his famed wild west show, with purebred Arabian stallions sheltered under the same roof that covered Argentine llamas and longhorn steers.

Here on the tree-shaded grounds bisected by Scout Creek camped Sioux and Pawnee Indian warriors who traveled with the wild west show; here sharpshooters Annie Oakley and Frank Butler practiced and developed their skill. Scouts' Rest Ranch at North Platte, Nebr., is truly a historic spot.

Aware of this, the citizens of that community are making the ranch into a State park, which they know will soon become a national shrine to one of our

Nation's most colorful showmen. And they are doing this with a local effort which is a fine example to individuals and communities who still feel they can solve their own problems.

I am happy to note today that North Platte, numbering fewer than 18,000 people in west central Nebraska, has passed the halfway mark in its local drive to raise $37,500 toward its share of financing such a State park.

To a huge Federal Government accustomed to spending billions of dollars at the drop of a hat, the sum of $37,000 may sound pitifully small. But to the citizens of North Platte and the State of Nebraska, it is a sizable amount to raise. And it is to their everlasting credit that they have elected to do this on their own initiative, without coming to the Federal Government with outstretched palm, as is popular nowadays.

After the $37,500 goal is reached, the State of Nebraska will match that amount and complete purchase of the ranch, now privately owned by a leading Nebraska beef cattle producer. Thereafter, the State of Nebraska will spend nearly a quarter of a million dollars in renovation, maintenance, and operation during the next 10 years.

Some day, Mr. Speaker, I hope all Members of Congress will visit, as I have visited, this unique and beautiful historic site in Nebraska. I am sure they will feel, as I feel, a sense of satisfaction and pride in the country which has produced such men as William F. Cody and still produces such people as the citizens of North Platte.

And, like me, perhaps they will reflect that here is a perfect example of community effort in our free enterprise system—with the initiative coming from the people on the local level, and with the control resting there.

I congratulate the progressive citizens of North Platte and their surrounding communities—and I have faith that they will continue their drive and bring it to a successful conclusion.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic is observed annually on March 25. It was on that day in 1918 that the people of Byelorussia set themselves up as a free and independent nation, only to be crushed a short time later by the Communist armies.

The anniversary of Byelorussia's independence occurs at a time when our Nation is embarking on a new era under a new leadership. We hope it will be an era of peace and freedom for all nations, including the captive nations of Eastern Europe who are suffering under communism. These nations, such as Byelorussia and others, have been the first and greatest victims of the Kremlin's policies.

Today the Byelorussian people are a silenced nation, but their kinsmen living abroad in this country and elsewhere are maintaining their history and culture and are also keeping world opinion informed on the subjugation of their people in their ancestral homeland, Byelorussia, by the Communists. The hope of these people to regain their freedom has not been crushed, however. We must help them keep this hope alive until it is realized.

President Kennedy To Address Italian Centennial Celebration, Thursday, March 16

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of all Members of Congress that President Kennedy will be the guest speaker at the formal observance of the 100th anniversary of the unification of Italy, which is taking place tomorrow, Thursday, March 16, at 10:30 in the morning, in the new auditorium of the Department of State.

Invitations have been sent to all Members of both Houses of Congress, and I hope they will all be able to attend. Among our honored guests will also be the Vice President and the Speaker. We plan to adjourn shortly before noon, in order to give the Members an opportunity to get back to the House for the session.

The centennial celebration is being held under the joint sponsorship of the Italian Embassy and the American Honorary Committee for the Italian Centennial. Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, is the honorary chairman of the committee. I have the great honor of being the chairman, and Representative PAUL A. FINO, of New York, is the secretary. Other members of the committee are: Representatives Peter W. Rodino, of New Jersey; George P. Miller of California; Hugh J. Addonizio, of New Jersey; Dante B. Fascell, of Florida; John H. Dent, of Pennsylvania; Roland V. Libonati, of Illinois; Alfred E. Santangelo, of New York; Silvio O. Conte, of Massachusetts; Emilio Q. Daddario, of Connecticut; Dominick V. Daniels, of New Jersey; Robert N. Giaimo, of Connecticut; and Joseph P. Addabbo, of New York; also the Governors of the following four States: John A. Volpe of Massachusetts, John A. Notte of Rhode Island, Michael V. Di Salle of Ohio, and Albert D. Rosellini of Washington.

In addition to our distinguished national leaders and the Members of Congress, invitations have also been extended to the members of the Cabinet, the Supreme Court, the diplomatic corps, leading Government officials, heads of Italian-American societies, and others.

I should like to request all of our colleagues to be in their seats by 10:15. The President is expected to arrive a few minutes later and we shall start the observance promptly at 10:30. The Most Reverend Patrick O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington, will give the invocation. As chairman, I shall then make brief welcoming remarks. The Italian Ambassador Manlio Brosio will read a message from President Giovanni Gronchi of Italy. Prof. Gaetano Martino, head of the Italian delegation to the U.N. Assembly, will deliver an address. President Kennedy will then make his address, which will conclude the formal part of the observance.

A recital of Italian operatic music will then be presented by Metropolitan Opera stars Miss Renata Tebaldi, soprano, and Mr. Franco Corelli, tenor. Prior to the official opening of the observance, the U.S. Marine Band, under the direction of Lt. Col. Albert Schoepper, will present a musical program.

May I also call to the attention of the House the fact that Congress last year passed unanimously a resolution calling for official participation by the United States in the Italian centennial celebration in March 1961. This is the event which we had in mind at that time.

On March 8, 1961, President Kennedy issued a proclamation pertaining to this centennial anniversary. I am pleased to insert into the RECORD at this point the text of the President's proclamation, which reads as follows:

CENTENNIAL OF THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY—BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, A PROCLAMATION

Whereas the centennial of the unification of Italy, which occurs in 1961, commemorates a great event in the history of nations; and

Whereas in observance of the centennial there will be many celebrations in Italy, in the United States, and in many other countries as events of a century ago are relived; and

Whereas we in America are confident that the people of Italy, in the celebrations reenacting the events and experiences associated with the struggle for unification a century ago, will find renewed strength to further their vital contributions to the cause of freedom; and

Whereas it is the sense of the Congress, expressed by House Concurrent Resolution 225, agreed to July 2, 1960, that the President extend official greetings from the United States to the people of Italy on the occasion of the centennial of the unification of Italy:

Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby extend greetings and felicitations from the people of the United States to the people of Italy on the occasion of the centennial of the unification of Italy, in recognition of the progress and achievements of the Italian people during the past century and the bonds of friendship between our two nations.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 8th day of March in the year of our Lord 1961, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 185th.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.