U.S. Congress. Congressional Record

Appendix

The Crusade for Democracy in the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Luis A. Ferre, business, political, and civic leader of Puerto Rico, has made a real contribution to current discussions of Latin American policy in a paper entitled "The Crusade for Democracy in the Western Hemisphere." Under leave granted, I include it with my remarks and urge its consideration by all who are interested in this most important problem:

THE CRUSADE FOR DEMOCRACY IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

(A program for action by Luis A. Ferre, partner, Ferre Enterprises, Ponce, P.R.)

There are many contradictions in the U.S. relations with Latin America. The people of the United States are free and enjoy all the benefits of democratic government. And our country is rich, too. We have the greatest productive machine in the history of the world and we have bolstered our economic system by a whole complex of social safeguards, including minimum wages, social security benefits, FHA home construction loans, free education, and many others.

And yet we have complacently acquiesced while our sister republics south of the Rio Grande continue enmeshed in the old social system—exploitation and economic tyranny. What is worse, our own capital investments have many times unwittingly contributed to the perpetuation of that system. Thus, even though we condemn and punish governmental corruption where we find it in the United States, we have felt no compunctions in dealing with corrupt governments in Latin America. As a result we have seemed to condone the economic oligarchies and the military strongmen these regimes have represented.

This sort of inconsistency has provided a veneer of plausibility to communistic propaganda here in the Americas and facilitated the penetration of our hemisphere by Communist agents. There is no difficulty in finding an example; Castro's Cuba is only minutes away from both Florida and Puerto Rico.

Of course, some of the advantages that our tacit acceptance of social injustice provided the Communists have now been undone by Castro. The slogan "To the wall" epitomizes the violence and mob hysteria that has characterized the Cuban regime. The lesson is unmistakably sinking in with the people of this hemisphere.

And Fidelism has certainly helped to open the eyes of the people of the United States, too. We were not ignorant of Communist oppression before. We had read of the way in which Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Bulgaria, Rumania and, most poignantly, Hungary were crushed.

But that seemed remote, somehow. It did not fully register in our minds. Dictatorship is now right on our doorstep, however. Thus, once the haven for Europeans fleeing Old World despotism, our hemisphere now harbors the worst sort of Communist police state. Tyranny, we see, is not a phenomenon of time or geographic situation; unfortunately, it is contained in the very nature of man.

The feeling of isolation which gave all the Americas a sense of security has been shattered by Castro. The barbarians are literally at our gates. Our mission is like that of Charles Martel who fought off the Moors at Tours. This is no mere historical flourish; I deeply believe that the threat to the survival of Western civilization is now precisely as grave as it was in A.D. 732.

What can we do? As the first imperative, we must not any longer accept the defeatist notion that democratic institutions cannot be adapted for use by all peoples. That simply is not true.

Instead, we must convince the people of the world (and certainly of Latin America) that representative democracy is, as Winston Churchill put it, "the best form of government ever devised by man to guarantee his fundamental freedom and to insure his material progress." We must put it across that, given the proper training, any people can and will learn to thrive under democratic institutions. And, basic to all, we must win recognition for the fact that only government "of the people, by the people and for the people" can safeguard against the sort of authoritarianism that has made this a century of war and now threatens a new outbreak that might end civilization and literally vaporize mankind.

But how can we convert this general approach into a working program?

As a first step I urge that we combine with all our fellow members of the Organization of American States and establish a Pan American code.

The cornerstone upon which such a code should be founded would be a prohibition against the creation of any government in our hemisphere that is not some form of representative democracy. A basic requirement, therefore, would be regular—and absolutely free—elections. Possibly, the code would go as far as laying down some formula under which the OAS would supervise such elections.

Indispensably, the code would also commit the nations to economic progress for all classes. Necessary steps would include:

1. A Common Market, in which tariffs and other trade barriers are gradually reduced as wages are increased.

2. A Pan American Loan Fund to finance economic development (a great part of the capital would, of course, come from the United States, and we should insist upon the same sort of self-help system among the recipients that crowned the success of the Marshall plan).

3. Regional minimum wages, to be attained within a fixed period of time, say 10 years. This phase of the code program should be supervised by regional boards that would review the minimum standards periodically and raise them in line with the gains scored in productivity (which should be considerable thanks to the adoption of better production techniques and the economic stimulation of the Common Market).

4. A minimum standard of social protection, establishing the rights of unionization and collective bargaining; workman's compensation; maximum hours of work per week and per day; the employee's right to regular vacations with pay; unemployment insurance; social security and all other basic social benefits.

The encouragement of private investment (the U.S. Government should help in this by guaranteeing private investments by U.S. entrepreneurs against unlawful and willful expropriation or blocking of currency, provided these investors are willing to permit local participation in their Latin American ventures equaling at least 40 percent of total capital).

6. Special tax treatment by host countries (and by the United States) on profits returned to the United States where the entrepreneur has assumed leadership in the payment of higher wages and broader fringe benefits.

7. A progressive income tax—the foundation of an equitable tax policy—to be established in all countries. The code would prescribe minimum standards.

8. Standards on public education, sanitation and health, norms to be determined in terms of minimum percentages of national budgets to be appropriated to these purposes.

9. An FHA system for all those acceding to the code in order to spur homebuilding throughout the hemisphere.

10. Pan American cultural centers for the various nations, to be financed from a common fund, with the objective of stimulating the exchange of students throughout the Americas.

This is a practical plan. It would work. And, I am convinced, it can be attained. By it, we shall be able to strike a massive blow against poverty, tyranny, and prejudice.

But there is no value in merely spinning out 10-point programs. Instead, we must all go to work—energized by the huge need that exists and by our moral obligation to extend the frontiers of freedom to all the peoples of the world.

This is another hour of trial for the human spirit. We must recognize that either the whole world will be free, or it will inevitably be wholly slave. Establishing the Pan American code for a stronger Western Hemisphere can help us tip the world balance toward freedom.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 3, 1961

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on January 27, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] delivered before the Harvard Medical Society, at Boston, Mass., a speech entitled "Medical Care for the Aged." Because of the importance of the speech and its interesting content, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

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

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

(Speech by Senator BENNETT on January 27, 1961, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Mass.)

It is good to be with you today to discuss some of the problems pertaining to medical care for the aged. It is rather an unusual situation in 1961 for someone to be coming from Washington to Harvard. The trend in recent weeks has certainly been quite the reverse. However, I appreciate the invitation which was extended to me by Dr. Peterson to meet with you and give you some of my views on this important problem.

The problem of medical care for the aged has been with us for many years. However, the problem has only come to the forefront as a political issue during the past two Congresses. The length of the working life and the number of years an individual spends in retirement have increased tremendously since 1900. The average number of years an American male could expect to spend in the labor force increased by over 11 years between 1900 and 1961. At the same time, the number of years a male at age 20 could expect to spend in retirement increased by 3.6 years. In the year 1900 life expectancy in the United States was only 47.3 years, whereas today it is 69.7. Thus, we can see why this problem has grown to the extent where today we have almost 16 million persons over the age of 65.

Congress has not been unmindful of this problem as is evidenced by the enactment in 1936 of social security legislation which has been changed and added to by almost every Congress since that date. Last year, Congress passed a law setting up a program to supply medical and institutional care to meet the needs of people over 65 years of age. This legislation is referred to as the Mills-Kerr bill and is now Public Law 86-778. This law calls for cooperation between the Federal Government and the States and provides for Federal grants on the basis of local needs and efforts to meet the problems of the aged who are in need of medical attention. Several States have already passed legislation to implement the medical care bill passed by the last Congress and it is expected that most States will have this new program in operation before the end of this year.

Yet, even before this new law can become operative we are being asked to reconsider the problem and accept a different solution—a solution which was considered and rejected less than 6 months ago. At least seven bills have been introduced in the House and two in the Senate, all patterned after the Forand-McNamara-Kennedy bills of the last Congress which would institute a compulsory system of medical care for the aged under the social security system.

Why is there so much pressure being exercised for this new legislation? The answer is simple. There has been no change in the need for a law of this type, but there has been a change in the political administration in Washington. Last year, as a candidate, our new President supported the social security approach and used all the power he could exercise to get Congress to adopt such a plan. He failed. Now, with the greatly increased power he has as President, he is going to try again. Unfortunately, this time he may quite likely succeed.

ANALYSIS OF TWO APPROACHES OF MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Let's look at the situation, first as it existed last year, and secondly, as it exists now, and explore the two different approaches in trying to solve this problem.

1. Has there been, or is there now, any spontaneous public demand for any such program? The answer is no. During the months in which this legislation has been pending before Congress, I have received from my constituents only a handful of what I would consider personally written letters urging the adoption of a medical care program tied to social security. It is true, I have received several hundred identical form letters inspired by labor unions and other pressure groups urging approval of the social security formula for solving this problem. Generally, however, I have not received mail in sufficient volume to indicate that there is any great ground swell demanding enactment of a compulsory medical care program, such as that advocated by President Kennedy and his legislative leaders in the House and Senate. In fact, most of the mail received in my office has indicated just the opposite—that there is no emergency which would require a crash program in this area. Consequently, I am convinced that whatever pressure exists for this legislation has been politically generated. Last year medical care for the aged was a good campaign issue. Now it is a campaign promise to be kept.

2. Next we turn to the question of need—national and personal.

At the present time, the population of the United States is slightly in excess of 182 million people.

Of this number, approximately 16 million are 65 or over.

Only 4 million of the 16 million are not under social security.

Of the 16 million only half a million can be classified as suffering from chronic illness.

According to the Health Insurance Association of America, 49 percent of persons 65 or over are covered by health and medical insurance, and at the present rate of growth, this coverage is expected to reach 75 percent by 1965 and 90 percent by 1970.

According to a recent national study published last August by Dr. James W. Wiggins and Helmut Schoeck of Emory University, the medical needs of our aged have been greatly overexaggerated. Their survey indicated that:

Nine of every ten older persons report they have no unfilled medical needs.

Ninety percent of those 65 or over reported they enjoy good or fair health.

Sixty-eight percent said they could pay for a medical emergency out of their own means.

Half of the persons queried reported income in excess of $2,000 per year; 1 out of 20 had income in excess of $10,000.

Most of the aged reported net worth in excess of $10,000.

Sixty percent did not think a new Federal program could do anything for them personally.

Majority indicated life was much easier for them than for their aged parents.

Ninety percent could think of no medical needs that were not being taken care of.

Sixty percent are now covered by private voluntary health insurance.

Eighty percent are member of a church. If special care was needed for outside the family, twice as many elderly Americans would prefer to get such assistance from their church rather than from the Government.

Wiggins said much of what has been reported in the past about the health and welfare of older persons is based upon inaccurate data derived from the experiences of a generation ago or from the studies of the hospitalized or chronically dependent.

The Wiggins report indicates that the great majority of Americans over 65 are capably financing their own health care and prefer to do it without Federal Government intervention.

3. Based on the facts and statistics before us, Congress had to decide whether this record justified a Federal program—even in the face of the lack of public demand. But politics in a presidential election year creates its own demands and they were great enough to produce action. In the final debates in the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, and again on the floor of the House and Senate, the Forand and McNamara bills were soundly defeated. Likewise, the Kennedy-Anderson amendment, which preserved the social security approach, but which was more restricted as to benefits, was defeated 51 to 44. As I previously indicated, bills patterned after the Forand and McNamara approach have been reintroduced in this session.

4. Regardless of the details of any program selected to solve the medical care problem, we in the Congress are wrestling with a philosophical decision represented by three essentially different points of view. Briefly described they are the following:

1. Should the Federal Government recognize the value of the growing volume of private health insurance, and help to expand this protection by contributing part, or all, of the cost of premiums to those who could not provide these funds themselves?

2. Should these benefits be available to particular people as a matter of special right regardless of need, under a program added to the Social Security System?

3. Should we make actual need the basis of the distribution of benefits and thus reduce the cost by taking advantage of private funds available in each case? Under this approach, the States would share in the cost and administer the program, including the criteria for the determination of need.

The first-named program, introduced by Senator JAVITS, of New York, with the support of Vice President Nixon, was never really seriously considered. It got 28 votes on the Senate floor, and passed out of the controversy.

The social security approach, represented by the Forand bill in the House, and McNamara and Gore bills in the Senate had the support of AFL-CIO, as well as Candidate Kennedy, but was rejected by both Houses, even in such modified form as the Anderson amendment.

The "needs" approach had the approval and support of the AMA. It was worked out by the Ways and Means Committee of the House and adopted there. When it came to the Senate, the Finance Committee modified it further, but did not change its essential features, and it was passed on August 23 and became Public Law 86-778 on September 13, 1960.

RIGHTS AND NEEDS

The contest between the "rights" and the "needs" approach was bitterly fought, and is not settled yet. Each point of view has its strengths and its weaknesses, and these are worth cataloging.

A. Those who advocate medical care for the aged tied to the social security system, hope to benefit from the general public acceptance of that system. But as an opponent to this approach, I would like to point out the following weaknesses:

1. A medical care plan placed under social security would change the basic pattern of payments from one of cash benefits based on earnings to service benefits without regard to contributions.

2. Its added cost would overburden the social security system. Social security taxes, now at 6 percent, divided between employee and employer, are due to go to 9 percent by 1969. If medical care benefits are added this tax could conceivably rise to 20 percent in the not too distant future.

B. Cost estimates for the various medical care plans:

1. Forand-McNamara bills: Most conservative estimates place the initial cost between $3 and $4 billion with sharp increases ex-

pected as additional benefits and persons are added to the plan. In fact, if the same extensions are made to the medical care plan as has been our experience with other social security benefits, we could expect the cost of this program to soon be in excess of $8 billion per year.

2. Anderson amendment: Proponents of this bill estimated it would cost $700 million the first year and $1 billion each year thereafter. However, actuaries for the Health Insurance Association in reviewing this measure said the cost would be almost double the first year ($1,331 million) and would be in excess of $2 billion per year thereafter.

3. The Senate Finance Committee bill, which is now Public Law 86-778, is estimated to cost the Federal Government approximately $190 million per year.

Government security welfare programs incubate an overwhelming political demand for more welfare. Our own programs indicate this. But Sweden is much more of a welfare state. There, pensioners have become politically powerful, demanding even more from the rest of the people. During the past year, Sweden was forced to slap an additional 4 percent sales tax on top of all other taxes to help pay the ever-mounting costs of their cradle-to-the-grave welfare programs.

It is important to point out that all of these plans are now in their infancy and would undoubtedly grow in the future. Originally, the cost of social security when it was enacted in 1936 was to be 2 percent on the first $3,000 of each worker's income. The cost is now more than 450 percent higher. We are now paying 6 percent on the first $4,800 of income each year and the program is still underfinanced. Deductions will go up to 9 percent by 1969.

Six major changes (four in the last 6 years) have been made in the social security program since its birth. Retirement benefits have been increased 17 percent more than the increase in the cost of living. Coverage has been vastly extended. Survivor benefits have been enlarged. The age for eligibility for women has been lowered to 62 and bills are now pending which would grant earlier retirement to men.

4. Malingering would be rampant if care as a matter of right were extended to all. This system which would substitute entitlemetn by right in place of actual need would encourage widespread overuse and abuse of medical facilities.

I have always remembered a personal experience I had 25 or 30 years ago. A small company with which I was connected instituted a system to provide sick benefits for employees and entitled each worker to a limited number of days of sick leave each year. One employee near the end of the year suddenly became sick almost every other day. When the visiting committee went to call on him unexpectedly, they found him in bed with his clothes on, including his shoes. They chided him for it and asked him why. His answer has been ringing through my mind ever since. He said, "I means to have my share." I am certain there are many persons who will attempt to have their share on the basis of entitlement rather than need.

5. Under the Forand-McNamara approach, service will be supplied as a matter of right to many who don't need it and will be denied to some who do. For instance, there are more than 4 million persons over 65 who are not covered by social security who would not be entitled to any benefits. Likewise, retired railroad employees and also Federal employees would not be covered under the plan even though their medical needs are certainly as great. On the other hand, many veterans would be eligible for double entitlement and could pick and choose wherever they thought they could obtain more benefits.

6. It would put an unfair burden on the presently employed people contributing to social security. Nine million would get benefits for which they have made no contribution.

7. It concentrates on a narrow tax base—$4,800.

8. It has been called pay-as-you-go but social security is pay now, you get benefits later—maybe. (There is no relationship between payments and benefits.)

9. Contributions would be compulsory, just as is England's health scheme but this was carefully played down, and the idea of "rights" was stressed.

10. To the doctor it represents an unhappy intrusion of the state into his relationship with his patient. While under the Anderson bill, he could get no money from the program for his services, the money to pay the other bills would come directly from the Social Security System to the vendor—the person would not pay his own bills. This would involve a proliferation of local social security office and eventually a new health care agency—duplicating existing State and local ones.

ADVANTAGES OF THE VOLUNTARY APPROACH

We who supported the Mills-Kerr approach, based on need, made the following arguments:

1. Under the present old-age assistance program, we have an existing system professionally staffed to care for the needs of our elderly—including to a limited extent health needs. The Mills-Kerr approach will add responsibilities but will be no wrench to the system, and would not adopt any new method of handling payments.

2. The costs can be kept at a minimum.

a. State participation will help control it.

b. Costs would vary only with need—might actually be near their peak now. The proportion of the aged in our population is now 8.6 and it is expected to level off at 9 percent.

c. Less susceptible to political measures.

d. Full needed services available—no foot-in-the-door limitations.

3. Cost would be spread over broadest possible tax base—all Federal and State taxpayers. It is a true pay-as-you-go basis.

4. No compulsory contributions—no double burden for present wage earners.

5. Services of doctors included—no change in present patient relationship.

The chief argument against the Mills-Kerr bill was a bold falsehood—that the bill required a pauper's oath. No such thing is required. The basis for determining need is left to each State. If this is degrading then all service involving decisions by trained social service workers is degrading.

WHAT TO EXPECT

The Kerr-Mills bill is now Public Law 86-778. I sincerely doubt it will be repealed. Instead, some version of the original Forand bill will probably be superimposed on top of it, and require two parallel organizations. Eventually, under Gresham's law, the rights approach will drive the needs approach out, and we may end up with compulsory Federal health insurance, covering all needs for all people. At first, we can expect medical care just for the aged, but eventually the age limit will be gradually reduced, and finally eliminated. Simultaneously, the definition of "right" will become fuzzy and disappear. This will be the end of the present social security, and we will have federalized medicine, dentistry, hospitals, nursing homes, medical education, and drug production for all our population.

Can it be stopped? We won the battle last August, but it will be much harder this time, with the power of the Presidency behind it. I think it's worth the fight.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the current controversy over whether private and parochial schools should be included as recipients of Federal largess in the proposed aid-to-education program, the basic issue is being shoved into the background. The question of whether Federal aid to education is necessary or desirable is being sidetracked.

It is time to get back into focus, for we must not let our citizenry lose sight of the fact that the big billion-dollar lollypop for the Nation's schools would be manufactured with taxpayers' contributions and then wrapped for distribution only after the Washington bureaucracy had taken a substantial bite out of it. With the passing of years, the share for the several States and local schools would become progressively slimmer, for big government has an insatiable appetite.

For the State of Pennsylvania, the stick of candy handed to us by the patronizing bureaucrats would from the start be much smaller than what we put into it. The Federal aid to education bills are nothing less than an insult to the intelligence of the people of our State, inasmuch as those bills brashly set forth a set of calculations which would require us to put millions of dollars more into the school kitty than we would get back for our own educational needs.

Pennsylvania, plagued with critical unemployment in scores of communities, would experience only additional hardship if the proposed legislation were to be enacted. Of course, some of our friends who have cooked up this expensive scheme are attempting to cover up the deficit that would be incurred by our State by indicating that the whole program can be carried merely by undertaking to put the Federal Government further into debt. Our people have had enough of these delusory promises. Our citizens recognize only too well that increases in the Federal debt are the direct cause of inflation, which cruelly reduces the buying power of wage earners, pensioners, and all others who look to savings and social security payments to see them through their twilight years.

Back in 1956 some Members of Congress began making headlines with the idea of setting up a $400 million fund annually for a total of 4 years to provide for construction of schoolhouses. At that time we were assured that $400 million was the maximum figure that proponents wanted, that 4 years would be the limit of the program, and that construction alone was the objective. Since then this balloon has been inflated out of all proportion, teachers' salaries have been thrown into the recipe as an added sweetner, and where it will all

end is too vague for conjecture. What will come in the next go-round would tax the most precocious imagination, but the history of the program could very well lead one to believe that the local school board member will be offered a sugar plum in hopes of promoting additional support for the Federal aid project.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Congress can better promote the general welfare and national defense by getting the Federal aid to education bills out of the way and moving on to the business that we have been sent to Washington to handle. I do not deny that many local school districts could find their burden much lighter and be able to provide well-deserved increases in teachers' salaries through congressional action. I stand ready to help in this worthy objective by any of a number of sound legislative possibilities.

For a number of years I have proposed a larger deduction in income tax rates for all individuals—men, women, and children. I know of no more convenient way to make more funds available for educational needs and for other local purposes. If our constituents prefer that some portion of Federal taxes now being channeled into Washington be earmarked specifically for school funds, then there is a variety of ways in which this mission can be accomplished.

Perhaps the simplest method is for us to pass a law ordering the Director of Internal Revenue to remit to each State a check for an amount equal to an agreed-upon percentage of the personal and corporate Federal income taxes collected for any 1 quarter, or any 1 year, with said sums to be used by each State for educational purposes only. Such a plan would enable the States, on a fair basis, to help themselves to solve their educational problems—whether they pertain to schools, equipment, or teachers—in their own way without any Federal control, intervention, supervision, regulation, or interference.

The matter should be settled promptly. I have read recently of isolated cases in which communities have rejected bond issues designed to provide the wherewithal to build new schools. Unless the Federal aid problem is disposed of once and for all, there is a serious danger that promises made in Washington will prompt more and more communities to hesitate in planning for new schoolhouses. If the Federal free-spenders are going to make funds available for obligations that have heretofore been our own responsibility, why should the local citizens bother to put up the money? Thus the promises being made by proponents of Federal aid to education become a detriment to local initiative and industry.

There is also the case of the failure of St. Louis voters to accept a bond issue to build new schools and modernize some of the old ones. As reported in the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat on March 24 by a staff writer for the Associated Press:

Apathy, ignorance, and resistance to taxes were major factors, but in St. Louis it was something more.

It was distrust of the St. Louis School Board, rocked by scandal and hint of scandal.

I have excerpted the crux of the article, Mr. Speaker. There were other reasons cited by the writer, but I believe that what I have quoted should give Congress reason to ponder.

If the citizens of a city are so distrustful of their own school board as to hesitate to approve a bond issue for new schools, can the Federal Government in conscience turn over Treasury funds to such groups? Does Congress have no more pride in its own stewardship? Furthermore, Federal grants would tend to destroy whatever interest a community has in cleaning up unsavory conditions, for when local funds are not involved the incentive for keeping a close watch on responsible parties would be lacking. I also point out that, according to proponents of Federal aid to education, the Federal Government could do nothing regardless of how dishonest a local school board happened to be, for no control from Washington is one of the assurances that perennially goes with the proposal.

I regret that interest in the basic premise—whether it is good or bad for the Federal Government to get involved in local school problems—is being diluted by the important but only collateral issue regarding private and parochial schools.

When we get back on track, let us hope that the bills will be defeated on principle—a principle laid down by our Founding Fathers and respected until the whole concept of government by the people became distorted through attempts to advance a people-for-the-government philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I include the following article from the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat of March 24, 1961:

BOND ISSUE REJECTION ADDS TO ST. LOUIS WOE

(By G. K. Hodenfield)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—"Somehow we have to get our messages across," says the superintendent of schools in St. Louis. The message: More money needed. But the city's voters turned thumbs down all last year. This is the last of three articles on school financing problems.)

ST. LOUIS, MO.—St. Louis has found an enormous rathole and is busy shoveling dollars into it.

In March, in May, and again in November last year, the voters turned down a $24.3-million bond issue to build new schools and modernize some of the old ones. They also rejected, three times, a $5.2-million bond issue for school fire protection.

Because the bonds weren't passed, and the schools can't be built, the school system this year is chartering 70 buses to transport 3,600 pupils from their home neighborhoods to schools up to 9 miles away.

BUSES COST $195,000

The buses are costing the city $195,000 this school year, plus $40,000 in overtime pay for teachers who supervise the bus rides. This is $233,000 for the 1960–61 school year.

No one seriously argues here that the new schools aren't needed: Six elementary schools are at double their normal capacity; 2,000 elementary school pupils are attending classes in high school buildings; 525 elementary pupils are being taught in rented church quarters; some classrooms have as many as 60 pupils.

Then why did the bond issues fail?

Apathy, ignorance, and resistance to taxes were major factors. But in St. Louis it was something more.

BOARD DISTRUSTED

It was distrust of the St. Louis School Board, rocked by scandal and hint of scandal. A racial problem apparently was involved also.

Perhaps most of all, it was a State law requiring that school bond issues must be approved by a two-thirds majority. "We can get 60 percent," one leading citizen declared, "but that last 6 percent comes mighty hard."

A school building commissioner, appointed by the school board, was removed from office by a circuit court on charges of gross misconduct in office. Several board members have resigned amidst charges they used school board labor and materials on their own homes.

The voters are well aware of this state of affairs. One board member himself said that, under the circumstances, the people of St. Louis would be justified in turning down the bond issues.

Said one homeowner: "Of course I voted against the school bonds. Why should I vote money into the hands of those people?"

POPULATION DOWN 100,000

St. Louis has a population of about 750,000, a drop of more than 100,000 since the 1950 census.

Much of the loss can be attributed to the flight to the suburbs, which many American cities are experiencing.

But in that same 1950–60 decade, the average daily attendance in the St. Louis public schools rose from 80,626 to 90,581. Much of this increase has been in Negro pupils, who now make up about 45 percent of the school population.

Many of St. Louis' problems can be traced directly to the slum clearance project in Mill Creek, a section in the near-downtown area. Negroes from Mill Creek moved en masse to North St. Louis, which had been a predominately white neighborhood. There weren't enough schools to handle the influx of pupils, and it is these children who now are being taken by buses to other parts of the city.

RACIAL FEELING

"It's up North where they need the schools," said a housewife in conservative South St. Louis. "We don't need them down here. And if those colored folks think we're going to carry them on our backs, they've got another think coming."

In all three St. Louis elections the school bond issues carried by what, in suburban Parma, Ohio, would have been a comfortable majority. In February the vote was 62,236 for and 35,772 against (63.5 percent approval); in May it was 35,826 for and 21,453 against (62.5 percent approval); in November it was 95,565 for and 64,755 against (59.6 percent approval).

But in St. Louis, where it takes 66.6 percent approval, these are recorded as just three consecutive defeats for the school bonds.

But apathy played a big part, too.

In March, the "No" votes of 11.1 percent of the registered voters were enough to defeat the bonds.

In May, it took only 6.7 percent of the registered voters to block the passage.

In November, the "No" votes of 18.6 of the registered voters were decisive.

NO ORGANIZED OPPOSITION

As in Parma, there was no organized opposition to the school bonds. Both metropolitan newspapers urged their passage, al-

though both papers had serious reservations about the school board. Catholic and Lutheran church officials supported the bond issues wholeheartedly. Parent-Teachers' Association groups worked hard for them.

It was stressed that the bond issues would not be expensive. The average cost to homeowners: About $5 to $6 a year in increased property taxes.

"I voted against them," a white-collar worker said. "I'll vote against them every time they come up. It means an increase in our taxes, and I can't afford it.

TAX BILLS COMPARED

"Look, here are my tax bills. In 1949 my property tax was $43.52, now it's $106.12. That's more than a 100 percent increase. How much do they want, anyway"?

A housewife said, "Our property tax is high enough right now. Those people at city hall are just trying to stuff something down our throats. I don't trust them."

On April 4, St. Louis will hold a school board election. Shortly after that, the school bonds will almost certainly be put up to the voters again.

MUST KEEP TRYING

"We have to keep trying," said Philip J. Hickey, superintendent of instruction for the St. Louis schools. "We just have to. Things are going to get worse as we go along.

"Our transportation costs will be much higher next year. We expect at least 2,000 new pupils, perhaps more, next fall. We can't keep those elementary pupils in high school buildings, the high schools themselves need the room.

"Nearly half our schools are more than 50 years old. Some of them go back almost to Civil War days. Some of them are fire traps.

"We'll just have to try again. Somehow, someway, we've got to get our message across."

Industrial Progress of Fort Smith, Ark., Through Voluntary Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3, 1961

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, much concern is currently being expressed for the so-called depressed areas across the country. I am proud to point to a city in the State I represent that, despite adverse circumstances, has avoided this appellation through the effective efforts and unrelenting initiative of its resourceful citizenry.

I speak of the city of Fort Smith which is located on the Arkansas River, in the western part of the State. About 2 years ago, the Army's installation at Fort Chaffee, on the outskirts of the city, was deactivated. That came as a tremendous economic blow to the area, and caused an estimated population loss of some 6,000 persons, and erased over 1,000 civilian jobs at the Fort.

Since that time the city of Fort Smith has literally pulled itself up by its own bootstraps. Last year, alone, the city attracted enough new industry to more than make up for the jobs lost by the closing of the Fort; and today the area is among the most progressive in the Nation, in the matter of industrial expansion.

The amazing story of the accomplishments of the citizens of Fort Smith is very interestingly told in a current bulletin published by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

PROGRESS THROUGH VOLUNTARY ACTION

Business and community leaders in the city of Fort Smith, Ark., fretfully expected for a number of years eventual loss of one of the area's biggest payroll producers.

The day of reckoning came in 1959. That's when the U.S. Army closed down huge Fort Chaffee, sprawling infantry center on the outskirts of the city.

Almost overnight, free-spending GI's disappeared from the town's wide streets. Simultaneously, paychecks ceased for more than a thousand civilian employees on the shuttered post.

For sale and for rent signs dotted lawns in front of hundreds of vacant dwellings. Businessmen catering to Army personnel folded up.

Fort Smith and environs sustained an estimated population depletion of 6,000.

Under current criteria, Fort Smith should have qualified as a depressed area.

NO DISTRESS LABEL

Instead, 1960 saw the thriving little city on the eastern side of the Arkansas River acquiring a reputation as one of the best jobmaking, hottest industrial developments locations in the Nation.

That it didn't receive the depressed area appellation is a tribute to far-sighted business and civic leadership that revitalized itself more than 5 years ago.

Realizing that an inevitable economic shock would result when military planners in far-removed Washington, D.C., decided that Fort Chaffee's days of usefulness were over, these leaders went to work to put new lifeblood into the Fort Smith Chamber of Commerce.

GETTING INTO GEAR

Engaging a new, hard-driving executive manager of proven performance for the chamber, they were almost immediately confronted with his ultimatum that they fall to, give more of their time to the chamber's program and also kick in more dues money to make the overall effort move. They acceded.

One of the first steps was a complete overhaul and expansion of the chamber's industrial development program.

To begin, a 100-man industrial development committee was organized into minutemen teams to inventory the area's tangible assets.

The results substantiated facts the community of 60,000 persons had always known, but had never assembled in an accumulative package as a sales piece, plus some facts that were surprising even to knowledgeable natives.

When put together, their survey results asserted that Fort Smith could show prospective industry lower operating costs than in many other locations in the country; that there was no congestion; that adequate municipal services were available on a lower tax bill; that its school system rated high; that it had excellent transportation, recreation and hospital facilities, and that it was blessed with an abundance of natural resources, including an almost inexhaustible supply of fuel (natural gas and coal), power and water.

WEATHER PICTURE

Added to these tangibles were climatic conditions that permit year-round construction activities, favorable plant maintenance costs, plus low employee absenteeism.

The portfolio didn't neglect an explanation of Arkansas' State law on financing aid for new industries, a law that permits communities to vote tax-free revenue bonds to be retired through plant lease and lease-purchase arrangements.

Armed with this evidence, industrial location teams, summoned at a moment's notice by the Fort Smith chamber upon the faintest glimmering of interest indicated by a prospective new industry, have been darting out of town to the home offices of prospects.

ON THE GO TEAMS

On one hurry up occasion, five Fort Smith businessmen were alerted late on a Thursday. An hour or so later they were winging away from the airport to headquarters of a large company in the East.

They were laying their wares the following morning before the firm's executive officers. The effort loaded and tipped the scale in favor of their city as a location over several other areas under consideration.

In 5 years, 45 new industries have been brought to Fort Smith through the unity of purpose, business-civic effort that started as a precautionary movement and then became one of prime economic necessity after the Army post closed.

When the newest and largest plant, now under construction, is completed, Fort Smith will have 4,500 persons added to its manufacturing payrolls.

FILLING THE JOB GAP

Last year alone, the city added 1,188 new jobs. That erased the 1,053 jobs lost when Fort Chaffee went silent. Seven brandnew industries, and 22 industrial expansions in 1960 meant a total capital expenditure of $18,047,000.

The big new plant nearing completion is the Norge unit of Borg-Warner. This is a $10-million, 25-acre plant on a 104-acre site—largest single industrial start last year in the Nation by private industry.

Production started last month in the new $3 million Ohio Rubber Co. plant, fabricating auto floor mats, industrial tires, and other molded rubber products. Initial employment was 300.

The Dixie Cup Co., a post-World War II arrival, is undergoing its third expansion, which, when completed, will increase its employment total to around 1,200.

INTANGIBLE COUNT

Admittedly, the tangible assets have played a big role in Fort Smith's economic muscle building, but its prime assets are the intangibles generated by people.

Friendliness on the part of everybody in Fort Smith, plus a good supply of people ready to work, provided the reason, in the last analysis, for his company's decision to come to Fort Smith, said the manager of one of the newer plants.

The building superintendent on the big new Norge plant marvels at the "full day's work for a full day's fair pay" that he is getting from the construction workers. "And they aren't reluctant to tell me—the boss—how we can speed things up to make the job go faster," he declared.

Fort Smith's two lively newspapers and the chamber of commerce are hand-in-glove, reminding the people almost daily that every citizen is a salesman for Fort Smith.

EVERYBODY SELLS THE CITY

Taxicab drivers, waitresses, barbers along with businessmen and housewives are urged to speak up about Fort Smith's good points, to give all visitors the sincere impression

"that we all like and believe in the section we live in."

That visitor, the chamber tells the home folks, may be nosing around to discern the people's attitude, the business climate and other vital facts that might weigh strongly when it's time to decide whether Fort Smith gets another job-creating plant.

Beneficial offshoots from the perked-up economic situation in Fort Smith are numerous.

Last fall, the people voted $2,500,000 for additional school facilities, and just prior they endorsed a bond issue of $1,500,000 to apply on a new civic auditorium.

A new vocational training school is being established on the Fort Smith Junior College campus through business firm donations.

New street lights glow up and down the city's main thoroughfare, Garrison Avenue, so named for the early 1800 billet of Army men who established the original Fort Smith.

New shopping centers are springing up, new office buildings are abuilding and there's renewed interest in improving municipal facilities through an unusual family-type cooperation between the city administration and the chamber.

A building store front facelifting is further transforming the appearance of Garrison Avenue. One of the scheduled remodelers: the chamber of commerce.

When asked if they'd like to see Fort Chaffee reactivated, Fort Smith businessmen declare they'd rather not resume the frets they knew for such a long time, and that the better course might be for Uncle Sam to surrender the installation so in some way it could go back on the county tax rolls.

Disdaining any kind of Federal aid from Washington, Fort Smith's business leaders declare: "We're a city on the move. There's no limit where we can go."

Reports on Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in a world torn asunder by irreconcilable ideologies, and with the dread "four horsemen" on the prowl in various parts of the earth, it is appropriate at this Eastertide to gaze with hope at one bright spot on an otherwise drab horizion.

Project Hope is no longer an experiment. It has proved its worth by emphasizing America's faith in a lesson taught 2,000 years ago—peace on earth, good will toward men.

Hope is indeed an appropriate name for this humanitarian program which to the extent possible is bringing the miracle of modern medicine and sanitation to underdeveloped areas and emerging nations of the free world.

In connection with this effort, I am privileged to include two news articles from the Seattle Times, reporting on the activities of two Seattle physicians, Dr. John F. LeCocq and Dr. Bernard Goiney, who volunteered their medical skills for service aboard the SS *Hope I*. These two fine physicians have demonstrated in a very practical way their dedication to the Hippocratic oath and have earned the plaudits of their fellow countrymen:

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, Feb. 24, 1961]

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MERCY SHIP "HOPE" OFF INDONESIA LAUDED BY SEATTLE PHYSICIAN

(Dr. Bernard J. Goiney, of Seattle, is a volunteer aboard the hospital ship *Hope* off Indonesia. He describes his experiences for the Times.)

(By Bernard J. Goiney)

We had no sooner finished dinner on the day we arrived in Jakarta—several days before we boarded the *Hope*—than our houseboy came in with a note stating that there was a sick baby outside.

When you come right down to it, I was the only practicing physician present. There was a radiologist, a pathologist, an oral surgeon, a general surgeon, and me, just a plain old working doctor.

I saw the infant, 10 months old. It had been ill 7 days with fever and diarrhea. It was pitifully dehydrated and looked to be at the point of death. There were no phones so I sent a runner to get an ambulance to try to take the baby to a hospital for fluids.

The baby died before anything could be done. I really felt helpless.

We spent the next day seeing the hospitals and medical installations in Jakarta. Transportation is a big problem.

If you can imagine the traffic both foot and automobile after a football game, add thousands of bicycles and pedal-type rickshaws, then put all 3 million in Lake Forest Park, tear up the roads, add torrential rain and 90° heat—you might get a picture of what happens here.

The work that the ship *Hope* is doing medically and surgically is terrific, fantastic and unbelievable. There is so much medical work to be done in these areas that one could spend a lifetime of surgery and medicine in the United States—and accomplish the same thing here in 1 month.

These are not tropical diseases, but heart, kidney, lung and other systemic diseases. There is a surgical opportunity unparalleled here.

The other day I was part of a surgical team that did the first open-chest work in Makassar. We removed a large tumor. Everything went perfectly and the patient is doing well.

The people are friendly and constantly try to assure me that they love the Americans and do not like the Communists. Project Hope is probably the most wonderful thing that has come out of the States. For the small cost and the terrific impact on the people, this is a huge success.

I am convinced that I will benefit immensely from the short time I will be here. I only wish other doctors could see this. They, I am sure, would be eager to come here and participate.

But even more important than the experience available to doctors is the reaction of the Indonesians. I have met and talked to many. They tell me that up to now their impression was that the American thought only of himself. This project is changing their minds.

Our State Department could well take the time to evaluate and promote this project. Its value is greater than the hundreds of millions that have been spent on other projects in these areas.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Contributions to Project Hope, sponsor of the hospital ship, may be sent to Box 9808, Washington 15, D.C.)

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, Mar. 9, 1961]

DR. LECOCQ WINS INDONESIA'S THANKS

(By Carrie S. Midgley)

(An author in Jakarta sent the following account of honor paid Dr. John F. LeCocq, Seattle physician, who was a Hope Foundation volunteer in Indonesia.)

Every seat in the tile-roofed auditorium in central Java was filled and the crowd of doctors, nurses, technicians, and reporters fell silent as the guest of honor entered.

They were gathered to bid farewell to a skilled doctor and a good friend, Dr. John F. LeCocq, of Seattle.

Dr. Soeharso, director of a rehabilitation center at Solo, Indonesia, rose to address Dr. LeCocq, an orthopedic surgeon.

"We have learned more from you in 3 weeks than we could have learned in many years had you not come," Dr. Seharso told the physician. "We learned not only medical skills, but also the dedication and spirit that you brought with those skills.

"We thank you for your untiring efforts here in Solo and ask your permission to hang portraits of you and your nurse in our hospital center."

Dr. LeCocq was accompanied to Solo by Miss Marjorie McQuillan, another Seattle volunteer to Hope. She was a nurse at the Seattle Orthopedic and Fracture Clinic.

Solo, an ancient city hundreds of miles inland on the banks of a chocolate-colored river, is the nucleus of orthopedic rehabilitation in Java.

Dr. LeCocq wasted no time on arrival in Solo. He arranged to perform two operations a day for his 3 weeks. In addition to surgery, the first Hope doctor at Solo was responsible for guiding Indonesian technicians in converting American braces for the smaller Indonesian patients.

With the aid of an orthopedic-equipment catalog—where he pointed to pictures of items he needed—and a skilled mechanic, Dr. John built his own equipment.

The Asian custom is to start work early in the morning and quit at lunch time. The American doctor insisted on maintaining his normal work schedule.

"I've never stopped working in the middle of the day for more than 40 years," he said with a smile, "and I can't start now."

"It took a lot of energy just to keep up with him," Miss McQuillan said.

Dr. John is quick to praise the Indonesian physicians who work under handicaps of lack of equipment and trained personnel.

When the staff of the hospital learned of Dr. John's imminent departure, they quickly arranged the farewell testimonial.

Dr. LeCocq's portrait will hang in the small hospital in Solo, and his bust will stand in the nursing academy at Jakarta. As an Indonesian doctor said:

"We may forget many things in our lifetime, but we will never forget our teacher."

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GALE W. McGEE
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 3, 1961

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Birching the Birchites," published in the Washington Post of April 2, 1961. The editorial deals with the activities of the John Birch Society.

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

BIRCHING THE BIRCHITES

We can't think of two groups that more richly deserve each other than the John Birch Society and the House Un-American Activities Committee. Still, we are troubled by the demands that the committee in-

vestigate the ultra-right-wing society. The Birchites are indubitably American, as their incubus on American soil attests; and they also are patriotic within the somewhat narrow and twisted framework in which their views operate. They may be a nuisance, their methods may be reprehensible, and their attacks upon respected public figures may be disgusting, but they scarcely now constitute a threat to the security of the Republic.

For this reason we commend Chairman WALTER of the Un-American Activities Committee for his apparent reluctance to investigate the John Birch Society—even though a committee member, Representative GORDON SCHERER, says of the group: "I look with favor on it." Too often the justified complaint is that the Un-American Activities Committee can't keep its hands off those who utter unpopular views.

Under the Constitution members of the John Birch Society are free to propound their doctrines—however noxious—without being tried by congressional inquisitors. This does not and should not shield them from criticism and their views from scrutiny. We welcome the forthright condemnation of the society by Chairman DODD of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, whose previous denunciations have usually been directed toward the other side of the political spectrum.

In one sense there is a close analogy between the John Birch Society and the Communist Party, which the society professes to combat with every means at its command. In politics the shortest distance between left and right can be a circle in which the extremes intersect at a common point. Like the totalitarian left, the Birchites have patterned their organization on semisecret, authoritarian lines and use the tactic of infiltrating front groups. There is the same contempt for democracy, the same belief that conspiracy explains all history, the same conviction that dissent from the party line cannot be tolerated.

The society also has its cabalistic scriptures, the most notorious of which is "The Politician," a book written by the group's organizer, Robert Welch. Among solemn revelations in this volume is the assertion that Dwight D. Eisenhower is a part of the international Communist conspiracy along with his brother Milton and that the late John Foster Dulles was "a Communist agent."

This is such palpable nonsense that even the group's more respected fellow travelers have been defensive about Mr. Welch's extravagance, and now Mr. Welch has sought to divorce his views from those of the society. But the fact that people can be attracted to a society built on such doctrines is testimony not merely that the crackpot fringe is still around, but also that the urge to pounce on scapegoats for national frustrations, so avidly exploited by Joseph McCarthy, is by no means dispelled. The John Birch Society does not yet represent the new McCarthyism, but it could.

Still, we think that the best remedy is the commonsense of the American people in detecting spurious political prescriptions. It is true that groups like the John Birch Society could acquire a more sinister significance in the case of a major debacle in U.S. foreign policy. The country cannot be complacent when men of wealth and influence seriously contend that President Eisenhower was a traitor. But the proper offset is continued exposure. We do not think that Mr. Welch's doctrines can survive this examination—even in the balmy season.

Problems of Small Businesses in Smaller Labor Surplus Areas Are Acute; New Categories and Legal Changes Advocated To Spread Procurement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 3, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the question of small business—especially small business in chronic labor surplus areas—participating to a greater degree in Government procurement is one about which literally millions of words have been spoken, written, and printed. Many ideas have been advanced; many proposals have been made; numerous legislative measures have been introduced and debated; riders have been attached to appropriations bills; and Executive orders have been issued by our country's Presidents, each supported by departmental and agency regulations—but the arguments continue and the evidence accumulates concerning the degree and the nature of small business and depressed area firms' participation in contract awards by the Federal Government.

In remarks made last Friday, I commended President Kennedy's and the Defense Secretary's efforts to improve the machinery by which Federal contracts can be channeled to firms located in labor surplus areas, and in that instance it was necessary for me to note that a ruling by the Comptroller General of the United States on March 3 had upset the President's and the Defense Secretary's plan to set aside some types of military requirements for bidding by firms in labor surplus areas only.

We are aware that the Comptroller General wrote in an opinion for the Secretary of Defense that a 100-percent set-aside of procurement of any item for bidding exclusively by firms in labor surplus areas is illegal because it would not "in the absence of free and unrestricted competition, assure the lowest obtainable price" to the Government, as required by law.

I expressed then, and I repeat the hope now that the President will not be permanently blocked in his praiseworthy efforts to have distributed on a more equitable basis the Federal contracts for military procurement.

Not only must appropriations act riders be made less stringent, but, indeed, other changes in law must be made if small businesses in general and those in the smaller labor surplus market communities are to participate in any effective and helpful manner and degree in contract awards and expenditures for Government-procured goods and services.

This fact is brought to attention again in an article which appeared in the Charleston (W. Va.) Sunday Gazette-Mail of April 2, 1961, under the headline "Small Business Not Helped, Burgess Says; Disgruntled Logan Manufacturer Wants Changes in U.S. Purchasing."

The article relates to experiences of a small businessman in a community situated in the depressed bituminous coal mining area of southern West Virginia who sought ways and means to participate in government procurement of items manufactured by his and his father's small industry. This gentleman, Jim Burgess, of Clothier, W. Va., related a story to Don Marsh, able staff writer for the Charleston Sunday Gazette-Mail, which is not unfamiliar to me because it is typical of many other similar recitations of experience by constituents who have brought their problems to my office.

I believe we in the Congress should do more than we have been doing about the problems of the Jim Burgesses, and I agree with an observation made by this gentleman that the area redevelopment legislation will be relatively ineffective for many communities and the businesses situated in them, or new industries hoped to be brought to them, unless and until substantial changes are made in laws and regulations having to do with government procurement policies and practices.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the article to which I have been referring.

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

DISGRUNTLED LOGAN MANUFACTURER WANTS CHANGES IN U.S. PURCHASING

(By Don Marsh)

Jim Burgess, proprietor of a small business located in a depressed area, thought he had a sterling idea:

Why not, he asked himself, take advantage of special concessions made by procurement officers to small businesses and to depressed areas and obtain a Government contract?

Burgess, whose close cropped hair is turning gray at the temples, sometimes talks like a combat infantryman, which he once was.

Burgess and his father, James, Sr. own the Mine Ventilating System in Clothier. They make protective cloth used in coal mining.

They've also devised self contained barricading units for use by men who are trapped in gas filled mines. In the 3 years the company has been in business, it has grown steadily.

"The Government buys millions a year in protective covering which is the same kind of material we're utilizing," Burgess says. "They use it for all sorts of things—the Navy, the Army, the space program.

"We had our own financing and we had a building. The Bank of Danville had promised to help if we ran into any kind of money troubles. I thought there was every reason to believe we could get some Government work.

"I don't know how familiar you are with Government purchasing but they have what they call a 'set-aside' program which is supposed to benefit small businesses or depressed areas.

"On any Government procurement, they'll set aside approximately 50 percent for bids and restrict bidding to small businesses or to depressed areas. The set-aside isn't used for programs that call for research and development. But it covers millions of dollars of purchases.

"To get a set-aside, I wouldn't have to be the low bidder. I'd have to be within 20 percent of the higher bidder. Then I could get a part of the contract.

"That's fine. That's a good system of procurement if you want to help depressed areas and small business. I thought, 'Man, this is made for me.'

"So I got Representative JOHN SLACK to arrange some meetings. He scheduled them in Washington with all sorts of agencies—the Army, the Navy, the Post Office Department, the Space Agency, the Maritime Commission, and the Department of Agriculture.

"I saw right away after I got there that I wasn't going to get a contract. But I wanted to chase it out. So I went to Philadelphia and saw a couple of more offices.

"I'll say one thing: they were all nice. They all said they wanted to help me. They all talked to me. But they couldn't do anything."

The trouble, Burgess thinks, is that standards set by the Government are not realistic.

"Do you know what they call a small business?" he asks. "It's one employing 625 men or less. Now, how can I compete with them? That's a big business. How many businesses in West Virginia employ 625? You could count them almost on two hands.

"Then they say any area with 6 percent or more unemployed is a depressed area. Now what kind of a rule is that? Charleston is classed the same as Boone County or Huntington is the same as McDowell County.

"In Boone County and McDowell County we have 20 to 30 percent unemployed. My argument is that there should be a further breakdown because to me, conditions in Charleston or Huntington are nowhere like they are in Logan or Boone or Mingo or McDowell.

"And another thing. Suppose I got a contract. Now they would send an inspector out in 90 days. They would send him down here to see if I had the facilities to produce, plus a bond; so the question I asked the man was:

" 'Well, what are we supposed to do? Put up a plant and buy the equipment hoping we'll get a Government contract because we can't get a contract until we have the equipment?' "

Burgess said his experience convinced him that major changes would have to be made before industry would move into the depressed areas of West Virginia.

"I learned one thing," he said. "This hollering ain't going to help the people of West Virginia. These people are just living in false hopes because there's not much help they can get except 12 more weeks of unemployment and more mollygrub.

"You take these redevelopment companies they're setting up. They're speaking of getting large industries. There's no large industry that's going to come into Madison.

"Why should a man move a plant into one of the coal-mining counties when he can go over on the river and have all the advantages of water transportation, better roads and closeness to markets?

"In Madison, they've secured this land and they say they'll give it to industry that employs 250 people or more. Why, there's not an industry that's going to come in and support 250.

"It's not a question of capital, either, I say if a man has a sound business proposition, he wouldn't have any trouble raising $5 million right in Charleston.

"But if you say to a man, 'If you put up $10,000 in this company we might get a Government contract to use the equipment we'll buy with your $10,000.' Nobody but a fool would do it, see? That's my argument."

Burgess says he thinks the area's best hope for recovery is in attracting numerous small businesses, such as his.

"But the Government is going to have to change its standards. It's got to if really small businesses are going to compete."

He says he thinks two things should be, and could be done immediately. First, different ratings should be assigned companies, depending on their size; and depressed areas, depending on their unemployment rate.

"I think we could have four classes of companies," he says. "Class I could be from 1 to 50 workers; class II from 50 to 150 and so on.

"I also think we should have classes of depressed areas. Class I could be with 6 to 9 percent unemployed, as an idea. Class II could be 9 to 12 percent and so on.

"I think it's silly to expect a little business that hires a dozen men to compete against a company that hires 625. And I think it's silly to say that Charleston or Huntington are as depressed as Boone County or McDowell County."

He says he strongly endorses Governor Barron's crash program ("because we've got to do something for these people now, not next year") and he supports Barron's hiring of a liaison man to work with Federal authorities.

"You got to camp out there. These big companies do that. They know when a contract is going to be let. They get the information. Small companies can't do this."

Burgess says he is not seeking personal publicity. "One of my troubles is that I shoot off my mouth too much," he adds. "I don't want to get out on the string about this thing.

"But it burns me up for people to be living under the conditions they're living under with the hope they're going to be helped because they're not going to be helped. * * *

"These coal mines are never going to employ these men again. Those men laid off, think someday they're going to go back to work and they're wrong. Look at your tonnage records compared to men employed. We're right now producing more coal with 48,000 miners than we used to with 120,000. And they're not even working full time.

"Something's got to be done about the rules for determining a small business and a depressed area. All the procurement officers said it would take an Executive order by President Kennedy to do it.

"One of the procurement officers told me he'd give me a contract today if he could. He said honestly I'd like to help you. But I can't. It's against the law."

Light and Power Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Light and Power Lines," written by P. B. Garrett, publisher of Electric Light and Power magazine:

LIGHT AND POWER LINES

The enigma of the Government-business alliance: "Your success and ours are intertwined," said President Kennedy in sizing up the interrelationship between the Federal Government and American business enterprises, in his recent address before the National Industrial Conference Board. Last year's $6-billion drop in corporate profits, he pointed out, cost the Government more than enough tax money to pay for its whole health and education program in 1961.

Then along came President Kennedy's Interior Secretary, Stewart L. Udall, with the statement that "We are not out searching for ways to let private industry have access to major hydroelectric sites and to the falling water at some of the dams built with Federal funds." Making it plain that the Federal Government is back in the electric-power business in a big way, his pronouncement spells trouble for all investor-owned power companies. And so does the later indication by Mr. Kennedy, in his special message to Congress on natural resources, that his administration intends to meet what it considers a Federal utility responsibility.

Now a 5-State, all-Federal transmission system to carry to preference customers the 1.2-million kilowatts of power to come from hydro plants of the Colorado River storage project has been approved at the highest administration level. It is the key link in a federally-dominated giant power grid envisioned by the late Leland Olds in the 1930's and still the goal of a crusade by his disciples. As pointed out by Ralph Elliott, our Washington editor, in his "Washington Outlooks" comments in our March 1, 1961, issue, this giant power grid idea has long since passed the dream stage and is moving grimly close to reality.

The inconsistency of our Government's statements and actions in the entire field of Government-business relationship was stated in concise and arresting form in a recent letter from one of our readers. He reported a recent conversation with a Hollander who said: "I can't understand your Federal Government. Industry contributes so much to your welfare yet it seems that your Government consistently does everything in its power to destroy it. You charge the same price for your products as your competitors and you are charged with collusion. You lower your prices and you are charged with unfair competition. You raise your prices and you are liable to be accused of making an unfair profit. And after all this, if you do make a profit, the Government takes 52 percent of it. I just can't understand your Government's attitude toward business."

Our Electric Light and Power reader concluded his letter with the statement "And I thought to myself: 'I doubt if anyone else does'."

There is little that can be added to so apt a remark except to say that this whole situation has deadly serious implications for all of our American business enterprises—and particularly for our electric-power industry.

Address by Robert E. Lee, Federal Communications Commissioner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3, 1961

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on March 7 of this year, the distinguished Commissioner Robert E. Lee, of the Federal Communications Commission, addressed a legislative dinner of the New York State Broadcasters Association. The address was made before members

of the legislature and other dignitaries, including Governor Rockefeller and industry representatives. Because of my interest in educational television and because of the interest in that subject on the part of many of my colleagues in the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY COMMISSIONER ROBERT E. LEE, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, NEW YORK STATE BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION, LEGISLATIVE DINNER, ALBANY, N.Y., MARCH 7, 1961

In my opinion, most of the States of the Union look to New York State for leadership in common problems and from where I sit it appears to me that such leadership has been singularly lacking in the field of educational television. There are many reasons that I know contribute to this and probably many other reasons that I am unaware of and this is why I emphasize that this fact is apparent to me from where I sit.

In 1952, the Federal Communications Commission wisely reserved several hundred television channel assignments for noncommercial educational television broadcasting.

I have been impressed with the importance of this decision and have virtually stumped the country in an effort to encourage the implementation of these channel assignments by educational authorities.

There are over 50 educational stations now in operation and many more being planned throughout the United States. I consider this progress encouraging, yet I had hoped for more.

There have been several barriers to educational television but I think they are being overcome.

For a time it was new and there were, and perhaps still are, skeptics as to the effectiveness of classroom teaching by television since some professional educators considered that there was a plan afoot to substitute television teaching for the teacher himself. May I remind you that when the printing press was invented hundreds of years ago there was a great hue and cry from a significant part of the academic world to the effect that the printed word would obsolete the teacher. Funds for educational broadcasting were slow to be authorized. However, the biggest bugaboo appears to have been the fact that many important cities were not assigned VHF channels. While this proved in error, it may prove to be a blessing in disguise for now it appears that the educational use of the UHF band will save these frequencies for broadcasting since two-thirds of the educational assignments are in the UHF.

As you may be aware, commercial UHF broadcasting has done anything but flourish. There are about 70 commercial UHF stations presently on the air and I suspect the majority are not doing too well financially.

There are technical reasons for the inability of commercial UHF stations to compete with VHF stations in the same markets. I need not dwell at length on these reasons except insofar as they pertain to educational broadcasting. UHF stations do not produce usable signals as far as VHF stations and many areas do not have sets capable of receiving UHF signals.

It took many years for educators to recognize that the competitive problems that beset commercial broadcasters were not common to educational stations; that in-school television could be theirs by the expenditure of but a few more dollars for all-channel television receivers; and that the shorter range of UHF signals was not a serious handicap to their television plans. Now educators recognize that they must have more than one channel to perform the task before them. Pittsburgh, Milwaukee, and Oklahoma City are authorized two channels each and I confidently expect there will be many more—doing the job of filling in for missing teachers and unbuilt classrooms.

Many States are now, at this moment, busily reexamining their statewide requirements in this area and are finding that the allocations available are insufficient for a statewide integrated system. Petitions are and will be coming before us for additional allocations which are only available in the UHF portion of the spectrum. I believe I can say that the Commission is sympathetic to these requests but I caution that the problem becomes almost impossible if the request comes when these channels have been granted to other users.

Of course, there is the problem of money, for it costs hundreds of thousands to build and operate stations. Some of our great foundations have made significant contributions to the furtherance of educational television and there are several bills pending before Congress which would grant States funds to help in this endeavor. There is every expectancy that a bill will be signed into law.

I don't think I need tell New York or any other State how badly it needs more funds for education—for classrooms, for teachers and for the administrative personnel necessary. America spends $3½ billion annually for educational facilities and we are about 200,000 classrooms short. These classrooms cost from $25,000 to $50,000 each and require teachers which we do not have.

Mr. Paul L. Chamberlain, an official of General Electric, recently released some interesting figures with respect to educational needs in the Empire State. He advocates incidentally, four UHF television stations for each school district. To accommodate the increased birthrate in this State, 3,700 new classrooms will shortly be needed and you now have a shortage of 9,500 classrooms. New York will need 70,000 new teachers. Where will they come from? One-half of these will be needed to accommodate new enrollments. There will be a 100-percent increase in college and university enrollment by the year 1970. I know that New York will meet this grave responsibility and also retain its very high academic standards. I suggest that you utilize educational television to make a more effective use of the educational dollar.

There are economies that will flow from educational broadcasting that a prudent administration could scarcely afford to forego. It has been estimated that only one-third of school space is devoted to the classroom proper and the remaining two-thirds to such as gymnasiums, auditoriums, cafeterias, and offices. Were these large rooms equipped with large screen receivers or a number of normal screen receivers, as many as hundreds of students could learn their science and math with only a monitor to keep order.

Centralized school districts by broadcasting with four channels, as an example, and utilizing their auditoriums and other large rooms, when not otherwise in use, can cut education costs drastically.

There are fringe benefits too. Exceptionally gifted students, as well as slow students, could receive extra training which would not disrupt the curriculum of average students.

I have suggested that multichannel broadcasting will soon be universally recognized as the only economic means by which our teacher and facility shortages can be overcome. Since the VHF spectrum is virtually saturated with stations, largely commercial, it will become necessary to implement the UHF which is ready, available and adequate.

The only drawback to use of these channels is that in many areas, receivers are incapable of utilizing UHF signals because of scrimping by manufacturers in a highly competitive field. While this poses no problem for in-school education, it will deter adult education until overcome. We at the Commission have recommended to the Congress that we be empowered to require the manufacturer of all-channel sets. It is difficult to predict whether our proposal will be enacted into law. It is safe to say that if it were, the country would have such receivers in a few years to the extent that adult education would become effective.

Adult education will undoubtedly have a profound effect upon our lives. What is more, educational programing can be attractive, fascinating and not without entertainment value. There is no question that the whole fabric of commercial broadcasting could be enhanced. Commercial stations would find serious competition to their too frequently tasteless and unimaginative fare and would conceivably broadcast a greater portion of their programs to satisfy adult minds. These improvements will not come overnight and they won't come without cost and bold imagination. Certainly the public is cheated if they are never started.

Perhaps you have heard of the UHF tests which the Federal Communications Commission is to conduct starting this Fall. This project, which is partly to obtain technical data and partly demonstrative, will furnish valuable information with respect to the feasibility of UHF television operation in large cities which are difficult, even for VHF stations, to serve with good picture quality. This project has stirred much interest in government and industry and has prompted the city of New York to enter into discussions with us which we expect will lead to cooperation which will be mutually beneficial. At the completion of our tests, I am sure that a sale or gift of the equipment could be negotiated. This, of course, presumes that our tests will furnish satisfactory evidence that UHF broadcasting hitherto confined to much smaller cities will provide a satisfactory medium in New York City and its environs.

We expect to have this station on the air by October 1, 1961, broadcasting from the Empire State Building with about a megawatt of power. Observers will compare the signal quality with the existing services from several thousand observation points. At a later date, in the experiment, we very likely will install a second station to improve coverage and a scheme called multicasting.

Another valuable project which will have its impact on education and UHF broadcasting is that which is being pursued by the University of Purdue in cooperation with educational and civic leaders in six States, with a $4.5 million grant by the Ford Foundation. The experiment is designed to transmit simultaneously over six channels and thereby telecast 71 expertly taught programs per day. This will be a great boon to rural areas.

But education via television can take any form ranging from high-powered airborne transmitters to low-power stations and translators which pick up signals from the air, convert their frequencies, and rebroadcast to small communities. Or it can take the form of closed-circuit television. I note that New York City, in addition to educational programing over a commercial VHF station, has closed-circuit language programs to low-cost housing developments to overcome the language barrier between English- and Spanish-speaking peoples. This closed circuit broadcasting could, of course, be more economically achieved if New York City had their own station on the air.

However, regardless of the medium or techniques, educators must provide good equipment and assure dependable pictures or else there will be losses of instruction time, high maintenance costs, and losses of confidence in the system and the medium.

I mentioned earlier that the educators may someday save the UHF for broadcasting. As you perhaps know, the Commission licenses radio to many users. The television band is quite suitable to other uses and many licensees which are jammed into other bands have been seeking the use of the UHF band allocated to broadcasting. Their arguments are quite valid and difficult to resist. There are 12 VHF channels and 70 UHF channels. If the educators come forth with their plans for multichannel UHF operations at this time and act effectively to implement these channels, they can be saved for the needs of both educational and commercial broadcasting. Otherwise, it is difficult to say what the outcome will be.

I believe that television will ultimately be moved to UHF. There are very practical obstacles but the overall public interest dictates that this must be done. To make it as painless as possible, I have suggested that we permit a conversion period of perhaps 5 years during which interval the existing VHF operators would broadcast on two frequencies—the UHF and the VHF. This would minimize the cost to the public since the average television receiver is replaced within this period of time.

We have been hearing a great deal about the New Frontier these days. We are told that we are in a slack or a soft economy. I submit that the introduction of UHF broadcasting would stimulate the manufacturing industry in the expectation of building an estimated $30 billion of receiving sets over the next 5 years. I could not begin to calculate the stimulus to the economy (in dollars) that would flow from freeing the existing VHF broadcasting space for other users. This would provide new and remarkable tools for improving the American way of life.

We at the Commission have studied the plight of commercial UHF operation. We are firmly convinced that the UHF must become a viable medium for broadcasting. Through appropriate procedures we have made certain areas all UHF and are considering others.

Recently the Commission authorized pay television tests in Hartford, Conn., which operation will be in UHF. It is conjectural as to how the public will respond but it is apparent that if successful in this city, pay television may be authorized in others. It is principally the UHF portion of the spectrum which is feasible and available for this new use.

I emphasize the feasibility and desirability of UHF station operation with full knowledge that the board of regents of the State of New York was awarded construction permits in New York City, Binghamton, Buffalo, Ithaca, Albany, Rochester, and Syracuse and has an application on file for Utica. All of these contemplated operations are in UHF but to date there has not been great evidence of putting these valuable facilities to work. I know of only one educational station in operation in New York State and that was a gift from a defunct UHF operation.

I suggest that the Empire State has a great responsibility in the education of its children and that the contributions which these enlightened children will make to the Nation's welfare are far beyond my limited means to evaluate.

However, I can tell you with assurance that other States look to New York for leadership in many fields and I can assure you that Educational TV is on the march and I hope the Empire State joins this big parade.

Thank you.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Address by Daniel E. Lambert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Daniel E. Lambert, of Orrington, Maine, fifth district commander of the American Legion.

The address was held before the 42d anniversary banquet of the Daniel E. Geagan Post No. 98, the American Legion and Auxiliary of Brewer, Maine, on Monday, March 13, 1961, at the Brewer Auditorium, entitled "The American Legion Faces the Future." Commander Lambert's address is a sterling call to duty for all citizens of the Nation.

Commander Lambert is a four time wounded veteran of the famed "Darby's Rangers" of World War II and currently directs the Legion activity in the Penobscot, Hancock, and Piscataquis County areas of the Maine department. One of the Legion's key speakers, Commander Lambert gives over 175 talks and addresses during a year in the program to promote Americanism. He has maintained that record for 10 years.

A member of the Brewer American Legion, Commander Lambert serves as district chaplain for the district No. 4, VFW of Maine, is a past president of the St. Teresa's PTA unit of South Brewer, Maine, and is a member of the board of directors of the Eastern Maine Friends of Retarded Children, the Bangor-Brewer Catholic Social Service Bureau, and the American Legion District Service Board.

A member of the Maine Civil War Centennial Commission, Commander Lambert has a deep and abiding feeling in the American heritage of freedom. Commander Lambert comes from an all Legion family. His wife is the former Capt. Elise C. Pooler, ANC, who served in the Pacific area during World War II and belongs to the Brewer Legion and Auxiliary groups. The Lamberts have three daughters, Cynthia, Margaret, and Maureen who also belong to the Brewer Junior American Legion Auxiliary units.

In 1960, Commander Lambert was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal Award from Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge for his addresses. On March 1, 1961, it was announced that Commander Lambert had been awarded the honor for a second year for his talks on freedom.

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

My fellow Americans, we are assembled here to celebrate the 42d birthday of America's champion—the American Legion.

I refer to our organization as a "champion" because no other single word encompasses so aptly the principles and purposes of the American Legion.

Webster defines a champion as "one who acts or speaks in behalf of a person or a cause; a defender." For 42 years, the American Legion has spoken convincingly and acted boldly in behalf of the preservation of the American ideal. The American Legion has become a living symbol of the highest form of love of country, patriotism personified by millions of men and women serving their Nation in time of peace as well as during the crisis of war.

Today, the American Legion not only stands ready to refend the American way of life against all challengers, but also maintains a ceaseless vigil for possible threats by would be aggressors.

Ours is a unique organization. The American Legion first saw the light of day on foreign soil. The first AEF breathed life into the Legion at the historic Paris caucus on March 15 through 17, 1919, and sent it on its way to become the fighting organization it is today. Forty-two years and two wars later, membership in the American Legion signifies fulfillment of the highest obligation of citizenship—the bearing of arms in defense of America in time of war.

From its humble beginning 42 years ago, the American Legion has surpassed the fondest dreams of its founders. Born in the minds and hearts of valiant men—nurtured by leaders of great foresight—and dedicated to the most noble of causes, the American Legion today is a powerful bulwark against the forces of evil.

To reach such a prominent and respected position, the American Legion has had to accomplish mighty achievements. Our founders must have foreseen something of our destiny when they cemented the foundation of this organization with the immortal words of the American Legion preamble.

Upon that foundation have been built monuments to American Legion accomplishments, each one the answer to a great challenge.

We are here to close the 42d chapter of American Legion history. It is appropriate that we pause to reflect on American Legion accomplishments of the past in the light of the challenges of the present.

There is no greater monument to the Legion's endeavors than the Veterans' Administration, with its hospitals and domiciliary institutions. They have made the American war veteran the best cared for in the world. They symbolize the American Legion's success in keeping the Nation mindful of its obligation to the men and women who have sacrified much to keep America free.

The benefits of the VA program have not been confined to the Nation's veteran population. Progress attained through VA research and study has helped to raise health standards and alleviate suffering for all mankind.

There is scarcely a family in our Nation which has not been helped in some way by the American Legion's fight for economic readjustment of the wartime veteran.

The American Legion's GI bills of rights assured the veterans of World War II and the Korean war that they would be spared much of the heartbreak and neglect which faced those returning from World War I. These great legislative achievements by the American Legion did more to raise the educational level and promote homeownership in this country than all other laws combined.

Today, we are a great Nation—but tomorrow, we must be even greater. The American Legion is contributing much to the development of able leaders and enlightened citizens of the future. They are the youth of today who are learning the responsibilities of citizenship and discovering their leadership potential through positive programs of Americanism.

America's future is being built solidly today through such activities as Boys State and Boys Nation, the National High School Oratorical Contest, School Medal Awards, and Boy Scout sponsorship.

Because of the American Legion's active role in child welfare, many a youth will assume his citizenship responsibilities tomorrow with a sound body and a sound and intelligent mind. "A Square Deal for Every Child" has been more than a slogan to the American Legion. Dedicated to this ideal, we have successfully sponsored Federal and State laws streamlining the concepts of child care. These laws have established new legal safeguards for children, modernized juvenile courts, improved adoption and probation laws, and halted child labor exploitation.

Today, our Nation is in the midst of a cold war—a war of nerves. That this cold war hasn't erupted into a hot one can be attributed mainly to the military strength of the United States. A great measure of this strength stems from the American Legion and its continuing campaign for adequate military preparedness. It is obvious today that the great retaliatory power of our Nation is a major deterrent of would-be aggressors who seek world domination.

The pages of American Legion history are filled with great accomplishments which resulted when dedicated Legionnaires met head on the challenges facing them. We have shown ourselves to be able to withstand the verbal attacks of those who strive for a weakened America.

An article in a recent issue of a national magazine had this to say about the American Legion:

"The thing about the American Legion that impresses the objective historian is that on the big issues—the issues that have cut most deeply into our national character—it has had the disconcerting habit of being right.

"The two great issues on which it has made its stand, from the day of its conception, have been communism and disarmament. Any appraisal of the Legion's record in these critical areas shows that it was 100 percent—yes, 100 percent—right, and that its enemies, its detractors, and its mockers were tragically and almost fatally, wrong."

But, we cannot stop with a recounting of past achievements and say that our job is done. Far from it: The preservation of our

Nation faces the most crucial test in its history. America is being challenged by a force far more sinister than any which would lay waste our fair land through war.

We are living in perilous times. Our precious American heritage—our fundamental belief in the dignity of the individual—is threatened by the scourge of godless communism.

This is our challenge which America's champion must meet. For 42 years, the American Legion has been an enemy of communism. The Communist movement which the world is suffering today is just a few months older than our own organization. Yet this scourge which seeks to dominate our planet by the subjugation of individual dignity has engulfed two-thirds of the earth's population. Today, it is entrenced only 90 miles from our shores.

Recently, the leader of the Soviet Union declared that communism would gain world domination through "peaceful coexistence." He warned that any interference with Communists aims by capitalist powers would lead only to war.

This despotic butcher has dared to tell us that we must stand idly by and watch freedom-loving people subjected to the yoke of world communism—or else.

As America's champion, the American Legion must answer this challenge. Millions of dedicated Legionnaires have faced squarely the challenges of the past to contribute much to the greatness of America today. It is our duty to carry on in this tradition.

So, we are here on this occasion in a spirit of rededication. We are here to keep the faith of those who met 42 years ago in Paris. We are here to reaffirm our belief in the American way of life.

If America is to be preserved, the march of world communism must be halted. Our Nation's ability to retaliate against any military aggression has helped to stem the Red tide. But, if we are to bring this enemy's drive to a standstill, we must counter his offensive in another arena—the battle for the minds of men.

In this engagement, the exotic tools of warfare are of little use. In this theater of operations we must employ weapons which will build, rather than destroy. We must devote our talents and our energies to an America which will continue to set the shining example for freedom-loving men everywhere.

The challenge facing America today affords a golden opportunity to the American Legion to once again prove itself a champion. Our history has shown that we have been equal to the challenge of the past. Now, we must show ourselves to be equal to our tradition and worthy of the trust of our founders.

For such a difficult challenge, our battle plan is amazingly simple. The blueprint for victory is clearly outlined on the back of every membership card in the immortal phrases of the preamble to the Constitution of the American Legion. For 42 years, this declaration of principles has inspired countless Legionnaires to overcome the challenge of the hour.

We can muster the strength necessary to meet our enemy today. Armed with the knowledge that we are in the right, we can face this aggressor in the finest tradition of the American Legion. Dedicated to the high principles that have carried our organization over seemingly insurmountable challenges of the past, we will attain the victory.

For God and country, it shall be done.

A Push for the Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article which appeared in the Boston Traveler on March 29, 1961:

A PUSH FOR THE PORT

Boston's long fight to win freight rate parity with competitive ports has scored a small but encouraging gain through this week's action of the Department of Justice.

The Justice Department has asked that a Federal court set aside a December ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission which refused Boston's bid for port freight rates as low as those of Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Hampton Roads. The case is slated for argument July 18, on the Justice Department's contention that the ICC order was erroneous.

This is by no means a decisive victory for Boston, but at least it's a reprieve from defeat. And it keeps alive our protest against an unjust ICC attitude that has crippled our port activity and is costing us millions of dollars a year.

The ICC had some logic to its case back in 1905. In those days, Boston's comparative nearness to Europe made this city a booming center for export and import shipments. So in order to give a fair break to southern tier ports, the ICC decided that rail freight shipped through Baltimore should move at 3 cents less per 100 pounds than freight through Boston or New York. For Philadelphia, the rate was 2 cents less.

But times have changed since that ancient ruling. And for the past 40 years, Boston has been fighting for the removal of the obsolete rate differential.

The prize is worth the battle. If we had equal freight rates for the port of Boston, our cargo shipments would jump by 10 million tons a year. This would mean at least $140 million a year extra pumped into Boston's economy, and roughly $500 million a year for the economy of New England.

We're not asking for an edge over other ports. All we ask is a fair chance to compete. It's time we got it. And the Justice Department's action should help our struggle.

Gold Reserve and Unfavorable Balance of International Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gold Is Good for It," which appeared in the Indianapolis Star, March 31, 1961.

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

GOLD IS GOOD FOR IT

It is being quite seriously proposed that the present requirement of a 25 percent gold backing for the U.S. currency be abandoned. There have always been some who wanted to dispense with the gold backing, but the proposal comes up now as a supposed way out of the gold problem.

The problem is that a persistent unfavorable balance of international payments for more than 10 years has been causing an outflow of gold reserves which has now become quite serious. The reserves have dwindled to such a degree that it is now possible that the Treasury will soon have nothing left except the required gold reserve.

The practical means of stopping the outflow lie in reducing the Government's spending overseas—chiefly for military operations and foreign aid. The liberals and internationalists will not think of such a thing for a moment.

Hence the proposal to dispense with the required reserve. Then, the argument goes, it would no longer matter how much gold the Treasury had. It could go on paying out gold to foreign creditors, as long as it lasted, and not worry about it.

This is like amputating an arm to remedy a broken wrist. To be sure, that would get rid of the problem of the broken wrist. Furthermore, the problem wouldn't recur. But it could hardly be called a remedy.

Dropping the reserve requirement would get rid of the problem of having to keep gold in reserve. But when the gold was all gone, what would you use then to settle the balance of payments, if it was still unfavorable? Not dollars. For without gold to be paid out at a standard ratio on dollar claims, the dollar would not for long be worth anything in international exchange.

A startling sign of the nature of some of the thinking within the Government about the gold reserve is found in the memorandum on foreign aid and payments which in February went from the U.S. Government to the West German Government.

It implied that the last decade's sustained annual loss of gold is a laudable achievement on the part of the United States. It declared that the opposite, a sustained accumulation of gold and other international reserves by any one country, is "disruptive to the international community." In this context, the memorandum said that "we must learn to use our reserves on a communal basis, recognizing that one nation's gain can only be another nation's loss."

This approach dovetails with the proposal that the gold backing of currency be dropped.

There is here an abysmal lack of understanding of the nature of money. The detractors of gold—after all, you can't eat it—seem to think that the printed paper which the Government issues is real money, that it has been endowed with a self-sustaining value of its own. It is not so. Nor can it be so, unless all of the history of economics is wrong.

The dollar is kept "as good as gold" by two things. One is the discipline of the reserve requirement, which prevents the unbridled issue of printing press money. The other is the availability of gold in foreign exchange for dollars, at a fixed rate. If either were taken away, the dollar would become a shifting commodity, its value subject to the whim of the Government and the manipulation of speculators.

Dollar Will Still Shrink Under Kennedy Budgets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget message which was delivered to the Congress was certainly a masterpiece in juggling the figures. Rather than take the face value of the statements emitted from the Budget Bureau, I feel that the following editorial entitled "Dollar Will Still Shrink Under Kennedy Budgets," which appeared on Monday, March 27, 1961, in the Chicago Daily News, deserves our serious consideration:

DOLLAR WILL STILL SHRINK UNDER KENNEDY BUDGETS

As a critic of Federal budgets, President Kennedy is superb. In his message to Congress on fiscal policy he tore to shreds the artifices and excessive optimism by which the Eisenhower budget submitted in January contrived to show a surplus.

It is regrettable that Mr. Kennedy is not sitting on the opposition side to dissect his own device of separating his budget into two doses. He thereby distracts attention from his proposition that no matter what we may have to pay for security, it should not interfere with spending on civilian and vote-getting welfare programs.

The bad news was that we are in for 2 years of red ink—a combined deficit for fiscal 1961 and 1962 of $5 billion. The national debt will climb to a new record high, even assuming that Mr. Kennedy does not find additional unmet needs requiring increased defense outlays.

The President was critical of the Eisenhower budget for its failure to provide for a number of inescapable commitments made by the last administration. In his own forecast for 1962, however, he budgets $843 million from a postal rate increase, which in fact he has hardly more hopes of getting from Congress than did Mr. Eisenhower.

The President said bravely that he intended to be "a prudent steward of the public funds." He defined that to mean obtaining "a dollar's worth of results from every dollar we spend."

Results to the head of a political party intent upon maintaining itself in power are quite a different matter from results sufficient to justify perpetuation of staggering taxes the while we plunge deeper into debt.

Even the forecast of a 2-year deficit of $5 billion was as full of ifs as a tipsheet on a maiden race: If Congress doesn't get spending fever; if revenue estimates prove accurate; if taxes are not cut; if farm subsidies do not rise, and so forth.

More evidence will be required to clinch it, but the President's first budget message places him with those to whom the meeting of politically conceived needs is more important than the question of whether the country can afford them.

He is in distinguished company to be sure; it has been the pattern of every President since Herbert Hoover. That is why in the last 8 years the Federal Government wrung from the taxpayers $53 billion more than it did in the 164 preceding years—in addition to another $23 billion which it borrowed and spent.

That is why Mr. Kennedy was obliged to ask that the present $293 billion limit on the Federal debt be again hoisted to a higher figure. He pays the same lip service as his predecessors to the desirability of debt reduction in good times, but there is no sign that Uncle Sam will ever be prosperous enough to pay his debts.

Anybody who thinks this is compatible with pledges to maintain the stability of the dollar ought to read the grocery ads over the last two decades.

The Johnsons of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD what I consider to be a very well deserved editorial. It appeared in last evening's Washington Star, and is entitled "The Johnsons of Texas."

It is a very commendatory editorial dealing with the fine work Vice President JOHNSON and his lovely wife are doing as representatives of the President on the African Continent.

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

THE JOHNSONS OF TEXAS

In this era of most sensitive person-to-person diplomacy it is gratifying, but in this instance not surprising, that the Johnsons of Texas have been welcomed with the warmest of acclaim as America's foremost representatives at Senegal's Independence Day festivities in Dakar. For LYNDON and Lady Bird long ago—in Texas, in Washington, and on the nationwide campaign trail—demonstrated the charm and graciousness that win friends. On this basis alone, President Kennedy chose wisely in asking the Vice President to represent him officially at the anniversary ceremonies.

The occasion has brought to light other gratifying aspects. The warmth of welcome to Mr. and Mrs. Johnson and others of the American delegation obviously was not based entirely on personal grounds. Greetings from the Dakar crowds reportedly included shouts of "long live the United States, champion of independence"—a recognition not always accorded to our country in the current maelstrom of African politics. For the record, too, both the popular and official reaction toward the United States and its delegation was in contrast to the perfunctory reception given the representatives of the Soviet Union.

Perhaps most significant of all, however, were the words of President Leopold Senghor of the Senegalese Republic, itself a former French colony. Addressing his own countrymen in the presence of nearly 100 foreign delegations, Mr. Senghor saluted President de Gaulle of France as a statesman who has opened the road to independence for much of Africa, and warned the new nations of the continent against the error of attacking their former rulers. "Remember," he said, "that the colonizers of yesterday are the friends of tomorrow." It is, of course, an apt reminder, fully justified by the interest and willingness of such former colonial powers as Britain and France to contribute to the political and economic development of these young countries. As for our own country, not a colonizer, it has been made amply clear that we are ready and willing to aid in the same ways. In this context, the visit of the Vice President to Dakar is a manifestation of meaningful sincerity.

Agriculture in an Uneasy World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, several weeks ago I observed a most interesting article published in the Washington Star. As a matter of fact, it was published in the Star under date of February 26. It was from the pen of former Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace. I was greatly impressed by the article. A few weeks later I met the former Secretary and Vice President at a social affair in honor of former President Truman. I complimented Mr. Wallace on the article, and I told him that I had intended to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thereafter he sent me the full text of his remarks, which were made at a forum conducted during Farmers' Week by the Michigan State University, on February 1, 1961.

The statement by the former Secretary of Agriculture is a very fine contribution to our efforts to solve this very serious farm problem.

I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I may say that there were many things in Mr. Wallace's philosophy with which I did not agree. In fact, I was diametrically opposed to some of his views. However, Mr. Wallace was a great Secretary of Agriculture, and whenever he speaks on farm problems, he is entitled to be heard.

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

STATEMENT PREPARED BY HENRY A. WALLACE FOR THE FORUM, "AGRICULTURE IN AN UNEASY WORLD," FARMERS' WEEK, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST LANSING, MICH.

Chairman Hannah has asked each of the five former Secretaries of Agriculture to cover the same three points in 12 minutes.

First I would say that every Secretary of Agriculture must have a fixed goal. In my case I wanted the farmers to get equality of bargaining power and parity of income while at the same time increase soil fertility and feed the people of the United States and the world more abundantly. I could never forget the masthead motto of the farm paper of which I had been editor for many years, "Good Farming, Clear Thinking, Right Living."

Of course every Secretary wants the conditions of living and the opportunities for education on the farm to improve. Therefore every Secretary wants greater security of tenure but no diminution in the speed of adopting modern technologies.

In 1933 when I became Secretary the situation was so desperate that the farm organizations, many insurance companies, and

even the U.S. Chamber of Commerce were behind me in getting action legislation from the Congress.

I had fought for the McNary Haugen bill and its equalization fee when my father was Secretary of Agriculture. Therefore, I was in close contact with farm organization leaders. These people looked on me as a special pleader for their cause. But I felt I had to be more than that.

Moreover I found what every Secretary of Agriculture knows, that I had to reckon with the Budget Bureau, with the Secretary of State, with the Secretary of Treasury, with the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture and the House and Senate Subcommittees on Agricultural Appropriations. And above all there is the need for loyalty to the President's overall program. A Secretary soon discovers that Senators and Congressmen often sympathize much more with high pressure, special interest groups, than with the President's program as set forth in either legislative requests or budget askings. Sometimes there is discord even in the Cabinet family.

The crosscurrents probably put the Secretary of Agriculture in more uncomfortable and difficult positions than any other Cabinet officer. He must balance off a large number of conflicting forces. He usually ends up by pleasing no one completely.

My second 4 minutes are supposed to center around the changes that have taken place since I ceased being Secretary of Agriculture in 1940.

First the war made temporarily irrelevant my ever-normal granary legislation of 1938 which was based on crop loans at 52 to 75 percent of parity. Great war needs rapidly used up the supplies accumulated in the ever-normal granary and the farmers were assured of a good price for everything they raised. The farmers responded so terrifically, partly because of price incentive, partly because of patriotism, and largely because of very rapid improvements in seed, fertilizer, machinery, and management that postwar surpluses rapidly accumulated.

When I left the agricultural post in 1940 1 worker on the land could support 10 people. Today 1 farmworker can support 25 people. In other words farmworkers since 1940 have been increasing their efficiency at the rate of 4.3 percent a year. For the 60 years before 1940 farmworker efficiency increased at the rate of only 1.2 percent annually. Population in the United States and the world at the present time is increasing at the rate of only 1.6 percent annually.

No one can say that the American farmworker is not doing his share of carrying the world's burden.

The one large area where the American genius for organization and efficient, hard work shines forth most clearly in definite superiority over all other large nations is in agriculture. Russia will overtake us in many industrial fields before she begins to catch up with us in agricultural efficiency. Here we are supreme and are likely to remain that way for a long time.

Where else can one farm worker feed 25 people with abundant supplies of good food containing excellent proteins from animal sources as well as a variety of fruits and vegetables? From the standpoint of health most citizens of the United States get too many calories rather than too little.

If they pay too much that is not the farmer's fault. During the past 13 years farm net income has gone down more than 35 percent whereas nonfarm income has gone up more than 60 percent. Prior to World War II the income of livestock farmers went up and down almost precisely in step with the total payrolls of labor. Since 1946 payrolls of labor have left livestock farm income far, far behind.

It is much more difficult for a Secretary of Agriculture to sponsor continuous wage increases for city labor in 1961 than it was in 1935 or even 1946. The bargaining power of labor has outdistanced the bargaining power of the farmer. The gap between what the consumer pays and what the farmer gets continually widens. The Secretary of Agriculture must more and more appeal to the Secretary of Labor and labor leaders for labor statesmanship in the general interest.

In 1932 agricultural surpluses were built up partly because of low purchasing power on the part of our unemployed and partly because of unemployment overseas. Today only a small part of our surplus is due to unemployment at home. The surpluses accumulated during the past 10 years are due largely to rapidly expanding technology.

The problem is to turn these vast surpluses into a blessing instead of a curse. Public Law 480, passed in 1954, is one mechanism for doing this. We can use our vast surpluses either as a weapon in the cold war or to develop backward nations to a point where they can help themselves. We can store vast quantities in places where they can be protected from fallout both in this country and abroad. A strategic reserve is all-important. I felt this in 1939. I feel it many times as strongly in 1961.

Lastly, looking ahead 10 years I feel that all Secretaries of Agriculture will have to recognize that Government is in the agricultural business to stay.

I do not like it. Farmers do not like it. But how are farmers to get equality of bargaining power without help from the Government? The bargaining power of both corporations and labor comes largely from Government. If minimum wages are guaranteed, farmers will insist on minimum prices. They will never get parity of income as defined during the campaign. If they could be sure of half that amount year in and year out they would be lucky. As long as there are subsidies direct or indirect either of power or money to nonfarm groups, farmers will want their equalizer.

The Secretary of Agriculture in the future will be subject to greater pulling and hauling than any previous Secretary. His only safety will be in defining his goal in such a manner that when he lays down his office he can feel:

1. He has done his part to improve the soil of the United States.

2. His use of Government power has enabled the farmers of the United States to feed the people of our country well while at the same time farmers have been able to bargain more successfully in the marketplace.

3. His use of Government surpluses and surplus legislation have made our beloved country safer at home and abroad.

4. He has maintained the forward march of agricultural technology.

5. He has increased the pride of the farmers in their calling.

6. He has cooperated with his fellow Cabinet members in serving the welfare of the world.

7. He has convinced city people that food surpluses properly used are a blessing and that agricultural welfare is vital to city welfare.

8. He has convinced the State Department of the dominance of the agricultural problem in all of the crowded, undeveloped nations of the world.

In order to give life to these eight goals he must get the best judgment of—

1. The farm organizational leaders.

2. The land-grant college technicians and farm management experts.

3. Key men from Congress.

4. Farm economists in the USDA.

5. Agriculturally minded men in the State Department.

6. Commodity and cooperative leaders who are well posted on the details of the great surplus crops produced on 20 million or more acres.

7. Experts in the livestock-feed grain complex.

There will be many conflicts as many selfish interests collide. In 1935 we tried to reconcile these conflicts county by county, State by State, and region by region. That might be well done again against the background of 1961 realities.

It is quite possible that philosophers and historians at the end of the year 1999 looking back over the 20th century as they prepare to greet the 21st century will say:

"The United States failed because she failed to understand the earth-shaking potentialities in the nationalistic aspirations of the people in the crowded, underdeveloped areas. She could have used her agricultural surplus and agricultural technology to have prevented much of that destructive violence which has stained the last four decades of the most bloody century in all history. She did not bring together the best brains to meet that problem and act accordingly."

The statesmanship of the Secretaries of Agriculture and State during the next three administrations will largely determine whether or not this judgment of doom will be passed upon our beloved country.

Unemployment Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Job Incentives, Not Doles," which appeared in the Indianapolis News, March 20, 1961.

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

JOB INCENTIVES, NOT DOLES

Most of Governor Welsh's conference on unemployment problems was devoted to extolling Indiana participation in the new Federal jobless pay program.

We could not disagree more on the merits of this plan. Not only is it a temporary palliative, but it does long-range harm to its recipients, the low-seniority workers who are always the first to be laid off.

The conference on unemployment problems might far better have occupied itself with incentives to business confidence in the State than in the ballyhoo of rewards for unemployment.

The principle of Federal extension of unemployment pay and its creeping increase should be of great concern to everyone. It can lead only to a kind of permanent dole, placing a premium on many to stay unemployed.

This increase, for example, is actually discouraging to a return of full business prosperity, since—in Indiana—it will place an additional tax burden on already hard-pressed employers, estimated by the Federal authorities at $28 million.

Furthermore, the added tax falls most heavily on new employers—the ones who have to pay high rates until they can prove the stability of their enterprises. Increasing taxation of this nature is the very opposite

of encouraging the new business Indiana needs to insure full unemployment.

The Governor's conference should have devoted its major attention to getting people back to work by giving their employers assurances that new taxes and new restrictions will not be imposed on them at the very time they need encouragement to resume and rehire.

Indiana's unemployed deserve every State help, but with emphasis on the word State. And with emphasis on job restoration and new job opportunities rather than on extension after extension of unemployment pay.

Some Hard Facts About Good Union Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the labor movement in the United States has had a brilliant history in working for the social and economic welfare and justice of workingmen and women of this Nation.

The road has not been easy. At every turn the labor movement has been confronted with opposition and hazards. In recent years, the public press has carried many adverse comments concerning individuals and practices within organized labor.

In view of this, I was most gratified to see the following editorial which appeared in the San Leandro Morning News of my district, which is a timely reminder of the many good labor leaders and unions which exist in our great democracy. I am delighted to submit it for the RECORD:

SOME HARD FACTS ABOUT GOOD UNION OPERATIONS

Good works, unfortunately, are seldom heralded by headlines.

The newspapers save the big headlines for stories about gangsters moving into unions and for articles about billion dollar price rigging conspiracy by industrial giants.

These are examples, we like to believe, of the exceptions to the rule. The majority of the labor movement, and leaders of industry are honest in their operation.

This week the East Bay Labor Journal printed some hard facts about good unions. Declared the voice of the labor movement in Alameda County: "No union corruption is right. No business corruption is right."

Russell Crowell, president of the county central labor council declared, "We must differentiate between the union in which an isolated union officer goes bad, and one permeated by corruption."

This is not to mean that the labor movement should try to gloss over the convincing evidence which the McClelland committee has produced—of sweetheart contracts, gangster tie-ins, looting of treasuries, perversion of the legitimate ends and aims of unionism, denial of union democracy and intimidation and violence. A black eye on the labor movement—whether they are AFL-CIO or not—hurts all who carry union cards.

Crowell declares that "there are some unions whose leaders have forgotten how to lead." No union member or officer should forget that the union exists for the rank-and-file membership.

Alameda County is fortunate that both Crowell and Executive Secretary Robert S. Ash stresses the need for responsible labor leaders. Labor leadership in the county has been a clean, vigorous movement with an outstanding record.

Project Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, a group of business leaders in Milton, Fla., has responded with a novel idea to President Kennedy's plea to the American people to think in terms of what they can do for America.

Their idea is called Project Employment. It calls upon the citizens of Santa Rosa County to provide a boost to the economy of the United States by making needed repairs and purchases now. They reason, and rightly so, that such a move would help to provide employment and help the Nation's economy.

I commend both their ingenuity and their sense of civic responsibility.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the presentation of their idea as it is contained in an advertisement published in the Pensacola Journal of March 3, 1961.

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

PROJECT EMPLOYMENT

The President has asked the American people to think in terms of "what we can do for the Government" and not in terms of "what can the Government do for us."

In response to his suggestions, we are now submitting to the people of Milton and Santa Rosa County: Project Employment.

The idea is simple:

If your house needs painting, paint it now.

The money you spend for such work will give employment and such employment will put money into circulation.

Multiply the number of homes that do need painting and you will come up with many jobs for many people.

In each case, the person who has his home painted is not giving money away. He is merely insuring and, perhaps, increasing the value of his property.

The same holds true in such projects as reroofing, planting shrubbery, trees, flowers, and lawns. Property value is enhanced. Properties are beautified.

Business properties fit into the same category.

Ask yourselves these questions: What can I do to put more money into circulation? What can I do to fortify our economy?

Perhaps your automobile needs repairing. Do it now.

Perhaps your boat needs repairing. Do it now.

Perhaps your home needs electrical wiring. Do it now.

Perhaps you need to trade your present automobile. Do it now.

Perhaps you need a new suit of clothes. Buy the suit now.

There are many ways we can help.

Fortunately, in Santa Rosa County, our economic position appears sound at this time.

But we can better keep it that way by sponsoring Project Employment.

By adopting such a schedule, it may be that we shall be the first community in America to accept the President's suggestion.

We believe we will be the first. Be this as it might, we three Milton business houses are happy and consider it a civic privilege to point out our opportunity with you.

Military Invasion of Other Countries by Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Big Words Won't Do It," which appeared in the Indianapolis Star, Thursday, March 30, 1961.

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

BIG WORDS WON'T DO IT

When the armed forces of one nation invade another and occupy nearly half of the territory of the invaded state, international law, diplomatic usage, and the rules of war provide three possible courses of action for the victim of the invasion:

First, the invaded state might capitulate and ask for an armistice of surrender. The invaders then are usually allowed to occupy the whole territory of the invaded state and impose their own conditions of peace as victors.

Second, the invaded state might ask for a cease-fire to be followed by negotiations for armistice and peace based on existing military positions at the time the cease-fire agreement is signed. That means that the invading forces are allowed to hold all the territories they have occupied by force of arms. This kind of cease-fire request is not a full surrender, but is the nearest thing to it. It acknowledges that the invading armed forces have been victorious in battle. In future negotiations, which may or may not lead to armistice and peace, the invaders enjoy all the diplomatic advantages, since the negotiations themselves are the direct result of their military victories and provide a de facto recognition of their military conquests.

Third, the invaded state might demand the withdrawal of the invading armies from the territories they have occupied and then back this demand with military action, or the threat of military action. The course of events after that depends on the military strength and the political skill of the two opponents. If the invaders become convinced that the invaded state might be supported by superior military forces of powerful allies, then the invaders are likely to retreat without serious fighting. Or they might be forced to retreat after the armed forces of the invaded state have won a decisive battle.

In Laos the United States and the West have so far chosen the second course of action—the nearest thing to a surrender offer. This is the British proposed cease-fire agreement based on existing position, i.e., the Communists holding all the territories they

have occupied by force of arms. This puts the Communists in extremely advantageous diplomatic positions, as the cease-fire—if signed—would officially acknowledge that the Communists are de facto rulers of the territories they have conquered, i.e., nearly half of the Laos State.

Of course, in future negotiations the West might demand that the Communists should leave the territories they have occupied. Western diplomats might even persuade the United Nations Assembly to pass a resolution to that effect. But the Communists would pay as much attention to such demands and resolutions as they did to the demands and resolutions which asked them to withdraw from North Korea, from Hungary, and from Tibet.

Communists never, absolutely never, withdraw voluntarily from territories they conquer by force of arms. The Communists will not leave the territories they have already occupied in north and central Laos, unless they are forced to do so. And unless they are forced to do so by the threat of military action, neither the Communists nor anybody else would take the serious warnings of the West very seriously.

The Communists do not plan and organize invasions of foreign countries for the sake of impressing the West with their political moderation or good will, or intentions to work for a better international atmosphere. Communists plan and organize invasions with the purpose of conquering territories and enlarging the size of the Communist empire. The Communists will not be stopped on their road to world conquest by big words or vague warnings. They will be stopped only when they are confronted with superior military forces united against them and when they become convinced that aggressive military moves into the territories of their neighbors do not bring them military victories and diplomatic advantages, as they have done in Laos.

National Scholarship Auditions of Friday Morning Music Club Foundation, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, most of us are aware that when George Washington directed Maj. Pierre L'Enfant to plan a Federal city 170 years ago, he specified that it should be planned as a cultural and civic center for the new United States. The father of our country recognized, even at that early date, that our Capital City would be a showpiece of our way of life—a window through which much of the world would view our new Republic and its people. And, in his great wisdom, he recognized, too, that the fine arts and education would continue to reflect the true status of our Nation—the values which, in the words of President Eisenhower, "make our civilization endure and flourish."

We in America have every right to be proud of the diversified cultural life of our country and of the continued efforts by our citizens to encourage and expand appreciation of the creative output of our poets, playwrights, composers and visionaries of the past and present. We, here in the Congress, have demonstrated our recognition of the significance of the national level of our cultural heritage through enactment of Senate bill 3335 during the 85th Congress—which bill I was happy to cosponsor, and which resulted in Public Law 874 for the establishment of a National Cultural Center here in the Nation's Capital. Many of my colleagues will recall the long and sometimes discouraging battle fought by many dedicated Members in both Houses of the Congress in order to secure legislative approval for such an international cultural beacon, which will be commensurate with our leadership in world affairs. Many public-spirited citizens maintained the courage of their convictions that here was a project which would enrich countless numbers of lives through expansion of cultural horizons. They realized that this was an absolute necessity in order for our Capital City to fufill its role of importance as a tourist center from which local and foreign visitors derive their knowledge and lasting impressions of the United States. And, a splendid example of how Members from both sides of the aisle can work together in harmony for the cultural advancement and mutual benefit of our great country was shown in the commendable bipartisan spirit which marked enactment of this legislation.

Since that time great progress has been made by many prominent individuals who are contributing their time, efforts, and funds toward eventual realization of this center which will belong to every citizen of the United States. Such a national cultural establishment will develop a greater knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of the fine arts by providing a suitable building for the presentation of music, opera, drama, dance, and poetry.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention at this time to an outstanding example of our Nation's cultural maturity to be found right here in our Capital City—the Friday Morning Music Club, Inc. Founded in 1885, this pioneer organization is well qualified to assume its place in the forefront of our expanded cultural horizons; for the objectives of the Friday Morning Music Club are dedicated generally to the ennoblement of the spirit and specifically toward the promotion of musical culture among its members and in the community. One of the largest and most active musical organizations in the Capital, the club has a membership of 600 women musicians—active, associate, honorary, and student—who periodically sponsor concerts of local and world renowned artists.

In 1949, through the untiring efforts of one of its distinguished members—Mrs. Florence Howard, the club expanded its objectives to the younger generation by forming the Friday Morning Music Club Foundation. Incorporated in 1948, the foundation—of which Mrs. Howard is the capable director—establishes a legal means for the club to receive and administer bequests and gifts in order to promote and provide musical education for the especially gifted student; and particularly for those who need help to launch their careers or to provide further training.

As a result of this fine program, national scholarship auditions are held every 18 months for young musicians who compete for awards of $1,500, $1,000, and $300. After 3 days of elimination competitions, in which selected members of the music club choose six finalists, the winners are chosen by judges of outstanding reputation in the music field.

On Friday night, April 7, the foundation will hold the finals in its national scholarship auditions at the John Wesley Powell Auditorium, here in Washington. The auditions this year are for singers between the ages of 18 and 26 and applications for the contest came from 165 young singers from all our 50 States, including Hawaii. Applications were carefully screened by members of the foundation and 40 were accepted to compete in the auditions. The finalists on Friday night will be judged by a panel of distinguished musicians including Boris Goldowski ("Mr. Opera"), Julius Rudell, director of the New York City Opera Co., and Rose Bampton, former leading soprano of the Metropolitan Opera Co. Previous winners of the national auditions have included violinists, pianists, singers, and a cellist; all of whom are now actively pursuing their careers and some of whom have already made such names for themselves as to give promise of becoming stars in future years.

The top award this year has been named by the Friday Morning Music Club "The Florence Howard Award," in honor of the founder and director of the foundation; who, through her untiring efforts, has fulfilled so completely the club's purpose of "promoting musical culture among its members and in the community."

Mr. President, in these times when the United States is faced with the challenge of providing the alternative to the path toward communism, I believe that we need more such constructive efforts which prove to the world that the citizens of our great country are not materialistic—that our own unique approach to private action, endowment, and support of the arts produces the finest artists; and that we are truly worthy of being the leader among nations—culturally and spiritually, as well as economically and defense-wise.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a listing of the officers and trustees of the Friday Morning Music Club Foundation, Inc.; along with a listing of honorary membership in the foundation and past scholarship awards.

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

THE FRIDAY MORNING MUSIC CLUB FOUNDATION, INC.

OFFICERS

Director of the foundation, Florence Howard; chairman of auditions, Kathryn Hill Rawls; secretary, Constance Russell McKay; treasurer, Katherine Riggs Burchard; assistant to the director, Jane Lea; assistant to the chairman of auditions, Lenore Bryan; president of the Friday Morning Music Club, Dorothy Raynor.

TRUSTEES

Nabiha Gazda, Helen Grimes, Neva Garner Greenwood, Evelyn Swarthout Hayes, Alma Mitchell, Alice Nagle, Miriam Taylor, Margaret Tolson, Olive McD. Witters.

HONORARY MEMBERSHIP IN THE FOUNDATION

National Judges

Miss Alice Eversman, Dr. Rudolph Ganz, Mr. Walter Golde, Mr. Julian de Gray, Mr. John Gutman, Mr. Mieczyslav Horszowski, Mary Howe, Mr. Alexander Kipnis, Mr. Boris Kroyt, Mr. Marks Levine, Mr. Eugene List, Miss Mildred Miller, Mr. Mischa Mischakoff, Dr. Howard Mitchell, Mr. Homer Mowe, Miss Elena de Sayn, Mr. Mischa Schneider, Mr. Leonard Shure, Mr. Martial Singher, Dr. Reginald Stewart, Mr. Roman Totenberg.

SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS

September 8, 1950: The Friday Morning Music Club Foundation and Patrick Hayes $1,000 award. Winner, Diana Steiner, violinist, Philadelphia, Pa.

April 16, 1952: The Friday Morning Music Club Foundation Award for Singers. Winner, First award, $700—Madelaine Chambers, White Plains, N.Y.; winner, second award, $300—Bettye Brown, Nashville, Tenn.

September 11, 1953: The Bonita Crowe $1,000 Piano Scholarship. Winner, Naomi Weiss, New York, N.Y.

April 13, 1955: The Friday Morning Music Club Foundation $1,000 Scholarship for Strings. Winner, Elaine Skorodin, Chicago, Ill.

September 12, 1956: The Friday Morning Music Club Scholarships for Singers. Winner, first award, $1,000—Robert Kerns, Detroit, Mich.; winner, second award, $300—Gilderoy Scott Memorial—Robert Moulson, Atlanta, Ga.

April 11, 1958: The Friday Morning Music Club Scholarships for Pianists. Winner, first award, $1,000—Virginia Hutchings, Atlanta, Ga.; winner, second award, $300—Jerome Rose, San Francisco, Calif.; winner, third award, $100—Emily Zachary Bayly Memorial—Anton Baker, New York, N.Y.

September 11, 1959: The Friday Morning Music Club Scholarships for Strings. Winner, first award, $1,000—Toby Saks, Cellist, New York, N.Y.; winner, second award, $300—Charles Castleman, Violinist, Braintree, Mass.; winner, third award, $100—Frances Steiner, Cellist, Philadelphia, Pa.

April 5–7, 1961: The Friday Morning Music Club Scholarships for Singers. The Florence Howard Award, $1,500 (honoring the founder and director of the foundation); the second award, $1,000, the Church-Lyons-Scott Memorials Award, $300.

Prospects for Negotiated Truce in Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Terms?—Theirs," which appeared in the Indianapolis Star, March 31, 1961.

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

THE TERMS?—THEIRS

Before there is too much good feeling about the prospects of a negotiated truce in Laos, the people of the United States should understand the basis for these diplomatic conversations.

The United States, Great Britain, and any other of our allies who enter talks with the Russians about Laos will do so on Communist terms even though our diplomatic corps will attempt to paint the scene in the colors of a victory.

The first and glaring inconsistency in the whole business is the expressed Russian hope that Laos may be a truly neutral nation, and not a pawn of the great powers. This is an absurdity. If Laos were capable of being anything of its own volition—neutral, pro-Communist, pro-American—there would be no crisis in southeast Asia today.

Laos is a pawn in the power struggle because the Communists made it so. The Reds have poured military hardware and supplies across the border to the pro-Red forces in Laos. In the face of constant warnings by this country and by other nations, the Communists have persisted in military operations against the Lao Government.

Two other points will show the real grounds for negotiations on Laos. President Kennedy has set no time limit for a cease-fire, nor has he indicated where a so-called cease-fire boundary will be drawn.

The Communists, in Russia and China, can continue to talk, and may continue to fight in Laos. Only when they are ready to stop shooting will the war there end. The Reds started the invasion of Laos, and they will be able to continue that intrusion at their leisure.

If past history offers any sort of precedent, the Communists will negotiate to keep absolutely all of the territory they have conquered in Laos. Current reports indicate the Pathet Lao has cut the narrow-waisted little country in two. If that is the case, the Communists will be happy to accept such a situation in the knowledge that the two amputated parts of the nation may be picked up at their later convenience.

A few concrete examples of this Communist method will serve to emphasize the statement made above. In Korea, the boundary lies right along the line of farthest Communist advance. The Reds are in East Germany and Berlin to stay, they say, even though a final agreement for Germany has never been reached. In Hungary, the Russians were willing to talk after they crushed the freedom fighters and reoccupied the country.

Measured coldly by the facts, the United States and its allies are preparing to negotiate on Communist terms for the dismemberment of Laos. Under such circumstances, there can be no diplomatic victory for the United States. At best, a nasty war fought a long way off from either Moscow or Washington may be averted. At worst half of Laos will be lost and the rest may follow later.

Tribute to Dr. Roy Lynde, of Ellendale, N. Dak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, many interesting stories have been written concerning most unforgettable characters. The current issue of the Reader's Digest has such a story concerning a Dr. Roy Lynde, of Ellendale, N. Dak., a city close to where I lived most of my life. I have been privileged to know Dr. Lynde for many, many years. The fine things said about him in this article are all true; and even much more could be said. He spent a lifetime helping others, oftentimes, without compensation, especially during the depression years. Most of his reward will be in the world to come. Probably one of the greatest joys of his life has been in being able to help other people.

Having grown up in a rural community, I am very familiar with the hardships endured by Dr. Lynde and other country doctors. Often such a practice involves night trips far into the country during all kinds of weather, including the worst of blizzards. Theirs has been a great contribution to mankind.

This particular story concerning Dr. Lynde was written by Helen Graham Rezatto. I am privileged to know the author, as well as other members of her family. Her father was a very public-spirited person and greatly interested in community, State, and National affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that this story be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE MOST UNFORGETTABLE CHARACTER I'VE MET

(By Helen Graham Rezatto)

"I've got to make a call," Doc Lynde said to me. "Want to come along?"

"Oh, yes, Doc," I cried. All the kids in Ellendale, N. Dak., vied to accompany Doc on his rounds and this time I, a 10-year-old, had beaten out the teenagers.

I delivered the exciting news at home and raced back to Doc's garage. Dr. Roy Lynde loved medicine and machinery in about equal parts, and with his brother Guy had the town's Plymouth-Chrysler agency. It was a two-story brick building with salesroom and service garage on the first floor, Doc Lynde's office and bachelor living quarters on the second.

Doc was waiting for me, and off we rolled over the flat farmlands toward the Coteau-Missouri hills. This was the fall of 1930, and the land was in the grip of the great drought. As we drove through the desolate countryside I saw endless drifts of dust, once topsoil, piled against the fences. Sometimes grasshoppers blanketed the road, and as we drove over them we'd hear a crisp crackling sound and the car would skid a bit. We talked about the drought, about school, and the teachers, about the football team. I talked as if he were 10 years old and he talked as if I were 55. We understood each other perfectly.

Finally we turned in at a farmhouse, and out of it came a man and woman in faded, patched clothes. Inside we found a boy, about my age, in bed. His face, terribly pale because of a blood disease, lit up when he saw us. Doc took his temperature, thumped and poked him, all the time talking about a baseball game he'd seen recently. Finally he poured some pills into an envelope and handed them to the anxious mother.

"You know what's gonna fix you up?" Doc said to the boy, "Frog spit." The boy let out a whoop of delight. "You do what your mom tells you, and when you're strong enough to get outdoors, then you get some frog spit on the middle finger of your right hand, and you'll be fit as a fiddle."

As we were going out through the kitchen I saw the farmer reach up on a shelf for a Mason jar half full of coins. Doc saw this, too, and hustled me out the door. "Next

time," he called over his shoulder, "Next time."

As we roared away Doc grumped, "The damn fool. Last money he had in the world and he wanted to give it away."

Strangers sometimes thought Doc Lynde was a grouch. True, there was a downward set to his month and a bulldog thrust to his chin and he said "hell" and "damn" a good deal, two words not generally employed in our Lutheran and Methodist town. But all you had to do was look at his eyes to see the merriment inside. He was every kid's friend, and the grownups' too.

Doc didn't have office hours; he was available around the clock. The 1,900 people in Ellendale went to bed early, but at any hour of the night in the darkened town you could find one square of light: Doc's window. It told us that he was sleeping lightly, ready to respond to any need. It gave everyone a feeling of security.

Realizing that his appearance at a bedside was good medicine, Doc would make a house call no matter what the distance or difficulties. I remember one January day during a terrible blizzard when the county road foreman stomped into my father's law office, shaking his head in disbelief. "You know what Doc just did? He came into the highway garage and said he had to make a call at the Schmidt farm and wanted me to plow him a way to it. I told him that's a back road and I've got barely enough men to keep the county roads open. Next thing I knew he jumped into one of the plows and took off into the storm. He's got 20 miles to go and he's never handled a snowplow."

"He'll make it," my father said.

He did. And he made it in another storm, too, a few winters later. That time he borrowed a handcar and we watched him head down the railroad tracks, pumping for all he was worth, to see a sick man in the north part of the county. It was midnight before he got home, by the same method.

Doc's bedside manner was unique. He'd enter the sickroom cracking jokes or telling stories, and never give the patient a chance to list his complaints. But all during his monolog he would carefully probe, touch, look, analyze. His theory was that if he ever appeared to take the symptoms seriously, the patient would imagine that he was sicker than he really was.

Actually, Doc's diagnostic skill was amazing, and he was ahead of his time in treatment. He massaged polio victims before Sister Kenny was heard of, and he gave thrombosis patients limited exercise when the rest of the country was giving only bed rest. Hypochondriacs and malingerers received short shrift, however. "Dam it," he'd say to a patient. "I wish I had your heart."

The Lynde garage was an after-school hangout for kids. We delighted in the practical jokes Doc and his cronies played on one another. We laughed when they laughed, and felt grownup. Doc always treated us as if we had good sense and opinions that deserved an audience.

The town's No. 1 sports fan, Doc didn't miss a single high school game if he could help it. When the games were out of town, he'd pile his car full of kids and off we'd go to cheer for Ellendale. When we grew older, Doc would loan us brandnew cars out of the showroom for joy rides and out-of-town games. (He still carries special insurance to cover this.) He never said, "Be careful." He said, "Take her out and see if she's any good." And because he assumed we were responsible, we were.

I never had an accident with one of Doc's cars, but I did with my father's. I wrinkled a fender against a telephone pole, then drove the car to Doc's garage and broke into tears.

"Hell," he said. "You didn't do much damage. We can fix that so your dad will never know."

He and Alvin, his mechanic, went to work on that fender and it came out smooth and shiny, and Dad never did know. No charge, of course.

Ray's Cafe was another hangout, where we went for sodas after school. Whenever Doc happened to drop in, every booth would set up a clamor for him to sit there. One time he paused before the booth where I was jammed in with seven other girls, looked directly at me (I thought) and said, "Damn funny thing. All the kids I deliver turn out to be the best looking."

I blushed with pleasure and pride, then suddenly realized that every girl in the booth had been delivered by him. Still, we each took it personally.

My first really objective view of Doc came after I had gone away to college and returned home for Thanksgiving vacation. Visiting his office, I observed his habit of dipping the thermometer in alcohol, then wiping it on his necktie before putting it in a patient's mouth, and noticed how he allowed Tom, his big striped cat, to sleep in the baby incubator when it was not in use. So what? Nobody ever got sick from the germs on Doc's tie, and no baby objected to Tom's use of the incubator.

I made a few country calls with Doc, but now he had a new systm of priorities; any medical student who was home vacationing had first rights. At least 10 boys from Ellendale were becoming, or had become, doctors because of Doc's inspiration—and often with the help of his cash. Kenneth Leiby was one of the medical students that fall. One morning as I was talking with Ken's mother, Doc's car came down the street. Ken was with him and his face was split with a triumphant grin. Even Doc was allowing himself a small Cheshire-cat smile. Ken jumped out of the car and came racing toward us.

"Do you know what happened?" he cried. "We went on this OB case about 50 miles out in the country, and she delivered at about 6 this morning. Well, Doc has the baby up by the heels and is spanking some wind into it when he turns to me and says, 'I got mine, now go get yours.' Gee, she was having twins—and I delivered a baby. What do you think of that?"

We thought it was pretty wonderful, and no one was prouder than Doc.

After college I married, and in 1943 my husband went off to war leaving me in New York, pregnant. I went to an immaculate, efficient obstetrician with a starched nurse and gleaming equipment, and I hated every minute of it. I wanted an old, cluttered medical office over a garage. I went home. Doc Lynde had delivered me, and it was he who delivered my baby son. With my husband away, it gave me a comforting sense of the continuity of life.

Doc was always there when needed. One afternoon while my father was working in the garden he had a heart attack. Doc was at our house in minutes and this time there were no jokes. Crisply he ordered me, "Run down to the garage and tell Alvin to bring the oxygen tank, the one we've been using to weld broken springs."

When we returned with the tank we found that Doc and my mother had improvised a tent with bed sheets draped over the four-poster and pinned down to the mattress. He inserted the valve of the oxygen tank under the sheets and began turning it on and off by hand. This makeshift arrangement needed constant attention and Doc was on his knees with it for 4 hours straight. He saved my father's life. It was this kind of devoation he gave to every sick man and woman and child in the county.

Despite other heart attacks, my father lived an active life for 9 more years. Then even Doc Lynde could do no more. After my father's funeral the family returned to the bleakness of an empty house. Each sat with his own heavy burden of loss. Suddenly up the sidewalk came Doc. He entered the room briskly, tossed his hat and coat in a corner and said, "Well now, that was a mighty fine speech the minster made about Fred. Don't you think so?"

The text had been from Timothy: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith." Doc grinned at us. "Now, you can't deny it, Fred did have some good fights."

My father had indeed been a strong-willed, rugged individualist. Doc now began to recall his more notable legal and political battles, and we found ourselves smiling, then laughing. Soon we were immersed in wonderful, sustaining memories of the living man. Doc helped us through that first day without our even realizing that we were his patients, that he was prescribing the potent medicine of good memories.

It took our town a long time to discover that Doc was growing old. He was so much a part of our daily lives that we failed to notice the slow accumulation of wrinkles on his face, or that he paused more and more frequently to catch his breath. It was hard to face the fact that one day the beacon light on the second floor of the garage would be extinguished.

Suddenly we all wanted to express to Doc how we felt about him. But how? Then someone thought of giving him a surprise party on his 76th birthday. On that evening he was taken out for an automobile ride. As the car approached the high school Doc saw the drum majorettes standing by the gym and he exclaimed, "Damn it, have I forgotten a game?"

His host suggested they stop and find out. As Doc stepped from the car the majorettes surrounded him and escorted him in. A mighty roar went up from the residents of Ellendale and Dickey County, and then the throng burst into "Happy Birthday." Doc looked stunned and glanced behind him as if to escape, but the drum majorettes were between him and the door. With a sheepish grin on his weatherbeaten face, he took the place of honor at the head table.

There were skits, speeches and gifts. Dr. Kenneth Leiby, the boy who had delivered the twins with Doc and was now a successful general practitioner in New Hope, Pa., had commissioned a large oil portrait of Doc, painted from photographs, which he now presented to the community.

At one point during the speeches the toastmaster said, "Of course, since Doc is a bachelor he has no kids."

"I'm Doc's kid," squeaked a 3-year-old, jumping up.

"I'm Doc's kid," called out a young housewife, standing.

"I'm Doc's kid," boomed the town newspaper editor, rising to his feet.

One by one, people identified themselves until there was a great throng standing. They looked at Doc and he looked back at them and suddenly his chin began to quiver. We had found a way to thank him. Our very existence was our tribute to his skilled and loving hands.

In recent years we've tried to honor Doc in other ways. We built the Dr. Roy Lynde Memorial Nursery section of the county hospital. On the 50th anniversary of the day he began medical practice after graduating from the University of Minnesota, we held a civic holiday with a parade and a doubleheader during which we dedicated the ball park as the Dr. Roy Lynde Memorial Athletic Field.

Today he is 86. The dust in his office is undisturbed, for his instruments are now relics of the past. When he leaves the garage to go to the restaurant for dinner he walks very slowly and, should he falter, a dozen people are at his side. Each night a

different neighbor looks in on him to be certain he's all right. During the week the population of Ellendale parades past his chair in the garage just to say, "Hi, Doc." The mighty force of the love he has given others over the years now returns to range protectively around him.

I look at him and think of all the sick people he's held in his arms, the bills he's forgotten, the jokes he's laughed at, the kids he's spoiled, the kind deeds he's hidden. And I think of the richness he's brought to our town. Each of us has tried to be a little bit like Doc. None of us made it all the way, but we're more understanding and generous and loving than we would have been if he hadn't lived among us.

Could any man hope to accomplish more?

The American Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The American Essay Contest—I," from the Indianapolis Star of April 2, 1961; an editorial entitled "The American Essay Contest—II," from the Indianapolis Star of April 3, 1961; also an editorial entitled "The American Essay Contest," which appeared in the Indianapolis Star on April 4, 1961.

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

THE AMERICAN ESSAY CONTEST—I

We have been both delighted and dismayed by the results of the Star's American Essay Contest—delighted because the winning papers were so excellent, showed thorough preparation, research, good writing, and a clear understanding of the difference between a republic and a democracy—dismayed because the great majority did not.

But in this first editorial on the subject we want to speak of our delight in the job done by the 33 winners and several hundred other entries. These contestants made a real effort to discover the fundamental nature of the two contrasting systems. Most of them gained a fairly clear undertsanding of the obvious differences. As one of the top three winners put it, quoting former Chief Justice John Marshall, "Between a balanced republic and a democracy the difference is like that between order and chaos." Pure democracy, as it was under the Greeks, can become mob rule and usually does. As this same essay reminded us, Christ was crucified because of the democratic vote of a mob incited by the priests. Socrates took the hemlock for much the same reason.

Another of the top three papers made a vitally important point that was missed by so many of the others. Only in a republic are the rights of minorities protected. "In a democracy," this essay said, "the will of the majority suppresses minorities. Each man is equal before the law, but he is not equal in his ability to make the laws." It was for this reason that the Founding Fathers established a republic with the Constitution and Bill of Rights. It was for this reason that they sharply divided the powers of those who govern and left so much authority in the hands of the States—to prevent the centralization of political power so that it could not be seized in time of crisis by tyrants, either elected or imposed. Because they knew from history that this happened in democratic Greece and later in republican Rome, they went even further than the Roman Republic in providing protections for the people from the advent of tyranny.

Another thing that pleased us greatly about the winning papers was the excellent selection of a bibliography for reference. The best papers were uniformly the ones with the best reference works, not only books but also articles and papers like the Federalist Papers. Without a study of a variety of books and other material on the subject, a first-class essay simply is not possible. Not only were the best essays based on good sources, they also showed that what they read was applied in their work.

We are happy that we have received so many letters and calls from students and parents and teachers and others who are pleased that this American essay contest has stimulated a real interest among our high school students in the principles of American government. One contest winner's father came in to tell us that his son had now decided to make the study of government his main academic concern because of his experience in preparing his essay.

Finally we were very much encouraged to note that even in those papers that did not measure up, the ones that showed poor preparation and weakness in understanding, the participants were eager to learn about their country's institutions. They clearly showed their pride and gratitude for being Americans. They appreciate the liberty and the opportunity that the American way of life offers them.

Certainly the results of the American Essay Contest have been worth all of the time, effort, and money spent. The Star is proud of our young students and especially proud of those winners who did such a splendid job.

THE AMERICAN ESSAY CONTEST—II

Yesterday we said we were both delighted and dismayed at the results of the American essay contest sponsored by the Star. A minority of high school students did do a good job of differentiating between a democracy and a republic. That delighted us. But what dismayed us was that the majority did not. Their essays were, in many cases, simply almost word for word repeats of part of what they read in two encyclopedias, the Brittanica and the Americana. Some who added other books to their reference list plainly either did not read them or did not understand what they read. A great many showed by their essays that they had virtually no training in formal essay writing. In fact one teacher who wrote us said that this was the first chance her class had to write a formal essay. This astonished us.

And so did some of the conclusions reached by the students. Let us quote some: "There are many more people who immigrate from their republican form of government to our democratic government, than emigrate from our democratic government to a republican form of government [sic]."

"Republics fail to recognize the dignity and worth of the individual."

"I believe that our Government has gone through a great change. We have grown from a small colonial nation, which persecuted the minority, through our democratic and republican stages of government, and we are now entering what could be the answer—the socialistic stage. Could it be that this type of socialism is the same socialism that Russia is seeking so unsuccessfully?"

"I have always been taught that we live in a democracy. I can see now that this statement is not always true."

"What is the difference between a democracy and a republic? It really never occurred to me or probably to anyone else."

"In a republic a change of authority generally is begun or ended with riots."

"A democracy believes in more responsibility for economic conditions of the country by the government, and republics believe [sic] that most economic decisions should be left to private companies and to the people themselves."

"A republic, in my eyes, is a state led by a dictator and his own self-appointed people. The people can't go to bed at night without fear of bodily harm."

"A democracy is people working for themselves in free enterprises and paying taxes to local and State governments, for support, in proportion to what they earn. Therefore, the United States is an example of a democracy and the Soviet Union is an example of a republic."

These quoted ideas ran through hundreds of the essays we read. What conclusions should we draw from this?

First we must conclude that in many Indiana schools children are not taught the difference between a republic and a democracy, and their history or government books do not explain it.

Second in many schools essay writing is not required in English or other courses.

Third, in many schools students are taught that the United States is a democracy and not a republic despite the words of the pledge of allegiance and the history of the founding of the Republic.

No wonder so many students wrote that they hadn't considered the question before because "it really never occurred to me."

It seems clear, therefore, that school boards and principals and teachers should take a second look at the books they use and the courses that are taught about the Government of the United States. As we said, the majority of the entries do not show any understanding of the difference, which simply means that they were never taught the difference.

When asked about the results of the Constitutional Convention Benjamin Franklin replied, "We have given you a republic if you can keep it."

How can we keep it if we don't know what it is?

So what must the student do to make a clear distinction between a republic and a democracy? If he is not taught it in school he has to go outside to fundamental sources. Reading "The Federalist" papers, of course, would be instructive. But there are many books on the subject. For instance, Felix Morley's "Freedom and Federalism" is an excellent sourcebook. Morley, a political philosopher, journalist, and student of government, points out that the United States was conceived as a Federal Republic deliberately designed to limit democracy and avoid dictatorship. Quoting John Adams he writes, "There never was a democracy that did not commit suicide." He adds that democracy "was certainly not the system these men were supporting for the United States." And, "The theory of check and balance, as superimposed on our Federal structure, was derived from the writings of the French philosopher Montesquieu and has no relation whatever to the English political tradition."

Students preparing essays for the "American Essay Contest" should begin first with pondering the roots of the word "republic." It comes from the Latin res publica—meaning public things or something belonging to the people. If a government belongs to the people it cannot be either a dictatorship or a Communist state, for in those states the people clearly belong to the government.

We hope that teachers, students, and parents will all take to heart the lessons learned in this first "American Essay Contest." It has

been most gratifying to know that some of the students have come to learn well the distinction between a republic and a democracy. It has been useful to learn that many others, the majority, do not. For now that unfortunate situation can be corrected by students, teachers, and book publishers alike.

Santayana once wrote that "people who don't know history are bound to repeat it." If Americans don't know the nature of their own government, they are bound to lose it.

THE AMERICAN ESSAY CONTEST—III

In our second editorial on the Star's "American Essay Contest" we revealed that the majority of students competing either did not know or had only a vague idea of the difference between a republic and a democracy. The reason for this is quite clear. They are not taught the difference in their history or government courses in many schools. The references they used, chiefly two encyclopedias, the Americana and the Britannica, gave them only what might be termed the "modern" interpretation of the two concepts of government—which is most confusing.

This interpretation, used particularly by the Encyclopaedia Americana, classifies any government which calls itself a republic as a republic. We don't know why the Americana doesn't also claim the same for democracies, for the Soviet Union calls itself a republic, but it also calls its captive states "people's democracies." It should be clear to anyone who has studied the history of the American Republic and the Roman republic and also the government of the socialist Soviet Union that the Soviet Union is neither democratic nor republican. But the Encyclopaedia Americana states that there are three kinds of republics: "(1) democratic republics of the West," "(2) states officially designated as republics although they are in point of fact military or junta dictatorships." "(3) the Communist republics." Thus the average high school student would conclude, if this is his only source, that a republic can be a dictatorship or a Communist state, which is nonsense.

The Encycloaedia Britannica does not go nearly as far in making this distinction. It states, "The insistence that a republic is not synonymous with democracy either as direct democracy or as absolute majoritarian democracy, but rather as synonymous with constitutional democracy is correct in the specific U.S. context, though that usage is a narrowing of the wider use of the term to denote any nonmonarchial regime."

Of course any "nonmonarchial regime" could be a Communist state, and the student could conclude from this definition that outside of the United States a Communist regime could be a republic.

This kind of definition dilutes and destroys the true meaning of the word "republic" until it has no clear meaning at all.

Lift From Bootstrap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a well deserved editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, April 2, entitled "Lift From Bootstrap." It is an endorsement of the nomination of Mr. Teodor Moscoso, the former director of development in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, to be Ambassador from the United States to Venezuela. I am certain that Mr. Moscoso and President Romulo Betancourt will be able, together, to work toward improving the economic and political conditions in that important country, which is obviously so necessitous, and whose freedom and economic strength are so important to the Western Hemisphere.

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

LIFT FROM BOOTSTRAP

Teodoro Moscoso, who has been designated as U.S. Ambassador to Venezuela, is a singularly able economic planner and a likeable public servant. He is also a Puerto Rican. In some Latin American capitals, where the myth persists that Puerto Rico is an unhappy colony, the appointment of Mr. Moscoso may be regarded mistakenly as a diplomatic slight. We think that President Kennedy was right in feeling that the merits of the appointment are well worth the risk.

It is understandable that some Latin Americans are confused about Puerto Rico's status—it is sometimes perplexing to a continental. Although Puerto Ricans are citizens of the United States, they have freely chosen commonwealth status. If Puerto Rico wanted independence, there is little doubt that the request would be granted. But the islanders themselves have voted to remain within the Federal system as a self-governing commonwealth.

No one is better qualified to explain Puerto Rico's unique status than Teodoro Moscoso. As the administrator of "Operation Bootstrap," he can give first-hand testimony on how the island has benefited from its status and has managed to double living standards in a generation. No less important, he can make clear that there has been no loss of dignity or of liberty under the island's elective government.

Puerto Rico's experience under "Operation Bootstrap" is a precious resource that can be profitably used in other countries facing similar problems of growth. But before the resource is employed, the myth of Puerto Rican servitude must be exploded. One way to do this is to appoint more islanders in a variety of posts until the service of Puerto Ricans is taken for granted.

Mr. Kennedy has already named Dr. Arturo Morales Carrion as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State. The assignment of Mr. Moscoso to Venezeula is all the more welcome because it will hasten the time when further appointments will become matter of course.

Opportunities for Use of Retired Persons in Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Not Try This?" which appeared in the Indianapolis Star, Thursday, March 30, 1961.

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

WHY NOT TRY THIS?

Since the United States apparently is going to have a Peace Corps, complete with a Kennedy kinsman at its helm, the suggestion of Forest M. Shafer of this city deserves serious consideration. More than a month ago, he came up with the sound idea that retired persons be used as ambassadors of free enterprise in under-developed areas.

He broached the plan to Dr. Cleo Blackburn, director of the board for fundamental education, also of this city. Dr. Blackburn said, "It is my opinion that these mature senior citizens might provide a much more stabilized leadership in guiding people in underdeveloped countries than young people." There shouldn't be any serious argument with that statement.

Retired citizens, who wished to join the Peace Corps, could certainly serve as counterweights for some of the more enthusiastic young folks who undoubtedly will find their way into the organization. By the simple exercise of experience gathered over a lifetime, the older men and women would have knowledge and skill readily available without training. They could, if they wished, work in foreign nations at salaries under the figure which the Government has been accustomed to pay "career workers" in this field.

The retired man or woman will not have to learn about America or the free enterprise system of business from a textbook. He will know. The lives of the older citizens will be a human reflection of what the American system can do for its people.

As long as the New Frontier is looking for new ideas, this seems to be much sounder that the original plan which drew so much uncritical applause from the colleges of the land. Peace is not the prerogative of youth, but rather of advancing years. The President should think seriously about asking retired Americans to aid in the Peace Corps.

A Crusader Against Government Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, Delawareans are proud of the senior Senator from Delaware, JOHN WILLIAMS, and his continuing fight for economy in Government.

I commend to my colleagues in the Senate an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 2 by Victor Wilson which tells the story of Senator WILLIAMS' crusade against Government waste.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

A CRUSADER AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE

(By Victor Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—Members of the Senate are waiting with anticipation—tinged with just a bit of apprehension—for its strongest foe of waste in Government spending to unveil his latest finds in that field.

That Senator is JOHN JAMES WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware.

Though he helps to represent the second smallest State in the Union, there is nothing puny about Senator WILLIAMS' unrelenting campaign for economy in spending the taxpayers' money and against its misuse.

It shouldn't be long now before the gentleman from Delaware speaks out. An associate confirms that the Senator has a number of private investigations underway, and it's just a question of time until one of them jells firmly enough for him to provide details publicly.

The reason there is just a bit of apprehension among Senator WILLIAMS' colleagues about what he might disclose is their knowledge that he plays no favorites.

His next target could just as well be an influential constituent of a Senator or Representative, as the Pentagon, the Agriculture Department, the Internal Revenue Service, or the Federal Maritime Board. All have felt the whiplash of his senatorial indignation at one time or another.

The nature of Senator WILLIAMS' political courage is well illustrated by a vote of his a couple of years ago. His home State has frequently been called "The Du Pont Duchy." However, when a bill came up in the Senate beneficially affecting that giant company's interests—but failed to square with the Senator's conscience—he unhesitatingly voted against it.

At the last session of Congress Senator WILLIAMS spelled out in detail, on the Senate floor, the probable loss of millions because of the President's penchant for negotiating defense contracts with individual firms instead of calling for free-for-all bids.

Later in the session he told Senate colleagues how a group of westerners bought up some virtually worthless swampland, did a bit of crop-planting to "create a record," then quietly put it in the soil bank and collected Federal fees for not planting more crops there.

Wherever there's waste, or a lack of economy, one usually finds Senator WILLIAMS poking into it. Two years ago he revealed that one company collected $14 million in one year from the Government for storing surplus crops and another more than $13 million for the same purpose.

Three years ago he tried but failed to bar free, or cut-rate, trips on Government-subsidized vessels for Federal officials and Members of Congress. Last year he tried, but failed again, to require all Congressmen traveling in this country or abroad on Federal business to submit detailed expense accounts.

Way back in 1951, however, he had a bill passed making the salaries and expense funds of Presidents, Vice Presidents, and Congressmen liable to income tax, minus only legitimate business expenses. He declared that the previous practice of making the expense funds nontaxable favored these officials over ordinary citizens.

The value of a dollar came to Senator WILLIAMS early as the 9th in a family of 11 children. He was born May 17, 1904, on a Frankford, Del., farm and attended that community's grammar and high schools.

At 18 he struck out for himself, moving to nearby Millsboro, Del., and starting a chicken farm and a feed and grain business. He still lives there and still runs the farm and business, with his brother's help.

He got his first political experience on the town council of Millsboro (population about 1,000). In 1946, to use his own words, he became "fed up" with what was going on in Washington, particularly continuation of price controls by the Truman administration. He decided to make a bid for a Senate seat.

He ran against New Deal Senator JAMES M. TUNNELL, pushing hard on the issue of Federal controls on the national economy, and trounced him, 62,603 to 50,910. He took his Senate seat January 3, 1947, was reelected in 1952 and again in 1958.

Even before he went to the Senate, Senator WILLIAMS began to suspect something was wrong in the Internal Revenue Service because of a rather involved incident in his own bailiwick. In 1951 he helped expose corruption, fraud, and bribery in that agency. Sixty-one officials quit, resigned, or were indicted in the scandal. It's one of the Senator's proudest trophies.

Senator WILLIAMS has good sources of information as ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee and as a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-Essential Expenditures. He also watches General Accounting Office reports, which check Federal outlays.

Married, with one daughter and three grandchildren, Senator WILLIAMS likes hunting, when he finds time. He's also rather proud of the fact that he makes the AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education list of least desirable legislators as frequently as any Republican Senator.

States' Rights and Federal Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why States' Rights?" which appeared in the Indianapolis News, Tuesday March 28, 1961.

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

WHY STATES' RIGHTS?

Last week a letterwriter challenged the News on its continued defense of States' rights. Surveying some of the absurdities and malfeasances of the late legislature, the reader said:

"These, then, are the clowns to whom the News and others would relegate our destinies. You go on preaching States' rights and the evils of the Federal Government. As for me, I am willing to pay a little more and take my chances with Washington." As we see it, the point is a good one to raise—not because it disproves the case for States' rights, but because it establishes it.

The reader, who signs himself "Servetus," seems to think that, in some way, the same legislators who are "clowns" in Indiana become statesmen when they are transported to Washington; that an agency, government, which acts foolishly when we are close to it, acts wisely when we are far away from it; that, by increasing size and distance, government gains in virtue.

As it develops, exactly the opposite is true. Government is government at all levels—an instrument of compulsion, wielded by fallible men. When it becomes more distant from us, and more complicated in its workings, it does not lose any of its flaws. The only real difference is in the ability of the voter—such as our irate reader—to keep tabs on what is going on. Thus when government acts absurdly in Indianapolis, it is recognized as being absurd. But when it acts absurdly in Washington, it is either pictured as too much a matter for "experts" for the average citizen to understand, or else labeled "confidential."

Granted, hula dancers and a lost thoroughfare bill are ridiculous. But what about building roads in Laos that don't lead anywhere, or uninhabited apartment houses in Lebanon? What about misestimating Federal road costs by $1 million a mile? Or a farm program that pays farmers to produce and not to produce—and has piled up $9 billion in surpluses? Or Federal aid programs which "help" us by selling us dollars at $1.87 apiece?

Could anything be more ridiculous than these actions by our Federal Government? Yet, because that Government is distant from us, we have accepted these and other absurdities as a matter of course. To make the point specific, let us consider two instances involving increased taxes—at the State level, and at the Federal level.

There was considerable unhappiness when Governor Welsh proposed a reduction in the gross income tax exemption. The change would have raised Indiana taxes by about $9 million a year. No one, including Democratic legislators, wanted any part of it, and the proposal never got off the ground.

Now look at the Federal level. President Kennedy proposed, and Congress passed, an unemployment compensation bill that will raise Indiana's taxes by $28 million. The measure passed with hardly a ripple of protest, and our taxes will go up to pay for it.

Why did no one protest this tax increase, after all the outcry against Welsh's program? The answer seems clear enough. The Federal proposal was so distant, and its mechanics so unfamiliar, that many people did not realize they were being asked to accept a tax increase. The remoteness of the Federal Government makes it seem like a cornucopia of subsidies—benefits which somehow do not have to be paid for. At the State level, this fiction cannot be maintained.

It is precisely for this reason that we prefer to keep government close to home, where the people can control it.

Economic Losses in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Make the Break Complete," published in the Miami News, of March 15, 1961. I commend the editorial to the reading of all Members of Congress.

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

MAKE THE BREAK COMPLETE

The Miami News believes that if the United States continues to pour $70 to $80 million a year into Cuba, our Government is abetting Cuba's leaders in their avowed purpose of spreading communism throughout Latin America.

Fidel Castro's vituperative reaction to President Kennedy's proposed 10-point plan for the revitalization of Latin America is simply another in a long line of Castro insults to the people of the United States.

These insults we have endured, and we would continue to endure them if we thought there were any hope that economic relations would be of benefit to the Cuban people. There is on longer basis for such hope.

Continued purchase of products from Cuba can only prolong the tyranny in which the Cuban people are held.

We doubt that many Americans realize as well as we in south Florida that when this country stopped buying Cuban sugar, only about two-thirds of Cuba's exports to the United States were eliminated. Some 3 million pounds of Cuban fruit, vegetables, molasses, and tobacco still enter U.S. ports each week. Florida markets alone contribute $25 million annually to what remains of the Cuban economy.

Our own economic losses have been fantastic since the Castro regime came to power in January 1959. Millions of dollars in American property have been nationalized, and there is no hope that Castro will ever fulfill his promise of repayment.

All this from a regime that has ground to dust the basic democratic freedoms enjoyed by so many in this hemisphere and sought by so many others.

Hospitality for Foreign Visitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, on several occasions recently I have discussed on the floor of the Senate the need for a Host Corps here at home in the United States. This Host Corps would provide hospitality, guidance, and helpful reception for foreign visitors in conjunction with our newly accelerated efforts to improve the tourist industry within our country.

The American Bar Association has written to me acknowledging its interest in this project and describing its own efforts to further international understanding.

The American Bar Association's hospitality work among foreigners visiting our shores is to be highly commended and so that all may read of its endeavors, I ask unanimous consent that the association's letter to me be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1961.

Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: I have read with interest your remarks in the March 1961 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding hospitality for foreign visitors. The work of the American Bar Association and of the many lawyers on the local level in this field may be of interest to you.

Recognizing the need for making proper contacts for the many foreign lawyers and judges who visit this country, the association has established a special committee on relations with lawyers of other nations, composed of members in each State. The Washington office of the association acts as a clearinghouse for information about foreign visitors by maintaining liaison with embassies, the State Department and private organizations which arrange itineraries for the visiting lawyers. The special committee of the association has held a series of luncheons in Washington for representatives of the various Embassies to impress upon them the desire of the lawyers in this country to assist in making the proper contacts for visting lawyers and judges. This activity has been warmly received by Embassy officials. We make an effort to contact lawyers and judges in every community to be visited by the foreign lawyer. The success of this activity is evidenced by the comments of our foreign visitors after their stay in the United States.

The association is doing a great deal of other work to further international understanding. The annual meeting in Washington last August at which we had as our guests some 1,400 solicitors and barristers and their families from Great Britain, was perhaps the largest undertaking of its type by any voluntary association. The American Bar Association and some State and local bar associations are carrying on projects to collect modern lawbooks for the universities and courts of foreign countries. You may also have read that the association has now established a special committee to cooperate with Cuban lawyers in exile.

The nationwide observance of Law Day is one of the most extensive public relations projects of its type undertaken by voluntary associations. By action of the Congress, May 1 of each year has now been designated Law Day U.S.A. The purpose of Law Day is to foster an increased respect for law, to encourage responsible citizenship and to make more meaningful to Americans of all ages their inheritance of "freedom under law" and in doing so to point out the contrast between the great principle and the subordination of human rights under communism. This observance has international effect in that speeches are broadcast behind the Iron Curtain by the Voice of America, Law Day materials are sent to foreign countries, and Law Day observances are held in some nations.

An extensive program is being carried out by our world peace through law committee to crystalize the ideas of leading lawyers of the world as to effective steps that can be taken toward the establishment of the international rule of law to bring about an orderly conduct of relations between countries. In the pursuit of this objective continental conferences are scheduled for lawyers of the Americas, of Asia, of Africa and of Europe sponsored by the American Bar Association Special Committee on World Peace Through Law with funds supplied by the Ford Foundation and the International Cooperation Administration. The continental conference will have the participation of the national bar associations of 23 nations in the Americas, 19 participating associations of Asia, 29 participating associations in Europe, and in Africa delegates from 33 nations. The continental conferences are to be exploratory and educational in character, with the purpose of helping to lay a proper foundation for a world conference of lawyers. The first conference is that of the Americas and is scheduled to be held in San Jose, Costa Rica, on June 11–14, 1961, and the second, the Asian Conference is scheduled for Tokyo, Japan, on September 17–20, 1961. Plans for the European and African conferences are yet to be finalized.

Through these activities many American lawyers are striving to bring about a better understanding throughout the world of our system of law and justice.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD E. CHANNELL,
Director, Washington Office.

Espionage Activities by the Kremlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 6, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Moscow's U–2," which appeared in the Indianapolis News, Tuesday, March 28, 1961.

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

Moscow's U–2

A sardonic footnote to the London spy trial would be good for a laugh if it did not so deeply expose the Western World's potentially fatal loss of will.

The footnote is this:

A lawyer for the defense of two of the spies disclosed that "U–2" was the designation of one of the hiding places used by the group convicted of employing elaborate equipment and methods to send secret submarine data from London to Moscow.

The Kremlin made an unholy fuss last year about the reconnaissance flights over Russia by the American plane designated U–2. Khrushchev and all the little Khrushchevs of the world threw up their hands in mock horror. A "summit" conference was wrecked. A President of the United States was humiliated. Further flights by the remarkably effective U–2 were canceled, a wrongheaded decision that has the hearty endorsement of the current President.

So perhaps the Slavic funnybones of the Kremlin agents involved in setting up the London espionage stakeout were tickled by the idea of naming one of their activities "U–2." Last year the Khrushchev gang obviously got a great wallop out of the way their very mention of the term "U–2" produced twitches of guilt in westerners who still believe we must court world opinion by going skunkhunting in top hats.

Despite legends to the contrary, Britons have a sense of humor. We hope they will find the disclosure of the London espionage hideout arrangement named "U–2" worthy of both a self-deprecating smile and a reappraisal of the way some of them carried on in protest against "those warlike Americans" after the original U–2 episode.

Espionage, as both Britons and Americans should know, is a two-way street. The enemy travels his way with determination and effectiveness. We of the West should do the same and not be detoured by spurious shrieks of "warmongering" from the Kremlin and from the faint of heart.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Now That the President Has Asked the Congress To Provide Federal Aid for Public Schools He Should Also Ask the Congress To Modernize the Tax Structure in Order That Citizens May More Easily Give Financial Aid to Private and Public Educational Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, along with all other Americans I am deeply concerned over the financial plight of private educational institutions in our country. Now that the President has asked the Congress to provide Federal aid for public schools he has a clear moral responsibility to ask the Congress to modernize the tax structure in order that citizens may more easily give financial aid to private and public educational institutions in accordance with their own wishes.

As a member of the American Association of School Administrators, a former superintendent of public schools, and as ranking minority member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I feel that the present educational misunderstanding need not have arisen, that it is serving no useful purpose, and that it is divisive at a time when unity of our people is more vital than at any previous period in our history.

Historically, financial support for American education has had two major facets: Public support for public education, and private giving for public and private education, the latter assisted by wise tax laws.

The new Democratic administration would have the Congress provide major benefits for public education but refuses to take, at the same time, the steps necessary to provide the essential tax reforms which would make possible private giving of the magnitude required by private education at this time in our history and without which it cannot and will not long survive.

Aid to public and private education through the tax route is as historic and as constitutionally sound as are Federal contributions to public education.

Private education is the leaven of our educational system, and democratic government such as we have always known in America cannot possibly long survive the disappearance of private education from the American scene.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 5673, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide funds for educational purposes by providing increased incentives for private giving through the allowance of a tax credit for charitable contributions to educational institutions, and to allow a deduction for tuition and other expenses incurred by a taxpayer or his spouse or dependent at an educational institution.

I was highly pleased when the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK] praised my bill recently and pointed out that a study of his own legislative record would show that he had sponsored and worked for similar legislation since coming to the Congress.

The approach to the problem of financing education represented in my bill, H.R. 5673, is clearly nonpartisan and my mail, which is coming in from all sections of the country, proves that it is a bill which is popular with, and appeals to, all segments of our people.

The Clark-Morse plan for Federal loans to private education is a blind alley and American leaders in the field of private education should waste no more time on it. If grants to private schools are illegal, as President Kennedy says they are, then the loans which the Clark-Morse plan would provide are equally illegal.

Senator CLARK, apparently, is really trying to solve, with his educational loan bill, his personal political problem in Pennsylvania where Democratic Congressman WILLIAM GREEN, if he chooses to enter the senatorial campaign next year, will certainly beat him soundly. It may well be doubted if the Clark-Morse plan was really seriously designed to solve the dilemma which has developed over the growing financial needs of private education in our country.

Our private school educators should mobilize to support my bill, H.R. 5673, and the other bills, to modernize and update the tax structure of our Nation, which are gathering dust in the files of the House Ways and Means Committee.

The other educational advisers to the new Democratic administration are no more sound—if we are to judge by their recommendations in the field of education, and how else can we judge them—than Senator CLARK and Senator MORSE. Some of these advisers are grossly misleading the American people on the educational issue. Their approach to American education, by tackling at this time only one-half of the problem, is grievously dividing our people. This situation, I fear, will get worse before it gets better. These advisers should stop insisting that the appropriation of tax money by the Federal Government is the only legal way to help American education.

They are completely ignoring the role which tax incentives, provided by a modernized and updated tax structure, could play in providing, without any possibility of Federal control, and without the appropriation of a single cent of tax revenues, the funds necessary to adequately finance private education in the United States.

A half-truth is worse than no truth at all. I as astounded that the new Democratic administration should be so busily engaged in trying to sell the American people a half-truth. The entire performance of these New Frontiersmen regarding education is definitely misleading and devisive, because they refuse to take up, concurrently with their drive for Federal aid to public education, the equally pressing financial problems of private education. Division of the American people over any issue—and especially such a totally unnecessary issue—is morally wrong. And, unless decisive steps are taken to end this growing educational misunderstanding, the Democratic administration may entirely lose its school bill.

At his press conference on March 15, President Kennedy was asked what his position was regarding the proposals for modernizing the tax structure and to provide tax incentives for private giving to education which were before the Congress, especially to view of the fact that His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman had endorsed the tax approach to aiding private education.

The President replied that:

I think all of this matter should be examined carefully by the Congress. The Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE, has asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to send him up a brief on all of the various kinds of assistance which are given to nonpublic schools and colleges, which the Secretary is preparing to do. The committees then of the House and Senate, and the House of Representatives, can consider what kind of program they wish to put forward and at that time we can consider what the constitutional problems might be. But it is very difficult as new proposals are made for me or for anyone else to be giving constitutional opinions on each of them as they come up, without seeing the definite language. That obvious is not my function. I would be glad to have the departments of Government participate in considering these matters with the Congress. But my view on procedures which I hope the Congress will follow are well known. I am hopeful we can get the program which we sent to the Hill out of the way. Then the Congress will have to consider what it wants to do in this other area. And the administration will be delighted to cooperate. But I could not possibly, unless I saw exactly what kind of language, give even a private opinion as to its constitutionality.

In his March 28, 1961, report to Senator WAYNE MORSE, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abra-

ham Ribicoff, bypassed entirely, private giving to education and the historic tax route by which private giving to education has been encouraged by the Federal Government, to which the President had referred on March 15.

Yet the President, on March 15, as I have noted stated that:

The Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE, has asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to send him up a brief on all of the various kinds of assistance which are given to nonpublic schools and colleges, which the Secretary is preparing to do.

Because the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare did not make any reference to the tax route aids to education written into the Internal Revenue Code I have taken certain definite steps which I trust will remedy this deficiency.

I asked two of Secretary Ribicoff's top aides to meet with me in my office on Tuesday, April 4, to discuss this glaring oversight.

Jim G. Akin, Congressional Liaison Officer of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Philip DesMarais, assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, conferred with me for an hour and a half on April 4, and promised to make a study of the entire subject to private giving to education now provided under the tax laws, and to furnish this report to me.

As I have said, the President declared, at his March 15 press conference, that he—

would be glad to have the departments of Government participate in considering these matters with the Congress.

Since the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is already hard at work on these matters, the President should now request the Department of the Treasury and Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon to study and report "on all of the various kinds of assistance which are given to nonpublic schools and colleges" in the special field of Federal tax policy.

In other words, now that the President has asked the Congress to provide Federal aid for public education he cannot continue to ignore his responsibility to ask the Congress to modernize the tax structure in order to increase private giving to private and public education. For, clearly, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Ribicoff, is at a grave disadvantage in reporting on taxes and tax incentives, a subject which is so clearly in the province of the Treasury Department, and the Treasury Department is most unlikely to report favorably on any tax bill to aid education until the President requests it to do so.

I am taking the statement of the President of March 15 at its face value, and, for my part, have asked the House Ways and Means Committee to request reports on my bill, H.R. 5673, from the Treasury Department, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Bureau of the Budget.

I want at this time to thoroughly endorse the study in depth of the educational problem by leading educators from both the public and private educational fields meeting together for this purpose. Such a conference was suggested in the debate over the Columbia Broadcasting System on April 6 in which the participants were Msgr. F. G. Hochwalt, head of the education department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Dr. Oswald C. J. Hoffmann, director of information of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, and Howard K. Smith, CBS news chief. If such a conference is held the tax approach to the financial needs of American education outlined in my bill, H.R. 5673, will surely be one of the major recommendations to come out of such a meeting. It is extremely doubtful, however, if the Clark-Morse bill would even get to first base at such a conference.

H.R. 5673 provides the same kind of privileged giving status to millions of Americans which is presently being provided in the Internal Revenue Code to those few Americans in the highest income bracket. At the present time it costs a person in the 91-percent income tax bracket—$400,000 a year and up—only $9 to give $100 to education. It costs the rest of us, on an ascending scale, up to $80 to give a $100 to education.

The Democrats, whose hearts always bleed for the little fellow, as they continually remind us, certainly ought to be wholeheartedly in favor of my tax incentive plan to encourage private giving to education. In fact, some tax incentives are already provided in the Internal Revenue Code for private giving to American education and it can be readily demonstrated that both major parties have supported and voted for this type of Federal aid to education through the years.

I include, as part of my remarks, a summary of the changes in deductions permitted for charitable contributions to education from 1917 to 1957. This summary appears in a study prepared in 1958 for the American Association for the Advancement of Science by the Surveys & Research Corp., of Washington, D.C. This information was supplied by the Internal Revenue Service.

The tax approach set forth in my bill is in line with recommendations advanced by such organizations as the Association of American Colleges, American Association for the Advancement of Science, U.S. Chamber of Commerce's Education Committee, National Planning Association, American College Public Relations Association, American Alumni Council, and the Council for Financial Aid to Education.

The summary follows:

Summary of changes in deduction permitted for charitable contributions and in standard deduction, Federal income tax laws, 1917–57

Income year	Maximum deduction permitted for charitable contributions [1]	Standard deduction
1917–40	15 percent of net income computed without benefit of personal exemptions and contributions.	None.
1941	Same	Tax reduced by 10 percent on gross income under $3,000 in lieu of deduction.
1942–43	15 percent of net income computed without benefit of personal exemption, contributions, and medical expense deduction.	6 percent of gross income for gross under $3,000.
1944–47	15 percent of adjusted gross income	10 percent of adjusted gross income up to a maximum of $500.
1948–51	Same	10 percent of adjusted gross income up to a maximum of $1,000.
1952–53	20 percent of adjusted gross income	Same.
1954–55	20 percent of adjusted gross income plus an additional 10 percent for contributions to churches, tax-exempt hospitals, and educational institutions.	Same.
1956–57	Same as for 1955, but the additional 10 percent can include contributions to medical research organizations.	Same.

[1] Applicable, except for a few individuals who during the years 1924–57 qualified for unlimited deductions for charitable contributions. (See sec. 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and corresponding sections of earlier revenue acts for a complete treatment of this feature of the tax laws.)

Source: Communication, Treasury Department, Internal Revenue Service.

Father Eusebio Francisco Kino

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in 1962, Arizona will have much to celebrate—not that she is not possessed of these opportunities every year, but 1962 becomes a special one. First, we shall have been a State for 50 years. At the same time, we shall have been a member of the Union for 100 years. In addition, we shall celebrate rightly the 50th anniversary of my senior colleague [Mr. HAYDEN] in the Congress of the United States.

With all of these things to be grateful for, one could not imagine a State so rich in memory that she could possess even more. But 1962 will also be the 250th anniversary of the passing of Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, the illustrious Catholic priest who brought religion into what is now the United States, by building the string of missions for which the Far West is famed, beginning at Guevavi, and being topped by his most famous mission, San Xavier del Bac. A delightful article about Father Kino appears in the March issue of the Catholic Digest; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

FIRST RIDER OF THE DEVIL'S HIGHWAY

(By Weldon F. Heald)

March 15, 1961, marks the 250th anniversary of the death of Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, who penetrated the arid wilderness of northern Sonora and southern Arizona and almost singlehandedly planted the seeds of civilization there. Where Father Kino went, divided highways now follow. The heroic black-robed Jesuit looms large in our American past as a champion of God and as a man of action.

But what is planned by way of celebration on March 15 to honor our most distinguished founding father? I decided to find out. I could visualize a color-splashed series of pageants, Indian ceremonials, Mexican fiestas, and religious services—even perhaps a commemorative stamp issued by the Post Office Department; 1961 would be a Kino year in Arizona, for sure.

The Tucson area was the scene of much of the great padre's spiritual and temporal labors, so I called on five organizations which represent the religious, cultural, economic, and tourist activities of the city. At the first I was told that they knew of no plans whatever. The priest at San Xavier del Bac, Kino's most famous mission, said no particular observances had been scheduled. The mission is now Franciscan. At St. Augustine's Cathedral they said that it was too early to know; and at the fourth place I was informed that nothing had been planned.

I called the office of the tourist organization, and the personable young secretary offered to help me—but as she had never heard of Kino, she said she would have her boss call me back as soon as he returned.

But this indifference shouldn't have surprised me. It's typical. The sole "Kino" listed in encyclopedias is an astringent drug obtained in East India. And only three rather insignificant southwestern geographical features are named for him: Kino Bay and Puerto Kino on the Sonora Coast of the Gulf of California and the 4,200-foot Kino peak in southern Arizona's Growler Range.

North of the border there is but a single modest monument raised to Kino's memory. It stands unobtrusively in a little park back of Tucson's City Hall. The memorial was erected in 1936, and consists of an oblong block of dark lava rocks, with a bronze plaque showing Father Kino striding across the desert in his long robes, led by an Indian boy. The artist must have been unaware of the fact that he was depicting the tireless Padre on Horseback, whose equestrian exploits equaled or surpassed those of the best cowpokes who ever raised Arizona dust.

In fact, for more than two centuries the name of Kino and his activities in the Southwest were more legend than history. No picture or likeness of him had survived; no book had been written on his life; no exhaustive studies made of his remarkable achievements, nor any detailed chronicle of what he had actually accomplished. While Coronado, de Anza, and Father Serra grew in fame, Father Kino's brilliant light became dimmer as the years went by.

Then suddenly in the 1930's three eminent historians clearly revealed the true greatness and commanding stature of this extraordinary missioner, explorer, scholar, and empire builder.

They were the University of Arizona's Frank C. Lockwood, Herbert E. Bolton of the University of California, and Peter Masten Dunne at the University of Santa Clara. As early as 1919 Professor Bolton translated and edited the padre's own narrative as Kino's Historical Memoir of Pimeria Alta. This monumental two-volume work gives a description of the topography, plant and animal life, and natives of northern Sonora and southern Arizona.

Pimeria Alta—the upper country of the Pima Indians—was Kino's vast field of activity. It stretched 250 miles east to west and 200 miles from the Gila River southward.

But the two popular and definitive books on Kino are Lockwood's "With Padre Kino on the Trail," published in 1934, and Bolton's "Rim of Christendom," which appeared 2 years later. Both are based upon thorough research among original sources, and Bolton personally followed Kino's trails and visited the sites of all his missions. They make fascinating reading for those interested in the background of the desert Southwest. Father Dunne's contribution was to place Kino accurately in the long procession of Jesuits who carried the cross through the barbarian lands of northern Mexico to the shores of the Pacific in Baja California.

Because of this historical triple grand slam, we now know almost every detail of Kino's life.

He was born on August 10, 1645, of German-Italian background, in the little Tirolese hill town of Segno, 18 miles north of Trent, Italy. The Italian form of his name is Chini, and members of his family still live in the community.

Young Eusebio was well educated, having attended five south German universities. His proficiency in mathematics gained him the offer of a professorship at Freiburg. But after an illness and wondrous recovery, he adopted Francis Xavier, apostle of the Indies, as his patron saint, and entered the Society of Jesus in 1665. From then on he burned with unquenchable missionary zeal and constantly petitioned superiors for assignment to the wild frontiers of Christianity.

Kino's wish was finally granted, and he sailed from Cadiz, Spain, for Mexico in 1681. His first labors in the New World were in Lower California, where the Spanish attempted to plant colonies and missions. Because of international politics and other matters beyond Kino's control, the project was abandoned by order of the king, and he was transferred to northwestern Mexico.

There, on the outer fringe of civilization, Kino established his headquarters, Mission Nuestra Señora de los Dolores, in 1687. The site is a hilltop beside the San Miguel River, about 20 miles east of the present Sonora city of Magdalena, but no sign of the mission remains today.

At that time this was the end of the road—northward in all directions stretched an utter wilderness of deserts and rugged mountain ranges; unknown, and inhabited only by Indians. The region is still in a sense "Father Kino's country," for in his 24 years of ceaseless activity he pioneered there the main routes of travel we use today, and laid the foundations for many of our leading communities.

Historian Bolton mapped 35 major journeys, or entradas, made by Kino through Pimeria Alta. They followed down the Santa Cruz, San Pedro, and Gila Rivers westward to the site of Yuma and across the Colorado River. He also blazed the fiendish short cut across the desert along the Arizona-Sonora line, still known as El Camino del Diablo (the Devil's highway). According to one authority, between 3,000 and 4,000 travelers have since died on this trail from hunger, thirst, and fatigue.

Alone or accompanied by friendly Indian guides, and sometimes with a small military escort, the invincible padre rode the Rim of Christendom for God and the King of Spain. Kino's four-legged journeys were prodigious, and even his horses must have sensed the epic nature of his errands. In 1695, when 51 years of age, he covered 1,500 miles in 53 days. Two years later he made a trip of 700 miles in 30 days, and in 1700, he traveled 1,000 miles in 26 days, for an average of 40 miles a day. Once, between sunrise and sunset, he rode more than 75 miles in response to an urgent message from a brother priest.

But besides being one of our foremost early explorers, Father Kino achieved international fame as a cartographer, and his maps gave the first accurate delineation of the whole region. To him also belongs the credit for discovering that California is not an island, as was supposed, and for finding a practical land route from northern Mexico to the Pacific coast.

However, the great-hearted padre made his major exploration among human souls. Wherever he went he preached to the Pima, Papagos, Cocopas, Maricopas, and Yumas in their own languages, and he personally baptized 4,500 Indians. He established 25 missions—more than one a year—and many smaller vistas in the native villages.

He taught his converts how to plant wheat, maize, beans, and melons—and even furnished the Indian women with recipes for making bread and tortillas. He also brought in the first fowl, sheep, goats, cattle, and horses. In fact, Kino introduced large-scale stockraising, becoming Arizona's first "cattle king," with prosperous ranches totaling hundreds of thousands of acres. When San Xavier del Bac was started he was able to stock it with 700 head of domestic animals.

For a quarter of a century on the remote frontier of New Spain, Father Kino was builder, statesman, teacher, rancher, student, writer, and priest. A small band of stalwart Jesuits assisted him. But there were never enough and he constantly petitioned for more.

Three Kino missions were located in the Santa Cruz river valley in what is now Arizona. First was Guevavi, founded in 1692 8 miles north of present Nogales. It was devastated by the marauding Apaches in 1773. The ruins are barely traceable today.

The second mission, Tumacacori, established in 1697, still stands beside U.S. Highway 89, 17 miles north of Nogales. No sign of Kino's original church remains, and the present building, dedicated in 1822, is in partial ruins. Tumacacori, now preserved as a national monument, is an impressive structure, 100 feet long and more than 40 feet wide, with adobe walls 6 feet thick. At the monument entrance the Park Service has built a museum which houses exhibits pertaining to the early days of the mission and the life of Father Kino.

Nine miles south of Tucson stands by far the best known of all Kino's missions, San Xavier del Bac, founded in 1700. It seemed to be closest to the padre's heart. When there he became Arizona's first enthusiastic booster and predicted that someday a great city would rise nearby. The 1960 census figures have proved Kino to have been a true prophet. However, as at Tumacacori, he never saw the present establishment. After the Jesuits were expelled from Mexico in 1767, the mission passed to the Franciscans, who completed a new church in 1797. Called the White Dove of the Desert, it is considered today to be the most beautiful of all Spanish missions in the United States.

Situated in a reservation of Papago Indians, San Xavier del Bac is still active, and ministers to the descendants of its original communicants. They serve as choir, altar boys, decorators, and janitors. Men outstanding for their good deeds are annually chosen as the "12 apostles," and are the mission's leaders and deacons for the following year. The ceremony of their installation occurs over the vigil and the feast of St. Francis Xavier, December 2, 3, and 4. This is the mission's big fiesta and is a picturesque event worth going far to see.

The Tucson Festival Society has developed a brilliant pageant which is held each April at San Xavier. There are bonfires in the plaza, fireworks, religious processions, dancing, and feasting. In 1961 the festivities are scheduled for April 7, and I hope that some special observances in honor of the mission's distinguished founder will be included. Such would be particularly fitting at San Xavier. The Papagos are peculiarly Father Kino's people, for they have continued to this day the customs and ceremonies their ancestors learned from the great padre.

Iron men are not really made of iron. On March 15, 1711, while dedicating a new chapel at Mission Santa Maria Magdalena, Father Kino became ill. He died a few hours later. He was 65 years old. History gives no details, so we can only conclude that he was simply worn out from years of constant self-sacrificing service to his fellow men. He was buried in the chapel beside an image of St. Francis Xavier, who had been the guiding inspiration of his life.

We have made fetishes of our early Western gun slingers. But they were second-string people compared to the padres, like Kino, when it came to courage, fortitude, and stamina, in addition to zeal for God's greater glory.

NEW HONORS

Father Kino will probably enter the Hall of Fame in the U.S. Capitol soon. The Arizona Historical Foundation, recently established, has voted that such a statue be commissioned for presentation to the Statuary Hall. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, foundation president, said he would introduce Federal legislation necessary for acceptance of the Statue. Each State is allowed two figures in the Hall of Fame; Father Kino would be Arizona's second, joining Gen. John C. Greenway of the First World War.

Freedom Is Sold, Not Bought, by Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I have often said that the accomplishments of a Member of Congress, and his contribution to the Nation, are to be judged not by what he says but by what he does. The same holds true for the President and his Cabinet.

The following is an editorial which appeared in the New York Daily News on April 3:

JUST HOW FREE ARE WE?

At a banquet laid on here the other evening by the Four Freedoms Foundation in honor of the AFL–CIO President George Meany, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg orated as follows:

"The true national interest in America is the attainment of individual freedom—not only intellectually, so that we may look any man in the face and speak our piece, but economically, so that want and fear do not become the landlords of our private stations in life."

Those are noble sentiments, and it seems to us that all Americans can endorse them without reservation.

It happens, though, that we've just run across a news item, from the Tax Foundation, Inc. (nonprofit research), of New York, which makes us wonder just how free Americans are and are not, and what if anything the Kennedy administration is doing to make them more nearly free and less unfree.

The Tax Foundation's news is that the average American now has to pay out more of his hard-earned money on taxes than on food. This means all kinds of taxes—Federal, State, and local, visible and invisible.

In his working day, he puts in 1 hour and 39 minutes to earn enough for the day's food; and he labors 2 hours and 29 minutes to get up the money for his taxes.

Thus, in an 8-hour day, he gives just about 30 percent of his time to government as represented by the taxgatherers.

Since these gentry are extremely tough about collecting the last cent due them, it is fair to say that all of us are 30 percent slaves to government.

Of course, there have to be taxes, and no human being is completely free. But wouldn't it be a nice gesture if all our politicos, from President Kennedy on down, were to set their sights on cutting our tax bills to the level of our food bills, at the least?

The Case for Simplified Spelling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include as part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Parents' magazine, issue of January 1961, entitled "The Case for Simplified Spelling." The article is under the byline of Mr. George J. Hecht, publisher of the magazine.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of my colleagues because of my interest in reformed spelling of the English language. In each of the last three Congresses I have introduced legislation which would provide for the establishment of a National Spelling Commission, which would study our current language deficiencies and make general recommendations as to the means by which reforms and simplifications could be effected.

I feel that the material contained in the article by Mr. Hecht is of great interest in this regard. The article follows:

THE CASE FOR SIMPLIFIED SPELLING—IT WOULD SPEED UP THE EDUCATION OF OUR CHILDREN

(By George J. Hecht)

(This thoughtful article will undoubtedly give further impetus to the healthy movement to reexamine all facets of the proposal. One of the greatest needs in education today is for more research wherever it may carry us.—Lawrence G. Derthick, U.S. Commissioner of Education.)

The education of American children (and those in other English-speaking countries) could be speeded up very considerably by the adoption of a simplified system of spelling. Let's face it: English is one of the world's most difficult languages—especially difficult to spell and with many words difficult to pronounce.

If written English could be made phonetic, as is possible—with words all spelled as they sound and all pronounced as they are spelled—it would reduce the time devoted to the study of spelling by 2 years, according to experts. This would sharply reduce school costs or provide time for students to take additional courses. Another important point is that if written English were made phonetic and thus easier to master, this would remove one of the chief hurdles to the rapid spread of English as a world language.

The English language is composed of 40 basic sounds, but our alphabet contains only 26 letters, so certain sounds have to be designated by combinations of letters. Even so, pronunciation and spelling would be relatively simple if each sound were represented by a specific letter or a specific combination of letters. Unfortunately, this is far from true. First, the same letter often represents many different sounds. The letter a, for example, is pronounced in eight different ways (not counting the silent a in such words as dead): quota, are, any, make, image, what, walk. The same is true of letter combinations, such as ough in cough, rough, though, thorough, through, plough, thought, hiccough. Second, a single sound can be represented in many different ways. In the following sentence the long sound of o is spelled in nine different ways: "Tony, our chauffeur, and Mary's beau, yoemanly towed our bags to the depot even though he had stubbed his toe against the coalbin." Third, many English words contain unsounded letters, such as the b in debt, c in scissors, h in school, u in build.

The result of these irregularities is that children must memorize the appearance of words in order to learn to read and write them, instead of learning to associate appearances with sound. Estimates of how many words must be so memorized range from about 2,000 to 25,000. Obviously it would be a great deal easier if each of the 40 basic English sounds were indicated by a single letter. In many languages this is so. Russian, Turkish, Italian, Hungarian, German, and many other languages are almost entirely phonetic.

Originally, English also was a relatively phonetic language. Anglo-Saxon (also called Old English), spoken from about the year 500 until about 1066, was spelled much as it was pronounced. During the period when so-called Middle English was in use, from about 1066 to about 1450, many inconsistencies were introduced, largely because there were many dialects with variations in spelling. Then, in the early days of movable type, England imported many of its printers from Holland, and these men added to the confusion. Finally in the 18th century, when classical studies assumed a new importance, scholars tried to spell words so as to make clear at a glance their Greek or Latin origin, and even though in many cases their assumptions as to origin were incorrect, their way of spelling survived. The most notable of these men was Dr. Samuel Johnson, whose dictionary was enormously influential. He, probably more than any other man, should be blamed for the irregularities of English spelling.

Attempts to counter these tendencies and simplify the spelling of English began at a very early stage. Among the very first efforts at spelling reform were those made in the 1550's and 1560's by John Hart, Sir John Cheke, Sir Thomas Smith, and James Howell. Many other attempts to simplify spelling have been made since then but none of the radical ones has succeeded to any great extent. Prominent men who have advocated spelling reform include Noah Webster, Charles Darwin, Alfred Tennyson, Mark Twain, Jacob Grimm, Theodore Roosevelt, Andrew Carnegie, George Bernard Shaw, and Col. Robert McCormick. Shaw left a considerable portion of his large estate to be used for research and trials of a new 40-letter phonetic alphabet, and McCormick instituted a certain amount of simplified spell-

ing in the Chicago Tribune, such as tho, thoro, and thru.

Many plans of simplified English spelling have been advanced. The two leading organizations in the field, the Simpler Spelling Association of America and the Simplified Spelling Society of Great Britain, jointly suggest a choice of two different systems of simplified spelling. One is called world English spelling which would retain the present 26 letters but would make each of them designate a single basic sound, and would have certain combinations of these letters indicate each of the remaining 14 basic sounds.

The other most advocated system of simplified spelling uses the so-called Spelling Reform Alfabet. This system would add 14 new letters to our present 26-letter alphabet so that each of the 40 letters would indicate one of the 40 basic sounds out of which all English words are composed.

For many years, leading American educators have urged the simplification of English spelling. William T. Harris, who was U.S. Commissioner of Education from 1889 to 1906, devoted space in his annual report in 1889 to the advantages of phonetic spelling. He said, in part: "The American child must spend a large portion of his school days in learning, one by one, the peculiar combinations of the written words of his language. In fact, there are at least 5 years as good as thrown away in learning the mass of heterogeneous conventionalities dignified by the name of 'orthography.' "

Dr. Frank Laubach, who has taught many millions of people to read and write their native language in more than 100 different countries, and who is one of the world's leading authorities on linguistics and a strong advocate of simplified spelling, said: "In English we can never know with certainty how to pronounce a word which we have only seen written but never heard, or how to spell a word which we have only heard, unless someone tells us, and then we cannot be sure that he knows."

In 1918, the year after they gained control of Russia, the Communists modernized the Russian alphabet so that 36 symbols could be used to write the 34 standard sounds of which all Russian words are composed. In 1930 Kemal Ataturk not only changed Turkey's alphabet from the Arabic to the Roman one but added a letter to it so that each of the 27 basic sounds of the Turkish language could be represented by a single letter.

The French Government is now considering spelling reform of the French language and has set up a government committee to examine various possibilities. Among basic changes this committee has recommended that all "parasite consonants" (i.e., those silent ones in which French abounds) be thrown out altogether. There is no need, the committee said, for children of this modern day to spell words the same way their grandparents did.

A practical demonstration and scientific test on how simplified spelling speeds up the learning of English was conducted, strangely enough, in Sweden, shortly before the beginning of World War II. English was taught in a number of elementary schools as the second language, using the world English spelling system (which was called Anglik). That this system substantially speeded up the learning of English is certified to by Dr. Helge Kökeritz, now head of the English Department, Graduate School, Yale University, and formerly the assistant head of the demonstration and experiment in Sweden.

Dr. Ralph D. Owen, president of the Simpler Spelling Association, has said: "It takes most of our children 2 years of extra concentration on beginning reading and the necessary followup of spelling in order to compete with children who are fortunate enough to have a language that has a phonetic alphabet."

Russian children learn Russian very much more rapidly than American children learn English because Russian is a phonetic language. This gives the Soviet Union a great advantage in our education race with them. Parenthetically may I say that after I visited the Soviet Union in the spring of 1956 I wrote an article for Parents' magazine entitled "The Coming International Brains Race" (published in the November 1956 issue) which expressed the thought that we are in an arms, trade, scientific, and brains race with the Soviet Union, and that the most basic of all is the brains race. If for no other reason, should we not simplify our English spelling to eliminate our handicap in our educational competition with the Communist powers?

The Ministry on Education of Great Britain is currently greatly concerned about the difficulty that many British youngsters are having in learning to read. It is conducting an experiment this year, in which some 1,200 schoolchildren are learning to read and write with a 42-character alphabet, one for each of the 42 sounds which the Ministry calculates can be made by the human voice. No children are being pressed to participate in the experiment if their parents are opposed to it. In the new alphabet the letters "c," "q," and "x" are being dropped and 19 new letters are being added. Later, the speed with which these children learn to read and write, using this enlarged alphabet, will be compared with the learning time of those using the conventional one.

The adoption of any system of extensive spelling reform would require governmental action, preferably jointly by the United States, Great Britain, and the other English-speaking countries. First a commission, preferably but not necessarily an intergovernmental one, should be set up to decide which of the presently proposed systems of simplified spelling is the best, or to develop some better and simpler one. Furthermore, a standardized pronunciation of all words would have to be adopted. Then a date, some years hence, would have to be selected at which time the new system would be put into use.

If additional letters are to be added to the alphabet, new typewriters would have to be built and new typesetting machinery would have to be developed. Everyone would, of course, have to learn the new system of spelling. On a selected date, all newspapers, magazines, and new books would have to change over to the new spelling. All dictionaries, encyclopedias, and textbooks would, of course, have to be revised. Difficult as all this would be, such drastic reforms have been successfully accomplished in other countries. English-speaking countries should be able to do what others have done.

Although, in the 86th Congress, Representative HARLAN HAGEN, of California, introduced a bill to establish a National Commission for English Spelling Reform, I do not believe that the United States is ready to adopt any of the proposed systems at this time. Considerably more research is needed before legislative action should be attempted.

A thorough, far-seeing study of the whole question of simplified spelling should be made to investigate scientifically the desirability of a new system, which of the systems proposed or what new system would be the best, and how the selected system could be put into operation. The study should be undertaken by some outstanding American university or research institution, the National Education Association, or the American Council on Education. As far as I know, no funds are now available for this purpose. My hope is that one of America's great foundations or some other organization interested in education in particular, and public welfare in general, can be persuaded to finance the needed research. Then, on the basis of the experts' findings, a system of simplified spelling could be introduced through legislation and put into effect over a period of 5 years or so. The transition would be difficult, of course, but other countries have proved that it is not only possible but infinitely worthwhile.

The Capehart Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, retention of able, trained personnel is still a central problem in our defense preparedness. One of the farsighted proposals which is creating conditions favorable to retention of armed services personnel is the Capehart housing program.

Here is an article from the Air Force Times which analyzes the current situation in terms of benefits to service families:

CAPEHARTS PROVING "LIFT" FOR FAMILIES
(By Ed Gates)

WASHINGTON.—U.S. Air Force families receiving orders for a faraway station, like Kincheloe Air Force Base, Mich., can cast aside their apprehensions—about housing and hence their finances—if they are assured of Capehart quarters.

The same applies in only slightly lesser degrees if the orders are for a close-in post like McGuire Air Force Base, N.J. At scores of stateside bases the success of the family's tour may well turn on whether a Capehart is available.

The lucky ones live comfortably in modern, well-equipped homes, at a price they can afford—their quarters allowance. Dwelling on base, they are close to the exchange, theater, commissary, club, etc.—the things which comprise the little extras which make life in the service satisfying.

The unlucky ones, who can't rate good on-base quarters because there are not enough to go around, may find living difficult and life in general a financial headache, or both.

Civilian rentals normally are neither adequate nor reasonably priced. Frequently they are located miles from base, which makes continual travel costly and inconvenient and hence discourages families from taking advantage of the little extras found only on the base.

U.S. Air Force housing officials last week toured new Capehart projects recently completed at six bases. The Air Force Times representative who accompanied them had strongly suspected that getting a set of Capeharts can make considerable difference in whether a tour succeeds or fails for the family.

The journey confirmed it.

In addition to McGuire and Kincheloe, the housing party inspected quarters at Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y., Syracuse Air Force Station, N.Y., and Selfridge and Wurtsmith Air Force Bases, Mich. The locations, except for the frosty climate, are held to typify various housing situations found at bases throughout the country.

At each the story was similar: the family's morale rose when they moved into their new Capeharts. Pride in occupying a nice, new home was reflected in the care given the facilities and the attractive furnishing schemes individual families came up with.

Many obviously stretched their budgets a bit to purchase furniture to match the quality of the quarters.

Near McGuire and Griffiss, for instance, $125 for rent and $30 for utilities was reported as typical. These outlays, they said, by no means assure a home as nice as Capeharts, yet for an NCO drawing $96.90 in quarters allowance the arrangement requires he dig down into his basic pay for nearly $60 if he rents outside.

At Syracuse, station commander Lt. Col. Jerome Schweickert said that a typical NCO family living off base might well pay $125 plus utilities, while an officer family (for something slightly better) could expect to pay $150–$200 plus utilities.

At Wurtsmith, a resort area, the off-base rate for little more than a cabin may hit $100 a week during the summer months.

At Kincheloe, on the upper Michigan Peninsula only a stone's throw from the Canadian border, where things are truly remote, officials say the off-base rental story is one of "very little selection, and where something is available it is far below standards."

The point has been reached at many U.S. Air Force locations where the quarters allowance meets little more than half of a family's monthly housing expenditures, so rapidly have rents and utility charges climbed. An alternative is to occupy submarginal off-base quarters, which far too many families must do. But this is not the way U.S. Air Force officials want it, which is why they are arguing strenuously for authority to build 50,000 more U.S. Air Force Capeharts during the next 3 years.

Added to the 46,000 Capehart units already built, and the 14,000-plus under construction or already scheduled for construction, Air Force would then have around 110,000 Capeharts which, officials contend, is the "bare minimum" to handle requirements.

The odds on getting the administration and then Congress to approve a program of this scope are not good, Air Force this week was presenting its case for more Capeharts to the Senate.

At Kincheloe, meantime, 507th Fighter Wing Commander Col. Thomas W. Hornsby and his associates are bursting with pride over the 475-unit project recently completed and occupied. And well they might, for the quarters are delightful—inside and out.

These are slant-roof split-levels, featuring a large snug basement which easily converts into a spacious recreational room.

Exteriors are part brick, part aluminum siding, and the entire project is handsomely wedded to the pine trees native to the area. Through some magic of design, the homes appear to contain much more living space than is actually there.

The principal Headquarters U.S. Air Force houisng officials in the inspection party, Mr. George Robinson and Col. Guy Goddard, promptly awarded the Kincheloe project a rating of "9.00."

Kincheloe, while low in personnel strength at the moment, is representative of other bases in the total housing need department. When the named missions arrive at the base, during the next year, total military strength will hit nearly 4,000. Base officials estimate 2,500 units will be required to properly house the families. Here's what they can expect to satisfy this need:

The 475 just-completed units; a second project of 330 Capeharts now under construction; and a third project of 190 units which, with luck, will be completed by December 1962. Add some trailer pads and a drop of "community support," and the most the site can count on is around 1,300 in another couple of years.

To bridge this gap closer to the ultimate 2,500-unit total requirement (which includes airmen of the lower grades) Air Force would like to get 400–500 additional Capeharts in a fourth project for Kincheloe. This seems very "iffy" at the moment, however.

Even if all these plans eventually produce constructed homes, some Kincheloeites in the near future face one of two alternatives: (1) Try to find something off base, which won't be easy or satisfactory, or (2) leave the family behind.

Here is a capsule report of the other sites visited:

McGuire: A 300-unit Capehart project fully occupied, and a 1,450-unit project just completed and about two-thirds occupied, with others filling up rapidly. When fully occupied, the base will still be about 2,000 units short of what is needed. There are nothing like 2,000 adequate units in the nearby communities, according to Base Commander Col. Albert W. Brownfield.

Griffis: Two Capehart projects of 460 and 270 units each completed, the latter only very recently. Bids have just gone out for a third project of 135 units. The base also has 250 substandard Lanham Act quarters, for lower grade airmen, and 28 reconverted barracks for company grade officers. Air Force plans to tear down the Lanhams and the barracks. While the overall housing picture seems less difficult than at the other sites, base officials said they need 300–400 more Capeharts.

Syracuse: This Sage site has 216 new Capeharts, all occupied. Need for more is not too great, and none are planned.

Selfridge: This large site has many types of housing, totaling 1,205 units of which 918 are adequate. The newly completed 380-unit Capehart project, entirely for officers, is a beauty, although it's 3 miles off base. The 489 Wherry quarters, 367 of which have been rehabilitated, are exclusively NCO. The base wants $2,500 to improve its substandard Lanham Act quarters, but Air Force indicates they are beyond repair and plans to tear them down: (See story p. 44).

Wurtsmith: Has two attractive projects, beautifully situated in pine forests. The first project of 618 units is occupied, and the second of 330 units is moving fast toward completion and families probably will begin moving in it this summer. There is a small development of appropriated fund houses, and an on-base trailer park. Off-base selection is about nil, as there is no community of any size for 55 miles.

A Full and Complete Investigation and Study of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency Would Be Helpful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today to provide that the Committee on the District of Columbia shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the District of Columbia Land Agency.

I am moved to do this by two things: First, the study of this Agency by the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate which is already underway, and, second, the irregularities uncovered by the Comptroller General of the United States in his audit of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958.

I include as part of my remarks an excerpt from the 1959 report to the Congress by the Comptroller General on his audit of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 29, 1959.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Herewith is our report on the audit of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958. Our audit was directed principally to a review of transactions involving Federal financial assistance provided by the Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for slum clearance and urban renewal work.

The findings noted during our audit are summarized in the forepart of the accompaying report and concern principally (1) tentative approval by the Urban Renewal Administration of estimated cost of facilities as noncash local grants-in-aid (a) which do not directly and substantially benefit the slum clearance projects, as required by law, (b) where cost estimates were not supported with documentary data, or (c) where the bases used to determine percent of project benefit were not proper or not supported, (2) scheduled demolition of sound commercial structures which could possibly be retained, (3) costs of holding cleared land for redevelopers not reimbursable, (4) proposed disposition of land without competitive bidding, (5) need for followup on land value, (6) ineffective followup on collections of rent due from delinquent tenants, and (7) deficiencies in RLA operations pertaining to families self-relocated in private housing.

This report is also being sent today to the President of the Senate. Copies of the report are being furnished to the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency; Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency; and Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

REPORT ON AUDIT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY FISCAL YEARS 1957 AND 1958

The General Accounting Office has made an audit of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency (RLA), for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1957, and 1958, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53). This audit was our first, other than preliminary surveys, of the RLA and included limited reviews of operating activities and financial transactions before fiscal years 1957 and 1958. The scope of the audit is described on page 72 of this report.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our principal findings and recommendations are summarized on pages 1 to 8 and, together with other findings and recommendations, are discussed in detail in later sections of this report.

1. Federal subsidies may exceed total cost of facilities provided by District of Columbia as noncash grants-in-aid

Under existing law the District of Columbia is permitted to receive Federal subsidies which exceed the total cost of facilities provided as noncash grants-in-aid to slum clearance and urban renewal projects. No other local community is in this same position. If the Congress desires that the credit received by the District of Columbia for noncash grants-in-aid be limited in the same manner as for other local communities, sec-

tion 20(d) of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 will have to be amended. (See p. 20.)

2. Approval as noncash grant-in-aid of facility that will benefit the entire community

For project areas B and C, Urban Renewal Administration (URA) tentatively allowed one-third of the estimated total cost of the Southwest Expressway as a part of gross project cost and as a noncash grant-in-aid even though the expressway is of communitywide benefit.

We are recommending that URA adhere to the policy set forth in the Local Public Agency Manual (LPA Manual) and not allow the cost of facilities of communitywide nature as noncash grants-in-aid. (See p. 24.)

3. Certain cost estimates not supported with documentary data

The RLA files generally did not contain data to support the cost estimates for noncash grant-in-aid facilities to be provided by the District of Columbia. In addition, officials of RLA and of the District of Columbia were unable to locate data in support of cost estimates of the Southwest Expressway and a proposed grade separation at South Capitol and M Streets. Nevertheless URA had tentatively approved the loan and grant application for project area B which included these estimates.

We are recommending that URA require the RLA to submit to URA current cost estimates for all facilities to be provided by the District of Columbia, including sufficient supporting data to enable URA to make an adequate evaluation of such estimates, before approval of the amounts claimed as noncash grants-in-aid. (See p. 28.)

4. Bases used to determine percent of project benefit not proper or not supported

The percent of benefit claimed by the RLA for certain facilities was in our opinion determined on improper bases, and the data used to determine the percent of benefit on another facility was not supported by adequate documentation.

We are recommending that URA review the determinations and followup to obtain the needed supporting information. We are recommending also that, if revisions are found necessary in credits tentatively allowed, URA revise the project budgets accoordingly. (See p. 29.)

5. Scheduled demolition of sound structures

With some exceptions, the renewal of project area C will be accomplished by a strict clearance operation rather than by rehabilitation (demolishing only those structures which cannot be conserved). We were informed that certain commercial structures which, during our site visit, seemed to be sound in appearance and condition would probably be demolished. These structures, in areas which are to be redeveloped for commercial uses, have an estimated cost of about $2 million for acquiring and demolishing.

So that Federal costs would not be increased unnecessarily, we suggested that RLA consider the feasibility of retaining additional commercial structures in areas which are to be redeveloped for commercial purposes. The Chairman subsequently advised us that RLA will consider further the feasibility of the retention of additional commercial structures in areas which are to be redeveloped for commercial use. (See p. 35.)

6. Costs of holding cleared land for redevelopers not reimbursable

The RLA has agreed to hold certain acquired and cleared land for public and private redevelopers but will not be reimbursed for the costs it incurs from the date the land was available for delivery until possession is taken. These costs consist primarily of real estate taxes and interest on borrowings, which, with respect to land held for the General Services Administration, will amount to about $52,000 annually.

The Chairman, RLA, informed us that it is now the policy of RLA to assess private redevelopers carrying charges but that he did not believe that RLA could require that public redevelopers pay such charges because there is no agreement of a contractual nature.

We are recommending that in the future, where land is held for specific public redevelopers, the agreements provide that RLA be reimbursed for all costs of holding the land from the dates the land is available for delivery until possession is taken. (See p. 33.)

7. Proposed disposition of land without competitive bidding

The redevelopment plan for project area B was prepared jointly by the RLA and the National Capital Planning Commission. The redevelopment plan for project areas C and C–1 was prepared, in part, by a potential private redeveloper of the area. Because of the redeveloper's assistance, the RLA entered into a memorandum of understanding with him and believes that it has a moral obligation to negotiate only with him for the disposition of land that he desires to redevelop in project area C. Our review indicated that the RLA, therefore, has neither invited nor encouraged other potential private redevelopers to submit bids or proposals for the disposition of that land. We also noted that neither the RLA nor the URA obtained for comparative purposes independent appraisals of the Town Center land from Federal Housing Administration (FHA) when the initial value of $4 per square foot and the later value of $2.50 per square foot were established by the appraisers employed by RLA. FHA is expected to insure the mortgage on the Town Center.

We believe that generally the sale or lease by competitive bidding results in the disposition of land in a fair and impartial manner. We believe further that competitive bidding generally will give reasonable assurance that the highest return is obtained in the disposition of land. The disposal of project land on a negotiated basis does not appear to us to provide such assurance.

We are recommending that URA require the RLA to—

(a) Discontinue the practice of negotiating with only one potential private redeveloper.

(b) Publicize the availability of land and invite competitive bids or proposals.

(c) Refuse to accept redevelopment plans prepared by a private redeveloper if such acceptance obliges the RLA to negotiate only with such redeveloper.

We are also recommending, when it appears that FHA will insure the mortgages of property in the redeveloped area, that, before URA approves the disposition prices, it require the RLA and other LPA's to obtain independent appraisals from FHA for comparative purposes. (See p. 41.)

8. Need for followup on land value

The estimated value of $2.50 per square foot for the Town Center land was based on tentative plans and specifications of the redeveloper. At October 1958, the redeveloper had not submitted, for RLA's approval, the final plans and specifications for the construction of the Town Center. In view of the method used by the appraisers to value the land, we are recommending that the RLA have the appraisers review the final plans and specifications to be submitted by the redeveloper and report any construction changes that would result in a change in their valuation. If significant changes are made, we are recommending that the RLA require that appropriate changes be made in the potential selling price of the land and the annual ground rent. (See p. 48.)

9. Waiver of rent from former owners

On May 6, 1958, the RLA's Board of Directors approved a resolution whereby former owner-occupants would be given free rent until the first day of the second month after acquisition of their properties by RLA. This waiver of rent reduces potential revenue and results in increased net project costs.

We are recommending that URA revise part 3, chapter 3, section 4, of the LPA Manual to prohibit the granting of free rent periods to former owner-occupants unless satisfactory evidence of the necessity for granting free rent is submitted by the LPA and approved by URA. (See p. 55.)

10. Follow-up on collections of rent due from delinquent tenants not effective

In our review of accounts receivable from tenants in project area C, we were informed that through May 9, 1958, the RLA (a) obtained 175 judgments against delinquent tenants for possession of the properties, (b) evicted 3 tenants for nonpayment of rent, and (c) obtained no judgments to attach the assets or income of delinquent tenants. Of the 172 delinquent tenants that were not evicted by RLA, through May 9, 1958, 8 tenants had fully satisfied the judgments and 64 tenants had partially satisfied the judgments by the payment of rent. The other 100 tenants, however, had not paid rent after the judgments were obtained.

After completion of our review the RLA advised us that its procedures for collecting delinquent rentals have been strengthened. (See p. 58.)

11. Control over relocation operations deficient

The RLA's control over the records pertaining to the relocation operations in project area C is inadequate and statistics maintained by the RLA are inaccurate. We also found that suspected violations of the District of Columbia housing code were not reported to code enforcement units.

We are recommending that URA include a provision in the LPA manual requiring that LPA's report in writing to local code enforcement units those dwellings at which LPA's inspections disclosed obvious code violations of a serious nature. (See p. 60.)

12. Deficiencies in accounting procedures and financial statements

In our audit we observed a number of deficiencies in the RLA's methods of recording financial transactions in that Agency's accounting records and, because of these deficiences, we are unable to state that the accompanying financial statements present fairly the assets and liabilities of the RLA at June 30, 1957, and 1958. (See p. 67.)

Real Champions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, as one who many years ago participated in basketball, I am proud to advise my colleagues in the House that the basketball team of Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio, in my congressional district, won the NCAA championship as the best small college basketball team in the United States. The Wittenberg team this year had 25 victories, and the winning of the championship gave it its 100th, under the direction of Coach

Mears. It is pleasing to note the national press, and such news magazines as Sports Illustrated, have given full recognition to the championship victory of the Wittenberg University team.

I am also very proud of the fact that from my own district the basketball team of Urbana High School—the smallest school participating in the State tournament—took second place in the Ohio State AA Tournament among the 399 high school teams participating in the championship playoffs at district, regional, and State levels.

Farmers Face Income Loss as Result of Feed Grains Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, market trends of the past 3 weeks indicate that the New Frontier feed grains bill will cost farmers $75 million in lost income on their 1960 corn crop.

The sudden drop in the corn market is attributed by market experts to Government selling of surplus stocks plus fears that the Government will market even larger amounts of corn to keep market prices down.

The feed grains program enacted by Congress 3 weeks ago—over my opposition—permits Uncle Sam to sell surplus corn to depress prices. The aim is to induce farmers to agree to cut 1961 acreage and thus qualify for price supports.

The corn market the past 2 weeks confirms my fears that the bill would drive market prices down. The market is down about 15 cents a bushel, and with about 500 million bushels of 1960 corn still unmarketed, that means an income loss of about $75 million.

Market observers also predict that fear of Government price breaking will force a record number of farmers to seal their 1960 corn with Commodity Credit Corporation. This will add to Federal costs for handling and storage. The new feed grains bill has already had the effect of hurting farm income and adding to our tax burdens.

The current marketing year for corn started October 1, 1960, and runs to September 30, 1961.

When farmers planted last year's crop in the spring of 1960, they expected that the then existing program would be in effect throughout the entire 1960 marketing year. Now that the Department of Agriculture is intentionally depressing corn prices to stimulate sign-up in the new feed grain program, corn farmers rightfully feel that the rules have been changed in the middle of the game.

The corn market 10 days ago was actually reported by newspapers down 15 cents, the sharpest March decline in 13 years.

Since corn farmers have until May 31 to place their 1960 corn under loan, the lowered market price is encouraging more farmers to put more corn into Commodity Credit Corporation hands. This can mean only more storage costs, more handling costs, and a total increase in Government expenses.

The Wall Street Journal reports that grain men expect loans on 1960 crop corn will cover a record total of 600 million bushels.

Diplomatic Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, we have dealt from weakness in the Lao situation and as indicated in the following news article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer, which appeared in the Long Island Daily Press on March 31, our future position in that part of the world is quite clearly defined:

WE'VE LOST AGAIN TO MOSCOW
(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Whatever comes out of the Lao negotiations, one thing is certain: the United States has suffered a defeat and the free world has once more retreated in face of advancing communism. This is the price for avoiding a nasty fight in another faraway country of which we know nothing as Britain's Chamberlain called Czechoslovakia in 1938.

The United States thought, and rightly so, that Laos should be kept in our orbit. Now it is certain to be neutral in the unpleasant way of Indonesia and will probably go Communist.

Lenin's threat to take Paris and London through Peiping and New Delhi is one step closer to realization. And what is worse, this has been done with the connivance of Paris and London.

One can understand the reluctance of France—with its army bogged down in Algeria—to get into another Indochinese mess. Besides, France has never really forgiven the United States for urging it to relinquish Indochina and then stepping into France's former place as the chief adviser and protector of South Vietnam.

Britain has no such excuse. Yet the truth is, since 1945, the British have favored every decision that aided communism in Asia—not, of course, because the British favor communism but because they had no stomach for trouble in the Far East and hoped that the developments in that area would not ultimately endanger Britain.

Certainly, every time the United States has followed British policy in that area we have lost something.

Then, as now, Eisenhower chose to give in to avoid the risk of war.

Since then Britain has arranged two disastrous summit conferences at both of which the U.S.S.R. got unilateral concessions from the United States. It endeavored unsuccessfully to shackle the United States at the Formosa Strait and is trying—in the teeth of American congressional opposition—to get Red China into the United Nations and recognized by us.

Now it has masterminded another Western retreat—all, naturally in the name of peace and in areas remote from Britain.

The American administration had better ask itself how long it can afford to follow the policies of an ally whose people are still suffering from the shell shock of their marvelous wartime effort.

Some Americans refuse to blame Britain for the setback in Laos. They say that Laos was no place to fight a local war. The advantages were all on the other side, since Laos is contiguous to Communist strength in China. But actually the United States did not have to fight in Laos to save that country. It had the chance to bring pressures upon the Soviet Union elsewhere. President Kennedy could have informed Khrushchev that unless he stopped sending arms into Laos the United States would—

Break off negotiations and resume nuclear testing.

Refuse to negotiate disarmament or arms control until the Communists in Laos gave up.

Inform Russia and China that not only will we yield no more territory and peoples to communism but that our policy is to liberate all those peoples everywhere who were brought under communism against their will.

Such a threat—or only part of it—would have forced Mr. K, to do some frantic thinking. But it would require a real revolution in the thinking of many of President Kennedy's closest advisers.

For the First Cruise of the "Hope," Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following interesting editorial appeared in the Kansas City Times of March 18, 1961.

FOR THE FIRST CRUISE OF THE "HOPE," WELL DONE

The SS *Hope*—America's medical ambassador to southeast Asia—is home again. The overall effect of its shakedown cruise has been summed up by Dr. William D. Walsh, director of the People-to-People Health Foundation:

"Whenever one of us goes ashore in a jeep on the outer islands (of Indonesia), kids dart out of the jungle and yell 'Hopie, Hopie.' They certainly don't say 'Hopie, go home.'"

For 6 months the *Hope*, a former Navy hospital ship that borrowed the name of a distinguished World War II ship, cruised the Java Sea. Its 520 feet of glowing whiteness was a symbol of the good will of the people of the United States. As a joint effort of private citizens and the Government (which provided only the vessel and $2 million for refitting), the *Hope* was in a sense a pilot project for Mr. Kennedy's Peace Corps. The sponsoring foundation was so pleased with the results that it hopes eventually to send similar ships to Africa and South America.

In the beginning, the Indonesian reaction to the *Hope* was not entirely unmixed. Initially, the ship anchored in the larger ports. The more metropolitan areas of the sixth largest nation were disappointed. They had expected, apparently, a floating medical school. In Jakarta, some officials suggested that the United States would do better to establish permanent hospitals ashore, "as the Russians are doing."

But anticipation is usually greater than realization, and perhaps the publicity build-

up had been too great. At any rate, the *Hope* later encountered its greatest success in the more primitive areas. Skipper Jack M. Windas told the New York Times of the crowds that lined the beaches of Sumbawa for treatment in a clinic on the beach or on the ship. The few local doctors were instructed in the latest medical techniques.

In June, the *Hope* is scheduled to sail again, for South Vietnam. As a symbol of U.S. intentions, the ship should have a long and fruitful career afloat. And its record to date—its many successes and relatively few failures—might be instructive reading for the enthusiastic Peace Corps.

The Recession—Overall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the current recession which has caused so much comment from the administration is not alarming when compared with other recessions which have occurred since World War II.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert the following survey by Nate White, business and financial editor of the Christian Science Monitor, which is a reprint from the March 28, 1961, edition:

THE RECESSION—OVERALL

(By Nate White)

BOSTON.—It may be surprising to the reader to know that the recession now ending is the second mildest of the seven which have occurred since the end of World War II—second to the recession of 1948–50.

After all of the publicity about the sad state of the U.S. economy the past year, it is now time to take an objective look.

First, it is important to record that no recession can be taken lightly. It is basically an attack—an attack of bad planning, bad economic planning, for the economy is both flexible, resilient, and accommodating.

It is important to remember that numbers, as such, do not tell the story. For instance, 5,560,000 people were out of work in 1941. This was 9.9 percent of the 1941 labor force of 55,910,000 persons. In February 1961, 5,700,000 persons were out of work. This was 6.8 percent of the labor force of 70,400,000 persons.

The percentage rate in persons out of work has ranged as follows since the end of the war:

1945	1.7
1946	3.9
1947	3.9
1948	3.8
1949	5.9
1950	5.3
1951	3.3
1952	3.1
1953	2.9
1954	5.6
1955	4.4
1956	4.2
1957	4.3
1958	6.8
1959	5.5
1960	5.6

January 1961, was 6.6 percent. February 1961, was 6.8 percent.

MANUFACTURING HIT

The only years that unemployed persons numbered under 2 million since 1929 were 1943, 1944, 1945, 1952, 1953—all war years. The only years the unemployment rate fell under 4 percent, since 1929, were years of immediate postwar boom and Korean war boom, 1945–48 and 1951–53.

For this reason, it may surprise many to look at the picture of employment and unemployment. Employment steadily rises while unemployment has held relatively at the same levels.

Where the 1960–61 unemployment hurts is in manufacturing.

The 1960–61 recession took the following pattern: The economy hit a peak high in May 1960, and then held, as Chase Manhattan Bank terms it, "roughly level." This was an indication that it had stopped going up. What was not known was whether this was a "plateau" in which the economy stayed at a high level but went no higher, or whether it was the beginning of a decline. During the fall, most economic indicators began to slide, and as they did so, they increased in speed. February and early March found them beginning to make the turn back.

While this recession hit mainly in production, nevertheless production fell less this time than in any other postwar recession. It stopped greatly above the 1957–58 recession, and notably above the average of all of the others. See the Chase Manhattan chart accompanying this column [not printed in RECORD].

IN 1959, DISTORTIONS

Unfortunately no one has charted the decline in expectations. This would show probably an alltime and sharp falloff.

Two disturtions occurred in 1959 which were destructive and gave a false impression of the economy.

One was the rapid production buildup in steel after the destructive strike in that industry in 1959. This led the economy to an abnormal pitch of activity in January, February, and March 1960, and has exercised a distorted effect ever since. Despite efforts to write the steel strike off as inconsequential in the strange pattern of 1960, it cannot be written off. It distorted the picture in every major category.

The second distortion was in the advertising of expectations which were not founded in solid fact. Those talking and writing about the sizzling sixties usually failed to note that the increase in population would not begin to affect markets for houses and durable goods until about 1965 or 1966.

The sudden decline in expectations was more damaging in some respects, mainly psychological, than the actual declines which eventually took place.

For instance, the gross national product—which is the total output of all the Nation's work—increased substantially in 1960. It jumped from $482,100 million in 1959 to $503,200 million in 1960—a dollar increase of $22,100 million—or in noninflated dollars, equated in 1960 prices, an increase of $13,800 million.

FALLOFF IN GNP

That is a substantial increase in a year in any kind of language, inflated or noninflated. However, the economy was running at an increase rate of $25 billion the last quarter of 1959. It failed to sustain this rate and fell off 1 percent. This was not a major falloff. Here is the falloff picture in GNP as it occurred (expressed in 1960 prices):

Quarter 1, 1959: $485.1 (B).
Quarter 2, 1959: $497.9 (B).
Quarter 3, 1959: $488.5 (B).
Quarter 4, 1959: $491.5 (B).
Quarter 1, 1960: $504.8 (B).
Quarter 2, 1960: $506.3 (B).
Quarter 3, 1960: $501.7 (B).
Quarter 4, 1960: $500.4 (B).

The noninflated GNP ran at an increased rate of between 3¾ and 3⅞ during the early peak and the final falloff.

This kind of increase is not to be laughed at, yet for a growing, dynamic economy, many political economists argue that it should be greater.

RESEARCHERS REPORT

One of the finest research teams in the United States has made a careful study of the 1960–61 recession and finds it showing the following:

Industrial production: Milder, slower, more quickly over in its decline than any of the seven. The worst decline was 1957–59, next worst 1953–55, next 1948–50.

GNP: The same pattern.

Personal income from production: Here the 1960–61 recession was lightest in its impact, hardly approaching the others. Worst was 1948–50, next worst 1953–55, next 1957–59.

Employment: In this category 1960–61, despite the large talk about joblessness, showed plus factors with employment showing its seasonal (students back to school, etc.) dropoff, but otherwise a steady increase. Worst, 1948–50, next 1957–59, next 1953–55.

Unemployment: Worst, 1953–55, next 1948–50, next 1960–61, next 1957–59.

Average workweek in manufacturing: Worst, 1960–61; next, 1953–55; next, 1957–59; next, 1948–50.

Real retail sales: Worst, 1957–59; next, 1953–55 but closely approached by 1960–61; best, 1948–50.

Total new orders in manufacturing: Worst, 1953–55; next, 1948–50; next, 1957–59; best, 1960–61.

Excess of new orders over sales in manufacturing: Worst, 1953–55; next, 1957–59; next, 1948–50; best, 1960–61.

Housing starts: Worst, 1960–61; next, 1957–59; next, 1953–55; best, 1948–50.

Plant and equipment expenditures: Worst, 1957–59; next, 1948–50; next but ending sooner, 1960–61; next but declining longer, 1953–55.

Change in business inventories: Worst decline, 1957–59; next, 1948–50; next, 1953–55; sharply down but now at an end, and least in duration, 1960–61.

Consumer prices: Sharp, prolonged decline, 1948–50; steady plateau, 1953–55; steady, gradual increase, 1960–61 (1.5 percent); sharp, prolonged increase, 1957–59.

Federal expenditures: Sharpest decline, 1953–55; steady, steep rise, but violently fluctuating up and down, 1948–50; steady rise, 1957–59, almost paralleled by 1960–61.

Federal surplus or deficit: Steady, sharp decline and recovery in budget supply, 1953–55; 1957–59; 1948–50, with 1960–61 the mildest and due for a sharp decline, as deficits increase.

Money supply: Steady but low, 1948–50; falling but then sharply rising, 1957–59; steady rise after a slump, 1953–55; sharp increase, sudden drop, then recovery, 1960–61.

Yield on long-term Government bonds: Worst, 1953–55; next, 1957–59; next, but recovering, 1960–61; best for 8 months but then gradually declining, 1948–50.

Interest rate on Treasury bills: Sharpest down, gradually up, 1953–55; next sharply down, deeper, but sharply up, 1957–59; next sharpest down, but evening and trending slightly up, 1960–61; high on a nonvariable plateau, sharply off for 2 months and resumption of plateau, 1948–50.

In human terms—the terms of persons out of work—no recession can even be pictured for its intensity. But in overall economic impact, 1960–61 comes off with the judgment "mild and short."

Audit by U.S. Comptroller General Indicated That District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency Has Neither Invited Nor Encouraged Other Potential Private Redevelopers To Submit Bids or Proposals for Disposition of Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, in his 1959 report to the Congress on his audit of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958, the Comptroller General of the United States states that—

Our review indicated that the RLA, therefore, has neither invited nor encouraged other potential private redevelopers to submit bids or proposals for the disposition of that land.

We believe that generally the sale or lease by competitive bidding results in the disposition of land in a fair and impartial manner. We believe further that competitive bidding generally will give reasonable assurance that the highest return is obtained in the disposition of land. The disposal of project land on a negotiated basis does not appear to us to provide such assurance.

In connection with a bill I have introduced to provide for a full and complete investigation and study of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency I include here an excerpt from the report to the Congress by the Comptroller General to which I have referred:

PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF LAND WITHOUT COMPETITIVE BIDDING

The redevelopment plan for project area B was prepared jointly by the Redevelopment Land Agency and the National Capital Planning Commission. The redevelopment plan for project areas C and C–1 was prepared, in part, by a potential private redeveloper of the area. Because of the redeveloper's assistance, the RLA entered into a memorandum of understanding with him and believes that it has a moral obligation to negotiate only with him for the disposition of land that he desires to redevelop in project area C. Our review indicated that the RLA, therefore, has neither invited nor encouraged other potential private redevelopers to submit bids or proposals for the disposition of that land.

We believe that generally the sale or lease by competitive bidding results in the disposition of land in a fair and impartial manner. We believe further that competitive bidding generally will give reasonable assurance that the highest return is obtained in the disposition of land. The disposal of project land on a negotiated basis does not appear to us to provide such assurance.

On March 15, 1954, the RLA and the potential private redeveloper executed the memorandum of understanding which stated, in part:

"1. The redeveloper had already expended substantial sums of moneys for a schematic proposal for the redevelopment of the area and desired a memorandum of understanding with the RLA before additional sums were expended for further studies and plans.

"2. It is understood that the RLA does not intend to negotiate with any other potential private redevelopers, except by mutual understanding between the parties, for the disposition of land in the area during the period, not to exceed 15 months, when steps leading to a definitive proposal by the redeveloper are being pursued.

The period for the submission of definitive proposals was extended on several occasions and did not expire until September 15, 1957. At that time definitive proposals had been submitted for the construction of a proposed town center and about 50 percent of the residential property in project area C. In a letter dated September 24, 1958, to the redeveloper, however, the chairman of RLA stated that certain procedures had been approved by RLA's Board of Directors for disposing of land in the proposed plaza area of project area C. The procedures indicated that the redeveloper would have 6 months in which to submit plans and a proposal for developing the plaza area and that the RLA would not negotiate with other potential redevelopers for the disposition of this land during that period.

In May 1957, three appraisers employed by the RLA to jointly appraise the town center land submitted their report to RLA showing a value of $4 per square foot (about $2.4 million). The RLA advised the potential redeveloper that the selling price of the land would be equal to this value and that if the land were leased the annual ground rent would be based on that value. In June 1957, the redeveloper declined to purchase or lease the land on this basis and offered to lease the land on the basis of a value of $1.25 per square foot (about $0.75 million). In September 1957, the three appraisers employed by RLA reduced their appraisal to $2.50 per square foot (about $1.5 million). In October 1957, the RLA submitted this appraisal to URA for approval. The URA advised the RLA that a value of $2.50 per square foot was unacceptable and suggested that the RLA explore the possibility of disposing of the land by public auction. RLA's Board of Directors expressed the belief that a public auction of the land could be construed to be inconsistent with the intent of the memorandum of understanding with the redeveloper. In December 1957, URA approved the value of $2.50 per square foot and the RLA offered to lease the land to the redeveloper at an annual ground rent equal to 6 percent of the purchase price of $2.50 per square foot. The redeveloper accepted the offer in January 1958 subject to agreement being reached on the terms and conditions of the proposed disposition document.

Shortly before the redeveloper accepted the offer of $2.50 per square foot, the RLA received and rejected an uninvited offer of $4 per square foot for the land. RLA's Board of Directors stated that the offer of $4 was unacceptable because of the memorandum of understanding between the RLA and and the redeveloper who had prepared part of the redevelopment plan.

In arriving at the values of $4 and $2.50 per square foot for the land, the appraisers employed by the RLA used only the land residual method of valuation. The use of this method required that the appraisers estimate (1) the rental income and operating expenses of the proposed Town Center, (2) the construction cost of improvements, (3) a fair rate of return to the owner of the improvements, and (4) a fair rate of return on the land. The value of the land is determined by (1) multiplying the estimated construction cost of the improvements by the estimated rate of return for improvements, (2) deducting the product (the estimated income attributable to the improvements) from the estimated total net annual income, and (3) dividing the residual amount (the income attributable to the land) by the estimated rate of return on the land.

After a review of the land disposition phase of the slum clearance and urban renewal program, a firm of expert real estate consultants reported to URA in January 1956 that—

"There is a tendency among many of the reuse appraisers to use the land residual method, too often with little, if any, consideration of comparative land prices. The land residual method can be a treacherous procedure when applied to proposed or nonexistent improvements unless it be thoroughly understood, handled by extremely competent men and most astutely used in each one of its numerous important and critical steps. This method should never be used without full inclusion of checks against or with comparative transactions."

In appraising certain residential land in project area B, FHA used this method and three other methods of valuation. Regarding the land residual method, an FHA appraiser stated:

"As is always the case, we must caution that the land residual approach can at least be considered a 'check' and cannot be depended upon to be an accurate indicator of value."

We discussed the value of $2.50 per square foot for the Town Center land with FHA officials and they informed us that commercial land, such as that to be used for the Town Center, generally should have a higher value than residential land, such as that in project area B to be used for an 8-story apartment building. FHA valued this residential land at $2.50 per square foot, but has not appraised the Town Center land.

In a letter dated February 26, 1959, the Chairman, RLA, informed us that—

1. The RLA entered into a memorandum of understanding with the potential private redeveloper in order to secure a plan with a known market for a very large area. When the memorandum was executed on March 15, 1954, there was serious question whether a market existed for a project as large as area C. The redeveloper guaranteed to cooperate in the development of a plan and to underwrite the market for half of the area when the plan was approved. The firm did this and RLA has been negotiating in good faith with it for the lease of certain land in the project.

2. The RLA had advertised twice for proposals on the disposition of land in project area B and expects to advertise the availability of other land in the future.

The Chairman, RLA, also informed us that—

"As the audit report (draft) indicates, the reuse value for the Town Center land was set without FHA approval. The reason for this is that at the time the value was approved neither RLA nor the developer had considered FHA financing. * * * It might be pointed out that at the time the RLA price of the Town Center ($2.50 per square foot) was approved by HHFA and subsequently accepted by the redevelopers in January 1958, the redeveloper had not filed an application with FHA for mortgage insurance. Until FHA received such an application accompanied by a fee, it was precluded from pricing land. * * *."

In contrast to these stated reasons for not requesting FHA to appraise the Town Center land before approval of the price, we found that—

1. Representatives of the redeveloper, the RLA, and the FHA attended a meeting on November 18, 1957 (before the value of $2.50 per square foot was approved), and discussed the possibilities of the redeveloper's obtaining FHA financing, and on December 20, 1957, FHA administratively ruled it could insure a mortgage on the Town Center.

2. The FHA appraised the residential land in project area B in July 1955, and again in June 1956. FHA did not receive any appli-

cations for mortgage insurance and the required fees until December 14, 1956.

In March 1959, the RLA received uninvited offers of $3 and $3.50 per square foot for the land. The offerer of $3.50 also offered to reimburse the proposed redeveloper for all costs incurred at that time. Shortly thereafter the proposed redeveloper informed the RLA that he was willing to pay whatever value between $2.50 and $3 per square foot is set by FHA when it appraises the land for mortgage insurance purposes. The RLA then proposed to revise the value of the Town Center land upward to $2.75 per square foot. The redeveloper agreed to this revision provided that the FHA concurs in the valuation. If FHA considers the value of $2.75 per square foot to be too low, the matter will be restudied. If FHA considers the $2.75 per square foot value to be too high, the RLA will lower the price in accordance with the value established by FHA, but not below the initial agreed-upon price of $2.50 per square foot. The RLA rejected the other offers and accepted the revised proposal.

Considering the following facts, we believe that, when FHA appraises the land for mortgage insurance purposes, it will find establishing an independent value of more than $3 per square foot (if warranted) extremely difficult.

(1) The RLA and URA had previously approved a price of $2.50 per square foot.

(2) The RLA has now accepted a proposal between the limits of $2.50 and $3 per square foot.

(3) Five years have passed since the RLA and the redeveloper executed the memorandum of understanding, and all parties are anxious for construction to start without further complications.

(4) Both FHA and URA are constituents of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

(5) If a mortgagor defaults on an FHA-insured mortgage, the FHA has an option to purchase the land for a price equal to the value set by FHA for mortgage insurance purposes.

We believe that the RLA or the URA should have obtained for comparative purposes independent appraisals of the Town Center land from FHA at the time the initial appraisal of $4 per square foot and the later appraisal of $2.50 per square foot were obtained from the three appraisers employed by the RLA.

We believe also that, even if the RLA obtains a rental based on a land value of $3 per square foot, it still will not have reasonable assurance that it has obtained the highest return obtainable. Our belief is based on the fact that, at the time offers of $3 and $3.50 were received in March 1959, a proposed price of $2.50 was public knowledge and the offerers were no doubt influenced by that price.

On July 8, 1958, the operators of a restaurant to be acquired and demolished by RLA submitted an uninvited schematic plan for a restaurant and planetarium on land in project area C that had been planned for an overlook of the waterfront and requested that the RLA not negotiate for the sale or lease of the land for a period of 1 year. On September 9, 1958, RLA's Board of Directors accepted this proposal subject to the approval of URA. On December 10, 1958, the URA requested the RLA to reconsider the proposal because such disposal was not in accordance with the urban renewal plan.

The RLA files show that, in August 1958, other restaurant operators and owners to be displaced by RLA objected to the exclusive negotiation aspect of the proposal and indicated interest in developing the overlook land. We believe that the RLA should not have accepted a proposal of this type because it was similar to the memorandum of understanding dated March 15, 1954, and could create a moral obligation to negotiate exclusively with one redeveloper.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMMISSIONER, URA

We recommend that URA require the RLA to—

1. Discontinue the practice of negotiating with only one potential private redeveloper.

2. Publicize the availability of land and invite competitive bids or proposals.

3. Refuse to accept redevelopment plans prepared by a private redeveloper if such acceptance obliges the RLA to negotiate only with such redeveloper.

We recommend also, when it appears that FHA will insure the mortgages of property in the redeveloped area, that, before URA approves the disposition prices, it require the RLA and other LPA's to obtain independent appraisals from FHA for comparative purposes.

Children's Crusade of 1961, Potential for Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in his column appearing in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star, Constantine Brown describes the alleged Peace Corps as "a publicity stunt with the potential for tragedy." His valid criticism of the scheme deserves the widest possible circulation, and I desire to include the column as part of my remarks:

In the year 1212 a group of idealists, aided and abetted by some of the most naive parents, led thousands of children on a march from their homes in Europe to free the Holy Lands from the grip of infidels.

The debauchery, the horror, the torture, and the enslavery of these pathetic children is without parallel in history. By the time the atrocity was abandoned, the lives of 50,000 children had been sacrificed on the altar of human stupidity.

With the lessons of history behind us, the bold New Frontier plans to launch the children's crusade of 1961—the Peace Corps—to spread enlightenment and establish the brotherhood of man. This action could be likened insofar as the concept is concerned with the blunders of seven centuries ago.

It is remarkable that in this enlightened country few voices have been raised to label this proposal for what it actually is, a publicity stunt with the potential for tragedy.

A young man, Sargent Shriver, has been appointed to head the program. His only qualification seems to be that he is a very nice young man, a very sincere young man, who hates war. Perhaps, however, his lack of qualifications makes him eminently qualified as head of the Peace Corps because, insofar as can be determined, this 20th century crusade has no duties, no missions, no obligations, and only few chances of performing real services.

Any attempt to elicit from any public official the work to be performed by the Peace Corps is met with a rambling, nebulous discourse on the advantages of people-to-people communication in the name of freedom, love, and democracy.

Young American college graduates are expected to mingle with Congolese, Ghanians, and a host of others, trying to ingratiate themselves into their society.

Under the point 4 program, the Marshall plan, and the technical assistance program, we have for years been attempting to send to many areas of the world trained and talented specialists to assist these people to improve their economic status, their agriculture, industry, hygiene, etc. Billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money have been invested in these projects. Does anyone believe that the innocence of the youngsters of the Peace Corps will succeed where the knowledge of the mature and the experienced has thus far faltered?

Medical missionaries of every faith, such as Dr. Albert Schweitzer and the late Dr. Thomas E. Dooley, have devoted millions of dollars and their lives in efforts to bring to the unenlightened the message of hope in the hereafter and better, more healthy, prosperous life in the present.

How can we suppose that any part of the world desires to be invaded by a corps of American adolescents whose mission seems to be only to win friends and influence people?

Furthermore, we have been told publicly that these youngsters will not be allowed to preach either religion or anticommunism, since this would lend a political aspect to their undertaking and can be exploited by the Communists to create incidents which might have serious consequences.

On the other hand, we are told that the preliminary budget for this escapade will be about $10 million the first year and that aspirants to membership will be subjected to the most rigorous training. One might assume that by "rigorous training" is meant that members will be taught to be agricultural experts, medical doctors, engineers, biologists, chemists, linguistic or diplomatic experts, or industrial technicians. Such an assumption, however, obviously is fallacious since, if it were true, by the time the youngsters finished their training they would be adults competent to assist in the technical assistance program and not eligible for the children's crusade.

Of all the propositions advanced within the recent history of the United States this truly is the most astounding. Yet there has been so far little criticism of this amazingly naive project.

There was a day in America when the authors of such a scheme as the Peace Corps would have had to answer to very pertinent questioning of an alert, intelligent citizenry. Today they are fawned upon as though they had just found the Holy Grail.

The Flash of Lightning and the Deeper Tides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, this article by James Reston, published in the New York Times of March 24, 1961, analyzes the foreboding outlook for freedom in the Lao area. Mr. Reston also points with clarity and vision to the need for an effective consolidation of the free nations which are frequently known as the Atlantic Community.

I believe this article deserves the attention of all thoughtful Americans:

The Lao crisis is bad, but not all bad. It is a flash of lightning on an ugly truth. The situation was worse before the flash because Laos was slipping away in the dark. Now at least we can see a little of what is happening and President Kennedy is beginning to tell the country what it should have been told some days and even weeks ago.

In the process, it is fairly clear that, while taking precautionary military moves in the Pacific, the President is seeking an international solution to the problem, and any international solution is bound to be a compromise solution.

What the President said was impressive, but no more so than what he didn't say. He avoided any go-it-alone commitment to intervene in the Lao war. He put the question to his allies in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, including Britain and France, who are in no mood for any adventures in the Lao jungle.

What is happening there is roughly what happened in North Korea and North Vietnam. The Communists are expanding from their central position on the Eurasian continent into areas adjacent to their borders. They are close to home; to oppose them, we must travel to the end of a long line of communications and either intervene in the jungle of Asia ourselves or rely on troops that have little will to fight and little capacity to understand what the fight is all about.

The history of these battles close to the Communist empire is that they usually end in a truce. Thus both sides settled for a division of both Korea and Vietnam. Whenever one of the great powers was so committed to battle that the intervention of the other side might have produced a major war, the second always held back, or compromised.

This was what happened in Greece and Turkey in 1946–47; in the Berlin blockade in 1948–49; the Korean war of 1950–53; the Hungarian revolt of 1956, and the Lebanon crisis of 1958. In every case, either Moscow or Washington abstained when the other risked war, and when the war was fought by proxy through third-power troops, some accommodation was always reached, usually at the West's expense.

Thus what is happening in Laos is not the first skirmish on the fringe of the Soviet empire and it won't be the last. The outlook in these areas is not good. The assumption of the bold is that somehow the West can keep the Communists out of all the once-free areas adjacent to Russia and China despite the rise of Communist power, but it is not the kind of assumption most governments like to risk a major war to prove.

THE VITAL QUESTION

The drift of all this is that each side in the cold war tends to prevail when geography is on its side. The Communists may influence Cuba but they will not hold it. We may by bold maneuvers influence events in Laos and even save its independence for a while, but the odds are against us. It is not like the Congo, where we can beat Communists to the scene.

Two vast consolidations are now proceeding in the world: The Communist consolidation of all but a few areas next to their frontiers, and the Western consolidation of the free nations. In the Communist case the nations concerned are comparatively underdeveloped and therefore easier to control; in the other, the nations are old and proud and highly developed.

Accordingly, the Communist consolidation is going ahead faster than our own. It is proceeding by subversion and force, but it is moving fast.

The same goal is available to the West. It has the capacity, if it has the will, to create a commonwealth of the Atlantic, strong enough to stand against any threat from the expanding Communist nations.

Even in Laos, however, the Atlantic nations have had trouble working out a common policy or even adequate consultations.

Events in that area, they complain, are "uncontrollable," and this may be true despite the President's bold moves, but events in the Atlantic are controllable if somebody will concentrate on the task.

Control by District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency Over Relocation Operations Held To Be Deficient by U.S. Comptroller General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with a bill I have introduced today, to provide for a study of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency by the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives, I include an excerpt from the U.S. Comptroller General's report of his audit of this Agency:

RELOCATION

CONTROL OVER RELOCATION OPERATIONS DEFICIENT

We reviewed Redevelopment Land Agency's relocation operations in project area C and noted a lack of control over records, reports, and inspections pertaining to families self-relocated in private housing.

Section 105(c) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1455), provides that with respect to the relocation of displaced families:

"There be a feasible method for the temporary relocation of families displaced from the urban renewal area, and that there are or are being provided, in the urban renewal area or in other areas * * * at rents or prices within the financial means of the families displaced from the urban renewal area, decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings * * *."

In Report No. 1, transmitted to the House Committee on Banking and Currency on January 31, 1956, the Subcommittee on Housing made the following comments on the relocation of displaced families:

"The subcommittee is concerned that adequate safeguards are being taken to see that such families are transferred, as painlessly as possible, to alternative decent housing which they can afford. * * * The subcommittee urges that the Federal authorities charged with overseeing relocation responsibilities exercise increased vigilance to make sure that the municipalities are in fact doing an effective and humane job in this area. Every effort should be made to insure a workable relocation plan with adequate personnel to supervise the working out of the program. If displaced families are merely shunted to another slum area or an area which is on the verge of becoming a slum, the problem is only aggravated further."

Regarding voluntary rehousing, part 3, chapter 4, section 5, of the LPA Manual provides, in part, that—

"The local public agency should request permission to inspect the unit into which the family has moved.

"Results of these inspections shall be recorded. If the unit is not 'decent, safe, and sanitary' by the standards, which the local public agency has established, the move should be considered temporary offsite relocation, and further assistance in locating decent, safe, and sanitary housing should be made available to the family. Records of the action taken to encourage the family to move to decent, safe, and sanitary housing should be maintained in a manner which will enable the local public agency to report upon the status of families voluntarily rehoused at all times, until the relocation responsibility of the local public agency has been discharged."

In a report of relocation progress (form H–666) as of June 30, 1958, submitted to the URA, the RLA showed that 1,315 families in project area C had been relocated—310 families in public housing and 1,005 families in private housing. The report showed that, of the 1,005 families relocated in private housing, 956 families self-relocated and 49 families were relocated by the RLA.

Noted during our review were the following principal deficiencies:

1. Records made available for our review pertained to only 747, rather than 956, families self-relocated in private housing. We believe that RLA's statistics are inaccurate and that the number of families self-relocated in private housing and the total number of families relocated at June 30, 1958, were overstated in the report to URA.

2. RLA's report to URA showed that 340 dwellings to which families had relocated had not been inspected at June 30, 1958. We reviewed RLA's relocation record folders on July 29, 1958, and observed that 240 folders did not contain inspection reports—35 folders were segregated and awaiting inspections and 205 folders were mingled with about 870 other relocation record folders.

3. We observed 10 inspection reports on dwellings to which families had moved that showed the dwellings to be substandard and were filed in the relocation record folders which were mingled with over 1,000 other folders. The 10 relocation record folders did not contain evidence indicating that the RLA had (a) encouraged the families to move to decent, safe, and sanitary housing or (b) reported the substandard conditions of the dwellings to the city's code enforcement units.

4. From RLA's relocation records, we selected at random 37 families relocated in private housing to evaluate RLA's inspection procedures. Three families had moved to dwellings which had not been inspected by RLA and 10 families were not at home at the time of our inspections. Our findings concerning the 24 inspection reports are presented below:

(a) No dwellings existed at two of the addresses even though inspection reports had been completed fully.

(b) Tenants at nine dwellings informed us that an RLA inspector had not visited the dwellings. The description of the exterior design of two of the nine dwellings shown on the inspection reports was materially inaccurate.

(c) Tenants at three dwellings informed us that an RLA inspector had visited the dwellings but did not inspect the interior.

(d) Using RLA's standards as criteria, we observed that one dwelling, which the RLA certified as standard, was actually substandard.

5. We also inspected six dwellings to which families had moved in an area near the project area. RLA had certified all six dwellings as being standard. Tenants at four dwellings informed us that an RLA inspector had not visited the dwellings and a tenant at one dwelling informed us that an RLA inspector had visited the dwelling but did not inspect the interior. We observed that two of the five dwellings were actually substandard.

We discussed the above deficiencies with the chief of RLA's project management division and furnished him the addresses of the dwellings concerned. He informed us that action would be taken to (1) review all relocation record folders and to segregate those folders on families that have self-relocated in private housing which is substandard and in housing which has not been inspected by RLA, (2) inspect those dwellings that have not been inspected, (3) followup on families that have relocated in substandard private housing, (4) require that 1 out of 10 inspections of private housing to which families have relocated be independently checked by another employee, and (5) review and reconstruct the statistical data to be included in future reports to URA. Shortly thereafter, we noted that relocation record folders were being reviewed and segregated. On March 3, 1959, the RLA project management division issued new procedures designed to control inspections of private housing and provide for systematic followup on families relocated in substandard housing.

The Chief of RLA's project management division informed us also that the URA had suggested that all suspected violations of the District of Columbia housing code be reported to code enforcement units but that the RLA believed that such action would jeopardize its relationship with realtors and owners of the dwellings.

In a letter dated February 26, 1959, the Chairman, RLA, stated that (1) the RLA believed that if it were to report such violations, its ability to obtain listings from real estate firms would be impaired and (2) in certain respects RLA standards exceed minimum code requirements and a violation of RLA standards may not be a violation of minimum code requirements.

We agree that a violation of the RLA's standards may not be a violation of the District of Columbia housing code. However, when RLA's inspector encounters conditions which are obviously serious code violations, we believe that such conditions should be reported to the local code enforcement agency.

We believe also that URA should make periodic reviews of RLA's relocation records, reports, and inspections in order to determine whether adequate controls are maintained to avoid the recurrence of the abovecited deficiencies.

In a letter to us dated March 23, 1959, the Commissioner, URA, stated that HHFA regional office relocation staff made periodic visits to projects in execution to review relocation and property management activities of the LPA's. The Commissioner stated also that the supervision of these activities is now being strengthened through the use of site inspectors on the regional office staff who will be required to make monthly reports on their assigned projects.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMISSIONER, URA

To retard the spread of blight and slums to other areas, we recommend that URA include a provision in the LPA Manual requiring that LPA's report in writing to local code enforcement units those dwellings at which the LPA's inspections disclose obvious code violations of a serious nature.

PAYMENTS FOR PROPERTY LOSSES IMPROPER

We tested relocation payments totaling $45,256 that were made to families and business concerns displaced from project areas B and C. These payments included three payments totaling $5,850 to business concerns for alleged losses on fixtures and equipment moved by the business concern to their new location. The HHFA project auditors had questioned one of these payments which occurred in the period covered by their audit. The payments represented the difference between the replacement value and the liquidating value of the property.

We discussed the three payments with the chief of RLA's project management division and he stated that the three payments were proper because (1) in one case the business concern was required to construct an addition to the building at the new location to house the equipment and did not receive payment for any moving expenses, (2) in one case the business concern also received a payment for moving expenses, but that payment did not include the cost of dismantling and reinstalling equipment, and (3) in the other case the business concern did not receive payment for any moving expenses.

We believe that the RLA should have made payments to the business concerns for moving expenses, including the cost of dismantling and reinstalling equipment, rather than for losses of property.

The Housing Act of 1956, approved August 7, 1956 (70 Stat. 1101), authorized the making of relocation payments to individuals, families, and business concerns for their reasonable and necessary moving expenses and any actual direct losses of property, except goodwill or profit resulting from their displacement from a project area. Such payments may not exceed $100 to an individual or family, or $2,500 to a business concern.

Since August 1956, the URA has issued a number of LPA letters and revisions to rules and regulations prescribed by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator. In April 1958, URA issued an advisory bulletin titled "Questions and Answers on Relocation Payments," which interprets the rules and regulations. In October 1958, however, the LPA Manual (pt. 2, ch. 6, sec. 5, and pt. 3, ch. 4, sec. 8) contained provisions which (1) related to financial assistance to site occupants that were dated February 11, 1953, and May 19, 1955, and (2) were inconsistent with provisions of the Housing Act of 1956.

We recommended that URA revise its LPA Manual to include specific policies and procedures to be followed in making relocation payments, as authorized by the Housing Act of 1956.

In a letter to us dated March 23, 1959, the Commissioner, URA, stated that he agreed with the above recommendation as it applies to relocation payments authorized by the Housing Act of 1956. Pending the issuance of policies and procedures which are now in clearance for inclusion in the LPA Manual, LPA letter No. 171 was issued on December 31, 1958.

Kennedy School Bill Should Not Be Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very fine editorial which appeared recently in the Maryville-Alcoa Daily Times, Maryville, Tenn.

The editorial follows:

KENNEDY SCHOOL BILL SHOULD NOT BE AMENDED

The Kennedy bill on education has received many plaudits and educators have called the message in which he delivered the bill to Congress one of the great documents in the history of American education.

There is no doubt that this bill will become one of the landmarks in our educational system for it will start, if passed, a whole new idea of direct Federal help in this field heretofore considered a State responsibility. The fact that some States have not accepted their responsibility has brought the Federal Government into action and this time without the normal control which the central government exercises over all its other aid programs.

Incorporated in the bill is the following paragraph:

"SEC. 103. In the administration of this title, no Department, Agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system."

This paragraph, if left in the act at its signing, should allay any suspicions that Federal grants will mean Federal controls on our educational system. True, the natural bureaucratic tendency would be to advance interpretations which would weaken and change the intent of the no-control clause but the language is so definite and positive that little misinterpretation could take place.

The proposal of President Kennedy is fourfold. There would be grants to States for public schools for teachers' pay or construction or both, grants for 212,500 college scholarships to be issued on the basis of ability and need, long-term, low-interest loans for college academic facilities and finally more loans for residential housing for college students and faculty.

In all, the bill calls for $5.6 billion to be spent in support of the Nation's educational program.

As could be expected, many proposed amendments will and have cropped up. Some of them will try to circumvent the no-control clause such as the one proposed to allow no Federal aid to go into a school system which is not intergrated. This is a definite control measure and should be treated as being outside the intent of the bill.

Another measure which has caused a great deal of comment is the proposal by some bishops of the Catholic Church to include parochial schools in the program. Almost all churches have some type of church-supported school but, as far as we have been able to ascertain, this request by some members of the Catholic Church remains by itself.

In fact, the other religious groups are rather firmly against any intervention of the Federal Government in the financial affairs of their schools. Commercial and trade schools are also viewing the Federal grants and will act if other amendments are successful.

Many of the educators who helped write the bill are fearful that the zealous efforts of private groups will defeat the bill by the amendment route. The tacking on of these will add other groups in opposition.

The bill as designed will assure that every child is given the opportunity to learn in a school prepared to foster health and higher achievement. We are in full accord with the bill and with the benefits that are certain to accrue to the advancement of education in this country.

We cannot condone the amendments that private groups are proposing which will threaten the bill. It is our hope that they will defer their own selfish desires in order that the problems confronting public education in this country can be overcome.

The greatness of this country and the advancement of it in all fields of endeavor can be traced back to the public school system. This has failed to keep pace in many areas of the country and the Federal bill is designed to aid these without control.

Hope Dims for A-Test Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond appeared in the Washington Post of today, April 10. Having just returned from Geneva, where I attended the spring meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, I can agree 100 percent in what Mr. Drummond says of the Russian strategy. It is always the same; they will never give in and they will never take "No" for an answer. They are willing to wait years to obtain their objectives and they believe they can wear us out eventually.

It is for us to realize the truth and to face it without compromise and without fear. Any other action on our part can but spell the defeat of our cause.

REDS AT GENEVA—HOPES DIM FOR A-TEST TREATY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

We should be ready for bleak news on test-ban and disarmament negotiations with the Soviets.

I suspect the real state of affairs will soon be out in the open at Geneva.

The Russians are now backing away from any inspectable treaty to end the testing of nuclear weapons.

There is yet no solid Soviet agreement to begin the talks on comprehensive agreement August 1.

There is an appearance of an agreement, but Moscow has attached a condition. The United States, Britain, France, Canada, and the others are ready to resume the Disarmament Conference, where they left off last year. Moscow says yes, but only if some additional nations are brought to the conference table. So there is nothing firm about the August 1 date.

Such news from Geneva can only mean that the Soviets do not want to negotiate a test-ban agreement which has any element of secure enforcement. Naturally they do not say so. That would be bad propaganda, but their actions reveal their intentions:

1. The United States and Britain have made seven significant concessions to Soviet views on inspection. The Russians offer nothing in return.

2. Actually the Soviet delegate not only makes no return concessions, but he has withdrawn Russian approval of one of the most important agreements already reached in previous Geneva meetings—that a single neutral administrator be in charge of the test-ban control commission.

3. In place of a single neutral administrator, Moscow now says it will only accept a three-man committee on which, at all points, each would have to agree before any inspection was authorized.

4. This means inspection only at the will and wishes of the Kremlin. This means that the Soviets could stop the control machinery at any time, anywhere.

No wonder Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, after conferring with the American negotiators at Geneva, warned that the United States will not be lured into a treaty "just for the sake of a treaty" and will not accept a veto-locked inspection system.

It is quite possible that the Soviets have decided that the value of a test ban is not equal to the amount of inspection needed to make it work. Or, they might have decided that they can get the United States to continue the moratorium on testing without any inspection agreement at all.

Whatever their reasons, the Soviet demand for a veto-laden control commission makes the outlook for any kind of disarmament agreement nearly hopeless.

It now seems clear that the Kremlin is insisting upon a veto over any international agency which could affect the Soviet Union. Their demand at Geneva for a "committee secretariat" to run the test-ban control commission is exactly what Premier Khrushchev has been demanding at the U.N.—a committee to run the secretariat of the United Nations with a Soviet veto over any action.

Is there any reason to think that the Soviets will accept a veto-free inspection system for general disarmament when they will not accept a veto-free control commission to verify the test ban?

Thus far the Soviet record at Geneva is a dismal dashing of the hopes of the whole world for serious negotiation.

Participation in an Airborne Alert Mission Flown in One of SAC's B–52 Jet Bombers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to report to the House of Representatives about a most memorable experience which occurred recently when I visited my home, the Sixth Congressional District in the State of Oklahoma. During this visit, as many of you may know, I was privileged to become the first Member of Congress to participate in an airborne alert mission flown in one of the Strategic Air Command's giant, eight-jet, B–52 bombers which is assigned to the 11th Bombardment Wing.

We have two Strategic Air Command bases located within Oklahoma's Sixth Congressional District. They are Altus Air Force Base located in the southwestern corner of Oklahoma and Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base in the west central part of our State. Both bases are equipped with the Strategic Air Command's giant B–52 bombers and the high-altitude, high-speed KC–135 jet tankers which are used for in-flight refueling to greatly increase the range of SAC's bomber force.

Further, Altus Air Force Base has been assigned the task of establishing and maintaining 12 Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile sites. The Altus Base is also presently involved as one of the first operational bases to receive the Hound Dog, air-to-ground missile, which is carried beneath the wing of the B–52 to greatly increase that bomber's striking capability.

Altus Air Force Base is the home of the Strategic Air Command's 11th Bombardment Wing, commanded by Col. Frederick R. Ramputi. Under his able command, Colonel Ramputi has jet bombers, jet tankers, air-to-ground missiles, and will soon have operational ICBM's. To visit the 11th Bombardment Wing is to see a truly integrated aerospace force in operation.

Besides being one of the first bombardment wings within the Strategic Air Command to attain an integrated systems status—that is, to have both jet aircraft and ballistic missiles—the 11th Bombardment Wing has a long history of firsts and of excellent achievement. Most of you gentlemen are aware of the combat competition held annually by the Strategic Air Command. Top aircrews from all over the world compete for the huge Fairchild trophy which is given for excellence in bombing, navigation, aerial refueling and the highly technical field of electronic countermeasures. When you have the top crews, from the most awesome fighting force the world has ever known, competing for the Fairchild trophy, the winner must be really good. Gentlemen, the 11th Bombardment Wing has won that Fairchild Trophy three times during the 12 years of the trophy's existence. No other bombardment wing has ever won that trophy more than once.

In the 1960's Strategic Air Command's combat competition the 11th Bombardment Wing became the first to win the Fairchild trophy while using the B–52 bomber and the KC–135 jet tanker. Besides the huge Fairchild trophy, the 11th Bomb Wing also brought home the trophy for having the best jet tanker unit—the 96th Air Refueling Squadron—within the Strategic Air Command. These are the men that I was privileged to visit and to fly with.

Upon arrival at Altus Air Force Base, I was immediately given a tour of the newly completed Hound Dog missile facilities and it was explained to me how this missile would be carried beneath the wings of the B–52 to be launched hundreds of miles from a potential target or be used to wipe out enemy defense which might stand between the bomber and its primary target area. The B–52 is our Nation's first airborne missile platform bomber. The destructive capability of this weapon system defies the imagination.

From the Hound Dog facilities, we proceeded to the far north end of Altus' 2½-mile runway where I saw demonstrated the capability of the Strategic Air Command's ground alert concept. Aircrews, housed in a giant, half buried, concrete and steel building, maintain the ability around the clock, every day of the year, to launch SAC's retaliatory force. Within sprinting distance from the heavily guarded alert building many B–52 Stratofortress bombers and KC–135 Stratotankers perch, fully loaded and ready to roll down a high-speed taxiway to the runway. These dedicated men spend 25 percent of their lives living in isolation within the alert compound, always ready to perform their awesome task.

The men who fly these aircraft are highly motivated with their mission. When the klaxon horns sound an alert one had better get out of the way fast. If he does not, I will guarantee you that, Congresman or not, he is liable to be trampled. These men fully realize that

they must utilize every second of any warning they may receive of an impending attack and they are not going to be caught on the ground. There is not much humor in their deadly business.

The following day, it was my privilege to tour 1 of the 12 Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile sites presently under construction near Altus Air Force Base. These are to be hardened sites. That is to say, the missiles will be housed in giant silos buried 180 feet deep into the ground. This is to make them invulnerable to anything other than a direct hit by a weapon from any potential aggressor.

Conducting me on this tour were Air Force Col. Ernest L. Ramme, commander of the Site Activation Task Force and Lt. Col. Carl F. Baswell, project engineer for the Army Corps of Engineers, who are responsible for construction of the Atlas missile facilities. They explained to me many of the complicated problems involved in this $65 million project. I came away convinced that this is a sound investment of our defense dollars, because, as I stated earlier, these sites will be nearly invulnerable to attack.

Gentlemen, the real highlight of my tour came when approval was granted for me to fly aboard one of the 11th Bomb Wing's B–52 Stratofortress bombers on an airborne alert mission. The hours immediately preceding the mission were so filled with events that it is difficult to recall everything that happened.

Briefly, I sat in the premission briefing with the flight crew where top wing specialists outlined the requirements of the flight and briefed us on the weather that we could expect along our route.

After the briefing I was given a complete physical checkup and a clean bill of health by Lt. Col. Bradley W. Prior, the 11th Bomb Wing Flight Surgeon.

From the flight surgeon's office I was taken to the wing's personal equipment section where I was completely outfitted from head to toe with the heavy-duty clothing worn by all SAC crews whenever they fly. I was fitted with special, quick-donning alert boots, heavy winter flight coveralls, gloves, and jacket. Last but not least came the jet helmet—SAC men refer to them as "brain buckets"—and the very necessary oxygen mask which connects to the helmet. By the time they had a parachute strapped on my back I was beginning to wonder how these men managed to wear all this paraphernalia throughout a long airborne alert flight.

Gen. Thomas S. Power, SAC Commander in Chief, announced in January that Strategic Air Command aircraft were participating in airborne alert training which means that a certain number of aircraft are in the air at all times as part of the command's routine aircrew readiness program.

As the Members of the House are aware, the funds for the airborne alert training program are provided from money previously allotted to the Department of Defense to develop an airborne alert "on-the-shelf" capacity. I must say that these highly skilled men are making good use of those funds.

Missions, such as the one in which I participated, are flown under quite realistic conditions. At all times during the flight we were in direct radio contact with Strategic Air Command Headquarters at Omaha, Nebr., and could have been ordered to change course and strike any potential enemy target.

Colonel Ramputi, the 11th Bomb Wing commander, said that the feasibility of maintaining a part of the SAC bomber fleet in the air around-the-clock has been proven by over 6,000 airborne alert training sorties completed successfully by SAC bombers during the past 2 years.

In the cockpit I watched as Maj. Thomas W. Martin, pilot and aircraft commander of this giant craft, and his copilot, 1st Lt. Wilber H. Smith, went through page after page of checklists to prepare for flight. Behind me, 1st Lt. Raymond C. McAdoo carefully checked the maze of gear required to conduct electronic countermeasures activity. Downstairs, on the lower deck, Capt. David G. Ebert, the radar-navigator checked his bombing equipment while Capt. Frank M. Nakamura, the navigator, made certain that all navigational equipment was functioning properly. In the tail section M. Sgt. Russell D. Bick, tail gunner, busied himself checking out the defensive gunnery system.

The coordination required between these crew members both on the ground and throughout the flight is simply fantastic to one who has never witnessed these men on the job before. Their language, like their jobs, is highly technical and it was difficult to really understand all that seemed to be going on. I did know, the meaning of the term "roger." The crew, at every opportunity, explained to me what they were doing so that I feel I can really appreciate the tremendously technical business of getting a giant jet bomber into the sky.

When we took off, rain clouds hung low over the airfield but we climbed through them on instruments, along a designated flight path, almost as if the clouds did not exist. Soon we burst into bright afternoon sunshine, as if climbing into another world. During the takeoff, I had buckled into an ejection seat and connected my quick release parachute lanyard as Major Martin had shown me, however, I never had the slightest worry about having to make use of this equipment.

After the aircraft was established in the climb to altitude, I was free to move about and visit each of the crew member's positions, watch over their shoulders and learn something of each man's job. It was tremendously interesting. At some time during the flight I sat at each position while the crew set switches, tuned radios and focused radar scopes; all the while explaining to me what I was seeing or hearing with their equipment. At one time I was allowed to take the aircraft's controls and make a turn.

To maintain the bomber in the air for so many hours requires both day and night aerial refueling. Many hours after takeoff we rendezvoused with a KC–135 jet tanker of the 96th Air Refueling Squadron, also a part of the 11th Bomb Wing at Altus.

I was truly amazed at the precision flying required to place these two aircraft in position for refueling and I was astounded at the amount of fuel that flowed from the tanker into our bomber. It was almost unbelievable to see those pilots, strapped into the same seat for so many hours, make a night hookup and fly perfect formation, get their fuel. Believe me, they must have tremendous stamina, because refueling is really handwork.

During the 24 long hours of an airborne alert mission they continually fight cramped muscles and other physical inconveniences Under these conditions I think it must be doubly hard to maintain an alert, quick thinking mind, which is a prime requirement when flying at jet speeds. A continuous vigilance for other aircraft must be maintained by the pilots, who only leave their positions when it is absolutely necessary. But this crew never once slowed down. I found them highly conscious of air safety problems and extremely competent and careful.

During this long flight, I did manage to catnap on a couple occasions, however, I was far too interested in the activity around me and in these hard working airmen to worry very much about losing sleep.

As I talked with the men and it started to get light again in the east, I began asking myself what it must be worth to our Nation to have airmen such as these dedicated, devoted professionals, willing to endure the physical discomforts created by 5-pound helmets, heavy parachutes, and the many other inconveniences demanded of them in order to keep this weapons system ready to strike should ever the need arise. I came to the conclusion that these men are worth a great deal more than we are willing, at least at the present, to give.

These men told me of the thousands of man-hours and great technical knowledge that are required by their ground maintenance personnel in order to provide them with sound aircraft and reliable bombing, navigation, electronics countermeasures and gunnery systems which are required to make this an effective weapons system. The aircrew had nothing but the highest praise for the technical specialists who spend untold extra hours to make sure that their equipment was the best that was humanly possible to provide.

Gentlemen, I have always felt that the Strategic Air Command had mighty good men and equipment, but this flight made me appreciate them and the job they are doing a lot more. These men are a far cry from the old scarf and goggles Air Corps. I witnessed highly trained, highly skilled men doing a professional job infinitely more complex than I can begin to explain. And I must add doing it effectively and efficiently.

One of the greatest problems that the Strategic Air Command faces is that of holding their men. SAC spends millions of dollars training these men only to

have them leave the service for higher paying, less demanding careers in civilian industry. This is a great loss to our Nation; an unnecessary drain of defense dollars.

I walked away from that flight—truly one of the most thrilling experiences of my life—firmly convinced that we, the Congress of the United States, are not providing adequate compensation for these SAC men. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I shall strive to enact legislation to provide extra pay for the air crews who man SAC's alert force; for the highly skilled technicians who maintain SAC's intricate weapon systems and to find a way to provide more promotions for these most deserving men.

We can, and we must, provide greater incentives for these professionals to remain in military service. Their job is tough, demanding, exasperating and particularly hard on their families—yes, the average SAC man does have a family. If we fail to find the added incentives necessary to keep these men in SAC we shall have failed to spend our defense dollars wisely and—worst of all—we cannot help but to slip behind in our efforts to contain the Communist threat to world peace. I stand firmly convinced that we need immediate approval for increasing subsistence allowance for SAC's airmen, increase in SAC officer and airman promotions, establishment of an SAC alert pay and to do something about proficiency pay for these highly skilled technical specialists.

We, as Congressmen, must evaluate our positions, particularly with regard to defense spending, to see if we are really up to date with the requirements for establishing and maintaining the fantastically technical and complex aerospace force that present-day military concepts demand. I am certain that if every Congressman could just realize the type of prepardeness program that the Strategic Air Command has built and the great sacrifices that are made to maintain this vigilance, he would plainly see the immediate necessity for remedial legislation.

My flight aboard one of the 11th Bombardment Wing's B–52 bombers marked the anniversary of my first trip to Congress 20 years ago. The military services—and particularly the aerospace forces—have undergone a tremendous change in all areas of operation during that time. One cannot begin to draw a comparison between the efficiency and complexity of the forces today to those of 20, or even 10, years ago. Why, then, should we expect these men to work for the same pay or the same promotional opportunities that they have in the past?

In conclusion, just let me say that as a result of my flight aboard one of the world champion 11th Bomb Wing's B-52's, I have returned to my seat on the floor of the House of Representatives, a much more interested, more highly motivated, more determined Member of Congress. I shall work tirelessly to see that no stone is left unturned toward seeing the U.S. Air Force and the Strategic Air Command realize their famous slogan, "Aerospace Power for Peace." Thank you.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, because we are approaching the time when this body will be engaged in debate on Federal aid to education, I believe it behooves all of us to select from our reading articles which we feel will be of value to our colleagues as they try to make up their minds about the correctness or incorrectness of this proposed step.

There was published in the Chattanooga Free Press of Friday, March 31, a very excellent editorial entitled "The Facts Refute the Lobbyists." The writer of the editorial correctly pointed out that—

One of the most significant things about the current agitation for massive Federal aid to education is that its primary source has not been the people on the local level who are supposed to be in such need of Federal help.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE FACTS REFUTE THE LOBBYISTS

One of the most significant things about the current agitation for massive Federal aid to education is that its primary source has not been the people on the local level who are supposed to be in such need of Federal help.

Most of the propaganda for Federal aid has come from professional educationists such as those running the National Education Association, which maintains a lobby in Washington that even the AFL–CIO, with all its big spending for lobbying, might envy. And the Federal aid to education propaganda has spread from the NEA to various school administrators.

There are several things basically wrong with the idea of Federal aid to education.

For one thing, such a program as has been proposed would be unconstitutional, because the Constitution of the United States simply does not provide any authority for Federal aid to education, and does provide that the powers not specifically delegated to the Federal Government shall remain in the hands of the States or the people, where education is, has been, and should properly remain.

Another thing wrong with the idea of Federal aid to education—although the fact that it is unconstitutional ought to be enough by itself to cause its discard—is that it is economically unsound. The Federal Government has no money except that which its gets from the people. The Federal Government never returns to the people in aid more than a fraction of the money collected from them. So Federal aid, rather than creating more money actually shrinks the money available on the local level so that it buys less education than otherwise could be bought by proper local action.

Still another major fault of the idea of Federal aid is that it inevitably poses the threat of Federal control. Any level of government handing out tax money has a responsibility to direct how that money shall be used. Federal control of education would be extremely dangerous. The control might not be very noticeable at first. But after a short time local communities drained of tax funds to finance the Federal aid program would become dependent upon it, and then would be powerless to resist controls in the form of strings attached to the aid funds.

But there is still another overriding reason the Federal aid scheme ought to be rejected.

That reason: It is not needed.

Federal aid proponents claim 60,780 classrooms need to be built each year for the next 10 years. Current classroom building already totals 70,000 a year—without Federal aid.

Aid proponents say Federal intervention is needed because of increasing school population. The average annual increase in school enrollment for 1955-59 was 1.2 million; for 1960–64 it is expected to drop to 1.1 million—and for 1965–69 will decrease still more to only 0.6 million.

Furthermore, the aid backers are using phony statistics. For example, the Bureau of the Budget found that aid proponents claimed Alabama had a 256-percent increase in "pupils in excess of normal capacity"—although the school population had not increased but the number of classrooms had been increased by 4,200.

Just a few days ago we received, and assume that other newspapers across the Nation did too, a stack of eight alleged "news" releases that were propaganda from the lobbying NEA and the National Congress of Parents and Teachers agitating for Federal aid.

These outfits are pretty good at lobbying, but they can't change the facts that what they propose is: (1) Unconstitutional, (2) uneconomic and requiring high taxes, (3) an opening for Federal controls, (4) proposed on the basis of false statistics, (5) unneeded. Any one of these reasons ought to be enough to bring rejection; surely all together are reasons enough.

Death Claims Dr. Cloyd S. Harkins, of Osceola Mills, Pa., Internationally Famous Dentist and Pioneer in the Field of Cleft Palates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the death on March 22, 1961, of Dr. Cloyd S. Harkins, of Osceola Mills, Pa., ended his distinguished career of 51 years in the practice of dentistry.

Dr. Harkins' two sons, Dr. William F. Harkins, of Osceola Mills, Pa., and Dr. John F. Harkins, of Erie, Pa., followed in their father's footsteps in the dental profession assisting him in the operation of the Harkins Cleft Palate Clinic at Osceola Mills, Pa., founded by their internationally famous father.

The grief occasioned by the death of Dr. Cloyd S. Harkins is not only prevalent in his home community of Osceloa Mills, Pa., but is shared throughout the world by members of the dental profession and the countless thousands who have benefited from his expert knowledge which earned him world acclaim as a renowned specialist in odontology, orthopedics and prosthetics. Dr. Har-

kins' pioneering spirit and the dental techniques he developed remain as an enduring monument to his humanitarian and professional accomplishments.

It was my privilege to value Dr. Cloyd S. Harkins as a personal friend for many years. His sudden death is a source of deep personal sorrow. The community of Osceola Mills has lost a distinguished resident while the dental profession here and abroad has suffered the loss of an outstanding member.

Mrs. Van Zandt joins me in extending sincere expressions of deepest sympathy to Mrs. Harkins and sons Dr. William F. Harkins and Dr. John F. Harkins in their loss of a devoted husband and loving father.

In further tribute to the memory of Dr. Cloyd S. Harkins, I wish to include the following article concerning his notable career which appeared in the Clearfield, Pa., Progress March 23, 1961, and a subsequent editorial in the March 30, 1961, issue titled "He Left His Mark":

[From the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress, Mar. 23, 1961]

DR. C. S. HARKINS, INTERNATIONALLY KNOWN, DIES AT 72—OSCEOLA MILLS DENTIST, EXPERT IN CLEFT PALATE WORK, STRICKEN AT PHILADELPHIA

PHILADELPHIA.—Dr. Cloyd S. Harkins, of Osceola Mills, internationally known expert in cleft palate work and dentistry, died suddenly yesterday en route to Hahnemann Hospital at Philadelphia after suffering a heart attack.

Dr. and Mrs. Harkins and their son, Dr. William Harkins, also of Osceola Mills, were in the city attending the Greater Philadelphia Dental Association meeting.

In Dr. Harkins' death, Clearfield County loses an internationally known and honored citizen. Thousands of persons afflicted with a cleft palate lose the man who directly, or indirectly, made it possible for their handicap to be corrected.

Born November 16, 1888, at Orafino, Nebr., Dr. Harkins was the son of John and Josephine (Klare) Harkins. The family later moved to Mount Pleasant, Mich., where his father died of typhoid fever. Following her husband's death, Mrs. Harkins brought her children back to Wallaceton, her native home.

Dr. Harkins was graduated from the University of Pennsylvania with a degree of dental surgery in 1910 and the same year opened the dental office at Osceola Mills where he practiced continuously until his death.

The office at Osceola Mills became more than just a smalltown dental office. There Dr. Harkins developed the techniques and innovations which made him a recognized specialist in odontology, orthopedics, and prosthetics. He was a pioneer in research and rehabilitation of the cleft palate patient, a field virtually untouched until his work in it.

University professors, specialists in dental and palate prosthetics, and public health officials from all sections of the United States and from abroad came to observe and work with Dr. Harkins.

In 1935, the honors which were to continue throughout the remainder of his life began to come. That year he was made a fellow of the American College of Dentists. Four years later, after conducting clinics throughout the Argentine and classes at the University of Buenos Aires; the University of Litoral at Rosario; and at the University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, he was made a member of the Sociedad Odontologica Argentina de Proteses.

The following year, in 1950, Dr. Harkins received the Certificate of Honor from the American Dental Society at its national convention and in 1951 a similar certificate was presented to him and his two sons—Drs. John F. and William F. Harkins—who followed their father into dental work and the cleft palate specialty.

The same year Dr. Harkins received an honorary degree from Temple University and was made a member of Omicron Kappa Upsilon, honorary dental society; 1952 found the Osceola Mills dentist abroad again, this time in London where he was a speaker at the 11th International Dental Congress and honored by the Congress with its Certificate of Service. This was followed by honorary membership in the Congreso Universitario, Panamericano de Odontologia and being awarded a prized Thomas P. Hinman Medallion Award for leadership in dental progress.

Recognition in his home county came to Dr. Harkins in 1953, when the Clearfield County Medical Society presented him its first Benjamin Rush Award for outstanding health services.

For many years Dr. Harkins served as a member of the Pennsylvania State Dental Council and Examining Board and as a member of the State advisory board of vocational education. In addition to his private practice and public clinic work, he was an instructor and member of the staff of the Philipsburg State Hospital; founder and director of the State Department of Health Cleft Palate Diagnostic Clinic at the Philipsburg State Hospital; staff member of the Cleft Palate Clinic at Allegheny General Hospital at Pittsburgh; and consultant to the Diagnostic Cleft Palate Clinic at the Temple University Hospital and St. Christopher Hospital for Children, both at Philadelphia.

He was the author of "Cleft Palate Rehabilitation," used as a text in dental and medical schools, and just last year, of a second book, "Principles of Cleft Palate Prosthesis" written in collaboration with his sons. The prosthesis, or light plastic speech aid, he developed for the cleft palate patient is now, like his books and professional papers, standard therapy in their treatment.

Away from his professional life which also included membership in a dozen or more societies, Dr. Harkins found time for community and civic affairs. At one time he was a Scoutmaster and a member of the Executive Board of the Bucktail Council, Boy Scouts of America. He was also a member of the Osceola Mills First Presbyterian Church, the B.P.O. Elks and several Masonic organizations.

Included in the latter are the Moshannon Lodge No. 391, F. & A.M.; the Clearfield Royal Arch Chapter, the Moshannon Council, Royal and Select Master Masons; Moshannon Commandary, Knights Templar; the Williamsport Consistory, and the Jaffa Shrine.

Dr. Harkins was married in July 1911 to the former Irene Fritzinger of Slatington, who survives. His son, Dr. William Harkins is associated with the Harkins Cleft Palate Clinic and private practice at Osceola while Dr. John Harkins is located at Erie, Pa.

He also leaves five grandchildren.

Funeral services will be held Sunday at 2 p.m. from the Heath Funeral Home at Osceola Mills, with the Reverend Graeme Sieber officiating. Burial will be in the Umbria Cemetery.

Friends will be received at the funeral home from Saturday evening until time of services. Masonic services will be conducted at 7:30 p.m. Saturday.

[From the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress, Mar. 30, 1961]

HE LEFT HIS MARK

With the death of Dr. Cloyd S. Harkins of Osceola Mills a week ago yesterday while attending a dental association meeting at Philadelphia, not only Clearfield County and the Moshannon Valley but the Nation and, it is not exaggerating to say, the world, lost a great man and a great humanitarian.

Dr. Harkins was a pioneer in the field of cleft palate (open roof of the mouth) rehabilitation and his achievements in this field brought him international recognition. Few, if any residents of our area, can claim or ever attained the national and international honors that did Dr. Harkins in his lifetime. As is so often the case, his fame and contributions to humanity were never really understood or fully appreciated in the area that he called home. Not that we fellow citizens didn't appreciate his talents, but it was difficult to realize the worldwide respect that he enjoyed in his field of endeavor.

The work that Dr. C. S. Harkins did in his lifetime for cleft palate victims will live on for long years after his untimely death. His pioneering in cleft palate treatment and rehabilitation has given new hope and new life for victims of this birth-originated defect. We have no idea how many youngsters, and older men and women, too, Dr. C. S. aided by correcting a serious physical handicap but the total must be tremendous. His achievements and the knowledge he left behind him will be the means of aiding hundreds and thousands of such victims in the future. Undoubtedly, his methods will be improved upon by those who follow him, but his original pioneering and teachings will remain the basis for such improvements.

The success and fame that Dr. Harkins achieved did not surprise those who came in contact with him. He possessed the patience of Job in the trying and difficult task of working with his patients. Inborn or developed through his work, he had a determination to solve the cleft palate problem, regardless of the reluctance of his patients to accept treatment. Those who visited his office for ordinary dental work, at which he also excelled, came away marvelling at his patience and perseverance in the face of patient opposition. He was a fighter, and a stubborn one, too, for the cause in which he believed. He pulled strings, played politics, demanded until he gained recognition of the plight of the cleft palate victim and what could be done about it. For that fight we must be grateful, for without it cleft palate treatment and rehabilitation of its victims might still be unknown and its victims handicapped throughout life. Dr. Harkins was a worker who did not know the meaning of an 8-hour day, a 40-hour week. His sacrifice of his own personal health and life for the benefit of his fellow men possibly led to his death of a heart condition at 72, not an elderly age in these days.

Those of us who were privileged to know Dr. Cloyd S. Harkins professionally or as an acquaintance will never forget him or the work that he did. In the years to come, the youngsters with cleft palates and their parents will have cause to pay tribute to his memory because of the leadership in treatment that he gave to the medical and dental profession in this fairly common birth defect. We in the Clearfield County-Moshannon Valley area can take pride in the fact that he was a fellow citizen.

Supergraft on Superhighways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 was enacted by the 84th Congress, the

Federal-aid highway program has been the target of criticism.

Criticism was to be expected in connection with the most ambitious public works program in history, especially when it was geared to anticipate the Nation's needs almost two full decades in the future, and especially when it called for the expenditure of billions of dollars to bring into existence a national network of adequate, modern superhighways linking together the principal metropolitan areas from border to border and coast to coast.

It is an indisputable fact that the 84th Congress acted with commendable foresight. The intervening years have underlined with disturbing clarity an ever-growing transportation crisis, particularly in the urban areas, for which relief must be provided.

The 41,000-mile Interstate System and a sustained program of primary, secondary, and urban construction are pressingly vital to the national economy and the national defense.

There has been criticism of the Federal-aid highway program in the past. It is under fire now. It will be criticized in the future. It probably will always be subject to criticism.

Criticism is healthy when it is constructive and generates corrective action. It is destructive when utilized as a vehicle for condemnation merely to accentuate a posture of unalterable opposition.

The Federal-aid highway program has its friends and it has its enemies. Numbered among the latter are a great many reactionaries who refuse to equate costs with commensurate benefits that are evident in terms of the greatest good for the greatest number.

Some of the criticism of the Federal-aid highway program has been justified; much of it has not. Admittedly there was enough justifiable criticism to warrant the formation of the Special Public Works Subcommittee on the Federal-aid highway program on which I have been privileged to serve as a member.

Under the very capable and energetic leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, this subcommittee has been engaged in the separation of the factual from the fanciful. In a series of hearings conducted during the past year the subcommittee has been successful in bringing to light a number of serious deficiencies in the conduct of the program at both the Federal and State levels. Immediate corrective action has followed.

More than anything else, in my opinion, the work of the subcommittee has emphasized the necessity for maintaining the traditional congressional watchdog function during the life of this all-important program. The magnitude of this undertaking is indeed formidable. Many areas remain to be explored.

Members of the House can be confident that our subcommittee and its capable and indefatigable chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, will continue to carry out its assignment with vigor and determination.

My observations today are prompted by an article written by Stanley Meisler in the April 1 issue of the Nation. It bears the title "Supergraft on Superhighways."

Under the present state of the record before our subcommittee the title definitely represents too great an exercise of journalistic license and is designed, as so many such headlines are, solely to direct attention to the article.

I do not doubt that Mr. Meisler was motivated by a desire for reasonable objectivity. Obviously he has carefully scrutinized and weighed all of the testimony thus far adduced at subcommittee hearings. He has achieved a fairly creditable analysis of the testimony. I have noted, not without a sense of satisfaction, that Mr. Meisler praised the subcommittee for one of the fairest and most painstaking investigations of recent years and that he has placed a proper emphasis on the corrective action resulting from the subcommittee's hearings.

I concede that Mr. Meisler's article is studded with some painful truths.

Because I believe all Members of Congress should have access to material presently being disseminated, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of the article.

THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM—SUPERGRAFT ON SUPERHIGHWAYS

(By Stanley Meisler)

In 1975, Americans will have 111 million cars, trucks, and buses. To keep these wheels rolling, the Federal Government has embarked on the biggest public works project in history, spending billions of dollars for 41,000 miles of superhighways crisscrossing the Nation. Millions of this money already have been spilled over into waste, inefficiency, and fraud.

There is nothing secret about this. Newspapers and Congress has uncovered scandal after scandal. But the revelations have not evoked the same indignation and outcries that scandals like the Dave Beck plunder of the Teamsters treasury have caused. Instead, much of the public has a boys-will-be-boys attitude about corrupt highways. When you spend $41 billion in a public program, influential and impatient people say, you have to expect some tomfoolery, so let's get on with the show. Americans want their highways in a hurry.

"When you have a program of this magnitude," Representative GORDON H. SCHERER, Republican, of Ohio, told the House last July 1, "you are bound to attract the chiselers and the grafters." Carl A. Carpenter, Assistant Chief of Physical Research for the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, questioned closely about deficiencies in a road inspected by State officials who had accepted secret payments from the contractor, offered a House subcommittee on December 13 this analysis: "If we have to face these slight deficiencies in jobs that we have, I think they may be a lot easier to live with than extensive deliberation in this interstate program." What about the money lost by the taxpayers? "The taxpayer is the same person who is eagerly waiting for this job to get done * * *," Carpenter replied. And Al C. Church, State highway engineer for the Florida State Road Department, dismissed deficient roads and paid-off inspectors by noting, "If the taxpayers never get a worse job than that, they are going to be mighty lucky."

These statements evolve from a national mood, a mood aptly summed up by Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota, who heads the House subcommittee investigating the highway scandals: "In the 14 years I have been here, never has a multibillion-dollar tax program and construction program had such overwhelming confidence and support, not only in Congress, but from taxpayers all over America."

Taxpayers are supporting the program because it promises to satisfy their hunger for cars and roads. If the program progresses, by 1972 superhighways will link 90 percent of all cities with more than 50,000 population. A driver will be able to travel from coast to coast at 60 to 70 miles an hour without encountering a single stop sign, traffic light, or railroad crossing. In the main, these highways, with entry only at selected places, will have four lanes, swelling to six and eight lanes near metropolitan areas. President Kennedy has predicted that "the Interstate System when completed * * * will save at least 4,000 lives a year."

The estimate of total cost has varied. When Congress approved the program in 1956, the Bureau of Public Roads figured the cost at $27.5 billion; Congress, raising the Federal gasoline tax, agreed to put up 90 percent, the States paying the rest. Since then, however, the Bureau has raised its estimate to nearly $41 billion, and a controversy is brewing in Congress over President Kennedy's proposals for levying taxes to meet the difference. In fact, some of the attempts to minimize the scandals stem from the fear of highway supporters that Congress, in disgust, will refuse to authorize enough money to complete the system by 1972.

How corrupt is the program? A veteran newsman has said that if an editor sent six reporters around the country digging up information, he could put half the country's State highway officials in jail. The statement is no doubt somewhat exaggerated. But BLATNIK's subcommittee, in one of the fairest and most painstaking investigations of recent years, has quietly uncovered a depressing panorama of bumbling Federal bureaucrats, bribe-taking highway engineers, chiseling contractors, fat-cat State commissioners, and cracking roads in the Federal superhighway system.

At its first hearings in February 1960, the subcommittee unfolded a near-comic tale of bureaucratic ineptitude. The highway program had been sold to many Congressmen as a defense measure. The program officially is titled the "National System of Interstate and Defense Highways." But truckers, assigned to cart missiles from California to Cape Canaveral, testified they almost never could move the Atlas and other huge weapons under the 14-foot clearances of the highway overpasses. Sometimes a driver would deflate the truck's tires and move the Atlas under a bridge inch by inch while traffic on the highway backed up for 20 miles. On other occasions, the truck simply took an alternate, roundabout route.

For years, the Department of Defense and the Bureau of Public Roads had been unable to clear through their labyrinthine channels an agreement on a minimum height for bridges and overpasses. One unit of the Department of Defense told the Bureau in 1957 that 14-foot bridges were fine, while another ordered the production of missiles that could not clear these bridges. In 1959, the Department and the Bureau decided to study the matter further. But, while more study was underway, the Bureau continued to approve bridges with only 14 feet of clearance. Suddenly, on January 27, 1960, when BLATNIK's investigators started probing the matter, the Bureau and the Department hurriedly reached a decision; all bridges and overpasses must have 16 feet of clearance.

Since the start of the program, the Bureau of Public Roads had approved 2,259 bridges and overpasses on the 14-foot standard at a cost of $374 million. If the structures had had 16-foot clearances in the

first place, the cost would have been only $18.7 million more. Reconstruction will cost $205.7 million—a clear waste of $187 million.

In May 1960, the subcommittee investigated construction of the 13-mile Skelly bypass in Tulsa, Okla., which had cost the Federal Government almost $6 million. After examination of the finished product, already starting to crack, the directors of a private engineering firm and private testing laboratory testified that the contractor evidently had billed the State for $524,689 worth of materials which he had never put into the road. Testimony revealed that the contractor and the State engineers and inspectors had covered up the shortage by submitting false testing samples, making fraudulent bookkeeping entries, using improper scales, padding bills, adjusting record-books and ignoring State specifications. There was no evidence, however, that the contractor had bribed the State engineers and inspectors.

But the subcommittee did hear testimony linking the contractor, Layman & Sons, with a State highway commissioner. Lee Olen Downey, a partner in the D. & G. Construction Co. testified that Commissioner Tom H. Kight was a silent partner in D. & G. when the State highway commission awarded a contract to Layman & Sons for a section of the Skelly bypass. Layman & Sons immediately subcontracted half the sodding work to D. & G.

Federal inspectors never uncovered any of this fraud. Even after the Tulsa Tribune, in a November 1959, editorial, "Is Uncle Sam on the Job?" questioned the worth of the road, the Bureau of Public Roads found nothing. Disturbed by the newspaper criticism, the Bureau ordered its regional inspector, Ralph Cecil Glover, to examine the bypass again. "No stone was left unturned in efforts to secure the highest type of performance from the contractor," Glover wrote in his report. "* * * While accusations have been made * * * [they] have not been substantiated to date. Those making the accusations can hardly be said to be competent to judge such matters." But Glover, following Federal policy, simply had scrutinized the reports of the State laboratories and engineers—reports based on fake samples and fraudulent bookkeeping. He had not made a single attempt to test the road material himself.

Subcommittee Counsel Walter R. May questioned Glover at the hearing:

"Question. Did you accept those reports at face value?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. You did not ever go behind those reports to determine exactly what was happening?

"Answer. No.

"Question. Does the Bureau of Public Roads expect you to go behind those reports?

"Answer. No."

The subcommittee turned to Florida in hearings last December. Testimony revealed that six contractors, who had handled Florida road contracts worth more than $70 million in the last 4 years, had distributed $54,000 to $75,000 in gifts to 33 Florida State highway engineers since 1956. These came in the form of secret cash payments, unrepaid loans, liquor, lumber, hunting licenses, and bonuses for extra services. William L. Cobb, head of a large construction company, admitted he also gave gifts to State road officials in Georgia, Mississippi, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Alabama.

Cobb told the Congressmen he deplored the practice and had ordered an end to it, but other contractors and State personnel professed to see little wrong with the gift-giving. Charles E. Bailes, Jr., general superintendent of Cone Bros. Contracting Co., said his firm had mailed State engineers secret payments of $25 a week to get "that little effort" the company needed to complete the job. "And I believe the payments helped." Bailes said. "I am obligated to my company to do the best job I possibly can. * * * As long as I didn't engage in anything that I though was faulty, I would employ many different things to get this accomplished." One after another, the State engineers denied they had done anything improper to please the gift-bearing contractors.

But the subcommittee heard evidence that indicated laxity, at least, on the part of some of these paid-off engineers in seeing that the contractor met specifications. H. C. Weathers, Florida's chief testing engineer, testified that he had found substandard material, poor workmanship and poor inspection on a $2.5 million strip of highway built by Cone Bros. near Tampa. Weathers said some of the deficiencies were serious. Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, described the Howard Franklyn Bridge over Tampa Bay as rough and substandard. It had been built under the supervision of State Engineer Joseph R. Maseda, Jr., who received $4,700 in 4 years from several contractors, including the Hardaway Contracting Co., which had built the bridge. "If this is the kind of bridge we're building in America then there is something wrong with our standards," CRAMER said. In closing the hearing, BLATNIK said he found "it difficult in the light of all the testimony to believe that the conditions prevailed without involvement of a quid pro quo, whatever its nature might have been."

In its latest hearings, which ended March 10, the subcommittee, again spotlighting Florida, discovered that the State had lost hundreds of thousands of dollars because of the slipshod way it got rid of houses and other property on rights-of-way it had acquired. In many cases, the State paid a contractor to dispose of a house, which he proceeded to sell at a neat profit. For example, one contractor, Paul Slusher of Maitland, testified the Florida Highway Department had paid him to clear a house on an Orlando right-of-way for $100. He then sold it for $24,500. Testimony revealed that the State paid $103,000 for the removal of structures in Miami when it might have sold the property for $372,500. The loss to the State: more than $475,000. In contrast to this sorry situation, Frank Balfour, former chief of the rights-of-way division of the California Highway Commission, testified his State had made a 6-percent profit on the sale and rental of properties it had acquired on rights-of-way since 1956. At the close of the hearings, BLATNIK cautioned all States to get every possible dollar out of the houses and properties on lands they acquire for highway construction.

Despite the muck it has uncovered, the subcommittee still has not reached the core of corruption. The most damaging fraud in the program involves the $7 billion the States will spend to acquire rights-of-way.

A consulting firm hired by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads has produced a 200-page report on land appraisals in Massachusetts. The report is still secret, but, in a series of articles last May, the Boston Traveler said that an unnamed State official had put pressure on land appraisers to issue false, inflated evaluations. The Traveler said the estimates appeared to be 25 to 50 percent too high. The subcommittee has opened an office in Massachusetts and its next hearings probably will focus on that State. In the meantime, the Bureau has refused to reimburse the State for its rights-of-way purchases.

A scandal on rights-of-way acquisitions also appears to be stirring in Florida. Last December 1, Al Rogero of the State road board admitted to a legislative committee that he was an unnamed partner in a group that had bought a tract of land in St. Petersburg which was later needed for a highway. Rogero testified that the group bought the land for $165,000 in 1956 and sold it for $240,000 a year later. Rogero's fee: $24,000. But the official denied any conflict of interest. "I simply have refused to build a wall around myself and stop the purchasing, selling and developing of properties simply because I was a member of the State road board," he testified.

The subcommittee has a host of other areas awaiting investigation: an evidently excessive use of expensive, private consultants by several States, including Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland; monopoly practices by suppliers of highway material, particularly in the West; collusive price-fixing among contractors, such as the subcommittee noted in Oklahoma, where sodders met in secret before submitting bids to the State; the care of homeless persons who have been bulldozed out of the way by highways cutting through large metropolitan areas; and waste such as the General Accounting Office found in Nevada, where 3 interchanges were built on a 3-mile stretch of highway to handle an average of 89 cars a day.

It is not difficult to spot the reasons why the interstate highway program reeks of corruption. In a recent interview, BLATNIK, in his precise, articulate way, outlined the causes. First, he noted, State highway departments traditionally have been close to the Governor's office. The departments have become centers for dispensing patronage and extending favors to contractors who contribute to the party treasury. Next, the States have poor recruitment policies and low salary scales. As BLATNIK had pointed out in an earlier hearing, "You find some of these inspectors and even engineers working at a salary at which you couldn't hire a good file clerk here for the wages they are getting back there." To these men, a $25 cash payment, a loan, a turkey at Thanksgiving, a bottle of whisky at Christmas, become formidable gifts. Finally, BLATNIK said, there has been inadequate supervision both by the States and the Federal Government. In many cases, the States make no checkup at all. And, BLATNIK emphasized, there has been "an utter failure by the Bureau of Public Roads to poke through the façade." The Bureau traditionally never disputes the word of the State.

Anyone attending the hearings can sense certain attitudes that supplement BLATNIK's outline. An observer is struck, for example, by the corruptibility of small people: How simple it is for a man to participate in a system of bribery without a twinge of conscience or even a realization of his wrong. A business ethic also emerges from the testimony, a feeling by the contractor that anything goes so long as the job gets done and the profits pile up. When the ethic is questioned, the contractor reacts by despairing that congressional investigators ever will understand the business world. This attitude evokes sympathy from highway bureaucrats, particularly State officials who like to feel that they understand the peculiar problems of the contractor and that this understanding allows them to wink, when the contractor cuts corners to get the job done. An observer quickly senses that these State officials were totally unprepared to handle the billions of dollars suddenly put into their hands by the Federal Government. At the same time, a smugness, an almost lazy indulgence, is exhibited by Federal bureaucrats as they talk vaguely of States rights while justifying their refusal to interfere with the machinery of the State, no matter how lax or stupid or corrupt.

But, knowing the causes of the trouble does not lead automatically to finding a solution. The subcommittee has not made any legis-

lative recommendations and evidently does not have immediate plans to do so, even though the staff has drafted a tentative report. Most likely there will emerge limited proposals for revision of the income-tax laws to discourage gift-giving and increased appropriations to the Bureau of Public Roads for more inspectors. No radical change in the program is expected.

Any such change would stir enormous complications. In view of all the corruption, one logical change would be to slow up the program, at least until the States clean house. But this would ignore two factors: that the administration is using highway funds to stimulate the economy and that the country, no matter how much the critics of Detroit decry a culture on wheels, actually will need the roads in 1975.

An even more logical change suggests itself. If the States can't do a proper job, the Federal Government must wrest control of the highways from them. State officials recognize the validity of this threat to their power. At the annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials last November 28, its president, David H. Stevens, warned: "If the States cannot satisfactorily demonstrate that they do have the ability to carry on the program in a proper manner, then the Federal-State relationship will be further modified or eliminated. It will be a tragic day for the States if either should occur."

If Congress does hand control of the highways to the Federal Government, the day could be somewhat tragic. The highway program will have proven that Federal aid really does eventually become Federal control. And the proof will drop new weapons into the laps of the enemies of such needed spending programs as Federal aid to education, who have always argued that Federal aid leads to Federal control. For this reason, liberal Congressmen, no matter how appalled at highway corruption, will not find it easy to vote control to the Federal Government.

These complications, however, do not mean that the country is powerless to eliminate corruption from the highway program. The subcommittee's hearings themselves have had some beneficial effect. State highway officials seem to have been attempting to tighten up the program on the State level, if only out of fear that Blatnik's subcommittee may strike them next. The American Association of State Highway Officials has revised its handbook to suggest ways of eliminating some of the abuses uncovered by Congress. And the Federal Bureau of Roads, smarting from the barrage of congressional criticism, has taken steps to initiate some realistic inspection.

But the subcommittee continually faces two obstacles as it tries to carry the story of highway corruption to the public. One is an undertone of Republican disparagement based on fears that the Democratic-controlled subcommittee will use the scandals to embarrass Republicans. (But during the Eisenhower administration, the subcommittee investigated Democratic State highway boards with as much vigor as it investigated the Republican-administered Bureau of Public Roads.) A second obstacle involves news coverage. Newsmen in Washington have tended to treat the hearings as regional stories. In this way, stories about the Oklahoma hearings were filed mainly for Oklahoma newspapers. The same was true of the Florida hearings, which made headlines in Florida newspapers and almost nowhere else. The subcommittee must share the blame for this. Its hearings generally have focused on a specific bit of wrongdoing in a specific area, instead of spotlighting corruption in several areas at once. If, in its next hearings, the subcommittee would show how fraud has infested right-of-way acquistion in several States and would call a parade of witnesses from areas all over the country, the press would suddenly grasp the national implications of the highway scandals and treat them accordingly.

The end of highway corruption will be signaled when the American people begin to realize that there is nothing normal or playful about contractors, State officials, and speculators stealing millions of dollars from the Federal Government. Public indignation may be a more effective weapon than legislation in the battle against highway corruption. And the time for public indignation has come.

Recession Not in San Mateo County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following page from the March 29, 1961, issue of the San Mateo Times, San Mateo, Calif., which shows that the business people in our county are doing business and not talking about recession:

RECESSION? NOT IN SAN MATEO COUNTY—BUSINESS IS BETTER THAN EVER—MERCHANTS FROM PALO ALTO TO SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO TELL US

Here are some statements and figures for you to ponder:

TO OPEN NEW BRANCH

"We really believe in our specialty of serving skin divers, outfitting and equipping them. As is customary with a new business, we did so 3 months ago with confidence in ourselves, but with some caution regarding the public's acceptance of us.

"Whatever reservation we had has since been swept aside in these last 3 months by the public's interest and demand for our services and equipment. We have been so greatly encouraged that we have taken the further step of opening a branch in Monterey.

"We wish to take this opportunity to thank the Times for their aid in making this possible.

"T. H. DUFFY,
"*The Seven Seas.*"

AN 8 PERCENT INCREASE

"As you know, every February Loewe & Zwierlein holds its annual spring fabric event. This year, in spite of recession talk, we had a very nice 8 percent increase during this month long event. We are looking forward with enthusiasm to our annual anniversary sale and anticipate increase in volume.

"LOEWE & ZWIERLEIN,
"HERBERT WALCHA."

SUBSTANTIAL GAIN

"A substantial gain for the month of February and so far in March are running well ahead. We feel that this spring season will be much better than 1960. Business looks good.

"J. C. PENNEY CO.,
"W. I. HANKS."

BEYOND OUR EXPECTATIONS

"Our San Mateo store is one of three locations. Concerning business here, we find such far beyond our expectations during this first year. We have done better in San Mateo in the opening of our Ski Shop than in our Sacramento grand opening which took place 5 years ago, and with the present excellent business indications, we expect before long to exceed anything we have ever done in our Sun Valley shop.

"HELM OF SUN VALLEY,
"C. J. HELM."

EXCEEDED LAST YEAR'S SALE

"Our fourth anniversary sale was a smashing success. The first day's business exceeded last year's, a feat which we thought to be impossible. There's no recession at Rakestraw's.

"RAKESTRAW'S MARKET,
"BILL RAKESTRAW."

TWENTY-SIX PERCENT INCREASE

"What we have done to offset the recession is simply to step up our advertising and do more of it. We have studied * * * all our advertising efforts, and have concentrated most of it in what we consider our best media * * * newspapers. This year we advanced our usual spring program about a month, but I think the consistency of our advertising has been one of the greatest factors in its effectiveness. The results: Last year a 22-percent increase over 1959; the first 2 months of this year a 26-percent increase over the same period last year.

"BAILEY RUG & UPHOLSTERY CLEANERS,
"D. W. BAILEY."

WHAT CAN "NORMAL" BE LIKE?

"My experience hereabouts may be somewhat unique in comparison with the majority of business firms in the area, being engaged not only in retailing, but also as a wholesaler and manufacturers' representative * * * as well as being relatively new in the area. Also, the retail branch of my business operations is predicated on a somewhat different and individualized approach to the selling of high quality imported furniture, home accessories and gifts from Scandinavia at low prices on a direct-from-importer-to-you basis.

"However, perhaps for the very reason of being engaged in both wholesale and retail operations, I have been privileged to observe both aspects of business in recent months. And because of being relatively new in the area, perhaps I have also been able to view the situation open-mindedly. In any case, I can assure you that I have found every justification for the confidence I originally felt when, after careful consideration, comparison and evaluation, I chose to set up business operations and make my residence in the beautiful and prosperous San Mateo area.

"As far as the public is concerned, the retail aspect of my business operations, known as Kjell of Norway, is perhaps the more familiar. * * * This retail store in San Mateo was opened early in February of this year. Of course, I had read and heard much about the so-called 'recession' and the dire forebodings for business and economic conditions. However, I felt that this talk was somewhat overdrawn, and ventured ahead anyway.

"From the first day the store was opened, business has not only justified but has exceeded expectations many fold * * * and if this kind of result can occur in what some people are terming a 'recession,' then I can only wonder what 'normal' business conditions are like in this wonderful section of this marvelous country. Of interest also may be the fact that the only advertising or promotion undertaken in behalf of my Kjell of Norway retail store has been a relatively small and modest program of advertising in the San Mateo Times. The results have been exceptional, and convince me of two things: (1) there is no 'recession' if you offer people what they want when they want it and at the right price; and (2) the Times is the strongest medium for advertising and promotion available to local businesses, and has readers who possess discriminating taste and

the buying power to act on purchases which appeal to them.

"KJELL OF NORWAY,
"KJELL REIMERS."

BUSINESS MOST GRATIFYING

"Thank to the faith of our clientele in us and in our country's economy, business is most gratifying at present and most encouraging for the future.

"ROBERT W. GATES OF BURLINGAME,
"ROBERT W. GATES."

GRAND RESPONSE

"Although we have only used the San Mateo Times and San Mateo Post once a week since our grand opening March 1, we are very happy with the grand response the readers of these papers have made to our ads.

"We will be making every effort to perpetuate the fine trend of customers that the Times and Post has helped us to achieve by continuing to give good values and service.

"FARMERS MARKETS, INC.,
"WILLIAM F. SCHMITZ."

SAVINGS BONDS SALES UP

"Sales of U.S. savings bonds in San Mateo County during January and February showed a big gain over the same period in 1960.

"Sales for first 2 months in 1961 totaled $973,623 against $882,512 a year ago, showing a net gain of $91,111 or 10 percent.

"GEORGE A. MCQUEEN,
"Volunteer County Chairman."

MOVING FORWARD

"The cooperation of the San Mateo Times in assisting the Hillsdale merchants plan and execute our 1961 spring merchandising events has been most rewarding.

"Business is good at Hillsdale and we are constantly moving forward. Our plans and programs are optimistic for the rest of 1961."

"HILLSDALE SHOPPING CENTER,
"CLARK C. MADSEN."

TEN-MILLION-DOLLAR EXPANSION

"California—particularly the bay area—has a challenge and an opportunity. We have the greatest number of people employed in the history of this State. But at the same time, the labor force in California during the last calendar year increased by more than 240,000. This means we must find jobs for this addition to our actual work force.

"People create business opportunity and markets. Business will take advantage of this opportunity, thus creating more job opportunities. Thus, the total velocity of growth will be accelerated.

"An example of this is the expansion now starting at the Hillsdale Shopping Center where approximately $10 million is being committed in new construction and store development. This is evidence that knowledgeable businessmen are aware of the increasing purchasing power. The expenditure of $10 million, in itself, creates hundreds and hundreds of job opportunities. The completed stores, such as the Emporium, will permanently employ hundreds of people. This is a local example of confidence.

"DAVID D. BOHANNON ORG.,
"DAVID D. BOHANNON."

NEW SALES RECORD

"Levy Bros. is confidently predicting and planning for a new sales record during 1961.

"LEVY BROS.,
"G. W. BROMFIELD."

GOOD RESULTS

"Very good results obtained in advertising in your St. Patrick's Day ad."

"MIRACLE AUTO PAINTING,
"JOHN THAYER."

BUSINESS IS GOOD!

"Here are examples that business is flourishing:

"1. Five hundred thousand dollar office building under construction in Mills Estate—27,000 square feet of luxurious offices for national tenants being built by George E. Congdon Construction Co. and Delcon Realtors.

"2. A new office building for the Girl Scouts Council of San Mateo County, to be constructed on the corner of Juanita and California Drive in Burlingame.

"3. New apartment buildings soon to be built: 121 Lorton Avenue, Burlingame; 1108 Peninsula Avenue; and 124 El Camino Real, Burlingame.

"4. Recent sales include the commercial property located at the corner of Murchison Drive and California Drive, Mills Estate—the future site of a service shopping center; an eight-unit apartment building on Lorton Avenue, Burlingame; a new four-unit apartment building in San Mateo; three new homes in Mills Estate and Burlingame Hills.

"DELCON REALTY,
"DON NAHRWOLD."

CONFIDENCE AND HARD WORK

"As far as we're concerned, our viewpoint is that there just isn't any recession or anything else wrong with business conditions that confidence and a little hard work won't cure.

"In our own particular case, we can report that every month so far this year we are well ahead of last year's sales volume. And last year was the biggest in our history (and we've been in business for many years).

"We commend the San Mateo Times on its positive approach to dispelling this recession talk * * * and we shall continue to depend on the Times not only for straightforward news coverage, but also, and of vital importance to a local business firm, for our advertising and promotional efforts to build our business even bigger.

"TALBOT'S TOYLAND,
"GORDON MOORE."

OVER $200,000 SALE

"We have just * * * completed a sale of a new 16-unit apartment house in Belmont at 180 Irene Court for the price of just under a quarter of a million dollars.

"NICK CARTER CO., INC.,
"G. CECIL MARTIN."

EMPLOYMENT

In the bay area, 1,125,200 people were gainfully employed during Februray 1961, as compared to 1,114,300 in 1960, an increase of 10,900. Unemployment is up, too 86,000 in February 1961, but shows signs of decreasing. During the second week of March, the number of claims started dipped to 264 from 362 claims started during the week of March 6 to 10. The problem in San Mateo is that new workers are arriving at a faster rate than new jobs. If we keep moving ahead, that problem can be licked.

INCOME

People in California have more money to spend than practically anywhere else in the United States. The county income per family, according to Sales Management Annual Survey of Buying Power, the leading authority on the subject, is $8,350. That rates as the highest in California and the 16th richest county in the United States. Income per person, $2,657, is even higher ranked. We are second richest in California and fifth richest in the United States.

RETAIL SALES

According to sales management, effective buying income makes San Mateo County the newest billion-dollar market in California. The 1960 effective buying income is $1,087,225,000. Retail sales per family are $4,757.

POPULATION

According to the 1960 census, population in San Mateo County is 444,387. This represents a 10 year gain of 208,728 over the 1950 figure of 235,559. The number of dwelling units has more than doubled in 10 years to 143,039 from the 1950 number of units, 71,448.

INCREASES IN BUSINESS, INDUSTRY, AND TRANSPORTATION

There are over 6,000 businesses in San Mateo County, an increase of over 1,600 in 10 years. Likewise, there are close to 1,200 industries, an increase of 631 in 10 years. Air travel increased threefold in 10 years, with over 4½ million passengers passing through San Francisco International Airport. In the first 10 weeks of 1961, there were 33 announcements of new plants and 30 expensions of existing plants announced in this county. All evidence that San Mateo County is dynamic and growing.

Newsweek magazine's continuing survey of consumer buying plans indicates Americans are optimistic. A rundown on buying plans as indicated in the survey which was conducted during November and December 1960:

HOUSES

"House buying plans at year's end were at the same level as a year ago, but considerably improved over the second and third quarter rates. Plans to buy new houses were 2 percent below 1959 levels, but buying plans for older houses scored a 6-percent advance. The overall pattern shows that the decline in homebuilding is about over, and builders can expect a somewhat better year than they had in 1960."

APPLIANCES

"Of all the items surveyed, television sets showed the best improvement over 1959 levels, with buying plans up 21 percent. Hardest hit were the 'luxury' appliances: buying plans for air conditioners, dishwashers, driers, and freezers were running, on the average, some 20 percent below 1959 levels. The more essential appliances whose market depends on replacement demand (e.g., refrigerators, ranges, and vacuum cleaners) were holding near the 1959 levels."

AUTOMOBILES

"Plans to buy autos were 5 percent above 1959 levels in November and December, due to a 22-percent surge in plans to buy used cars. Plans to purchase new cars were 4 percent below the 1959 figures. While a better year than 1960 is still possible, it's more likely that auto sales this year will be somewhat less than in 1960 and somewhat more than in 1959. Best sales area: The South and Far West."

VACATIONS

"Americans will travel more in 1961 than in 1960 although they may not travel as far. The biggest gains were in vacationers' plans to travel in their own State and to visit neighboring States, or Canada. Plans to take a European vacation were down 25 percent, and plans for trips to other places abroad dropped 26 percent."

Centennial Anniversary of the Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in this year of the centennial anniversary of the

Civil War many admirable ceremonies, publications, and other forms of commemoration are being conducted to remind our citizens of the great tragedy of a century ago out of which our forebears forged in blood and pain the more perfect union of which we are the beneficiaries.

One of the most notable of the centennial events is the publication of Newspaper Americana's Civil War papers. It was recently my privilege to be presented with Newspaper American's copy of the New York Herald headlining the inauguration of Abraham Lincoln as President of the United States.

Newspaper Americana's Civil War papers, published by Mr. Robert Miller, of New York City, are a significant set of historical documents which constitute a worthy contribution to the centennial commemoration while contributing to the knowledge and edification of all who read them.

University of Redlands, Redlands, Calif., Associated Students President Writes Congressman Clyde Doyle, 23d District, California, in Support of Youth Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, a letter I have recently received from the student body president, Redlands University, Redlands, Calif., concerning the student council's support of the "proposed Youth Peace Corps":

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS,
UNIVERSITY OF REDLANDS,
Redlands, Calif., March 1, 1961.

Rep. CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DOYLE: The student council of the associated students of the University of Redlands takes this opportunity to express to you its deep concern over the recently proposed American Youth Corps and we enclose a resolution adopted by the student council of the University of Redlands supporting the proposed Youth Peace Corps.

As the resolution indicates, we believe the establishment the the Youth Peace Corps would again demonstrate to the world that the United States is still primarily concerned over peace—in eliminating poverty and underdevelopedness from the world for that reason alone. We find that the positive benefits of the Youth Corps, in terms of American public relations and foreign policy effectiveness, far overshadow any minor problems involved in establishing it.

In actively supporting the Youth Corps proposal, we are not advocating, and we do not believe it is even implied in the proposal, that the American Armed Forces be weakened. This proposal is supplementary in our national defense, but nonetheless vital. We are especially concerned over the draft-alternative controversy, and we cannot help but feel that all the arguments which have been asserted thus far objecting to the selective service alternative are nothing short of ridiculous.

We send you the enclosed resolution, unanimously adopted, and the accompanying student newspaper articles, with the hope that your convictions will lead you to actively support the Youth Peace Corps idea—which perhaps is the most dynamically new, forceful and idealistic peace proposal in years.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY TINKER,
Student Body President.

The Blame for the Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Roscoe Drummond from the Washington Post of April 1, 1961:

BUDGETS AND POLITICS—THE BLAME FOR THE DEFICIT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

President Kennedy is, I think, making a serious mistake by claiming that the next two budget deficits, this year's and 1962, are due to Eisenhower "miscalculations."

This claim is made over and over again in the President's message and in Budget Director David Bell's testimony. Repetition does not make it true. The budget figures just do not bear out this claim.

This kind of thing can't do anybody any good. Certainly it is not going to win Mr. Kennedy the support of those Democratic and Republican liberals who believe that a larger Federal deficit is desirable during the present recession. And it is not going to win Mr. Kennedy the support of those Republican and Democratic conservatives who will judge the President's "fiscal responsibility" by what he does, not by what he says.

Mr. Kennedy is not one who is overly eager to spend the public money. He does not belong to the school of "when in doubt, let's spend." When you consider the high cost of defense and the urgency of the Nation's needs—highways, housing, schools and aid to depressed areas—the Kennedy administration has acted moderately in adding to probable Eisenhower deficits.

But the President cannot claim that the projected 1961 and 1962 deficits will be the result of past misjudgments on income and spending. Such a claim is sheer political propaganda. It is inaccurate and misleading, and violates a pledge which, as candidate and President, Mr. Kennedy made: to neither blur nor sugar-coat the facts.

Here is the way Mr. Kennedy put it in his budget message: "Should there be a deficit in 1962, it will be the consequence of the overestimation of revenues and underestimation of expenditures" in Mr. Eisenhower's January budget.

The catch in this claim is all in one little word—the word "it." The "it" refers to the anticipated deficit 18 months from now. The budget message repeats again and again that the deficit will be limited to the miscalculations—the overoptimism of his predecessor, not at all to the Kennedy administration's own spending programs.

But do the figures in the Kennedy budget confirm the Kennedy words? Mr. Kennedy's own figures show that, while the new administration's expenditures do not alone create the deficits this year and next, they do increase the size of those deficits appreciably. That seems to me quite different from what the President is saying.

It is quite true that, because of the recession, the economy is producing less revenue than the Eisenhower administration expected, that Mr. Eisenhower underestimated his own expenditures. The truth is that Mr. Eisenhower would almost certainly have had a deficit and that Mr. Kennedy has increased it. The facts are these:

Mr. Kennedy's additional spending programs this year will produce an estimated deficit of $2,169 million while, even on Mr. Kennedy's own calculations, the Eisenhower deficit would have been $805 million. And in June, 1962, the Eisenhower programs would have produced a $704 million deficit while the new Kennedy programs, including $655 million increase in the defense budget, will produce a deficit of $2,826 million.

President Kennedy may have felt he had to go through this strained political exercise of blaming his predecessor for the upcoming budget deficits. Only 2 months ago he went far out on a precarious limb by declaring that his programs would not "of and by themselves unbalance" the earlier budget—and there he hung.

The President can reasonably defend his spending programs as prudent and necessary, but what seems unfair is to give so much "credit" to Mr. Eisenhower for the size of the deficits.

Free Flow of Dairy Products Between the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House a resolution adopted recently by the Minnesota State Legislature urging Federal action to encourage the free flow of pure and wholesome dairy products between the States.

This problem has concerned us for some time since unrealistic regulations have frequently been used to create and protect monopoly markets that are costly both to consumers and to the dairy industry itself. By the same token, reasonable and constructive action in this area will benefit the entire industry by improving and expanding the market for quality dairy foods.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 3

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact laws to permit the free flow of dairy products

Whereas the economy of the State of Minnesota is based to a large degree upon its large and productive dairy industry; and

Whereas production of pure and wholesome dairy products in the State of Minnesota exceeds the consumption in the State; and

Whereas certain dairy interests in the eastern markets have been instrumental in

the erection of artificial milk barriers under the guise of health barriers which inhibit the free flow of milk and dairy products from the productive areas of the Midwest; and

Whereas it would be to the mutual interest of the midwestern producer and eastern consumers to have Federal health standards for milk and dairy products which would be uniform throughout the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the Congress of the United States be requested to enact Federal laws which will permit the free flow of pure and wholesome dairy products between the States; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be requested to send copies of this resolution to the Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota, to the President of the United States, and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Victory of Bataan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 9, the 19th anniversary of the fall of Bataan was observed here in Washington when the two streets near the Philippine Chancery named Bataan and Corregidor by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners were dedicated.

The ceremonies were attended by high Government officials as well as many former servicemen who took part in the Pacific war. Recognition was given to the loyalty of the Filipino people to the ideals of democracy and freedom as shown by those who fought on Bataan during the dark days of 1942.

The following article by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, describes in detail the ceremonies as well as a defeat which was turned into a great victory.

The article follows:

THE VICTORY OF BATAAN

(By Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States)

Sunday, April 9, is the 19th anniversary of the fall of Bataan. To commemorate the event, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia decided to name two streets near the Philippine Chancery, Bataan and Corregidor. At the official naming ceremony which will take place at 3:30 in the afternoon, Secretary of State Dean Rusk will deliver the main address.

That Bataan and Corregidor should thus be remembered in the Capital City of the United States recalls the inner meaning of the blood brotherhood between the American people and the Filipino people that was sealed on that little peninsula and on that little rock whose names are enshrined in the histories of both our countries.

Bataan fell but its fall was really a victory. It was the victory of the human spirit. It was such a victory because it was a strange and wonderful symbol of what the 20th century could mean to the human race. Ever since these terrible days of 1942 we have been aware of this symbolism. It does no harm to repeat it now—because, like all great verities, it seems to acquire new truth each time it is repeated.

We recall the victory of Bataan: The demonstration to the whole world that people of different races, different origins, different backgrounds, have a common cause in liberty. That the old and despicable balance of mastery and slavery, of colonial power and subject nation, can be wiped out in a spirit of mutual trust and respect. That the men of the west and the men of the east can face a common foe in absolute and unquestioned equality.

That was the victory of Bataan. It sealed the bond of friendship between Filipinos and Americans—a bond already established through the long years that led up, before the great war came, to the guarantee of national independence. As the long shadows of military defeat fell over those Philippine and American warriors in the tropical night in Bataan, the victory of the free spirit hovered overhead. It foretold the irreversible march of nationalism in Asia and Africa, the massive and exciting roster of nations that would quickly win their freedom in the years to follow—India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, and all the others.

The victory of Bataan showed the way. It was important in time of war. It is even more important now. For we can now place the troubled problems of relationships between nations against the background of the lesson we taught ourselves on Bataan. Today we are faced with a new menace. We are really still fighting the battle that we fought on Bataan. It is a new threat, this menace of imperialistic communism. We see it in Laos, in South Vietnam, in Berlin, in the Congo, even in the august halls of the United Nation. And under the leadership of President Carlos P. Garcia, we are meeting it in the Philippines with the same determination and the same courage that we showed in Bataan 19 years ago.

Asia and Africa are afire with nationalism. This powerful force, which in a different incarnation gave Europe its bloodiest centuries and its most magnificent civilizations, can now do the same, one or the other, in the rich and vast continents peopled by human beings in the millions. American survival and that of freedom itself depends on the capacity of the people of the United States to recognize what is happening in the world; and, having recognized the nature of the upheavel, on the ability of American leadership to act with wisdom and imagination.

To us in the Philippines and to you here, Bataan is a symbol of the bond between us. Bataan is of the past; but the bond lives, and must never be shaken. And today we look to America for more than maintenance of that bond. It may be a natural human impulse to pay closest attention to those who waver than to those who are trusted; to give greater help to the uncertain, the uncommitted, than to the committed, to take stanch allies for granted. But it may be good to remember that this impulse, however human, does not always coincide with the realities of world affairs. Bataan should always stand as a reminder of the continuing mautuality of Philippine-American friendship.

So today, in 1961, we Filipinos and Americans recall the symbolism of Bataan—the spiritual victory that makes the military defeat look puny—and in the remembrance of that gerat moment in our common history we have the right to stand side by side through all the years to come, certain of the rightness of our cause and the timelessness of our frinedship.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—General Romulo was General MacArthur's aide-de-camp in Bataan, Corregidor and Australia and returned to the Philippines with the U.S. forces that landed in Leyte.)

Putting the Farm Situation in Proper Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, we read so much concerning the farm situation that I am sure a great many people in this great country of ours are completely confused.

Some publications emphasize the fact that statistics show farmers as a class are not receiving their fair share of the national income and are not deriving proper remuneration for the time they devote to producing the necessary food and fiber for the American people and an ever-growing number of people in foreign lands. They make the argument that the farmer is particularly deserving of sympathetic consideration by the American people and treatment by the Congress of the United States.

On the same day, you can read in another publication a story condemning the farmer for being subsidized and pointing out the great cost to the taxpayer of the farm programs.

There is some truth in each story and the degree of truth is almost as broad as the total number of farmers in the country and the number of other lines of endeavor which are also directly or indirectly subsidized.

I believe the last election indicated that a majority of the farmers are about like any other cross section of American citizens. They do not want sympathy. They want an unrestricted opportunity to run their own farms to the best of their ability and judgment and an even break in our competitive economy. In spite of Senator Kennedy's lavish promises of help, sympathy, and higher price supports during the election campaign, many predominantly agricultural districts elected Republicans to Congress. Why did this happen? Largely, I believe, because a majority of the farmers know that Republicans are just as sympathetic with the problems of agriculture as the Democrats. Further, that the farmer is considerably disillusioned over the results of Government farm programs over the past 25 years. He has come to recognize that for some reason, the price of some of his products such as cattle, hogs, potatoes, and soybeans which have had little or no help from the Government are enjoying the highest prices.

The farmer recognizes that if prices are to be maintained at a high level by Government assistance, production controls must be applied. Our sizable surpluses of wheat, corn, cotton, and grain sorghums—to name only a few—are the concrete proof that with a price incentive established by law production will exceed consumption unless production controls are in effect.

I believe the farmers do not believe the so-called supply management approach endorsed by Secretary of Agri-

culture Freeman can effectively apply to every farm. When Senator Kennedy stated in many speeches in farm areas his belief that all of agriculture must have "supply management" by Government, he scared the daylights out of a lot of farmers who still think they can do a better job of running their farms than any Federal agency in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, Newsweek magazine in its issue of April 10 carried an excellent editorial entitled "The Farmer's Best Friend," which puts the farm situation in extremely clear perspective. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE FARMER'S BEST FRIEND

(By Raymond Moley)

Last summer after traversing several of the major farm States during an automobile trip from New York to the Pacific coast, I expressed in this space some doubt whether there was any identity between the farmer himself and the image so pitifully portrayed by his political friends. For by observation and from what I heard along the way, the farmer's lot was not so unhappy after all. Then came the election and a great majority rejected the political party which had promised most to the farmers.

President Kennedy has now presented to Congress a plan the enactment of which may take weeks of hearings and debate. Then, if adotped, many months will pass before it is in full operation. Meanwhile, natural developments in agriculture will continue which may go a long way toward remedying the farmer's problems. If given time, the farmer may save himself and measurably eliminate Government from his business.

To the farm politician "the family farm" is an expression which calls for devout genuflections and muttered prayers. Scratch the skin of a family farmer in the Midwest and the hot blood of a score or two Congressmen and Senators will flow copiously.

Those politicians have been telling us about how farmers have been driven from their ancestral holdings in great numbers. Senator BENTON said a century and a quarter ago that in those stricken farm regions there is no sound but the auctioneer's hammer knocking down the family heirlooms.

SIZE BRINGS EFFICIENCY

It is true that the family-size farm is vanishing. But not the family farm. It has simply been growing in size and in well-being.

More than 1 million farms have "disappeared" in the past 5 years—a drop of 23 percent. In 1920 the average size of a farm was 148.2 acres, in 1940 170 acres, in 1954 it was 242.2 acres, and now it is 302.4 acres. This change has come about through the operation of economic law in a free society. It is an example of free enterprise. And it has not been accompanied by increasing distress.

A farmer can no longer realize a profit on what used to be a family-size farm. He must have more of the techniques of agriculture and more mechanical equipment. The farmer has learned to use machinery and to take advantage of new chemical discoveries. He now has the use of the internal-combustion engine and electrical equipment. His production per hour of work has risen. He must have more land, fully to utilize his time and equipment.

NATURE TAKES OVER

The economic status of the farmer has been gaining as the number of farms has decreased. Seventy-nine percent of the farms in the United States are owned by the people who operate them, an increase of 22 percent since 1935.

But what of those "poor" fellows who have left the farms which they have sold to other farmers? They have been getting excellent prices for their acres so that they carry away to other regions or into the towns a nice package of greenbacks.

In 1959 the selling value of land and buildings averaged out at $121 per acre, an increase of 44 percent in 5 years. For whole farms the average value of land and buildings has increased 63 percent since 1954. There are 12 percent more tractors than in 1954, 12 percent more trucks, 7 percent more combines, and almost 100 percent more forage harvesters and balers. More than 35 percent of the farms have two or more tractors.

I was told by a farm editor in Tulsa 2 weeks ago that until recently a good deal of "La Salle Street money" was available for financing corporate farms but that it has been "scared away" by the high prices demanded for farmland.

The farmer is irked by the controls now imposed upon him. Essentially he believes in a free market. He wants above all to be rid of government in his business. This cannot be accomplished at once—that would be a disaster. But surely and steadily the Government should take itself out of the farming business. It is getting to be a sector of the economy which will be able to stand on its feet if it gets the chance.

Freedom and Responsibility Within the University Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Clark Kerr, President of the University of California, is one of the foremost leaders in the field of higher education today.

At the university's 93d Charter Day ceremonies in March, President Kerr made some penetrating and thoughtful remarks regarding freedom and responsibility within the university community.

I believe that my colleagues will find these remarks of interest and value.

EXCERPTS FROM PRESIDENT KERR'S CHARTER DAY ADDRESS

And now for a few moments I should like to share with you a concern which goes to the very heart of the university—a concern about freedom and responsibility within the university community. In 1953 I delivered my first farewell to a graduating class of the University of California and I chose to welcome the members of that class as new alumni. One paragraph from those remarks applies perhaps as much today as it did then:

"One reason for stressing the importance of the alumni relates to the times in which we live. This is perhaps the most continuously troubled period internationally which has ever beset our Nation, and the consequences are felt far beyond the Army, the Navy, and the State Department. We do not exaggerate when we speak of ourselves as engaged in an enormous struggle for the preservation of the right of personal independence against the constantly pressing forces of totalitarianism. The consequences of a political climate of this sort will always be severely felt upon a university campus. The lifeblood of an intellectual community is free inquiry and discussion, yet on every hand the question is raised whether there is a right to freedom of inquiry and freedom of discussion, with the Nation in its present peril. Thus an important and even imperative function of an alumni body is to carry back to the community, by means which the college professor cannot command, the conviction that there cannot possibly be any connection between blindness and survival; that the right to free inquiry, even the necessity of free inquiry, is an integral part of the strength of a progressive society; that the nonconformist, as contrasted with the conspirator, today as in ages past also serves humanity and that the university is one of his havens; and that when freedom of thought and expression has died on a university campus, it has died everywhere."

Freedom of thought and expression has not died at the University of California; nor, despite the currently rising passions of the radical left and the radical right, will it die. As in all the affairs of men, freedom must be matched by responsibility if freedom is not to die. And the university has the responsibility to insure that the search for truth will never be subverted internally. For this precise reason, the University of California has refused to employ persons whose commitments or obligations to the Communist Party, or to any other organization prejudice impartial scholarship and the free pursuit of truth. That has been the policy of the regents and the academic senate for many years. That is our policy today. That will continue to be our policy.

Members of the university community, faculty members and students alike, deserve the same right to freedom of thought and expression which every citizen enjoys outside the campus boundaries. They are not, however, entitled to trade on the university's good name, or to use the university community or a part of it as a captive audience, or to violate the law. The university, in turn, is not entitled to place limitations upon the off-campus actions of students or faculty members in their roles as private citizens. Participation in the university community does not sever either the rights or the obligations of citizenship in the broader community.

Those of little faith are disposed today to see in one episode, or in one speech, the end of all they hold dear. But America is stronger than that; the way of freedom has more to commend it than that. Our Nation was founded not on fear, but on faith. Those persons who act as agents of suspicion and distrust, or who resort to conspiratorial action to defeat another conspiracy, are unwittingly forsaking the very heritage they claim to protect. Our American ideals are not fragile objects of historical interest to be sheltered from the reality of today's world. They are strong and resilient and as serviceable today as in 1776. They need no special care except daily exercise, and no shield but truth.

We need today a fresh avowal of confidence in traditional democratic principles and in good American commonsense and decency. We need a reaffirmation of faith in our citizenry, including its younger members, among them the students at this university; and of faith in the established institutions of our society, including its universities, among them our own. We welcome the voices of sanity and reason that are giving expression to that faith and confidence today.

Let us as members of a great academic community assembled here this afternoon rededicate ourselves and our institution to both preservation of freedom and the exercise of responsibility.

I should like to conclude by quoting from the celebrated essay by Cardinal Newman

when he was rector of the Catholic University of Dublin, on "The Idea of a University." The university, wrote Cardinal Newman, "is the place to which a thousand scholars make contributions; in which the intellect may safely range and speculate, sure to find its equal in some antagonist activity, and its judge in the tribunal of truth. It is a place where inquiry is pushed forward, and discoveries verified and perfected, and rashness rendered innocuous, with error exposed by the collisions of mind with mind and knowledge with knowledge."

That is "The Idea of a University." That is the "idea" of the University of California.

How To Depress Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, who fools whom with "pie-in-the-sky" legislation? The so-called area redevelopment effort of the Federal Government was discussed in the Wall Street Journal, this morning, in an article by Paul Duke, and further in a sensible editorial, both of which I submit for the interest of the Members of Congress:

HOW TO DEPRESS AREAS

By arbitrary definition of the Government, a "depressed area" is one which has reached a certain percentage of unemployment. Yet, as Mr. Duke notes on this page today, even the backers of the Federal depressed-areas bill before Congress doubt that it will have any appreciable impact on unemployment.

There are many reasons. A region receiving Federal aid to attract new industry may simply attract industry—and employment—from another area. In any case capital is by no means the only consideration in attracting industry; some depressed areas are depressed because new industry has no logical reason, in the form of good transportation or natural resources or whatever, for coming to them.

Nor are the defects of this proposed legislation solely negative. A community that is truly depressed for inescapable economic reasons cannot be given prosperity by Federal aid. It can only be put on a Federal dole. Such subsidy is hardly a prescription for economic growth or for combating unemployment; it is a prescription for permanent depression.

Thus the trouble with this bill, it seems to us, is that it misunderstands just about everything it is trying to deal with. It misunderstands the problem of unemployment and it misunderstands the economic development of the United States. It even manages to misunderstand human nature by supposing that handouts create incentive.

Is there, then, nothing the Government could do about depressed areas? There certainly is. The biggest imaginable spur to general economic growth would be a Federal spending-revenue balance that permitted large tax cuts.

That, it will be objected, would not help the people in an area depressed because the economy has passed them by. But real, noninflationary economic growth would obviously reduce unemployment and attract those in depressed areas to firmer ground. Since when is it a crime for Americans to follow the beckoning of opportunity?

The contemporary political mind, admittedly, doesn't work that way; it prefers to preach economic growth and practice stagnation. Even so, it would seem axiomatic that any welfare measure must provide welfare; otherwise it is a fraud and delusion on the general taxpayer and the specific would-be recipient. And that isn't even very good politics.

DEPRESSED AREAS

AID LEGISLATION RAISES SKEPTICISM EVEN AMONG BACKERS

(By Paul Duke)

WASHINGTON.—Within the next couple of weeks an uncertain Congress will put the final legislative touches on an ambitious new Federal program that even some ardent supporters doubt will be able to accomplish its assigned task.

The bill, a major recommendation of the Kennedy administration, is designed to rehabilitate areas suffering from prolonged unemployment by funneling more than $400 million in Federal grants and loans into hard-hit reigons of Pennsylvania, New York, West Virginia, Kentucky, Michigan, Illinois, and elsewhere.

Yet, even those who have fought hardest for the new program are skeptical of its potentialities. A Democrat from depression-ridden West Virginia is typical. "If anybody thinks this will solve the unemployment problem, he's crazy," the lawmaker declares.

If such a remark seems strange, it expresses perhaps the overriding contradiction of a new Federal program that is riddled with paradoxes. Consider: President Kennedy listed aid to depressed areas as part of his anti-recession program to pep up the economy quickly and put people back to work. Yet, Labor Secretary Goldberg and "liberal" Democratic sponsors in Congress don't regard the program as an antirecession device at all, but rather an attempt to revive communities over a period of years. "There's nothing (in it) that will put a man back to work tomorrow," says a House Democrat from Ohio.

Far from curing unemployment, many liberals who support the new program fear its chief impact may be merely to reshuffle unemployment geographically. That's because, despite alleged safeguards written into the bill, they're afraid the result may be to encourage the pirating of industry from one region of the country to another. "The Jolly Roger is flying at the masthead of this bill," gripes a New England Senator.

To win the votes of southern Democrats, a special provision was inserted in the bill to permit Federal aid for rural areas. Yet, almost no one thinks such a program is necessary because the Agriculture Department already has a rural development plan.

LOTS OF CAPACITY

Though the aid-to-depressed-areas scheme is designed primarily to help medium-sized communities, such industrial giants as Detroit and Pittsburgh would also qualify for assistance in building new plants and for community facelifting projects. Yet, their unemployment troubles stem more from unused rather than a lack of industrial capacity. "We've got more damned plant space in our State than we know what to do with," snaps a Michigan Democrat.

These, then, are just some of the more obvious difficulties involved in undertaking from Washington the job of invigorating local economies. The more subtle complexes can be enormous. Solutions that may seem logical on the surface can turn out to be illogical upon closer examination; actions to help can produce conuteractions of harm.

Consider, for example, the plight of a major company that planned to move its plant from one area of a State to another. To soften the impact on the community it was leaving, the company decided on what it thought was a bold stroke—save the jobs of its 300 workers by taking them along. Not that simple, however. New employment opportunities were scarce in the community where the plant was relocating, and the influx of 300 new workers threatened to create bitter antagonism from the local citizenry.

If the program's chances of success are so doubtful, why then is it all but certain to become law? The answer is not unfamiliar in the realm of politics: It's hard to oppose extending a helping hand to the downtrodden, even if the gesture outdoes the accomplishment. Most liberals, when discussing aid to depressed areas, will echo the philosophy voiced by President Kennedy in his inaugural address: "If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich." But many of these same liberals, when pinned down on the potential effectiveness of the legislation, agree with one colleague who concedes that "the chief value of this bill will be symbolic." Or, in the words of still another: "This is like the United Nations, the faith will greatly exceed the accomplishment."

To be sure, supporters of the depressed areas legislation see some solid good coming from the new multi-million-dollar rehabilitation effort. The very passage of the legislation, they believe, will lend new encouragement and hope to scores of areas on the economic skids. In more practical terms, backers believe the program will genuinely help some areas which have been unable to attract industry because of a lack of lending funds.

In West Virginia, for example, a shortage of private credit is cited as a major adverse factor in the State's drive for new businesses. Proponents of the new legislation note that the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority has lent $17 million since its creation 5 years ago and this has accounted for 26,000 new factory jobs with payrolls of $93 billion annually. If such a program can work at the State level, they ask, "Why can't it work on a bigger scale nationally?"

THE 1946 EMPLOYMENT ACT

Advocates claim that the Government already has a mandate to clear up pockets of depression under the 1946 Federal Employment Act which calls for policies promoting full employment in the United States. The longer Uncle Sam remains aloof, they contend, the more serious the blight becomes. Besides, the argument goes, the Government is losing potential tax revenue from economically depressed regions while Federal and State welfare and unemployment compensation payments mushroom.

Moreover, the plan's pushers envision it as the last barrier to a general public works program that would cost billions instead of millions. Commerce Secretary Hodges has already said that a new PWA will be necessary unless the economy snaps back soon and reduces the number of areas with substantial unemployment, now at 101.

Critics don't question the motives behind the new program, only its chances for success in easing unemployment. "This is one of the biggest phonies to come down the legislative pike in a long time," grumbles a Virginia conservative. What provokes him and others of like mind is that the program probably will take years to produce results, which may well be niggardly. For example, it's been estimated that only about 1 of every 17 unemployed workers in a depressed locality could hope to obtain a job as a direct result of the Federal help that's contemplated.

Most importantly, perhaps, many opponents think the program skirts the root problems of persistent unemployment. "It prescribes a painkiller without being concerned whether the pain is caused by an incurable cancer or a hangover," cracks a Western GOP critic. Better, the foes say, to remove the 10-percent excise tax on automobiles to help stimulate car sales; or to launch a crash program to find new uses for

coal; or to undertake a major job retraining program; or to reconsider trade policies.

Besides, the argument goes, factors other than favorable financing are frequently more important to business in choosing a plant location. What industry can overlook an area's transportation connections, the availability of raw materials, and the closeness of markets? Too, business is increasingly concerned about the character of the community—its schools, its recreational facilities, the quality of the work force. Some lawmakers suggest the Federal inducements will tend to attract only speculative and undesirable industries looking for windfall aid.

And, of course, it's pointed out that the Federal Government already is offering some area assistance through the Small Business Administration and the community facilities loan program. Moreover, 22 States now have privately financed development corporations to help in the obtaining of credit; Pennsylvania and nine other States have gone even further and set up State-supported credit corporations. New Hampshire and Maine have established public authorities for the construction of industrial parks.

PHILOSOPHICAL QUESTION

But even granting that economically stricken regions do need more help, there's the philosophical question of whether the job should fall to a special Federal program. And opponents pose these other questions: Should hard-hit communities be helped while others, only less slightly depressed, be denied assistance? What about the communities which aren't depressed but are earnestly trying to build up their economies and will face rougher competition in attracting new businesses? Should the Government favor some areas over others? Concludes a New England conservative: "This is a bad bill because it forces Uncle Sam to play favorites among his children." Possible upshot: Greater political pressure to enlarge the program to include more areas.

For all their self-doubts, supporters of the new depressed areas legislation tend to reject as exaggerated claims that the program eventually will expand significantly. "This is a rifle for a specific target," proclaims a Pennsylvania Democrat. "It was never meant to be anything else, and if properly administered, should not be anything else."

Nevertheless, friend and foe alike can pretty much agree on one basic conclusion: Even if the rifle does strike the target, it's not likely to penetrate deeply.

A Well-Known Constituent in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital has had the distinct honor recently of having as a visitor a well-known constituent of mine, Mr. Jack La Lanne. Mr. La Lanne is more than a television personality and advocate of physical fitness. He is a welcome fixture in households from coast to coast. His bright and cheerful program each morning has brought enjoyment to the lives, and slimness to the waistlines, of millions of American housewives and husbands.

During the last week, while Mr. La Lanne has been here in Washington, D.C., he has been in touch with members of the Government on the subject of our country's physical fitness. He has an especial interest in the Peace Corps, and I am certain Mr. La Lanne's counsel would do much to enhance the image of a vigorous American youth that we hope to project abroad through this exciting experiment.

Mr. La Lanne, as I said, is more than a television personality. His articles and books on physical fitness are read by thousands and thousands. Yet that is not all. For Mr. Jack La Lanne is, besides that, a man who devoutly believes in what he professes. He lives the sort of life he advocates, and is walking proof of his own good advice.

Next week, Mr. La Lanne will be broadcasting his daily television show from Baltimore. I would commend his counsel, and his programs, to all my colleagues.

Address of Constant Mierlak, National President of Byelorussian-American Association at the Commemoration of the 43d Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence at the Biltmore Hotel, New York City, on March 26, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 1961, the Byelorussian-American Association held a special ceremony at the Hotel Biltmore in New York City to commemorate the 43d anniversary of the independence of Byelorussia. It was my privilege to be present at that occasion and to bring to the group the greetings of the Congress of the United States and our assurance that we share with them the hope that the couutry of their origin will soon be free from Soviet oppression.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the address made to the group by Mr. Constant Mierlak, national president of the Byelorussian-American Association and also the text of a resolution adopted unanimously by the meeting. The address and text of the resolution follow:

ADDRESS OF CONSTANT MIERLAK, NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION AT THE COMMEMORATION OF THE 43D ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE AT THE BILTMORE HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, ON MARCH 26, 1961

Your Excellencies, distinguished guests and representatives of friendly nations, ladies and gentlemen, "we, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress, assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name, and by authority of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be free and independent States."

This is a quotation from the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America in Congress on July 4, 1776.

Nineteen years later Byelorussia, at that time known, as the Commonwealth of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, lost her independence, having been forcibly incorporated in 1795 into Imperial Russia.

Since then, the United States of America enjoyed the blessings of freedom in all branches of national life and built the most powerful and democratic nation in the world.

On the other hand, Byelorussia, during 123 years, endured russification and colonial exploitation, as a result of which, Byelorussia became the poorest country of all in the Russian Empire.

Having lost her independence, Byelorussia lost the right to live by her own laws, to speak her own language and to pray in her own churches.

During that time of persecution and slavery imposed by imperial Moscow the Byelorussians attempted several times to regain their freedom and independence and finally they succeeded in 1918, on March 25.

The Presidium of the Rada (Parliament), which was elected at the All-Byelorussian Congress in December 1917, declared in its Third Constitutional Act:

"Now we, the Rada of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, are liberating our country from the last vestige of state dependency imposed by the Russian monarchy upon our free and independent country.

"From now on, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic is proclaimed a free and independent state. The peoples of Byelorussia through their elected constituent assembly shall themselves determine the future relations of Byelorussia with other states."

Although the Byelorussian independence was declared 142 years later, the wording of the declaration is almost identical with that of the United States. The fate of these two nations, however, has been entirely different due to many factors: a different geopolitical location being one of them.

Today, 43 years later, we gathered here to commemorate the magnificent act in Byelorussian history and also to pay a tribute to the heroic generation of that time, who envisoned a free and independent Byelorussian state.

We also shall pay tribute to all who died since then defending the principles of freedom and democracy.

Free and independent Byelorussia, as well as other countries which became a part of today's Soviet Union, could not resist for a long time and fell victim to new Soviet or Communist imperialism which surged from the old traditional Russian messianism.

The historic Russian imperialism, now under new leadership, systematically destroyed people after people, nation after nation. Thus from 1920 to the present they have subjugated at least 23 nations which had been independent in the past and lived peacefully, respecting human rights and international treaties. Since that time the Russians completely destroyed and virtually wiped out from the surface of the earth about seven nations or ethnic groups consisting of several millions of people.

Nobody seems to have learned the lesson from Byelorussian history and from history of other nations which later on also lost their independence, that Communist imperialism destroys everything which stands in its way to world domination.

Through policy of containment, coexistence, etc., and due to misunderstanding of the nature of Russian imperialism and to our American complacency the Communists gradually succeeded in spreading their domination and influence as far as 90 miles from U.S. borders, and they are challenging our very existence through overt and subvert activities.

The manifest published by 81 Communist parties in Moscow demonstrates unequivo-

cally the conviction that the free world is unable to resist their aggression and therefore the Communists believe that it will not be necessary to use physical force in conquering other lands, as they have done before, but that the domination of the world will be accomplished through the coexistence policy.

According to the declaration there will be no nuclear war at all. The fear and lament, that the civilization will be destroyed in an event of such a nuclear conflict, is raised by the pro-Russian and pro-Soviet circles or by the pretended defenders of humanity in the United States. In reality this is simply an attempt to divert the attention of our Government from the real danger which our country is approaching.

Various actions coordinated between internal and external elements demonstrate how easily our society is led astray by disguised Communist organizations. This can be illustrated by the following facts:

The student demonstration in California against the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the organized "Operation Abolition" which culminated in the resolution introduced in the House of Representatives calling for the dissolution of the House Committee, show that all efforts were made to destroy the Committee in order to carry on the subversive activities more effectively.

Another fact, the authorization given by the Commerce Department to sell precision machinery to Russia which would enable the Soviets to put missile production on assembly line is extremely discouraging. It shows that the Federal Agencies are packed with politically immature elements, which should have been cleared off a long time ago. Thanks to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and particularly to Senator THOMAS J. DODD who objected strongly, the Commerce Department was forced to withdraw the authorization, but unfortunately it was too late: the Russians already got the blueprints.

To this, we may add the suppression and boycoting by the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty of the joint congressional resolution on Captive Nations Week (Public Law 86-90). The policymakers and so-called experts on Soviet affairs in the U.S. Information Agency and other private committees considered themselves better Americans who know better than the entire U.S. Congress what is best for the United States.

And here is another fact that concerns exclusively the Americans of Byelorussian descent: the attempts made by the Byelorussian-American Association to convince the proper U.S. agencies of political value and actual urgency of establishing Byelorussian-language broadcasts by the Voice of America have simply remained futile in the last 10 years. The director of the broadcasting service of the Voice of America writes: "The limitations of both the voice's funds and technical facilities have not changed since I wrote you on this matter on September 16, 1960."

After having read this and the headlines that the United States again granted assistance of $100 million to Tito of Yugoslavia one can become worried indeed about the fate of this country.

Ladies and gentlemen:

We gathered here not only to commemorate an act of declaration of independence, but also to remind the free world that there are nations which aspire to be free and which unfortunately are almost forgotten today in political dealings. Some countries, as for instance, the countries of Africa, are helped in gaining the independence; on the other hand, countries dominated by Soviet Russia are left at the mercy of their enslavers.

We also assembled here to rededicate ourselves in the struggle for liberation of our old country and to rededicate ourselves to the cause of preserving this country free forever.

The nation which aspires and fights for its freedom will eventually become free and equal among all nations and under God.

Thank you.

RESOLUTION SPONSORED BY THE BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION, UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT THE MASS MEETING COMMEMORATING THE 43D ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE ON MARCH 26, 1961, AT THE BILTMORE HOTEL IN NEW YORK CITY

We, Americans of Byelorussian descent, assembled at the commemoration of the 43d anniversary of Byelorussian independence, declare—

That the United States of America, politically and economically the leading nation of the democratic world, guarantees its people political, religious, cultural, social, and economic freedom;

That the American people have long accepted the basic principles set forth in the American Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal" and that they are entitled to the enjoyment and exercise of freedom and independence;

That on the other hand, during its 43 years of existence Communist Russia has enslaved many nations of Europe and Asia by means of aggression or subversion and deprived them of basic liberties;

That Russia has become a great imperialist peril which threatens all free nations and particularly the United States of America—our new fatherland; and

That the United States of America has the necessary strength and the will to resist aggression of Communist Russian imperialism and to defend the principles of freedom for all enslaved nations and for the Byelorussian people.

We protest—

Against imperialist aggression of Communist Russia, against enslavement of Byelorussia and deprivation of Byelorussian people of political, religious, cultural, and social liberties; against forced russification, economic bondage, and colonial exploitation; and

Against the government of terror in Byelorussia, against mass deportation and the policy of genocide which has resulted during the last 20 years in a demographic deficit of 6 million people on the territory of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

We condemn—

Any policy of coexistence and complacency with Communist Russian imperialism, any policy that approves the acts of aggression committed by Moscow, any policy that might assist in spreading the totalitarian Communist ideas;

Any policy of discrimination of nations, for example, a policy which supports the liberation movements in Africa but which, at the same time, denies the right for freedom to the nations enslaved by Russia;

The ignoring and boycotting of the resolution of the U.S. Congress (Public Law 86-90) by certain official agencies and privately sponsored committees;

The Communist-organized "Operation Abolition" and conscious support of this action by some American circles in order to destroy the House Committee on Un-American Activities and to weaken the Federal Bureau of Investigation and thus to paralyze the security laws of our Government; and

The discriminating attitude of the U.S. Government agencies regarding the Byelorussian language which is excluded from the programs broadcast by the Voice of America.

We support—

The Government of the United States in its aspiration to achieve a permanent peace in the world by means of securing freedom and justice for all men and nations;

The resolution (Public Law 86-90) which was unanimously voted by both House of the U.S. Congress and the proclamation by the President of the third week of July as "The Captive Nations Week";

The House Committee on Un-American Activities and its patriotic and indispensable services rendered in strengthening the security of the United States;

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, for his patriotic and farsighted action in halting the shipment to the Soviet Russia of precision machinery which would speed the limping production of Russian military missiles; and

The resolution sponsored by Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, Representative of Pennsylvania, in the House of Representatives proposing the creation of a Special Captive Nations Commission.

We pledge—

To strengthen our efforts to create a united front of Americans of Byelorussian origin in order to join more actively the political cultural and social life of the United States, in order to increase our contribution to the economic and spiritual growth of this country; and

To disseminate knowledge and truth about the Byelorussian people and their independence aspirations in order to win the sympathy and support of the American people for the cause of liberation of Byelorussia and restoration of the independent Byelorussian state.

We appeal—

To the people of the United States and of the whole free world to provide all possible assistance for the Byelorussian people in their perennial struggle for liberation from Russian communism;

To the U.S. Government to be on guard and properly prepared against inevitable aggression that is being planned by Communist Russia which intends to dominate the world; and

To the U.S. authorities to give due consideration to our request concerning the Byelorussian-language programs to be broadcast by the Voice of America.

The Sad Story of Haj Mohammed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the April 1, 1961, issue of the Chicago Tribune tells a story with a moral of which we should all make special note:

A 95-year-old Egyptian, Haj Mohammed Marzouk, has retired after spending 85 of his years embroidering quotations from the Koran in gold thread on the enormous black plush covers used to cover the Kaba stone in Mecca, toward which all devout followers of Islam face when they pray. His covers for the holy shrine reach Mecca each year before the arrival of the faithful on their pilgrimage.

Mohammed began this service to the Prophet as an apprentice of 10. A few days ago, when his final embroidery was finished, he was retired, receiving a pension of seven Egyptian pounds, or $20, a month after having been classified as a civil servant in the ministry of religion.

Then around came the tax collector, to say that the classification was wrong and that Mohammed really was a craftsman who should have been paying income tax at a

rate 5 percent higher than had been deducted from his pay during his working life. The collector thereupon presented a bill for £212 ($615) in back taxes.

To satisfy it, Mohammed was obliged to sell his few household effects, among them his bed and blanket. At 95, he is down to a ragged coat, without a piastre to his name. The man who covered the Prophet's shrine for 85 years hasn't a blanket to sleep under.

Somehow we see in this pathetic person a symbol and forerunner of that merciful governmental dispensation known in this country at the moment as the New Frontier. When we have all passed through the grinder of spending and taxing for the greater glory of the public sector, will we have a blanket to our name?

Distinguished Editor, Tom Goff, Huntington Park Daily Signal, Huntington Park, Calif., in the Great 23d District, Writes Two Timely Editorials Pointing Up Some Errors of Opponents of House Un-American Activities Committee and Critics of Film "Operation Abolition"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of two editorials written by Mr. Tom Goff, editor of the Daily Signal at Huntington Park, Calif., in the great 23d District which I represent this my 15th year. Because almost all of these years I have been an active member, and now am, of the House Un-American Activities Committee, I deem it especially appropriate I have the privilege of unanimous consent to insert these editorials which appear to me timely, pertinent, and crystal clear for any reader who is unbiased, unprejudiced, and who, Mr. Speaker, is anxious to throw all of his or her influence toward strengthening the international security processes of our beloved Nation against the deceitful, destructive, aggressive and subversive activities and programs and propaganda which emanates and grows out of the Communist conspiracy.

The first editorial "Ministers Overlook Basic Message of Anti-Red Film" follows:

MINISTERS OVERLOOK BASIC MESSAGE OF ANTI-RED FILM

The last thing in the world I want to do is to offend a couple of courageous gentleman of the cloth, but I am compelled, nevertheless, to voice the opinion that I believe both the Reverend Richard Dunlap, of Huntington Park, and the Reverend Norman Taylor, of South Gate, missed completely the principal message carried by the film, "Operation Abolition."

The premise, as I see it, is not as the reverend gentlemen stated in this paper yesterday that "to oppose the House Un-American Activities Committee is treason per se." It is, instead, that loyal Americans were led into committing illegal acts by an element whose loyalty is, at the very least, questionable.

NOT A QUESTION OF RIGHT TO OPPOSE

There is no question in my mind—or in any other thinking American's mind—that those who disagree with the purposes, methods or any other aspect of the committee have every right in the world to oppose it—by peaceful and legal means.

The truly appalling thing the film does show, however, is that a group of Americans—many of them college students—took it upon themselves to go far beyond this point. Following the lead of a few well-placed Communists they attempted to disrupt the committee session, in one instance, by catcalls and chants inside the hearing room, and in another, by creating a vocal disturbance in the hall outside the hearing room.

Furthermore, when ordered by police officers to stop the noise, they persisted and made it necessary for the officers to eject them bodily.

Now this type of thing is not mere opposition. It is, at a minimum, disturbing the peace. Those who express their opposition to the Un-American Activities Committee in this fashion are, no matter how high minded their individual motives—serving as duptes for the Communists.

HOW ABOUT CHURCH?

Let's bring the issue up to the level of religion, a field in which both the Reverend Dr. Dunlap and the Reverend Dr. Taylor are eminently qualified.

Now both of these gentlemen are Methodists, one of the great and widely accepted Protestant denominations. No American in his right mind would dream of challenging their right to conduct their business despite the fact some people disagree, to one degree or another, as to the correctness of their approach.

But let's suppose, just for the sake of argument, that some other denomination decided that the Methodist approach not only was incorrect but was harmful. And let's suppose that several members of this denomination decided to let their views be known by picketing, for example, the Reverend Dr. Dunlap's church.

Once again just for the sake of argument, let's suppose, too, that a handful of still another group—let's call them "church wreckers" for lack of a better name—joined the picketers and convinced some, not all, of the picketers that the best way to get their message across was to demand entrance into the church, interrupt the services with catcalls and boos and make so much noise on the steps of the church that the services could not continue.

Now, those who went along with the proposal would not, perhaps, be "church wreckers" per se. But they would be dupes of the "church wreckers." And they would be wrong.

RED TECHNIQUES

The Reverend Dr. Taylor made the statement in criticizing the committee that "you don't overcome it (communism) by adopting the same techniques they use."

I agree. And I would add that you can't correct any injustices—real or imaginary—caused by the Un-American Activities Committee by adopting Communist techniques such as were used in San Francisco.

And I say further that even tacit approval of the San Francisco demonstrations is an open invitation to the ridiculous type of thing I have described above in relation to the church. An encouragement of the San Francisco type of demonstration is aiding and abetting the Communist cause far more than any of the "injustices" charged to the committee.

The second editorial "All Americans Should See San Francisco Riot Film," follows:

ALL AMERICANS SHOULD SEE SAN FRANCISCO RIOT FILM

I'd like to devote this column to a discussion of "Operation Abolition," the controversial documentary film showing last year's violent attacks on the House Un-American Activities Committee during 2 days of hearings in San Francisco.

The film, being widely shown in the southeast district as elsewhere, is under heavy attack by Communists; their dupes who, for one farfetched reason or another, would terminate the work the committee is doing, and still others who naively argue the film does not offer a fair presentation of the San Francisco hearings facts.

The film has its weaknesses, to be sure. The commentary, for example, is far more heavily editorialized than necessary; its impact is lessened materially by too frequent "commercial" breaks to allow various members of the committee to make a pitch.

A MESSAGE FOR ALL THINKING AMERICANS

But these and other faults are minor points in the final analysis. Stripped to its bare bones, the picture carries a message which should be seen and absorbed by all thinking citizens of this country.

Parents, particularly, and youngsters starting or preparing to start a college career should make a special point to see the film. It should be required fare for every senior class in every American high school.

For "Operation Abolition" shows in the most graphic manner possible precisely how a few Communist agitators—expertly trained and wholly dedicated—can incite, cajole and seduce a group of young men and women into the misguided belief that open defiance of law and order is a crusade against "tyranny."

And that is the issue. There is no quarrel with the right of Americans, young or old, Communists or non-Communists, to picket or otherwise peacefully protest the work of the committee if they so desire.

On the other hand, wilful disobedience of the law, physical interference with the work of a legally constituted congressional committee, popular or not, and outright defiance of law enforcement officers carrying out legal orders in the performance of their duties is wrong. There can be no legitimate defense made for it.

I can readily understand why the Communists are enraged by the film. Not only does it lay wide open the particular techniques used in the San Francisco incidents, but it bares to all an eye-opening explanation of how they have been able to generate the riots which have become their favorite weapon throughout the world.

SPECIAL PREY

The special prey of the Communists in these activities everywhere have been college students and other young people.

Men and women at this stage of life, fortunately in most instances but not in this, are at their most idealistic. They want to do things; they want to crusade; they want to set the world on fire.

They become too easy victims of the professional agitator who would lead them to glorious victories over imaginary forces of evil.

Those who see "Operation Abolition" should not be misled, however, into believing that all or even most of those young people in the crowds around the San Francisco City Hall were there as participants. Far more of them, I am sure, were at the scene out of curiosity more than anything else.

Nor should parents be led to mistakenly believe that all—or even most—of the youngsters in today's colleges are willing Communist dupes.

The proportion really is small. The danger is that the youngster who hasn't been informed—the boy or girl who doesn't know what to look for—can end up a participant in a disgraceful exhibition such as that staged last year in San Francisco.

SHOE ON OTHER FOOT

I think, too, that it's about time we start putting the shoe on the other foot with regards to this Un-American Activities Committee.

It's time that we say a few words, even shed a few tears, for the men who sit on this committee and hearing after hearing, year after year, have the vilest kind of abuse heaped upon them by those who strive by every foul means written in the Communist library to put this Nation under the yoke of the cruelest tyranny the world ever has known.

Our sense of personal liberty slips way out of line when we make monsters out of the men who try to preserve this country by exposing these conspirators for what they are and make heroes out of those who would destroy us.

Sure, the Un-American Activities Committee and similar bodies have made mistakes. When battling shadows it becomes very easy to mistake a misguided dupe for the real thing.

But this committee and others like it have done a tremendous and thankless job in pointing out very real and very frightening dangers which do exist.

Only those who have reason to fear exposure to public view have anything real to fear from well-conducted committees of this sort.

Neat Budget Trick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following three articles from the Wall Street Journal of March 24, 1961, on current Government problems:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—NEAT BUDGET TRICK

Washington reports indicate that President Kennedy's budget message today, revising the Eisenhower budget for the next fiscal year, will be minus a sizable piece—namely defense costs. A revision of the defense budget, it's said, will be sent separately to Congress next week.

And the suspicion in Washington is that this is partly an attempt to allay any fears that the Kennedy administration is off on a wild spending spree. For it can be argued that, if you forget defense for the moment and assume the Eisenhower budgetmakers were correct in their revenue expectations, the nondefense budget would not necessarily be unbalanced, or hardly unbalanced.

In other words, the Kennedy increases in domestic spending might come to just about the $1.5 billion surplus forecast by the Eisenhower administration. As for the increases in defense outlays, to be presented separately to Congress, who can argue against spending for national security?

We hope this interpretation of the administration's thinking is wrong, for it smacks of devious devices to persuade the people that Federal "civilian" spending is not on a drastic rise. But in any case, the separation of defense from other outlays is a novel approach to budgeting which has disturbing implications.

It seems to be saying that all is well if part of the budget is in balance, or nearly so, even though the total plainly will not be. Thus it distorts the whole Federal financial picture.

Moreover, it seems to be putting defense into a category of its own, too sacred to be subject to the secular restrictions of normal budgeting. Obviously it is imperative to spend as much on defense as is demonstrably necessary. It is equally imperative to spend no more than that.

Once the idea became prevalent that defense is something apart from the regular budget, the quality of defense would dangerously deteriorate. Such an approach would be an invitation to still more waste and duplication and mismanagement. For when the yardstick of strict financial control is thrown away, it becomes impossible to establish defense priorities or intelligently allocate defense resources.

Finally, this separation of defense from other spending tends to put the finger on the Pentagon as the chief reason the total Federal budget has been soaring like a missile for so many years. The increases in domestic welfare costs, it's suggested, are minor compared to the enormous boosts in defense costs.

That assertion, however, is not borne out by the budget documents over the years; they show just the opposite. Since 1955, for example, Defense Department spending has gone up something like $5 billion, but total Federal spending has gone up about $15 billion. The bulk of the increase is not defense but the proliferating host of domestic subsidies, handouts, and whatnot. The budget category called "labor and welfare" has doubled in a decade.

And it is these domestic programs President Kennedy is so busily trying to add to and magnify. Perhaps their additional cost in fiscal 1962 will be no more than the $1.5 billion surplus estimated by Mr. Eisenhower, but no one has even tried to figure their eventual cost beyond the obvious fact that it will be staggering.

What is urgently needed now is a facing up to the financial meaning of the President's proposals, not a political budget trick to disguise their meaning.

WHAT'S 1 PERCENT?

As part of President Kennedy's approach to foreign aid, the United States reportedly will suggest next week that the members of the newly created Development Assistance Group, embracing Western Europe and Japan, join the United States in pledging 1 percent of their annual gross national product to aid the underdeveloped countries.

This formula seems at once modest and magnanimous, although a closer look reveals that it's neither. One percent of anything sounds insignificant, but 1 percent of the U.S. gross national product this year would be more than $5 billion. As for the estimated $3 billion in aid money which this approach would draw from the 10-nation group that sounds more impressive than it really is. Right now, by one means and another, economically advanced free nations are pumping out almost that much in aid.

What else may be said of this scheme that isn't all it seems? Well, it's strange to hear that this country's gross national product and foreign aid budget are intimately related. By this reasoning, our generosity to Upper Volta is in part determined by how many automobiles Detroit sells and what sort of year soybean growers have and the number of people who decide to buy houses. Never mind whether aid to Upper Volta makes any sense on its own merits.

Actually, the 1-percent formula contains a built-in apparently endless escalator. Since Government spending is included in the gross national product, an increase in foreign aid expenditures would automatically increase the gross national product. And that, of course, would make the proposed 1-percent aid allotment proportionately larger, which would automatically boost the gross national product and begin the cycle anew.

Of course, there's a hitch to hooking ourselves into this belt. The present weakness of the dollar, reflecting the large and persistent deficit in U.S. international payments, is an urgent warning that Government spending overseas must be cut back sharply. The warning, apparently, hasn't troubled the formulamakers. After all, what's a measly 1 percent?

SPECTACULAR HOMEWORK

In his recent message to Congress proposing Federal aid to school construction, President Kennedy observed:

"It is clear that we do not have enough classrooms. In order to meet current needs and accommodate increasing enrollments, if every child is to have the opportunity of a full-day education in an adequate classroom, a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed in the next 10 years."

Since the President left that stark statistic unexplained, one might easily suppose that here is another unmet need of the country which only Government can provide; that without Washington's help communities won't begin to build those 600,000 necessary classrooms. Happily, the impression is mistaken.

According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the country is building classrooms at such a clip that 1970 could bring a surplus. It is noted that the Government's generous estimate of future needs, proposed by the U.S. Office of Education, is 610,000 new classrooms by 1970. Local communities over the past 5 years have been building classrooms at the rate of 69,000 a year—a pace that would produce 690,000 by the end of the decade, or 80,000 more than Washington deems necessary.

No one, of course, would argue that each community in the country has all the classrooms it may need or desire. But neither can it be argued convincingly that the unmet needs of some localities add up to an unmet need of the Nation which only Washington can handle. On the contrary, the chamber's findings confirm the fact that parents and taxpayers in communities across the country are meeting their responsibility to their children, without aid or advice from Washington.

This spectacular achievement ought to delight educators and cheer up politicians who fear that the country is inadequate to the challenges of the 1960's. Yet, in the President's message and other pleading for Federal aid, it passes unnoticed and unapplauded. Obviously, if there is an unmet educational need, it is to enlighten Washington about the way communities are doing their homework.

The Penalty of Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the following editorial to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial ap-

peared in the April 3, 1961, issue of U.S. News & World Report and was written by David Lawrence:

Many millions of persons, with the best of intent, voted last year for a change of administration.

Many millions of others, also believing that they were doing what would be best for America, voted against change.

Today all the people of the United States are paying the penalty of the change. It is costly. It could lead us into a war that nobody wants.

If this happens, it will not be the fault of our President. For he will earnestly strive to keep us from such a catastrophe, and he will have the support of the American people, irrespective of party.

But 1960 was not the time for a change in administration, and events now unfortunately are proving that thesis true. The risk we have taken by "changing horses in midstream" is being revealed in the headlines.

We didn't take such a risk in the midst of World War II, when we even broke the third-term precedent by reelecting a President for a third and a fourth term.

What is being revealed today is that a cold war is really not much different from a hot war as far as possible dangers are concerned. A fixed election date therefore is risky. Flexibility in the date for holding national elections—such as the parliamentary systems provide—would be a wise precaution.

Nikita Khrushchev and his clique in the Kremlin knew, of course, that the Eisenhower policies would be maintained by a Nixon administration. But Moscow had been led to believe that the United States would be "softer" under a Democratic administration.

Hints to this effect were given to the Kremlin from time to time in the last few years by prominent Democrats, inside and outside of Congress, who criticized the Eisenhower policies.

Will the United States now suffer the effects of the Kremlin's miscalculation?

Almost immediately after the election last November, the Communists stepped up the cold war. They increased military support to their stooges in Laos. They sent arms to Lumumba's forces in the Congo in direct defiance of the United Nations. And they have moved more intensively in Cuba and other areas.

All through November, December, January, and February, the cold war was pressed with renewed vigor by the Communists throughout the world, while American policies stagnated. Though ostensibly concerned with the possibility of reaching agreements in negotiations for disarmament and on such issues as the status of Berlin, the Moscow government saw a chance meanwhile to build a stronger position for itself in Latin America, Africa, and southeast Asia.

Unfortunately, partisan comments in recent years in this country indicated that maybe a Democratic President in the White House would bring a "peace at any price" policy. It will be recalled that in the spring of 1954, when the Indochina crisis was developing, the United States was ready to take a firm stand to meet Communist aggression in southeast Asia. Vice President Nixon made an off-the-record speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors that was later paraphrased in print and viewed as threatening military action. It was indeed a show of firmness that was essential to our diplomacy. It led to bitter attacks by the Democrats. Senator Kennedy said at a political fundraising dinner in Chicago on April 20, 1954:

"The American people should be told the truth about the situation in the Far East. For if Secretary Dulles' and Vice President Nixon's words are to be taken at their face value, we are about to enter the jungle and do battle with the tiger. But I do believe it both proper and necessary that those who bear responsibility should indicate in advance the course that should be adopted."

So the Kremlin in 1961 apparently decided to test Mr. Kennedy's philosophy.

Another Vice President of the United States—LYNDON JOHNSON—now has made, after a conference with the President, the following statement:

"And I think it should also be known to the world that the United States, while it is going to be reasonable and prudent in all of its moves, is not in a mood to meekly permit an independent nation to be gobbled up by an armed minority supported from the outside."

It is to be hoped that blind partisans and the advocates of "peace at any price" will not again endanger American foreign policy by disparaging the comments of the present Vice President, who has just proclaimed the resolute policy of the United States.

Despite what was said by the Democrats in their ridicule of the policy of the late Secretary Dulles, called "brinkmanship," it is a fact that after 2 months of a Democratic administration we are at the brink of armed conflict. It is important, therefore, to let the Soviets know that the American people stand solidly behind their President and will back him fully in whatever stand he may take to resist any further aggression by the Communists in any part of the world.

U.S. Savings Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues during the 8 years prior to January 20, 1961, joined me in urging the Treasury Department to give more attention to savings bonds and to paying a fair return on them, commensurate with market rates on other securities. Most of our efforts were ignored.

I am pleased to note that without any prompting from us, the new Secretary of the Treasury has increased interest rates accordingly. Secretary Dillon is to be commended for his early attention to this important problem.

The Treasury Department's release of March 24, 1961. I am sure will be of interest to all our colleagues. It is as follows:

TREASURY ANNOUNCES HIGHER INTEREST RATE FOR LONG-TERM HOLDERS OF SAVINGS BONDS

Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon today announced new regulations that will benefit some 10 million Americans who own series E savings bonds issued from May 1941 through May 1949.

Under the new regulations, these bonds—the first of which will be 20 years old on May 1—will earn a full 3¾-percent interest a year. They may now be held for an additional 10 years. About $15 billion of the $43 billion currently outstanding in series E and H savings bonds will be affected by this action.

"In addition to benefiting the bondholder," Secretary Dillon said, "this action to encourage him to retain his bonds will diminish the Treasury's problem of refinancing the public debt and will contribute to the contry's stability by keeping a sizeable portion of it in the hands of the average citizen.

"By retaining their matured bonds and purchasing new ones, individual citizens will not only prepare themselves and their children for a more secure future, but will help strengthen the economy of our country. The more than $43 billion now outstanding in series E and H bonds testifies to the foresighted thrift of our people and to their faith in the future of America."

The new rate of interest on series E bonds bearing issue dates from May 1941 through May 1949 is comparable to the yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States that have 10 years to run to maturity. These bonds originally earned 2.90 percent if held to maturity. In their first extension period they have been earning from 2.90 to 3.47 percent if held to extended maturity. During the second extended maturity they will all earn a straight 3¾ percent per year, compounded semiannually.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

APRIL 1, 1961.

More new tax increases are shaping up (beside earlier unemployment compensation insurance costs; see newsletters, February 25, March 4, March 25) in user taxes in the highway program and social security program. The highway taxes will include, I suspect, an increase in the gasoline tax and truck taxes. Social Security will raise the employer and employee one-eighth of 1 percent each on the pay base of $4,800 annually and self-employed three-eighths of 1 percent. These are in addition to the escalator taxes already in the law to go up to 9 percent.

Aid for depressed areas or the area redevelopment bill, as it is variously called, was the big debate and controversy before Easter adjournment. Two days of debate and voting confused more than clarified the scope, intent and anticipated operation of the bill. On the surface, the language was repeated over and over, but the true implication, I must assume, the Members did not comprehend, unless, of course, politics completely replaced a sense of reason.

The Federal Government would extend outright grants and loans to "redevelopment areas" as determined and so designated by the Secretary of Commerce. One hundred million dollars would go to industrial area plant loans, $100 million to rural areas, $100 million for public facility loans, $75 million for public facility grants, $4½ million for technical assistance, $10 million for subsistence payments and $4½ million for occupational training, for a total of $394 million (as a starter). Everyone agreed this sum was a flyspeck compared to the amount really needed to do the job.

Let's look at the logic (as I endeavored to do in floor debate) of the declaration of purpose of the bill. "The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to take

effective steps in planning and financing their economic redevelopment; that Federal assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing redevelopment should enable such areas to achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by establishment of stable and diversified local economies and improved local living conditions; and that under the provisions of this act new employment opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing facilities and resources." Isn't that carte blanche control directly or indirectly in the bureaucratic hands of the Federal Government over private enterprise? Isn't that unconstitutional in a limited government of checks and balances wherein all rights reside in the people except those specified in the Constitution as the prerogative of the Federal Government? Doesn't that declaration of purpose put the Federal Government in the position of helping anyone or everyone according to bureaucratic whim from a complex industry and a whole community down to each and every specified individual of any designated area? It can mean nothing else. Here are other quotes from the bill:

"The Secretary is authorized to make loans to aid in financing any project within a redevelopment area for purchase of land and facilities, for industrial or commercial usage, including construction of new buildings, the rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or enlargement of existing buildings.

"The project for which financial assistance is sought must be reasonably calculated to provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment within the redevelopment area wherein it is, or will be, located. [What does that actually mean?]

"No such assistance shall be extended hereunder unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders or other Federal agencies on reasonable terms."

Loans or grants if "the project for which assistance is sought will tend to improve the opportunities."

Other features: (1) Secretary will work with local authorities determining their needs; (2) Secretary will "establish new rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this act." (3) The Secretary (of Commerce), Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will work together to "determine the occupational training of individuals residing in the redevelopment area"; (4) all wages paid on projects under this act will be at a rate set by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act; (5) the Secretary is authorized to delegate to the heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government any of the Secretary's functions, powers, and duties under this act as he may deem appropriate, and to authorize the redelegation of such functions, powers and duties by the heads of such departments and agencies.

Where is the constitutional limitation of power in this nightmare jumble of bureaucratic planning, regimentation and control? To do what—to help? No, to spend money the Federal Government doesn't have until it collects more taxes (Uncle Sam is worse than broke by hundreds of billions). What is this legislative sickness? It is: (1) An almost hypnotic belief in the efficiency of Federal spending, planning and taxing; (2) failure to understand basic economics, private enterprise and the right of property ownership—that what the Federal Government puts into the economy as aid is first taken out in taxes; (3) never to be forgotten, of course, is the determination of each politician to stay in office. My answer to "aid to depressed areas" is to lighten the tax load. A substantial tax cut within a framework of a balanced budget (less Federal spending) would spark an economic expansion and prosperity eclipsing anything in the history of our Nation.

Secretary Goldberg: Come See How Omaha Does It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Omaha is one of the four cities in the Nation with a balanced labor market. We have no serious unemployment in Omaha and we have not had since prior to World War II.

Such a situation does not just happen. It is the result of sound planning and a confidence in the future of the Omaha area, Nebr., and the Nation. It is typical of the attitude in the Middle West—an attitude that we can plan for the future, a prosperous future, without massive doses of Federal aid, but by having confidence in America.

The city of Omaha, Omaha Chamber of Commerce, and Omaha AFL–CIO joined last week in inviting Labor Secretary Goldberg to visit Omaha and learn how a nondepressed area operates. Noting press reports of Secretary Goldberg's visits to depressed areas, these Omaha leaders believed it would be valuable for the Secretary also to visit an area that is enjoying good business, high employment, and vigorous planning and expansion to take care of the future needs of the area.

Certainly if there are lessons to be learned from tours of depressed areas, there must be more lessons to be learned from tours of prosperous areas.

I hope Secretary Goldberg will be able to visit the Omaha area personally. I know he would learn a great deal about how a city operates and how its people, businessmen, and labor representatives work together for the common good.

I would like to include now a copy of the letter addressed to Secretary Goldberg and signed by the mayor of Omaha, president of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce, and president of the Nebraska AFL–CIO:

HON. ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GOLDBERG: Citizens of Omaha have been very gratified, but hardly surprised, to read recent reports from the U.S. Department of Labor describing our city as one of four balanced labor markets in the country. We had been well aware in Omaha that our economy was maintaining a generally prosperous level, and even improving in some sectors, while there was news of mounting unemployment and business slumps in many major cities.

We have noted with interest that you and representatives of your department have been visiting some of the designated depressed areas to gather information on the causes of the economic ailments which afflict them, with an eye toward finding possible cures.

As representatives of the city of Omaha, the business community, and the labor force, we feel that you and your investigators would find it equally valuable to study information on an area that is not depressed, that has succeeded in maintaining a favorable employment level and a confident spirit throughout this period of uncertainty in many industrial areas.

It is our opinion that Omaha's fortunate position at this time is the result of many factors. Among these are our diversified industrial economy, a business climate which has encouraged expansion of basic industries and development of a variety of new industries, a spirit of fairness and cooperation in labor-management relations which has given our city an enviable record of labor peace, a tax structure which has succeeded in providing needed Government services on a local level while giving rein to private initiative to solve local problems.

We were never more confident of Omaha's bright future, in terms of the period immediately ahead and for years to come, and it is our feeling that conditions here, created in part by circumstances but also through the vision and faith and integrity of our people, can be an inspiration if not a pattern for other communities in the United States.

The resources of the city of Omaha, the Omaha Chamber of Commerce, and the unions of the Omaha AFL–CIO are at the disposal of the Labor Department in assembling data for your study of economic problems of metropolitan cities.

If your busy schedule permits, we would welcome the chance to tell you our story personally in Omaha; if not, representatives of our city and our organizations would be happy to take our story to you in Washington. Communications on this matter can be addressed to Mr. Ralph E. Kiplinger of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce, 108 South 18th Street, Omaha, Nebr.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN ROSENBLATT,
Mayor, City of Omaha.
RALPH E. KIPLINGER,
President, Omaha Chamber of Commerce.
RICHARD NISLEY,
President, Nebraska AFL–CIO.

New England Council Requests White House Investigation of Residual Oil Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a release by the New England Council for Economic Development at Boston, indicating that it has asked for an investigation by the White House of residual oil import restrictions and resulting increased fuel prices to the New England consumer:

WASHINGTON, April 9.—The New England Council announced today that it has asked the White House to conduct a full scale investigation of residual oil import restrictions and resulting increased fuel prices to the New England consumer.

The regional economic development organization petitioned the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to restudy their original recommendations which resulted in Presi-

dent Eisenhower's March 1959 proclamation imposing mandatory quotas.

Charles W. Colson, Washington counsel for the New England group, said that "the new quota system announced by Secretary Udall last month is totally unsatisfactory. The Secretary of Interior has said that the new system is intended to permit an adequate supply of residual oil and that the quota would compensate between domestic production and domestic demand. This new system makes the existence of the quota program even more fruitless since it can no longer be said that the system is designed to limit imports.

"We think it is fair to ask why quotas should be imposed at all if they are no longer intended to restrict importation. Even more than before, the quota system is an artificial restriction on the normal competitive process and tends only to create monopolies in fuel oil distribution; its only result can be increased prices to the consumer."

The council's formal petition seeks removal of the mandatory quota system and asks for "an immediate investigation to determine the effect of the residual oil import program on the price of residual oil and other fuels in the East; and to determine the efficacy of the program with respect to the purpose for which it was established—to promote national security.

"We are convinced that an impartial study by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization would demonstrate clearly that the residual oil restrictions have not fulfilled in any way the national security objectives of this proclamation, but rather have resulted only in increasing hardships to industry and consumers."

Nearly 1,000 in Orleans Learn Now, Pay Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the grave problems confronting many high school graduates who desire college training is lack of money with which to do so.

Through the National Defense Education Act, our Government has helped many young Americans to meet their financial needs for a college education—particularly in the sciences and in engineering, but not limited to these fields. Mr. Robert N. Kelso, a reporter for the New Orleans (La.) States-Item, has written a very fine series of three articles dealing with the availability and the workings of federally financed student loans at New Orleans universities and colleges. Mr. Kelso describes what a particular American community is doing through its institutions of higher learning to aid well-deserving students to obtain university training.

With these thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on consecutive days. Mr. Kelso's three articles which appeared late last month in the States-Item. The first article follows:

[From the New Orleans States-Item, Mar. 27, 1961]

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CHIEF UNDERWRITER: NEARLY 1,000 IN NEW ORLEANS LEARN NOW, PAY LATER

(This is the first in a series of three articles dealing with the workings of federally financed student loans at New Orleans colleges and universities which help meet the current high cost of education.)

(By Robert N. Kelso)

Nearly 1,000 students are financing at least part of their college education in New Orleans on a "learn now—pay later" basis.

Chief underwriter of loans bolstering student pocketbooks is the Federal Government.

Congress in the summer of 1958 authorized a 4-year program to get more talent into and out of college through the National Defense Education Act.

Solons were spurred to action by the firing of Russia's Sputnik I on October 5, 1957, a scientific feat that brought searching analysis of the quality of American education.

The act was designed to "identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation" and to "insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States."

Special emphasis was given to training more and better teachers, and to turning out more engineers, scientists, mathematicians and experts in modern foreign languages to meet challenges this country faces in the space age.

Loans to needy and academically sound undergraduate and graduate students in colleges and universities are a key part of the program.

A total of some $295 million was to be pumped from Government coffers during the 4-year period ending June 30, 1962, into student loan funds administered by participating colleges and universities.

Expectations are the program will be continued beyond the expiration date of the National Defense Education Act.

Colleges struggling to help out needy students with their own heavily committed resources leaped at the offer to fatten loan funds.

Asked what their estimated needs for student loans were when the U.S. Office of Education began mapping operational plans for the program in the fall of 1958, 1,000-odd institutions came up with a total figure of $79 million.

Urged to whittle this figure, by the Office of Education, they pared the sum to $62 million.

But Congress had goofed. It had authorized spending of up to $47.5 million for the first year's operation of the student loan program, but wound up appropriating only $6 million.

The program, consequently, got off to a slow start. But it was in full swing by February 1959.

In New Orleans, Tulane University has asked for and received $250,000 annually—the top amount allowed any one institution—for the 2 years of full-scale operation.

Loyola University has funneled some $203,000 to needy students during the same period.

Lesser amounts—depending generally on the size of the school's full-time enrollment—have been parceled out by Dillard and Xavier Universities and St. Mary's Dominican College.

Louisiana State University in New Orleans has handled very little of this Federal money because the need for student loans at the lakefront facility is minimal.

LSUNO charges no tuition, and exacts annual fees totaling only $80. Ninety-six percent of its students live in the New Orleans area with parents or relatives, further cutting their expenses.

The student loans underwritten with Federal funds are far from signature only deals.

Participating schools take a hard look at the financial resources of the student and his parents.

They also scrutinize his academic accomplishments and capacity.

If the student is granted a loan it is no greater than needed to bridge the gap between what he can scrape together and what a year's attendance will cost him.

Under terms of the Federal law, a student may borrow no more than $1,000 in any academic year, for a total of $5,000.

Repayment of the loan starts 1 year after the student finishes school, and is paid back with 3 percent interest at a rate of 10 percent a year over a 10-year period.

Borrowers who become full-time elementary or high school teachers are exempted for repayment of up to 50 percent of the loan, plus interest, at the rate of 10 percent for each year of teaching.

Another easement is offered borrowers during periods of military service (or up to 3 years), or while they are attending an accredited college or university on a full-time basis.

No repayment on principal or interest is required during such period.

The college or university participating in this Federal student loan program has exclusive responsibility for selecting students who will receive the loans, for administering the program, and collecting the debt.

Each institution must put up $1 of its own money for every $9 it gets from the Government in the student loan program.

One fly in the ointment from the institution's standpoint—say local administrators—is that the Government so far hasn't put up a cent to help defray administrative costs. They fear these will run into substantial amounts when collections start on a large scale.

But they don't expect to lose money because of loan defaulters.

Tulane's student loan administrator, Dr. Joseph E. Gordon, says educational institutions with long experience in handling a big loan program for students find defaulters are rare birds.

"Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) has been in the big time loan business for about 20 years," Dr. Gordon said, "and they've found the bad debt writeoff to be about 2 percent."

The Reverend Father Robert L. Boggs, dean of students and loan administrator at Loyola, confirms this.

"The Government has made a study which shows that all institutions engaged in a loan program come up with gains because of the interest rate," Father Boggs said.

"There are a number of defaulters, but not enough to put anybody in the red."

Federal funds aren't the needy student's only hope.

There are also scholarships and part-time employment arranged by the school which can bolster student finances.

Some schools also arrange loans for students with big commercial finance companies offering low interest rates for such a purpose.

Beyond this, many schools have continued their own student loan programs alongside that underwritten by the Government.

Tulane, for example, lent out some $50,000 of its own money this year to graduate students, and provided some $10,000 from small endowments earmarked for loans to students needing emergency assistance.

A common practice at many institutions is to offer financial assistance in a "package" including loans, scholarships, and part-time jobs.

The applicant who proves his need may get help from any or all of these sources.

At Tulane, for example, an estimated one-third of its 4,500 full-time students are receiving some kind of financial assistance.

Dr. Gordon points out that 90 percent of the scholarships offered at Tulane are limited to tuition charges.

This still leaves a big gap for a student short of money.

A freshman at Tulane needs another $600 to meet expenses, says Dr. Gordon, "and a freshman normally can't make that much in a part-time job.

"If we just had tuition scholarships to offer," he added, "an impecunious student, even if he was the brightest boy in the world, couldn't come to Tulane."

The Aim and the Health of the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, we Americans owe an immense debt of gratitude to the physicians of this country. American medicine at its best has no equal anywhere in the world. We can indeed be proud of the dedicated men and women who are our doctors of medicine.

The organization which speaks for these physicians on matters of national concern is the American Medical Association. The American Medical Association has well served the health of the Nation in many areas of its activity. It is the American Medical Association which is in large part responsible for the development of standards and procedures for specialty certifications which contribute significantly to maintaining high quality medical care. The excellent training provided in our medical schools is a product of the American Medical Association's efforts to upgrade the quality of medical education to equal any in the world.

These facts make it all the more appalling to observe the role being played by the American Medical Association in the political and social sphere. The American Medical Association is in the midst of a campaign to distort the President's program to provide health benefits to the aged through social security. It is distorting the President's proposal beyond recognition and beyond the bounds of decency. I am convinced that the American Medical Association, when it does this, does not speak for the majority of informed American physicians. I suspect that a large number of doctors share the thoughts expressed by Samuel Standard, M.D., associate professor of clinical surgery, New York University. In the New York Times of February 26, he wrote:

> When the American Medical Association leaves medicine, and enters into the field of economics, politics, and general sociology, our paths of thinking diverge. I cannot agree with the AMA's insistence that, despite the advances in the science of medicine, the methods by which it shall be distributed to society's needs must remain unchanged.

What is most distressing is that the American Medical Association's fight against a new way of financing the hospital and related care needed by the aged is but the latest in a long history of opposition to social progress. The extension of social security benefits to the disabled, the elimination of a means test in the Federal program for crippled children, Federal grants to the States for material and child welfare programs—and even voluntary health insurance—all of these were at one time bitterly and vigorously opposed by the American Medical Association. All of these measures are today in effect over the original opposition of the American Medical Association, and all of them have made life better for vast numbers of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to put into the RECORD the documented history of the American Medical Association, related to the points that I have mentioned, in the hope that knowledge of these facts will provide the Members of the Congress with some perspective to assist them in evaluating the current activities of the American Medical Association:

THE DOCUMENTED RECORD OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

1. OPPOSITION TO THE EXTENSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS TO THE DISABLED

American Medical Association bitterly opposed from 1948 to 1956 the extension of social security to provide cash benefits to the permanently and totally disabled at age 50. The American Medical Association cited this program, which was enacted in 1956 and which is in its 5th year of successful operation, as a serious threat to American medicine. The incalculable cost to the public which the American Medical Association foresaw has been so moderate that the Congress in 1960 found it possible to eliminate the age limitation without any increase in social security taxes.

Source: The house commended the following statement by Dr. F. J. L. Blasingame and recommended that each delegate bring it to the attention of his constituent association:

"The proposed amendment to the Social Security Act, embodied in H.R. 7225, which would establish a cash benefit under the Old Age and Survivors Insurance System for disabled beneficiaries beginning at age 50, constitutes a serious threat to American medicine. It is obviously one important step on the road to a system of complete Federal medical care. No government can long provide cash benefits as a right under a so-called social insurance system without eventually injecting itself into the physician-patient relationship. It will necessarily become a responsibility of government to regulate the medical care and the rehabilitative programs that are associated with the payment of the cash benefits. Because of this undesirable impact on medicine, the incalculable cost to the public, the inhibiting effect on the patients' will to be rehabilitated, and for other reasons which have been detailed in many communications to you from our Washington office and the committee on legislation, we have properly opposed this proposal and recommended that a careful nonpartisan study be made of disability as it relates to employability for the purpose of determining the best possible methods of conducting constructive programs in this area." (Official proceedings of the house of delegates, American Medical Association, June 1956: 18, 66, 67; Digest of Official Actions, 1846–1958, American Medical Association, p. 661.)

2. OPPOSITION TO THE ELIMINATION OF MEANS TEST IN CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S PROGRAM

The American Medical Association in 1953 called socialistic a Federal regulation requiring that State crippled children's services shall "provide that diagnostic services * * * will be made available * * * to any child (a) without charge, (b) without restriction or requirement as to the economic status of each child's family * * * and (c) without any requirement for the referral of such child by any individual or agency."

Source: The house of delegates adopted the following resolution from Indiana: Official proceedings of the house of delegates, American Medical Association, June 1953: 56, 61, 62; December 1953: 50, 90, 91:

"Whereas section 200.9 of part 12–4 of regulations for maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, entitled 'Crippled Children's Program; Diagnostic Services' states as follows: 'State plans for crippled children's services shall provide that diagnostic services under the plan will be made available within the area served by each diagnostic center to any child (a) without charge, (b) without restriction or requirement as to the economic status of each child's family or relatives or their legal residence, and (c) without any requirement for the referral of such child by any individual or agency: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of trustees work through whatever channels may be necessary to eliminate this section of the regulations, the same being a socialistic regulation." (Digest of Official Actions, 1846–1958, American Medical Association, pp. 90–91.)

3. EARLY OPPOSITION TO VOLUNTARY HEALTH INSURANCE

Until the American Medical Association, in the midst of its fight against a national health insurance program, was advised by public relations counsel to support voluntary health insurance, organized medicine had been a barrier to the development of voluntary plans. In December 1949 the Journal of the American Hospital Association commented editorially that "It is a sad fact that through the 1930's and early 1940's the American Medical Association did not believe in voluntary sickness insurance, did almost everything possible to prevent its development."

Source: The American Medical Association's defense of its early record on the prepayment issue is set forth in Dickinson, "A Brief History of the Attitude of the American Medical Association Toward Voluntary Health Insurance" (AMA Bureau of Medical Economics Research Bulletin No. 70, 1949). The American Hospital Association, an organization in a position to know, reacted skeptically to this document:

"Bulletin 70 sets out to prove that the American Medical Association has never opposed voluntary sickness insurance plans in this country as they exist today. It quotes many official statements between 1916 and 1938. It points out that the opposition expressed—and this was sometimes pretty vicious—was aimed at earlier types of plans, not at those currently in operation. This document is not wholly convincing to hospital and Blue Cross leaders whose experience dates back a few years. Nowhere in the selected quotes is there a genuine word of encouragement to voluntary plans, much less a sign of leadership. There are words of caution, of criticism, of fear and warning. There are no words of confidence in the pioneers of voluntary sickness insurance, no words of faith in the principle of prepayment, and not even a forthright statement that some way must be found to make medical and hospital services more widely available.

"It is a sad fact that through the 1930's and early 1940's, the American Medical Association did not believe in voluntary sickness insurance, and did almost everything

possible to prevent its development." (Editorial, "Hospitals," Journal of the American Hospital Association, December 1949, p. 60.)

"It is difficult to reconcile with actuality the popular fiction * * * that the American Medical Association has always fostered experimentation in voluntary prepayment plans. The fact is that the American Medical Association did nothing positive to encourage voluntary health insurance until the formation of associated medical care plans only a year ago, though in 1938 the house of delegates had enunciated certain principles approving voluntary hospitalization plans, reversing an action taken 5 years previously when the plans had been roundly condemned. During the early struggles of the plans, many State and county societies, far from aiding in their development, actually opposed them; and it is reported reliably that American Medical Association officers from time to time expressed consternation at their growing popularity. To Blue Cross executives, among others, the doctrinaire view crediting the American Medical Association with early sponsorship of experimental voluntary prepayment programs emerges as a simple untruth." (Medical Economics, February 1947, pp. 80, 84.)

4. LABELING OF OLD-AGE AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AS A STEP TOWARD EITHER COMMUNISM OR TOTALITARIANISM

Speaking in 1939, on behalf of the American Medical Association board of directors, Dr. Morris Fishbein stated that "a Federal security plan * * * will be the first step in the breakdown of American democracy." He went on to say that "Indeed, all forms of security, compulsory security, even against old-age, unemployment, represents a beginning invasion by the state into the personal life of the individual, represent a taking away of individual responsibility, a weakening of national caliber, a definite step toward either communism or totalitarianism."

Source: Dr. Fishbein, speaking to the annual conference of secretaries of Constituent State Medical Associations, held in the American Medical Association Building, Chicago, November 17–18, 1939, said:

"The introduction into this Nation of a Federal security plan whereby the Nation itself, as a Federal agency, will step intimately into the sickness and life of every person in the country, will be the first step in the breakdown of American democracy. Indeed, all forms of security, compulsory security, even against old age and unemployment, represent a beginning invasion by the state into the personal life of the individual, represent a taking away of individual responsibility, a weakening of national caliber, a definite step toward either communism or totalitarianism. The people of this country today have begun to awaken to the insidious approach of such new forms of government."

The speech which ends with these words, begins with a statement by Dr. Fishbein that "the board of trustees has asked me at this point to interpolate a statement relative to a proposed platform of the association * * *." It appeared in the Journal of the American Medical Association under the heading "The Platform of the American Medical Association." (Journal of the American Medical Association vol. 113, No. 27, p. 2428, Dec. 30, 1939.)

5. OPPOSITION TO FEDERAL GRANTS FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD WELFARE PROGRAMS

In 1930 the American Medical Association condemned the principle of the Sheppard-Towner Act, granting Federal funds to appropriate State health agencies to reduce the death rate among mothers and children, as unsound in policy, wasteful and extravagant, unproductive of results, and tending to promote communism.

Source: The house of delegates approved the following resolutions and requested the board of trustees to initiate a movement to enlist every member of the medical profession to carry into effect the policy defined in these resolutions. (Official proceedings of the house of delegates, American Medical Association, June 1930: Pp. 35, 40, 41:

"Resolved, That the house of delegates of the American Medical Association condemns as unsound in policy, wasteful and extravagant, unproductive of results and tending to promote communism, the Federal subsidy system established by the Sheppard-Towner Maternity and Infancy Act and protests against the revival of that system in any form;

"Resolved, That it is the sense of the house of delegates that each State should be left free to formulate its own health programs, with the coperation of the U.S. Public Health Service if desired by the State, free from any inducement or compulsion in the way of Federal reward or coercion;

"Resolved, That any legislation involving cooperation between the Federal Government and the several States in the field of public health must, in the interest of efficiency and economy, in the judgment of the house of delegates, be administered under the joint supervision and control of the U.S. Public Health Service and the State health authoritites." (Digest of Official Actions, 1846–1958, American Medical Association, p. 92.)

Hiring the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the employment of handicapped people is a cause which should be championed by every fair-minded American. It is inspiring to know that this cause is vigorously supported in Oklahoma, and that our State has an effective program in this field.

In that program, one of the greatest influences operating in our State is the Oklahoma State Technical College in Okmulgee, which was recently saluted in an honor winning essay by Pat Deatherage of Okmulgee.

With pride in this high school student's achievement, as well as in the cause and the institution which are saluted, I am commending to the attention of my colleagues this essay, "Jobs for the Handicapped":

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

(By Pat Deatherage)

A challenge is something which offers real opposition to one's mind and body. Getting employers to realize the importance of hiring the handicapped is such a challenge. Breaking down old prejudices and replacing them with modern principles is many times an opposition to the mind which is almost overpowering.

Hiring the handicapped is our challenge, which we must meet if we expect the people of our Nation to be happy. But, what must we do to meet this challenge? First of all, we must educate ourselves with facts about the handicapped; what is being done to help them and what has already been done. Then we can present sound reasons to other people in persuading them to hire the handicapped.

Many times in talking with our friends, we may have a chance to put our education to work. For instance, a friend makes the remark that he would not hire a handicapped worker because a handicapped worker would not be as productive as other workers. If we can show our friend actual facts and figures which show that, quite often, the handicapped worker is more productive and efficient, and is a safer worker on the job than able workers, we may be able to change our friend's mind. If our friend will think about it, he will realize that it would only be natural for the handicapped to work a little harder on his job. The handicapped worker knows that he has to keep the job he has because another one may be hard to find. This tends to make him more productive and efficient. He also knows what it means to be handicapped, and this may tend to make him a safer worker than an able worker who does not realize how terrible a handicap may be.

It is also up to us, as a community, to see to it that the places of business have certain devices which will enable a handicapped worker to work there. By this, I mean, that the businesses should be equipped with elevators and ramps instead of stairs so that workers in wheelchairs can work there. When these businesses install the ramps and elevators, they will find that they are really helping themselves as much as they are helping the handicapped. They will receive goods returns from the handicapped worker in the form of efficient and productive work.

We should feel a definite responsibility for helping the handicapped. Wouldn't it be better to help them to help themselves than to pay taxes to support them when they don't want our help in the form of welfare? These people can be happy only when they feel they are a part of our society. So shouldn't we try to help them be a part by giving them an equal chance to work as normal people do? We must strive to make all our people happy, so, as a nation, we can stand united in the face of danger. We should also stop to think that some of these handicapped people may have received their handicaps while fighting for our country. Could we, as human beings, shove these individuals into a corner and just forget them when they have given so much for us? Likewise, we should also feel a responsibility for other handicapped people. Could the reason for their being handicapped be attributed to us? Was the car accident our fault in which the young girl lost her legs? Did we mean to check that piece of machinery to see if it was safe and just forgot to do it, and then someone lost a hand or arm because we forgot? We need not feel as guilty about being the cause of a person being handicapped as we should about not doing something about it.

Another reason we just can't forget these people is that they may be an inspiration for others. To see a blind girl holding a typist's position, or a man without legs doing the job of a draftsman, may be the inspiration needed by some other handicapped person who just needs a little push to make him have faith in life once again. It may also make able workers try just a little harder when they see how well some handicapped workers do their jobs.

Helping the handicapped to help themselves should give us a lift, too. Although we may never realize the thrill the handicapped worker gets when he can buy his family the things which they need with his own hard-earned money, we can realize the thrill of knowing that we have been even a small part in making someone else very happy.

In our own community we are very fortunate to have a trade school which has a rehabilitation center. I am referring to Oklahoma State Technical College in Okmulgee, Okla. At the rehabilitation center, the han-

dicapped are given therapeutic treatments, and at the same time they can learn a trade at which they can work with their particular kind of disability. The State aids the handicapped financially so that all handicapped people can attend and not just a few of them. This kind of center is one of the most wonderful opportunities for handicapped that there can be. People from all parts of the country come to the Oklahoma State Tech Rehabilitation Center to learn a trade so they can lead a normal, self-subsistent life.

If our community and all the communities in our Nation will realize the importance of hiring the handicapped and then meet the challenge which is put before them, our people will become a happier people, and our Nation will become more prosperous and united.

Wisconsin Loses Four Electric Co-op Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, a tragic car-truck collision at Mount Pleasant, Tex., took the lives of four of Wisconsin's outstanding rural electrification leaders. Killed in the accident were H. O. Melby, Mr. and Mrs. N. F. Leifer, all of Westby, Wis., and Elmer T. Smith, La Farge, Wis.

In addition to helping organize Vernon Electric Co-op and Wisconsin Electric Co-op, Mr. Melby served as president of these cooperatives for many years. Mr. Leifer was manager of Vernon Electric Co-op since 1937, and his wife shared his intense and active interest in a forward-looking rural electrification program. Mr. Smith was treasurer of Vernon Electric Co-op. All found time to be active in civic affairs in their communities.

As the Madison Capital Times observed in an editorial:

Without people of this stature, REA would never have become the great instrument of service it is for the farmers of this Nation.

Wisconsin and the Nation are better for the fact that they lived, and have been made poorer by their deaths.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD two articles from the Wisconsin REA News about the lives and deaths of these public-spirited citizens:

DEATH AT A PLACE CALLED PLEASANT

It had been such a pleasant affair, this 19th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. For the first time in many years, apprehension over frowns from the White House was absent. Instead there was enthusiasm over a statement from the Department of Agriculture that revealed a belief in the same principles which NRECA members had been advocating for many years. There was also enthusiasm over the man President Kennedy had designated to be the next Administrator of REA—Norman Clapp, of Wisconsin. Those in Dallas from his home State were very proud of him.

For everyone, and for Wisconsinites in particular, it had been the most enjoyable meeting in the history of NRECA.

But four persons from Wisconsin were destined never to get their enjoyment out of Texas.

The first news of the tragedy in Wisconsin was as terse as a police report. Some heard it via radio, others read it: "Four persons from Wisconsin were killed Thursday night when a truck-tractor skidded on wet pavement and crashed into the station wagon in which they were riding. The Texas department of public safety identified the dead as Norbert F. Leifer, 55, of Westby; his wife, Violet M. Leifer, 52; Helmer O. Melby, 72, of Westby; and Elmer T. Smith, 52, La Farge. The driver of the truck, Lloyd D. Lowe, of Iowa Park, Tex., was injured."

The impact of the news was not immediate because the names played tricks. Norbert F., Violet H., Helmer O. * * * could it possibly be Lefty, Pat, and H. O.? People called newspapers and radio stations for verification of the names, hoping perhaps for a mistake, but there was none. It was enormous truth.

Subsequent newspaper editions unfolded more of it. The ill-fated four had been heading east from Dallas on the road to Texarkana when a big truck, headed west, swerved into their lane to avoid another vehicle which had stopped in front of the truck to make a right turn. The station wagon from Wisconsin was smashed almost beyond recognition and four lives were ended there on the highway near a town called Mount Pleasant.

PERSONAL MEMORIES

(By Les Nelson)

When life ends for people dear to you, your mind reaches back beyond death for memories that suddenly stand out against the black curtain of today like precious cameos. Yesterday these memories were lost in the blur of current action; today they are so sharp and clear and prominent that even tears cannot blur them.

Everyone who knew Lefty and Pat Leifer, H. O. Melby and Elmer Smith is the possessor of such memories. Some will be able to discuss them with their friends, others will remain silent because voices break at times like this. A typewriter, less likely to fail, is a friend through which I can relay the memories made silent by the tragic anticlimax to last month's NRECA annual meeting. These are foremost among the many memories, some of them shared with others, some of them mine alone:

Last summer's pilgrimage with Lefty Leifer, Cliff Hooverson, and Harvey Schermerhorn to the Crawford County apple tree under which this publication was started 20 years ago. Lefty Leifer had been the first to see the importance of rural electrification publications and had published one of his own before he helped launch the Wisconsin REA News. The postal permit under which this publication is mailed was originally obtained for Vernon Electric Co-op by Lefty Leifer.

Although our purpose that day was to look back at history, Lefty characteristically looked ahead. He asked again the question he had asked so many times during the past several years: When are you going to print offset?

Lefty Leifer was the first and most active advocate of printing this publication by the modern offset method rather than letterpress. The decision to do just that was made during his lifetime, but the first issue printed by the new method will not be out until July or August.

The day in May 1953 when I first met Lefty and Pat. It was my first day on the job as a member of the REA News staff; in fact I had not yet been assigned a desk. Ten minutes after I walked in the door of the News office I was on my way to Westby. The Leifers treated me like an old friend and instilled in me a conviction I have never lost; that there is no better way to spend one's life than in this business of cooperative rural electrification. Later I learned that to visit Vernon Electric Co-op was traditional first assignment for REA News staff members. Jim Sullivan's first assignment was a trip to Westby. The same was true of Dick Priebe, and 2 years ago the tradition was passed on to Walt Seaborg. To go to Westby was the best possible way for a man to start off on the right foot.

The time in the fall of 1957 when I traveled to the NRECA regional meeting at Springfield, Ill., with Lefty, Pat, and H. O. Melby. I remember so many things about that trip—where we stopped to eat, what we talked and laughed about. But especially I remember the incident of the hotel keys on our way back to Wisconsin.

Mr. Melby had shared his room with me in the hotel at Springfield. About an hour out of Springfield, while talking about the World Series which had ended during the meeting with a Braves victory, Pat mentioned that the Braves players would certainly get the keys to the city when they returned to Milwaukee. This prompted me to search my pockets, where I found my hotel room key. Then Mr. Melby searched his pockets and found another key to the same room. He laughed uproariously and I laughed with him. It gave me great pleasure to share a small weakness with a man of so many great strengths.

The time I first met Elmer Smith. Lefty introduced us, and Mr. Smith in that tall, quiet, and sincere way of his, invited me to drop in to see him next time I was in the La Farge area. I promised that I would, a promise which this day I am sorry I never kept.

Then Lefty, talking through a grin to Mr. Smith, said "I hope you realize you are one privileged character as far as the REA News is concerned. Remember that picture they had of you in the paper a couple of months ago after you were elected to the board? Remember when that picture was taken at the annual meeting? I was shaking hands with you. Well, you saw what they did with the picture—they cropped me off and left you on."

"Well," replied Mr. Smith, who was 3 years younger than Lefty, "maybe they didn't want any youngsters like you in the picture."

I wasn't sure what they were joking about at the time because I hadn't been the one who took the picture and cropped it. I made a mental note to look for it but didn't find that note until tragedy sharpened my memory. Then I found the picture and wanted it and all of it and more.

New Britain Surgeon Back From "Hope" Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in the Hartford Courant, my district, a story of Dr. Paul Tisher, a New Britain surgeon who is back from serving 2 months aboard the hospital ship *Hope* in Indonesia.

Dr. Tisher's story is an encouraging one of what can be accomplished through people-to-people contacts, such

as President Kennedy's Peace Corps hopes to accomplish in other areas. The story of the *Hope*, and what it is doing, should be of interest to all of us and I commend it to the attention of the House.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Mar. 19, 1961]

NEW BRITAIN SURGEON BACK FROM "HOPE" TOUR

Dr. Paul Tisher, a New Britain eye surgeon who returned home this week after serving 2 months aboard the *Hope*, says the friendliness of the Indonesian people toward the American doctors and nurses extended from the bottom to the top of society.

President Sukarno received Dr. Tisher and his associates at the presidential palace in Djakarta and talked with them for an hour "in fluent English." Tisher said, "Sukarno couldn't have been nicer."

The people of Ambon held a party for the Americans in the school building, and at Makassar in the Celebes Islands families came as many as 200 miles through hill country to see the ship. In every port the piers were jammed with sightseers.

THE "HOPE'S" MISSION

The mission of the *Hope* is primarily to teach, Dr. Tisher says. More can be accomplished by teaching local doctors than by treating patients.

At one port he said, the local Chinese eye doctor told him 300 patients needed treatment. Dr. Tisher, who was accustomed to seeing about 50 patients in one morning, thought the workload a light one until he learned the 300 on the list were blind. The Chinese doctor was a thoroughly competent man, but he had been away from the centers of modern teaching for so long he did not know how to operate on cataracts.

In a few days Dr. Tisher and the local surgeon performed as many operations as possible, starting with younger patients and working through the list. They did not finish, but when Tisher left the Chinese could remove cataracts himself. Dr. Tisher's work in that village, and the work of the *Hope*, will continue. It is teaching which pays the greatest dividends, Dr. Tisher says.

PEOPLE TO PEOPLE

"The *Hope* is divorced completely from from military or government contact," Tisher told the Courant. "It is part of the People to People Health Foundation. The American people are sending American doctors, nurses and technicians to other parts of the world as teachers and ambassadors. And we learn as much from the Indonesian doctors as they learn from us." By and large Indonesian doctors are very capable. Their only handicap is being removed from teaching centers.

In their country infectious diseases, malnutrition, malaria, leprosy and tuberculosis are widespread, mainly as a result of poverty and certain unhygienic habits.

The country is progressing rapidly, using its own energy and resources as well as outside help. The Universities of California and Kentucky are assisting medical schools in Indonesia to expand their programs and improve their methods. "There are three good medical schools in Indonesia," Dr. Tisher said. In one of them "every member of the faculty will be American-trained when the University of Kentucky completes its program there in 3 years. And they will all be under 40 years of age."

Tisher concludes, "We are one step ahead of the Russians there. Our diplomacy is extremely effective."

WITCH DOCTORS

Alluding to the unhygienic habits of some of the Indonesians, Dr. Tisher said that in interior sections some witch doctors are still practicing; but the local doctors do not fight them. "They work with them, because the witch doctors do a certain amount of good with their herbs."

The universities are graduating about 100 doctors a year, with every prospect of increasing the number. And Tisher emphasized, "They are good doctors." The trouble is the enormity of their job. In an American city a doctor might operate 5 or 6 times in 1 day—and that would be a hard day's work—but in Indonesia 20 or 30 operations are sometimes necessary in a day.

One doctor, a permanent member of the *Hope's* medical staff, said the need is so great the ship could remain in Indonesia for years to come. The people are to erect a hospital in Djakarta to be staffed with American doctors. The cost of such a project is great. Operating expenses of even one hospital ship, the *Hope*, are $3.5 million per year, and all the money comes from private contributions within the United States.

The need is so tremendous and the obstacles so large, Dr. Tisher says, that the *Hope's* staff sometimes wonder whether the effort is worthwhile. "The morale of the ship fluctuates," he said.

Dr. Tisher was asked what was his answer to the question, "Is it worthwhile?" He said, "I have to wait and see. There is no immediate answer" in a long-term effort like this.

One index of effectiveness is that during his 2 months aboard the *Hope* Dr. Tisher trained three Indonesian doctors in up-to-date methods. He recalls talking about glaucoma with one doctor from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m.

One afternoon an Indonesian doctor, a member of the permanent staff of the *Hope*, talked to us directly from the heart. He explained patience was necessary in working in the Orient, where obstacles are overwhelming. The speaker cheered his listeners, and there was a visible change in morale aboard ship.

In every port the piers were jammed with sightseers.

"They wanted to see the ship," Dr. Tisher said, "and they also heard we were giving out ice cream.

"And we were."

Some Budget Director

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I am impressed with editorials appearing in the March 29 and 30 issues of the Chicago Tribune. Evidently the Harvard brain trusters think the New Frontier has unlimited boundaries. The editorials referred to follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 29, 1961]

Congress has listened to a lot of people spout a lot of economic nonsense, but surely it has never heard such concentrated nonsense come from a Director of the Budget as it did on Monday.

David Bell, who holds this position under Mr. Kennedy, appeared before the Joint Economic Committee to explain the Kennedy budget for 1962. He told the members what was already common knowledge: that the balanced budgets planned by Mr. Eisenhower for this year and next are out of date; that this year will end up with a deficit of about $2.2 billion, and that an even greater deficit is likely for 1962.

The Director of the Budget doesn't seem to be the least perturbed by all this deficit spending. On the contrary, he told the committee members that Federal outlays would be expected to climb steadily in the years ahead. He said that a consistent effort to balance the budget would be not only extremely difficult, but positively harmful. He said that deficits this year and next are clearly essential to economic recovery and won't lead to any significant inflation. And he said there is no use hoping for a decline in Federal spending unless there is a substantial reduction in armament.

To cap it all, he says that it would be a serious error to reject public spending programs simply because we cannot afford them.

What does Mr. Bell think the budget is? Most people think of it as something to live within. Historically it is based on the amount of money available to spend; the word itself, centuries ago, meant "wallet." The British Government still opens the budget.

Our Bureau of the Budget was established in 1921 in response to protests that the Government was living beyond its means. It was designed to fix responsibility for a sound fiscal policy. In 1939 it was made an independent office under the President, but the law still says that its studies and reports are to be made with a view of securing greater economy and efficiency in the conduct of the public service.

Here we have a Director of the Budget saying, in effect, that the budget should not stop anybody from spending what he wishes to spend. The agent who is expected to stand up against the extravagance of his colleagues (as Mr. Stans often did, to their discomfiture) is actually promoting extravagance. If the Budget Bureau is to become a spineless tool of the spenders, we would be much better off without either it or its Director.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 30, 1961]

The second section of Mr. Kennedy's budget, dealing with defense expenditures, discloses that he has upped Mr. Eisenhower's proposed spending on the Military Establishment by $700 million for the coming fiscal year. Coupled with Kennedy's proposals last week for nondefense spending, the combined budget is $3.4 billion higher than the $80.9 billion in spending recommended by the outgoing Republican administration.

Whereas Mr. Eisenhower had anticipated an estimated $1.5 billion surplus in revenue, Mr. Kennedy is reconciled to a deficit of at least $2.8 billion. The probability is that the deficit will be much larger than that, with spending both on nondefense and defense items destined to continue rising in the years ahead. All this is in prospect although Mr. Kennedy's conceded total spending in the fiscal year starting July 1 will hit just short of $85 billion, far and away a record for any peacetime year and a figure exceeded only in two of the World War II years.

The largest increases in spending are in the welfare categories of the nondefense budget, where Kennedy has added $3.2 billion, about 4½ times the increase for defense. As we suggested when, for the first time in American governmental practice, the revised budget was submitted in two installments, it is as is nondefense items bore no relationship to defense spending or to aggregate spending. The apparent intention was to confuse the people.

The result is what has been described as a fiscal fable and a confused apology for a deliberate program of deficit spending. In a recession and facing a troubled world situation, with an imminent threat of war, Kennedy proceeds unconcernedly as if there were no need to husband resources through fiscal discipline.

"We can afford," he says, "to do what must be done, publicly and privately, up to the

limit of our economic capacity—a limit we have not even approached for several years."

This is a statement that, although yesterday has failed to provide for today, tomorrow may be trusted to bring out today's improvidence all even. Things are to balance over the years of the business cycle—a theory that has been applied for 30 years and has yet to prove itself. Publicly—that is, by Government—Kennedy may think the country can afford anything. But if every citizen set out to govern his private affairs by the same standard, the Nation would be one vast and continuous sheriff's sale.

Department of Agriculture Has Positive Attitude on Farm Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the current attitudes and actions in the U.S. Department of Agriculture are refreshing and encouraging not only because they are positive, but because they are rooted in optimism and determination.

In the field of farm credit, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman recently had this comment:

To the extent that farm loan policies and available funds can prevent it, no qualified family farmer will be required to give up farming because of his inability to finance his 1961 operations.

The Secretary at that time asked the Farmers Home Administration of the Department to review its regulations and take every step within its authority to meet farm credit needs. The Secretary's request accompanied action by the President making an additional $35 million available for farm operating loans during the 1961 fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 9 years, declining farm prices and income have caused many beginning and other farmers to exhaust their normal sources of credit. This is a poor time to throw upon the labor market families which can, through loans and guidance enabling them to achieve full utilization of earning resources, continue in a way of life they know and love.

It is the intention of the administration, working in cooperation with the Congress and the farmers of our Nation, to reverse the downward farm income trend so our efficient family farmers can earn and get a parity of income. Secretary Freeman has said:

When the new farm program becomes effective, these family-type farmers will again be good commercial credit risks. It would be unthinkable to allow many efficient farm families to give up the struggle now because they are unable to obtain credit needed to finance 1961 operations.

The Farmers Home Administration's broadened look at the credit needs of small farmers does not mean individuals will be financed beyond ability to pay—but it does mean that problems will not be allowed to overshadow potentials. The revised loan eligibility requirements give increased consideration to young farmers who in the future will be able to obtain additional land and other resources, and to young and middle-aged farmers who may be able to obtain off-farm income in the future. The operating loans are made for purchase of livestock and equipment, for fertilizer, tractor fuel, feed, and other essential farm and home operating needs, and to refinance chattel debts. The loans are scheduled for repayment in accordance with borrowers' abilities, over periods not exceeding 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, experience has shown that Farmers Home Administration loans do not result in increased expenditures by the Federal Government, because borrowers have an outstanding repayment record.

Secretary Freeman and the Department of Agriculture deserve appreciation for their recognition of a genuine social and economic need in the field of credit, and their constructive attitude and actions in meeting it.

Some Guideposts for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, today the eyes of all Americans are rightly focused upon our educational system, and the need for its improvement wherever possible.

In a recent edition of an Oklahoma daily newspaper, attention was directed to some of the genuine virtues of the educational system of the Cherokee Nation, as that system operated in Indian territory before it became the State of Oklahoma.

In the middle of the 19th century, the Cherokees National Male Seminary and Female Seminary at Tahlequah began making a great contribution to the culture and progress of this great people.

We could learn a lot today from an examination of the operation of those seminaries, more than 100 years ago.

In the Tulsa Tribune of March 22, 1961, the Tribune's correspondent, Frosty Troy, summed up the story of the Cherokees educational system in this way:

CHEROKEES HAD RIGOROUS SCHOOLING—CATALOG OF TAHLEQUAH SEMINARIES REVEALS STERN DISCIPLINES

(By Frosty Troy)

"Morality and knowledge being necessary to good government, the preservation of liberty and happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged in this nation."

These words are found in the constitution of the Cherokee Nation, once the wellspring of educated red men whose profound effect upon Oklahoma affairs is still felt today.

The educational system of the Cherokees set them apart from other Indians, and from their lofty eminence they produced intellectuals, politicians and poets who had a hand in shaping the destiny of the 46th State.

The Cherokee thirst for knowledge led to the founding of the National Male Seminary and Female Seminary at Tahlequah in 1850.

Both institutions brought honor and fame to the Cherokees at a time when the white man's educational opportunities on the American frontier were primitive. The Cherokees were undoubtedly far in advance of their white neighbors in matters of education.

An old "Catalogue of the Cherokee Male Seminary" rests in the archives of the University of Oklahoma, and it contains the key to the success of the seminaries under the title of "Daily Programme." The schedule:

Students rise 5:30 a.m.; study hall 6–7 a.m.; breakfast and detail 7–8:30 a.m.; chapel service 8:30–9 a.m.; recitations 9–12 a.m.; recess 12m.–2 p.m.; recitation 2–4 p.m., military drill 4:15 to 4:45 p.m.; supper 5 p.m.; study hall 6:45–8:45 p.m.; first bell to retire 9 p.m.; final bell 9:15 p.m.

There was no beadwork, leathercraft or pottery in a Cherokee school. The male and female seminaries taught metaphysics, ancient languages, higher mathematics, natural sciences, English, history, music, military tactics, and domestic courses for the girls.

There were no fraternities or sororities, and all students, rich or poor, took turn washing dishes and waiting on tables, plus handling chores such as sweeping and cutting wood.

Students took turns reading at meals, sometimes from books, generally from the news of the day and the literary articles of magazines.

"The object being to stimulate reading and conversation upon current topics," the catalog said.

The institutions were nonsectarian, but this did not mean they were nonreligious. Moral training, the founders agreed, was every bit as important as Latin and Greek.

To make free time interesting, the Male Seminary built a greenhouse and stocked it with the finest in common and rare specimens of flowers and plants.

The catalog also explained the philosophy of discipline: "Correct teaching is one mode of discipline. Discipline itself is a great educational process. The well disciplined alone are well educated. Discipline can add nothing to the mental or moral capacities; but can bring them under such a process of training as to develop the latent energies of the mind and body, and direct them to a course of right action, so that the future citizen and law giver may be fitted for his great work."

By keenly selecting the students to attend the seminaries, the Cherokee Nation was able to produce leaders of unparalleled stature in Indian territory.

Not many decades after the schools were founded, one of the Nation's leaders boasted: "In no other country can such advantages be found in a first-class institution. The Cherokee Nation is not excelled by any other country in the inducements offered the youth."

During the Civil War, both seminaries were demolished, but the undaunted Cherokees rebuilt. It took the influx of white men to finally bring about the deterioration and eventual closing of the seminaries.

The Cherokees were a people who relied heavily on strict tribal discipline, but their young people were no match for the temptations of the settlers. Whisky, broadcloth, and trinkets and redistribution of Indian territory lands by the great white father eventually brought poverty and ruin to the Cherokee Nation.

When the Russians dazzled the world by sending the first sputnik aloft, an agonizing reappraisal of the American educational system was touched off.

Parents and educators began to discuss whether courses such as driver's training, home economics for boys, golf, personality development, and similar courses were really

necessary in the public schools and universities.

There was a hue and cry for hard education—math, science, languages, history, English—the type of educational process the Cherokee Nation had honed to a sharp degree on these very plains over a hundred years ago.

Former House Page in December 1887, When 10½ Years of Age, Writes Congressman Clyde Doyle of His Page Experiences and Recollections—He Writes at 83 Years of Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I herewith present the text of a letter written to me recently by Mr. E. L. Conklin, Compton, Calif. Mr. Conklin was born June 25, 1877, and became a page in the House of Representatives when he was a few days less than 10½ years of age: to wit, in December 1877.

In writing this letter to me he knew that my eldest grandson, Danny Doyle Stanton, is now a House page. I mention this because at the close of his letter he mentions Danny.

Historical comments and personal experiences of this senior American citizen who, as he says, was "stationed on the Republican side," will be of very great interest to all who read.

I am sure you, Mr. Speaker, and all my distinguished colleagues join me in thanking this distinguished American, Mr. E. L. Conklin, for writing this letter to me.

Supplementing his letter to me is a letter to me from his daughter, who is mentioned in his own remarks:

COMPTON, CALIF., *February 24, 1961.*

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: Complying with suggestion in your letter of February 14 addressed to my daughter, Mrs. Mildred C. Specht, I will endeavor to give a brief résumé of my experiences and impressions gained as a page in the House during the 50th, 51st, and 1st session of the 52d Congresses. I hope it may be of some interest to your grandson.

I was born on June 25, 1877, so upon assuming the duties of a page on the first Monday in December 1887, I was a few days less than 10½ years old, which was about 4 years younger than the next youngest boy. I was informed that I was the youngest to serve up to the time I was appointed. Whether there have been any boys who have served at a younger age since then I would not know.

My father was a veteran of the Civil War, serving under Generals U. S. Grant and Geo. G. Meade in the Army of the Potomac. He contracted typhoid-malaria during the campaign in the Virginia swamps, a fever which recurred each year with increasing intensity and longer duration, finally to the extent that he could not hold a job in private industry. Incidentally my father is buried in Arlington National Cemetery and upon visiting there 2 years ago, I found the marking on the headstone to be quite legible.

As was customary in those days, a committee from the Geo. G. Meade Post, GAR, of which my father had been a member, investigated our financial situation and obtained my appointment as a page. You may or may not know that at that time the GAR was a very powerful organization, politically stronger than veteran groups of more recent days. I trust you will understand that I have to go into so much detail regarding myself in order to explain why I received the appointment at such an early age.

There were, as I recall, 30 page boys; I was No. 28 and still have my badge "Page 28, H.R." We lined up in the lobby at 10 a.m. for rollcall; as there was no page school at that period, some of the intervening time until 12 noon when the House convened was spent placing in the file of the Congressmen's desks the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the previous day. The pages then took their places on the carpeted steps leading on either side to the Speaker's rostrum; the one in front answering a summons (the Representative signaling by clapping his hands) and the one returning from an errand taking his place at the end of the line.

It so happened that during my entire service on the floor of the House I was stationed on the Republican side. The 50th Congress was fairly serene although there would occasionally be a waving of the "bloody shirt" which would call forth some vituperative exchanges of language. My service during the 50th Congress was very limited due partly to my youth which gave the other pages an opportunity for teasing and it didn't help that my mother had enrolled me as "Bertie" when I much preferred being called Bert (actually my real name is Egbert Hopkins Conklin). I finally became fed up and suddenly hit one of my tormentors, unfortunately at an inappropriate time—directly after the House had been called to order—and place, center of the main aisle directly in line with the Speaker where I was standing awaiting the Chaplain's invocation.

Captain Chauncey who occupied a position of authority between the chief page and the Doorkeeper, doubtful of my promise to engage in no more fisticuffs and of the pledges of the others to behave, transferred me to the Press Gallery. However, I didn't remain there long as I naively repeated in my mother's hearing, some stories the reporters told and at her request (poor Captain Chauncey) was transferred to the ladies' reception room. I was the only page on duty there and was under the supervision of Captain Cunningham, titled the "Card Writer." He would write the lady caller's name on a card which I would take into the Member she desired to see. Now I must inject a personal incident into this already lengthy account. Early in my ladies' reception room duty I took a card in to a certain Member who, after looking at the card said "Tell her I'm not in." I was speechless for a minute for I had been trained to never lie; then I asked him to rise and I would report that he was "not in his seat." I mentioned this for I had occasion to use the same tactics on many occasions and believe I established a precedent as on a visit to Washington several years later I sat in the visitor's gallery, saw a page come in and hand a card to a Congressman who rose from his seat and handed the card back to the page.

The 51st Congress, Republican, was anything but serene. Thomas B. Reed of Maine was the Speaker and was known as Czar Reed. He had a heavy, raspy voice and was the most sarcastic man in public life; also the fact that he had held the House in continuous session for 3 days and nights, doors locked, in order to defeat a Democratic filibuster, helped earn the appellation. It was during this extended session that Representative Kilgore of Texas achieved passing fame for kicking down a door and striding out.

The Doorkeeper was our boss and under him were Captain White, a one-armed Confederate veteran on the Democratic side, and Captain Chauncey, a Federal veteran, on the Republican side. The men who actually were Doorkeepers serving both the doors to the House floor and the galleries, were all disabled veterans with one or more limbs missing. Indeed many of the Representatives themselves were disabled especially on the Democratic side, the South having "scraped the barrel" to maintain their army. There were also many military titles from major on up, so much so in fact that Representative Allen, of Mississippi gloried in the title "Private John Allen."

While I was reared in a northern, Republican family (where Democrats were usually spoken of as "rebels" or "copperheads") I had many more friendships among the affable and considerate Democratic Congressmen.

Awed and impressed as I was on my first day as a page, as I think every young man must be on his first day, I think the most impressive occurrence I have ever witnessed was the funeral for Chief Justice Waite, of the U.S. Supreme Court. The President and his Cabinet were there in the House Chamber, members of the Supreme Court, the Senate, the members of the diplomatic corps in their brilliant uniforms—I particularly recall the Chinese and Japanese Ambassadors in their richly embroidered uniforms—and the galleries filled with the wives and families of the statesmen. But the one whose appearance really thrilled me was Gen. Philip Sheridan, then commanding General of the Army who was the particular hero of my father and his veteran friends. The Commanding Admiral of the Navy was also there with his staff, in dress uniform as was General Sheridan and his staff. I wish I could recall the eulogy and by whom delivered for I remember it as being a masterpiece, even to my young ears.

Of course there were tedious times too during long debates but these were far outweighed by the exciting times as, for instance when Wm. F. Cody with his full-dress Indian chieftains talked to us all and gave us his autograph and Henry Stanley of Livingston fame addressed the House.

Should Danny have the patience to wade through this, he may possibly be entertained by contrasting a page's life in 1887 with that of 1961.

I should like to add that while I am not a constituent of yours, my district (the 15th) also has a very capable Representative, HARLAN HAGEN.

I appreciate your interest and should you see fit to answer am staying for the winter with my daughter Mrs. Specht, 704 South Ward Avenue, Compton.

Very truly yours,

E. H. CONKLIN.

COMPTON, CALIF., *February 24, 1961.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: I am happy that my father complied with your wishes—he did the writing and I typed it for him. I thought you might be interested in seeing this snapshot of him and my mother, though it was taken before she passed away 7 years ago. Unfortunately more recent pictures are slides which we haven't yet made prints of. I would appreciate it very much if you would return this picture.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. MILDRED C. SPECHT.

A Good Omen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walter Trohan's column, "Report From Washington," in the March 28 issue of the Chicago Tribune, pointed up some interesting and heartening developments among the young people of America. I wish to insert this article in the RECORD as follows:

A GOOD OMEN

WASHINGTON, March 28.—A strange and heartening movement is developing among the young people of America—those on college campuses and those who are making their way in the world.

Youth is in revolt, which is its right, but the curious thing about the current revolt is that it is on the right. Perhaps it is because there is no room on the left for revolt, but it is more likely due to sincere concern over an economic system which resists the pride of the young by doing too much for the individual and making it all but impossible for him to assert "the world is mine oyster" and proceed to open it with the keen blade of his own talents.

In the initial issue of a conservative magazine, the New Guard, Lee Edwards, an assistant to Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Republican of Maryland, sounded the call which is echoing over halls of ivy. He wrote:

"Ten years ago this magazine would not have been possible. Twenty years ago it would not have been dreamed of. Thirty-five years ago it would not have been necessary. Today, the New Guard is possible, it is a reality, and it is needed by the youth of America to proclaim loudly and clearly: We are sick to death of collectivism, socialism, statism, and other utopian isms which have poisoned the minds, weakened the wills and smothered the spirits of Americans for three decades and more."

MEMBERSHIPS IN CONSERVATIVE CLUB SWELLS

At Harvard, where the yard has been emptied to fill saddles of power on the New Frontier, the head of the student council is a crusading conservative, who has tossed down the gage of battle to departing professors. At Yale and Princeton where conservative clubs were as forlorn as a corporal's guard, membership is swelling to trumpeting legions.

At the University of Wisconsin in Madison, where a conservative had long been regarded as something for exhibition alongside a two headed calf in a side show, a student publication termed professors "a smug collection of liberals." Similar phenomena have appeared on other campuses where conservatives were long without honor, but where conservative groups now find students beating paths to their doors.

Three decades ago the mellifluous accents of Franklin D. Roosevelt were summoning a generation of young people to remove economic risks in their path. Today a new generation finds that the risks were reduced at the price of freedoms and wants the freedoms restored.

Today's generation appears to have been mobilized to action because the recent presidential campaign served to emphasize how little difference there is between the two parties.

GENERATION CALLS TEACHINGS TO ACCOUNT

Young people found the only challenge in the thunder on the right from the conservative wings in both parties.

This generation is openly calling to account the teachings of professors in economics and political science, if one can ever call the game of chance for power a science, just as the previous generation called the lessons taught in its day up for question.

One of their battle cries was drafted at a meeting of conservative groups in Sharon, Conn., during the campaign. These formulated a declaration of belief which read in part:

"That foremost among the transcendent values is the individual's use of his God-given free will, whence derives his right to be free from the restrictions of arbitrary force; that liberty is indivisible, and that political freedom cannot exist without economic freedom; that the purposes of Government are to protect these freedoms through the preservation of internal order, the provision of national defense, and the administration of justice; that when Government ventures beyond these rightful functions, it accumulates power which tends to diminish order and liberty."

One day the young people are going to own this country. Who has a better right to challenge the teachings of a generation which is piling up a public debt approaching $300 billion?

World's Largest Flatcar Completed at Delaware & Hudson Shops at Oneonta, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, symbolic of the major role which the city of Oneonta plays in the railroad industry of our country was the announcement made last week that the largest flatcar ever built in the world was recently completed in the shops of the Delaware & Hudson Railroad located in my district in Oneonta, N.Y.:

In view of the great skills in railroading which are represented by the people of Oneonta as well as other communities in my district, it is most imperative that Congress should take steps to see that the railroads are not allowed to die of neglect.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a news report from the Oneonta Star of Monday, April 3 describing this important event:

WORLD'S LARGEST FLATCAR COMPLETED HERE—CALIFORNIA JAUNT NEXT FOR "SPECIAL"

The Delaware & Hudson Railroad has completed the assembly in its Oneonta Shops of the world's largest capacity flatcar, J. P. Hiltz, Jr., vice president in charge of operation and maintenance, said Sunday.

The car will be available for the transportation of huge machinery units beyond the present capacity of existing equipment on American railroads.

Its first use, Mr. Hiltz said, will be in the shipment of a 535,000-pound turbine from the General Electric Co.'s plant in Schenectady destined for Bellflower, Calif.

The turbine was loaded aboard the car yesterday.

It will be shipped over the D. & H. to Jefferson Junction, Pa., where it will be turned over to the Erie-Lackawanna Railroad for the second leg of its journey to the Pacific coast.

Other railroads participating in the movement include Nickel Plate, T.P. & W., Santa Fe, Union Pacific, and Pacific Electric.

The car is 60 feet 6 inches in length and has four six-wheel trucks equipped with roller bearings and multiple-wear steel wheels. The load platform is constructed of cast nickel steel.

A complete set of the latest designed air brakes are installed on each end of the car along with handbrakes.

The car weighs 148,300 pounds and has a load limit of 604,700 pounds for a gross weight on rail of 753,000 pounds.

Mr. Hiltz said the car cost $110,000.

The car was designed by D. & H. engineers and built entirely by the railroad's own employees in the Oneonta Shops.

Rural Electrification Builds the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, more than 7,000 members of rural electric and rural telephone cooperatives across the Nation met in Dallas, Tex., in February for the 19th annual convention of the National Rural Electric Co-op Association, which has generally been termed as "the best, most enthusiastic NRECA annual meeting ever held." They passed a series of resolutions that adequately cover the broad field of rural electrification and public power. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a number of these resolutions in the RECORD:

PREAMBLE

As we enter the 26th year of rural electric development, it is heartening to the large number of rural as well as Government people who started this necessary program and carried it forward with courage in the initial 25 years, to realize that in the 1960 silver jubilee year a significant number of our Nation's people, who had known little about rural electric development before, came to accept the fact that "rural electrification is truly good for all America."

These first years have been in part exploratory, then developmental and now beneficial projection of good and dependable power service. The facts are impressive. The record is a challenge to accomplish substantially more for America's future as the experience gained in the past is applied to the effort exerted in the future.

About 16 million consumers have power because of this proved sound program of real consumer-government cooperation, thousands of new jobs have become available that never would have existed without this multibillion dollar new market for the goods used in generating, delivering and using power; the national wealth and economy has been substantially increased and advanced without the slightest loss of Government loan funds. This was done in the testing period behind us. The years ahead will be years in which we shall more completely than ever cooperate to the benefit of this program and this Nation. This cooperation will also exist between the rural consumers and their organizations and our Government officials in their expressed objectives of getting on with the job and making giant power do giant jobs across the total countryside of this Nation for the good of every American.

We shall not rest on our laurels, but, heeding the experience gained in the past,

we shall advance with a new and positive vigor to provide sources of supply and distribution of power and to aid in the effective use thereof—all in the Nation's interest.

To this task and objective we do subscribe and pledge our every capability, and now, in this 19th annual members' meeting, do lay out guidelines for its achievement by the resolutions herewith submitted:

"REA LOANS AND ADMINISTRATION—GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION LOAN FUNDS

"Whereas the continuing policy of REA under the Rural Electrification Act has been to make adequate loans available to borrowers to finance construction of generation and transmission projects where needed, making it possible to furnish adequate electrict service at the lowest cost consistent with sound business management to ultimate rural consumers; and

"Whereas from time to time attacks have been concentrated against the making of such loans; and

"Whereas if these attacks should be successful in jeopardizing the past prevailing policy in curtailing either the right of the Administrator to make such loans, or the past policy of the Administrator in actually making them, irreparable harm would result not only to consumers presently dependent for ultimate source of power or REA-financed generation and transmission facilities but on other consumers of REA distribution cooperative borrowers who would then be subject to increases in energy costs due in turn to unwarranted increases in wholesale rates charged by private commercial suppliers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the continuation of the established policy of REA—to make loans available for the financing of the construction of generation and transmission facilities and a continuation of the past and present policy of Congress to make available through REA of an adequate and secure source of loan funds for generation and transmission facilities—is essential to the sound and continued development of rural electrification and the attainment of the objectives of that program for the benefit of peoples in rural areas; and be it further

"Resolved, That any measures or activities designed to curtail or limit the established policies of Congress and REA with respect to generation and transmission facilities be vigorously opposed.

"LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS

"Be it resolved, That we respectfully request the Congress to authorize and appropriate the following amounts to maintain and carry forward the REA program during the 1962 fiscal year:

"(a) A new electric loan fund authorization of $220-million and a $60-million contingency fund which, with the expected carryover, is estimated to provide adequate loan funds to bring the electric program through the 1962 fiscal year; and

"(b) An administrative fund appropriation of sufficient size to maintain the REA staff and the legal staff at an efficient level; and be it further

"Resolved, That the legislative committee be authorized—as in the past—to make final adjustments in the above estimates as may be indicated when the NRECA annual loan needs survey is completed; and be it further

"Resolved, That we strongly support the National Telephone Cooperative Association in its recommendations for adequate loan funds which it makes on the basis of its annual survey of rural telephone systems, and that we lend our strong support to the efforts to correct the unbalanced ratio of loans between telephone cooperatives and commercial telephone companies since it is apparent a more vigorous promotion of cooperatives is needed if area coverage telephony is to be achieved.

"SECRETARY FREEMAN'S STATEMENT ON REA PROGRAMS

"Be it resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, be highly commended for the excellent statement of principles with regard to the REA programs which he outlined in a memorandum dispatched February 3, 1961, to the REA staff and to the rural electric systems; and be it further

"Resolved, That NRECA, being wholly in accord with the policies the Secretary set forth, pledges him its full support in carrying out those policies.

"REA INTEREST RATES AND MONETARY POLICY

"Be it resolved, That we reaffirm our long-standing support of the 2 percent REA interest rate and REA loan terms in order that the rural electric systems and the rural telephone cooperatives may be able to carry out the purposes of the Rural Electrification Act, as amended, in building a better rural America; and be it further

"Resolved, That we reaffirm our position taken at previous regional and annual meetings in support of a sound Federal monetary policy and an abandonment of the high-interest and tight-money policies which have added to the burdens of the residents of rural America during the last several years.

"TELEPHONES—TELEPHONE PROGRAM

"Whereas it is recognized that the original purpose and intent of the Rural Electrification Act, as it applies to the telephone program, was to provide telephone service to rural America on an area coverage basis; and

"Whereas in recent years the area coverage basis appears to have been disregarded; and

"Whereas some commercial interests are attempting to use the REA telephone program as a vehicle to purchase rundown telephone companies, rehabilitate them with REA loans and then reap a financial harvest by disposing of them at lucrative profits: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the present administration be advised of this situation and that we request that REA practices conform to the purpose and intent of the act and that REA promote, aid and assist telephone cooperatives in accomplishing this original purpose to a greater degree; and be it further

"Resolved, That electric cooperatives also be urged to promote, aid and assist the telephone cooperatives to do this job."

Ancient Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in the April 4, 1961, issue of the Wall Street Journal by William H. Chamberlain is an excellent accounting of how Roman fiscal policy brought the downfall of that great civilization and an event from which we all can learn a lesson. The editorial follows:

A BURGEONING CENTRAL AUTHORITY PRECIPITATED ROME'S FALL

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The greatest collapse of a mighty state, a large society and a fruitful civilization of which we have a reasonably full record has been immortalized by Gibbon's historical epic, "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire."

The eternal appeal of Gibbon's classic lies not only in its factual narrative, but in its superb literary style and its presentation of the rationalistic, commonsense philosophical outlook of the 18th century. As the modern British woman historian, C. V. Wedgwood, remarks in her essay on Gibbon, the latter, although he could not understand the soul of a Christian slave, could appreciate the mind of a Roman senator.

The Canadian Prof. W. G. Hardy, of the Classics Department of the University of Alberta, recently delivered and published in paperback form a series of lectures on the Graeco-Roman world, of which one, entitled "Why Rome Fell," presents in brief compass many of Gibbon's explanations of the Decline and Fall. Gibbon designated the era of the five so-called good emperors, ending with Marcus Aurelius, who died in A.D. 180, as the happiest and most prosperous in the history of the human race.

VOLUNTARY LOANS

And yet, as Prof. Hardy notes, even in this age of internal peace and security against external attack, internal weaknesses were developing which became aggravated with the passing of time and finally proved fatal to the very existence of the empire. One early symptom of trouble was that wealthy men began to dodge the expensive honors associated with the office of local magistrate. This was because constantly rising rates of taxation were shearing them more and more closely. Moreover, they were expected to help their communities out of debt by "voluntary" loans.

By the middle of the second century there were cases when individuals had to be drafted as local magistrates. And, as cities got into financial difficulties, imperial curators were put in charge and the cities lost their self-government.

This extension of paternalism, according to Professor Hardy, was accompanied by a tremendous increase in the personnel of the imperial civil service. Every bureau expanded its field and new bureaus were constantly being added. By the third century, to quote the historian Trever, "the relentless system of taxation, requisition and compulsory labor was administered by an army of military bureaucrats. Everywhere were the personal agents of the emperors to spy out any remotest case of attempted strikes or evasion of taxes."

Another financial burden was the growing cost of the handouts of free food and the public games which were considered the best means of keeping the Roman proletariat peaceable and contended. Originally a fairly frugal allotment of food was made once a month. By the time of Marcus Aurelius there was a daily distribution of bread, pork, and oil. The expenditure on gladiatorial combats and public spectacles continued to climb, until it reached the estimated equivalent of $100 million a year.

Roman financial policy became one of creeping and not-so-creeping inflation. The most common Roman coin, the sestertius, lost about 98 percent of its value between the time of Augustus, at the beginning of the Christian era, and the reign of Diocletian, almost three centuries later.

Perhaps the principal reason for the declining state of the Roman finances was the increasing burden of the military establishment. The cost of the army, according to Professor Hardy, doubled between A.D. 96 and A.D. 180, and this rate of progression most probably increased during the later phases of the decline. The proportion of Romans or Italians in the legions steadily diminished and Hadrian and other emperors pursued the policy of recruiting barbarian mercenaries and filling up the ranks

with peasants from the more remote and least civilized parts of the empire.

The consequences, according to Professor Hardy, were as follows: "The army became composed either of ignorant countymen from the most backward parts of the empire or of foreigners. In spirit and in culture they were peasant wolves with little, if any, respect for the fat sheep they were supposed to protect. This divorce between barbarzied army and civilized but soft civilians was the immediate cause of the collapse."

MILITARY ANARCHY

A period of military anarchy, in which emperors were put up and dethroned and murdered by the legions preceded the final inundation of the western part of the empire by the barbarians.

Diocletian, who brought some temporary order and stability into the declining empire about the end of the third century, issued an edict fixing the maximum price for all goods and all kinds of labor. Death was the penalty for breaking the code. Yet prices continued to rise, and this supreme effort to enforce economic regimentation ended in a fiassco.

The more well-to-do citizens in each community were made collectively responsible for bringing in the taxes, as a result of which they soon ceased to be well-to-do. Farmers were tied to the soil; and their sons had to remain farmers. Similarly the sons of artisans had to follow their father's trade. As Professor Hardy sums it up: "There was no escape from this relentless regimentation. For regimentation was the end result of the abdication of political freedom and of the pursuit of materialism. The welfare state had become a despotism."

Ever higher taxes, an ever-increasing bureaucracy, the growth of an omnipotent state, the paralysis of local initiative, a growing reliance on a central authority that started with some features of a welfare state and ended in full-fledged totalitarianism—such was the unhappy story.

Does it require much exercise of the imagination to recognize in our own country and our own time some germs, at least, of the political diseases that first sapped and finally brought down the "grandeur that was Rome"?

Great Decisions Program Discussion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, across the country, many thousands of people have been engaged this past winter in the great decisions program sponsored by the Foreign Policy Association. Based on concise summaries of major international problems, these discussion groups center on what alternative policies exist for this country.

I was interested recently to receive a letter from one of these discussion groups and a consensus of opinion on major issues that resulted from that group's course. I commend the people who took part in drawing this up, and I am sure their study will help them understand better the difficult questions that face our policymakers.

I pointed out in reply to them that theories and principles drawn from such study must then be translated into day-to-day decisions in foreign affairs, and this is not the least difficult part. I want to bring the results of this study to the attention of the members by placing it and the accompanying letter in the RECORD. While any examination of politics, international or domestic, brings with it controversy, the study and analysis of all these great decisions by as many of our people as can devote the time adds greatly to public understanding of what this Nation faces:

DEPARTMENT OF ADULT EDUCATION,
West Hartford, Conn., April 1961.

Hon. EMILIO DADDARIO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is a rather unpolished but absolutely honest outline which was developed and agreed upon by a class in foreign policy in the West Hartford, Conn., evening school in the winter session of 1961. The guide we used in the 10-week session of presentation and discussion was from the "Great Decision" booklets, a series of eight topics on world problems issued by the Foreign Policy Association.

It was our intention on the final evening to arrive at some kind of composite score for our semester's work. It was the decision of the class to complete a simple outline of our work and to send it on to our Members of Congress. Much of what we concluded we felt was not in need of any extensive degree of elaborate amplification, because such a communication might lose its value due to sheer length and rhetoric. This is only a humble but yet vitally concerned opinion of 28 American citizens.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES MCINERNY,
ROBERT DEROSIER,
Instructors, West Hartford Evening School.

I. "Deadlock over Germany."
(a) Forget unification.
(b) Maintain strength and status quo in Berlin.
(c) Assist and encourage Bonn Government to assume role of full-fledged member of Western alliance.

II. "Soviet Challenge and World Leadership."
(a) To achieve a nondiscriminating, practical, and realistic foreign policy in order to meet Soviet challenge.

III. "France and Western Unity."
(a) Perpetuate our traditional and historical relations.

IV. "Japan—Future of an Asian Ally."
(a) Constructive, reasonable, and equitable tariff program.
(b) To become equal ally and partner in defense.

V. "U.N. in Explosive Africa."
(a) Recognition of nationalistic aspirations in Africa, even to point of disagreement with allies.
(b) Evolve a U.N. timetable for future independent states.
(c) Continue to censure South Africa on policy of apartheid.

VI. "Americas in Jeopardy."
(a) Better and increased student exchange program.
(b) Avoid identifying all turmoil in Latin and South America as Communist inspired.
(c) Equitable trade policy and strong hemispheric policy in terms of the "good neighbor."

VII. "Arms and Survival."
(a) Keep strong and alert.
(b) Continue development of nuclear power only as a deterrent.
(c) Continue disarmament negotiations on open inspection basis.

VIII. "Blueprint for the World Economy."
(a) Trade with view of progressively liberalizing tariffs.
(b) Wise development of world resources in line with the conservation of world resources.
(c) Raise the living standards of people of the world.

Los Angeles County School Superintendent C. C. Trillingham Informs Congressman Clyde Doyle, 23d District, of County Board of Education Initiating Improvement of Administration Program of Schools, and Exploration and Study of Communism as a Real Threat Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, to a letter I have recently received from the distinguished superintendent of the Los Angeles County schools concerning their countywide approach to stimulate and assist school districts in their programs of Americanism.

His letter along with copies of various editorials illustrate what they are doing in this important project.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 3, 1961.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress, 1030 New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Thank you very much for your kind letter on our countywide approach to stimulate and assist school districts in their programs of Americanism.

We are at the present time inviting each school district to send representatives to a meeting which will probably result in the formation of a countywide committee to study such areas as: How to evaluate materials to determine their accuracy and value; how to develop in-service programs for interested groups of teachers; what curriculum emphasis might be stressed at various grade levels and what might be suggested as possible board policies, including public relations programs. This countywide committee will be meeting in the near future and we anticipate real progress.

Am enclosing copies of editorials and a news release on the subject and will try to send along progress reports.

Thank you again for your interest and concern.

Cordially yours,

C. C. TRILLINGHAM,
Superintendent.

SCHOOL VITAL IN RED THREAT

(While Dick Turpin, education editor of the Times, is on assignment in Europe, this column will be written by leading educators. Today's writer is Dr. C. C. Trillingham, superintendent of Los Angeles County schools)

Recent events at home and abroad have shocked many Americans into the realiza-

tion that the Communists are making good on the timetable laid out by Lenin 40 years ago.

The demonstrations in Japan by Japanese youth which led to the cancellation of the President's visit, the taking over of Cuba by Castro and his influence in Latin America, the Communist-led youth riots in San Francisco against the House Un-American Activities Committee, the continuing ideological struggles in the new and developing nations of Africa and the recent efforts of Khrushchev and his cohorts at the United Nations meeting to take over the controls have dramatized the uncomfortable fact that it is later than we think.

FACTS OF COMMUNISM

Such organizations as the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Bar Association, to mention only a few, are calling on the schools to teach the facts about communism—its purposes, its tactics and how it contradicts everything in which free people believe.

Some say that our best defense is a good offense. They suggest that the schools emphasize the positive by helping our youth understand and appreciate our institutions, ideals, freedoms, and opportunities that we too often take for granted. I believe that these critical times call for both treatments—an emphasis on the benefits and advantages of what we have and what we believe as well as a realization of the dangers of communism both within and without our Nation.

FOUNDATION STONES

On the positive side, the schools can teach more realistically about four foundation stones of freedom that have contributed to America's greatness. They are (1) our systems of constitutional government and the Bill of Rights, (2) our system of free, competitive, economic enterprise that has given us great productivity and increasingly high standards of living, (3) our system of universal education giving every boy and girl an opportunity for an education as long as they can profit from it, and (4) our system of Judeo-Christian religion which through the centuries has given man motivation, purpose, and direction.

All four of these foundation stones place emphasis on the importance and value of the individual. They support each other. When any one of them fails or falls, the entire structure will tumble. They are the embodiment of our great American ideals. We frequently fall short in actual practice because we human beings fail to measure up to the great promise of these foundation stones of freedom.

Under these concepts of individual freedom and responsibility, American standards of living and health and education have become the highest in all human history. Our human rights and equality before the law are without match anywhere in the world.

The world was saved from the scourge of Hitlerism by the miracles of American industrial output and technological genius, backed by American idealism. In the struggle against the present scourge of communism the United States represents the main bulwark and hope of Western civilization.

FEEDING AND HEALING

The wealth generated by our free economy and individualist philosophy is today feeding the hungry and healing the sick in vast segments of a distressed world. Millions of men and women in other countries have no higher dream than migration to the soil of the United States. Never before has a nation so powerful as the United States been less of a menace to weak neighbors or more of a hope to enslaved peoples.

Our youngsters must build a new loyalty and a new dedication based upon an awareness of the many freedoms and opportunities as well as the comfort and conveniences that are theirs.

As to the teaching of the dangers of communism, we are in the process of setting up a countywide committee that will develop a selective list of reliable instructional materials—books, reports, and films—that may be used by the schools in informing and alerting their youngsters to the fact that trained agents of the Soviet Union are working like termites everywhere, probing for our weaknesses and attempting to take us over without a fight.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS LAUNCH SPECIAL AMERICANISM PROGRAM

At its regular meeting on February 6, 1961, the Los Angeles County Board of Education authorized County Superintendent of Schools C. C. Trillingham to set up a countywide committee of school people to stimulate and upgrade the teaching of the American way of life, as well as the dangers to our way of life.

The action of the county board of education grew out of proposals of a small steering committee of school superintendents and county office staff members. This exploratory group considered all aspects of the problem and recommended that Trillingham invite the superintendents of all school districts in the county to designate one or more of their staff members to serve on such a countywide committee.

The full committee will be brought together to consider what needs to be done to improve the Americanism programs of the schools and how the job might best be done. Subcommittees would have responsibility for the review and evaluation of all types of instructional materials, including films and film strips, the development of in-service programs for interested groups of teachers with emphasis upon what Americans believe and stand for, the threats to the American way of life, the curriculum emphases to be stressed at the various grade levels, and such matters as board policy and public relations.

The superintendent reported to the board that the exploratory committee had agreed that there is a real Communist threat today, as well as other dangers, and that the schools should do something tangible about these threats, that the schools should emphasize the positive side of our way of life as well as the dangers facing it, that Americanism programs should be based upon authentic and accurate information, and that the schools are legally responsible for development of their own programs of citizenship and patriotism. The superintendent pointed out that outside groups may help but the schools are responsible to the public and must not become unduly involved in outside programs over which they exercise no control. It is anticipated that all school districts in the county will participate in this cooperative effort.

ARE WE AWARE

(By C. C. Trillingham)

The Canadian Intelligence Service has recently released some dramatic excerpts from "Brainwashing," a synthesis of a Russian textbook on psychopolitics used in training Red agents. These paragraphs appeared in the November issue of American Mercury under the heading Planned Delinquency. They were brought to public attention locally by George Putnam who read them on all of his television news reports during the week of March 7, 1960.

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors has urged the county superintendent of schools office to bring this message to the attention of all students in the schools of Los Angeles County. It is hoped that school district administrators and boards will cooperate by alerting their youngsters to this danger.

Here is the statement from the Russian textbook used in training their agents to take over the world.

"By making readily available drugs of various kinds, by giving the teenager alcohol, by praising his wildness, by stimulating him with sex literature and advertising to him or her practices as taught at 'Sexpol,' the psychopolitical operator can create the necessary attitude of chaos, idleness and worthlessness into which can then be cast the solution which will give the teenager complete freedom everywhere.

"If we could effectively kill the national pride and patriotism of just one generation we will have won that country. Therefore, there must be continual propaganda abroad to undermine the loyalty of the citizens in general and the teenager in particular."

This is one way the Communists are doing their part to soften the younger generation. They seem to have considerable help inside our own country. Wittingly or unwittingly, they seem to have plenty of assistance in preparing our young people for the "moral decay" that has preceded the fall of all previous civilizations, according to historian Toynbee. With alcohol, narcotics, and pornographic materials available to our youth and with much of our movie and TV fare featuring crime, violence, and loose morality, it is time that our homes, churches, schools and government combine forces to convince youth that honest and decent living represent the highest type of intelligence and patriotism.

Too many unscrupulous individuals are permitted to ply their nefarious trade for the dollars in it and do so under the guise of freedom and democracy. Without regard for the common welfare, freedom becomes license.

The high summit meeting of Communist leaders and representatives of the West is just ahead of us. Millions of people everywhere have great hope in the outcome. American visitors to the U.S.S.R. are impressed with the smiles, the handshakes, and the talk about peace and friendship.

But the declared purposes, the avowed timetables, and past records show that trained agents of the Soviet Union are working like termites everywhere, probing for our weaknesses and attempting to take us over without a fight.

Let's inform our youngsters what the Communists are trying to do to them. Then, let's review with them our many freedoms and opportunities, our comforts and conveniences that are too often taken for granted. Let's try to build a new loyalty and dedication to our Bill of Rights, our free enterprise system, our universal education, and our Judeo-Christian religion. Let's begin living up to the best promises of these great foundation stones. Let's help the youngsters see that we're in a battle of ideologies for keeps.

THE SCHOOLS AND THE COMMUNIST THREAT

(By C. C. Trillingham, county superintendent of schools)

There is evidence of increasing concern on the part of representative public groups that the schools step up their programs portraying the continuing encroachment and expansion of communism in the world today.

Not long ago any school official who suggested that we teach boys and girls about communism was under suspicion. Today responsible groups such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Medical Association are asking that the schools teach the cold, hard facts about Communist purposes and tactics.

As a means of exploring this problem, the county board of education authorized the staff to meet with a small steering committee of representative school administrators. This joint committee of school dis-

trict and county office personnel has met once and is scheduled to meet again later this month.

Thorough discussion has brought out some points of view that should be reported at this time. A full report will be given later. Here are some of the points of agreement:

1. There is a real Communist threat. A loyal American citizens who doesn't believe this today is either a confirmed optimist or a nonreader.

2. The schools should do something about the Communist threat. To acquaint boys and girls with the philosophy and strategy and the dangers and encroachments of communism is a responsibility of education.

3. What the schools do should be based upon authentic and accurate information. The schools should use materials that present incontrovertible facts. They should be concerned with sound education. This may call for appropriate inservice activities for teaching personnel.

4. The schools should be responsible for developing their own programs of citizenship and patriotism. Outside groups may help but schools are responsible to the public and must not become unduly involved in outside programs over which they exercise no control.

5. The positive side of our way of life should be strongly presented. This is basic to any consideration of the dangers of communism. There should be emphasis on what we believe in and what we stand for.

6. Each school district has responsibility for its own program. However, there may be strength in coordinating our activities on an areawide basis. It might be possible to do some things better together than to go our own separate ways.

7. There is need to keep those who support our schools fully informed concerning our programs of citizenship and patriotism. Too many times schools carry on good programs that are relatively unknown to the lay public.

One of the most difficult responsibilities is making sure that books, films, and other instructional aids—including speakers—are factual and acurate.

This is a project in survival in which all school districts can participate. It is anticipated that the next meeting of the special steering committee may result in plans for countywide efforts to deal constructively with the Communist menace on a sound educational basis.

Double Threat—Silt-Erosion Problem Greater Than Expected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Dickensonian, of Clintwood, Va., on March 17, 1961.

DOUBLE THREAT—SILT-EROSION PROBLEM GREATER THAN EXPECTED

The Flannagan Reservoir faces the threat both of pollution and siltation, according to surveys made recently, and reports of which have been received here. A report made by the U.S. Department of Agriculture a few days ago to Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON shows that the situation as regards the filling of the reservoir with silt is a more serious problem than was at first believed.

Senator ROBERTSON, in an accompanying letter, says that it is now apparent that a major reforestation program is needed, and the construction of small check dams, to prevent dangerous siltation. It was his opinion that the State water control board would take measures to prevent pollution, but that it had no jurisdiction over the damages already done by the strip mines.

The report of the Agriculture Department follows:

"Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
"United States Senate.

"Dear Senator ROBERTSON: Following our letter to you of January 30, 1961, concerning the flood and sedimentation problem above the John Flannagan Reservoir site in Dickenson County, Virginia, we have obtained additional information which we are glad to present to you.

"Strip mining began in Dickenson, Wise and Buchanan Counties about 1946. At first, this type of operation was on a small scale. As the demand for coal increased, and larger and better machinery was developed, strip mining really began to expand. Since 1950 strip mining has continued to increase until now approximately one-third of the coal mined in this area comes from strip mines.

"As a result of strip mining operations, thousands of acres have been laid bare and have contributed to increased flooding, erosion, and siltation of streams and bottom land. It is a well established fact that the disastrous flood of 1957 was much worse because of the large, barren, stripped areas.

"A recent survey by the Soil Conservation Service and the Virginia Division of Forestry shows that approximately 20,000 acres of land in the watershed of the John Flannagan Reservoir have been strip mined or affected by strip operations. Land is being stripped at the rate of 700 to 1,000 acres per year within the Flannagan Reservoir watershed. About 4 weeks ago, a stripping operation was started just above and around the proposed permanent pool of the John Flannagan Reservoir. This operation is going ahead at full speed. The back slope of this operation will extend down into the permanent pool of the reservoir. As of today, it is estimated that at least 15,000 acres of strip mine spoil need vegetative treatment in addition to other control measures.

"Prior to 1953, very little attempt had been made to reforest or revegetate strip-mined areas. Through the efforts of the Lonesome Pine Soil Conservation District, organized in the fall of 1953, a planned and deliberate approach was made on the problem. Trial plantings of trees, shrubs, grasses, and legumes were made on these problem areas.

"The results were very encouraging. As a result of these trial plantings, some of the larger coal companies have initiated a revegetating program as a part of their business operation.

"At present, approximately 1,000 acres of mine spoil in the three counties are either set to trees or seeded to some type of vegetation annually. Approximately 5,000 acres have received some sort of vegetative treatment.

"The larger coal companies have been very cooperative. The big problem is trying to get private landowners, who have had their land stripped, to do something. They either can't afford to revegetate, or they don't want to spend money on such a barren, seemingly unproductive area.

"There is no law in Virginia at this time requiring coal operators to revegetate strip mine areas. Such laws are in force in West Virginia and several other States. What has been accomplished thus far in Virginia has been strictly on a voluntary basis.

"We do not have facilities to accurately measure the amount of sediment going into the streams. However, we know that many landowners have brought suit against the coal operators for damages resulting from the siltation of streams and bottom land. Most of these lawsuits have been decided in favor of the landowners. Many of the streams have silted up completely. The Virginia Highway Department has a crew of men that spends full time unstopping drainpipes and ditch lines. This is a direct result of silt from strip mine areas.

"Although the Lonesome Pine Soil Conservation District, along with all the cooperating agencies, organizations, and individuals, has the technical know-how to combat this problem, it appears that additional means and authority will be needed before a high degree of sediment control can be secured in the John Flannagan Reservoir drainage area.

"We trust that you will find this information useful.

"D. A. WILLIAMS,
"Administrator, Soil Conservation Service."

Figures Show Federal Aid to Education Unnecessary and Undesirable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 10, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the existence of a national classroom shortage, a claim circulated by proponents of Federal aid to education, is purely fictitious as indicated in the following broadcast from the "Manion Forum." Moreover, even if these claims were true, there still would be no need for Federal action.

The claim that schools are not getting enough money serves largely as an alibi for the poor showing of many of their graduates when they reach college or start on their jobs. In addition, the popular impression that money from the Federal Government is free is fallacious. The Government first has to take money from the people before it can give any back.

These and other facts were brought out by Roger A. Freeman, a vice president of the Institute for Social Science Research and chairman of the committee on financing public education, on March 26, 1961, in a discussion with Dean Clarence Manion on the latter's weekly radio show. The discussion follows:

Dean MANION. Here, on my desk, are two big recent books dealing with the rising cost of public education and describing ways and means for raising the necessary money. At this moment, these subjects are critically important to every parent, child, and taxpayer.

These books, published by the Institute for Social Science Research, Continental Building, Washington, D.C., comprise a thorough, objective, and analytical study of the subject that is now shaking Congress and the country. ("Financing the Public Schools," 2 vol.)

It is a great tragedy that all of our Representatives and Senators will not be required to read both of these volumes before they vote on President Kennedy's recommendations for Federal aid to education.

Through his professional reputation for study and research, I have known the

author of these books for a long time. In 1953 and 1954, when I was Chairman of the first Presidential Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, this author, Mr. Roger A. Freeman, was an assistant to the Governor of the State of Washington.

At that time, he was recommended to our group as the best available man to direct the Commission's study on the relationship of our public education to the Federal Government. Mr. Freeman accepted the assignment and did an excellent job. But he went on from there to extend and elaborate upon his findings in many official and unofficial positions at home and abroad.

The first of his two volumes on "Financing the Public Schools" was published in 1958; the second appeared last December.

In addition to his assignment with the Institute of Social Science Research, this tireless and scholarly man is presently working with the Institute for Studies in Federalism at Claremont College, in California.

On this program a few weeks ago (Manion Forum Broadcast No. 328), I called attention to a pamphlet on the subject of Federal aid to education which Mr. Freeman prepared for the Citizens for Educational Freedom in St. Louis.

That reference brought such a flood of inquiries that I decided to answer them all at once by the direct presentation to this audience of the author himself. He is here with me now. By all professional standards, my distinguished guest qualifies as an expert witness on the subject of public school financing.

Mr. Freeman, I realize that you were required to write these two big books in order to give us all the answers on Federal aid to education, but I hope that you can hit some of the high spots in the course of this broadcast. For instance, do your findings reveal that Federal money is needed now to bring public school construction abreast of the increasing school population?

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Dean Manion. The reports on classroom construction show that States and communities are doing very well and that they need no help nor prodding. They have built 625,000 classrooms in the past 10 years, which is over 200,000 more than would have been needed to take care of the 11 million increase in the number of children.

In 1950 Congress ordered a national school facilities survey which was completed at a cost of over $5 million and reported a shortage of 312,000 classrooms. In 1954 the U.S. Commissioner of Education said that we were 370,000 classrooms short.

Then the figures started coming down, and 2 months ago the Office of Education said that we are 142,000 classrooms short—which is 230,000 fewer than 6 years ago.

Now, most of these shortages are purely fictitious but, even if they were correct, there would still be no need for Federal action. The Office of Education, taking all of these claims at face value, has estimated that we shall need to build 600,000 classrooms in the next 10 years, or 60,000 classrooms a year.

That is the figure which President Kennedy used in his education message. But, States and communities have been building 70,000 classrooms in each of the past 5 years. So, the volume of school construction could substantially decline from its present level and still produce all the classrooms we can possibly use.

But, the year 1960 established a new all-time record in school bond approvals, which suggests that school construction will continue at a record level.

The State school superintendents reported, in a survey of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that only 237 school districts, out of a national total of 40,000, were unable to build the schools they need. So, the facts don't add up to a situation which calls for action by the National Government.

Dean MANION. As far as overcrowded classrooms are concerned, are our American schools in worse shape than their opposite numbers in Europe and Russia?

Mr. FREEMAN. As far as Russian classrooms are concerned, one need only to look at Moscow schools to find the answer. The typical elementary school class in Moscow numbers 40 to 45 children compared with an average of 28 to 33 in our urban school districts. Practically all Moscow schools are on double shift while 98 percent of the American schools are not.

Many of the Muscovite teachers work two shifts, which is unknown in the United States. Russian teachers are poorly paid, contrary to some claims, and need two salaries to earn enough for a decent living. They get $100 a month or less for one shift.

The Russians have reported that they have built schools to accommodate 9 million children since World War II—and they are not likely to understate their case. American public schools have built classrooms for more than twice that many children and private schools have added space for another 1½ to 2 million. Moreover, Russian schools look like warehouse lofts to American observers who are used to our spacious well-constructed and well-equipped public schools. Similar comparisons could be made with schools in many of the other European countries.

EDUCATION COST OUT OF PROPORTION WITH RESULTS

Dean MANION. Mr. Freeman, is it true that good education is a matter of financing? In other words, does good education necessarily cost more?

Mr. FREEMAN. If the quality of education were proportionate to the amount of money going into the schools, our students ought to be doing very well, indeed. Since 1900, enrollment in the public schools has slightly more than doubled while expenditures multiplied 80 times. They jumped from $200 million to $16 billion. Cost per pupil in dollars of constant value multiplied eight times. Do children now learn more? According to many reports they learn less—at least in such basic subjects as languages, mathematics, history, or geography.

The fact is that training in mathematics or history cost less than in coed cooking or homemaking for boys and that insistence on rigorous mental discipline does not raise costs.

To be sure, the public schools need a great deal of money to give a good education to some 37 million boys and girls. A comparison with school outlays in other countries and with most private schools here—with their buildings, class sizes and teachers' pay—proves that our public schools have ample funds to provide standards of excellence second to none. But standards of learning, of promotion, of graduation in most public schools have declined or been abolished.

The most urgent need today is not so much to get more money for education but to get more education for the money.

If the available resources were fully and efficiently used, our graduates would rank far ahead of those of all other countries and we would not need to worry about them.

The claim that schools are not getting enough money serves largely as an alibi for the poor showing of many of our graduates when they reach college or start on their jobs.

Dean MANION. Would taxpayers save money by shifting the financial burden of the schools to the Federal Government?

Mr. FREEMAN. The advocates of Federal aid are promoting the idea that local support means higher taxes while Federal money comes for free. To some extent they seem to have proven their point. Over the past 10 years all Federal grants in aid to the States combined totaled $30 billion and Federal budget deficits amounted to $34 billion. So, it looks as if the money did come for free.

We know, of course, that in the meantime the dollar lost more than a fifth of its value. This means that we paid for the deficit not in taxes but by depreciation of our savings, pensions, life insurance, etc. This is a dishonest way of supporting Government which sets a demoralizing example to our youth.

If the schools or any other public services are to be supported from taxes, then they cost taxpayers at least as much if they are financed through the National Government as through State and local governments, and probably more.

The claim that Federal taxes are paid by rich people and corporations and State and local taxes by low-income people is a myth. More than five-sixths of the Federal individual income tax comes from the basic 20-percent rate and most of the corporation tax is shifted to consumers through higher prices.

The fact is that in a country in which well-being is as widely distributed as in ours, where three-fourths of all personal income goes to labor, and where taxes take about one-third of the people's income, most of the taxes must come from where most of the money goes: persons in the medium brackets.

The great mass of Americans who are neither very rich nor very poor bear the bulk of taxes no matter by what level of government and by what type of tax they are collected. The average man cannot escape his share through Federal aid and attempts to tell him otherwise is sheer demagoguery.

Dean MANION. By way of conclusion, Mr. Freeman, do you believe that we can have Federal financing for education without Federal control and what, if any, are the disadvantages of establishing national educational standards through Federal control of American education?

PROPONENTS OF FEDERAL AID UNTRUTHFUL

Mr. FREEMAN. You know, Dean, that the proponents of Federal school aid have been telling Congress and the public that there can and should be Federal aid without Federal control. They pay lip service to local control when talking for publicity because they know that the great majority of the American people want to retain power over their schools. But, when the professors of education and the school administrators talk to each other, they speak a different language.

A few months ago, Overview, the magazine of the school administrators, editorialized:

"The United States is inexorably moving toward a national system of education * * * the long-held views that education is largely a personal concern and that educational policy should be made by local units of government will have to go * * *. The national welfare demands a national system of education."

Other educators have ridiculed what they call our historical love affair with what might be called "grassrootsism" in American education and claimed that our present system of local control of education is far more conducive to totalitarianism than a national system of schools would be.

It is quite evident that the issue at stake is not so much the size of school support but who is going to run the schools and decide what to teach and how to teach it.

If it were true that the schools need more money than States and communities can raise—which it is not, but suppose it were true—then the money could be supplied through higher Federal taxes by methods that involve little or no control.

For example, it has been proposed in Congress that a percentage of the Federal income or cigarette tax collections be channeled back to the States with no strings at-

tached. The States could then use the money according to their own judgment. This proposal is being condemned and combated by the Federal school aid lobby because the funds would bypass Federal and State departments of education.

Another plan would either reimburse parents for tuition payments to public and private schools or permit them to deduct such tuition payments from their Federal income tax. That would leave the money in the communities rather than send it to Washington and back.

But, the educational bureaucrats fight such proposals violently, and thus reveal their real goal: they are not so much interested in getting more money as in wresting power over the schools from the parents and communities because they aim to reshape the schools according to their sociological theories. They want the schools to be institutes for life adjustment rather than institutions of learning.

That is the story, Dean Manion.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Mr. Roger A. Freeman. My friends, send these indisputable facts and figures to your Congressman and Senators now. Send them to your newspaper, to your local radio and television newscaster, to your local school board. You can defeat Federal control of your school with these facts and these figures if you act at once.

Timely Resolution of the Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles, Calif., on the Important Subject of Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, there follows for your attention and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, a resolution recently adopted by the county of Los Angeles, Calif., board of supervisors, dealing with the very serious national problem of air pollution:

"Whereas the pollution of both urban and rural atmospheres has become a serious national problem; and

"Whereas carefully coordinated programs at Federal, State, and local levels are necessary to bring about the rapid restoration of acceptable air quality levels; and

"Whereas this need has been recognized by the executive legislative branches of the U.S. Government through the implementation of an air pollution research and advisory program being administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

"Whereas the required inter-jurisdictional program coordination was substantially enhanced by the National Air Pollution Conference held in Washington, D.C., November 18–20, 1958; and

"Whereas the need for another such conference has been demonstrated by the rise of new air pollution programs at all levels of government by the growth of scientific knowledge and by the election of a new national administration, since November 1958: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles does hereby join with the Southern California Air Pollution Coordinating Council in the following petition to the President of the United States and to the California delegation in Congress assembled: That a White House Conference on Air Pollution be conducted in the fall of 1961, with special emphasis on the need: (a) for new air pollution research, advisory, and control programs at all levels of government; (b) for improved methods of coordinating existing programs; and (c) for improvement in air quality levels throughout the Nation in view of current medical opinions relating to the effect of air pollution on human beings."

I, Gordon T. Nesvig, clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and ex officio clerk of the Air Pollution Control Board of the Air Pollution Control District of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution which was adopted by the Air Pollution Control Board of the Air Pollution Control District of said county on March 28, 1961, and entered in the minutes of said Board.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the Board of Supervisors this 3rd day of April 1961.

GORDON T. NESVIG,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and ex officio Clerk of the Air Pollution Control Board of the Air Pollution Control District of the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

Hawaii Foundation for American Freedoms, Inc., Honolulu, Hawaii, Unanimously Passes Resolution on House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having heretofore been granted me, I bring to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, a letter I have recently received from the executive vice president of the Hawaii Foundation for American Freedoms, Inc., Mr. Lawrence V. Cott, with which he enclosed copies of the resolution unanimously passed by that organization commending the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The letter and resolution follow:

HAWAII FOUNDATION FOR
AMERICAN FREEDOMS, INC.,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 30, 1961.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is a great pleasure to forward to you 10 copies of the resolution on the House Committee on Un-American Activities which passed last Monday at the annual meeting of this citizen anti-Communist educational organization.

We hope that our small gesture will compensate in some measure for the abuse you must sustain by the mere fact of membership on the committee, but more importantly we hope it conveys our gratitude for your service to the Nation.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE V. COTT,
Executive Vice President.

RESOLUTION ON HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Whereas there is an international Communist conspiracy directed from the Soviet Union and dedicated, as its leaders have said innumerable times, to the complete conquest of the world; and

Whereas the United States is the avowed ultimate objective of the international Communist movement as enunciated in public documents and statements by Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has a duty to inform itself of all dangers to the Nation with the view to writing legislation to protect the freedoms of the American people from all enemies, foreign and domestic, including the international Communist conspiracy; and

Whereas the House of Representatives of the United States has delegated some of those duties and responsibilities to a Committee on Un-American Activities; and

Whereas the Committee on Un-American Activities, under the able leadership of the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, has performed its duties efficiently, courageously and honorably and has fulfilled its mandate without deviation or temerity and with due regard for the law, the rules of Congress and civil liberties, and has accomplished its task despite the most vicious slanders and provocations by Communists and their fellow travelers, and despite little understanding of the nature or nearness of the Communist danger by some of those who should know better: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Hawaii Foundation for American Freedoms, Inc. (Imua) commends the House Committee on Un-American Activities for its signal service to the Congress and the American people and express its gratitude to the committee and to the Congress that has so recently given its own overwhelming endorsement to the committee; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House, Chairman WALTER, and the members of the committee and to the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE, Representative from the State of Hawaii.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

2370

Appendix

Cordell Hull's Historic Role in Income Tax Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Charles Bartlett, distinguished journalist and reporter for the Chattanooga Times, recalling events which led to ratification 48 years ago of the 16th amendment authorizing Federal income taxes.

This historic change in our national tax policy was, as the article by Mr. Bartlett notes, to a large extent the achievement of Cordell Hull, then serving in the House as the Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee. In the long legislative struggle over this issue, Judge Hull carried to successful completion a reform battle that had been started by another distinguished Tennessean, Benton McMillin—both my distinguished predecessors—from the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

Without the income tax today our Government would not have sufficient revenue to support the defense of our country.

Mr. Bartlett's article, published in the Washington Sunday Star, gives insight into some of the traits of character which contributed to Mr. Hull's success as a Congressman, as a U.S. Senator, and as Secretary of State in the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, from 1933 to 1944. The same qualities of foresight, dedication, and resourcefulness which earned him fame as the author of the Federal income tax law later brought him international renown as author of the reciprocal trade agreements programs, father of the United Nations, and architect of the good neighbor policy.

The article by Mr. Bartlett follows:

THE INCOME TAX—HOW WE GOT IT

(By Charles Bartlett)

The docile acquiescence with which Americans have come to pay their income tax is a pale reflection of the sharp struggle which preceded the imposition of the tax less than 60 years ago.

The public's acceptance of the tax as a fact of life is a faint echo also of the Republican platform of 1894 which warned: "In this country an income tax of any sort is odious and will bring odium upon any party blind enough to impose it."

The ultimate responsibility for the tax was bipartisan in a curious way. The Republican conservatives who hated it the most made the tax possible with a huge miscalculation.

Some Democrats, particularly the Western Populists, had pressed for many years for an income tax. Other Democrats, like President Grover Cleveland, opposed it. Cleveland was in fact instrumental in keeping the chairmanship of the House Ways and Means Committee from a Tennessee Congressman, Benton McMillin, who was an ardent advocate of graduated taxation.

In vengeance Mr. McMillin managed, as chairman of a taxation subcommittee, to force enactment of an income tax provision in 1894. It was quickly declared unconstitutional.

CORDELL HULL'S ROLE

A young farm boy, Cordell Hull, succeeded to Mr. McMillin's seat in 1907. He was deeply schooled in his predecessor's battle and impressed by the inequities of a system under which the Government was financed by duties on imports and excise taxes on items like whisky and tobacco. He set about renewing Mr. McMillin's struggle, studying nights and Sundays in his office, larding the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with information about the tax as it was applied in other countries and in the United States during the Civil War, and pressing his views upon the legislative leaders, who came to shrink at his approach.

His issue had growing support. Theodore Roosevelt had railed at the vested interests and William Howard Taft, campaigning for the Presidency in 1908, endorsed a constitutional amendment to make the income tax legal. Mr. Hull's chance came in the course of debate on the Tariff Act of 1909, a supreme effort by the conservatives which was later known as the Payne-Aldrich Act. He proposed the inclusion of an income tax and the idea gathered momentum, particularly among the Republican progressives from the Middle West. In a last-ditch effort to defeat the tariff act, Democratic Leader Champ Clark proposed that the bill be recommitted with instructions to add an income tax. His motion fell before the Republican majority.

A CASUAL CONVERSATION

But as the powerful Republican majority in the Senate, led by Nelson Aldrich, of Rhode Island, was preparing to take up the tariff bill, Mr. Hull fell into conversation on a train with Senator Joseph Bailey of Texas, a Democrat who had been part of the 1894 fight for the income tax. Mr. Hull brought him up to date on developments and interested him in the plan of adding an income tax amendment to the tariff measure. Mr. Bailey's move was quickly joined by Senator Albert Cummins, Republican, of Iowa, and the momentum began to mount.

Mr. Aldrich, whose attention was centered completely on the bill to raise tariffs, did not like the menace of the Bailey-Cummins move. Aware of the strong possibility that it might pass, he coolly determined to enact a constitutional amendment, get the issue out of the way, and rest comfortably upon his estimate that the State legislatures would never ratify an amendment to make the income tax legal.

UNANIMOUS PASSAGE

The amendment passed unanimously after 2 days of mild discussion in a Senate that included 23 millionaires. Mr. Aldrich's strategy was expressed by Senator H. D. Money, Democrat, of Mississippi: "We can feel quite sure that an act of such far-reaching importance, that touches the pockets of very many rich people, is not very likely to become a part of the organic law of our Republic or of our Confederation."

Seven days later the House passed the amendment 318 to 14 with Mr. Clark asserting that the amendment "is simply a scheme to keep Congress from passing an income tax now." Mr. Hull and others continued to press for direct congressional enactment of an income tax as the amendment began its rounds of the State legislatures.

Four years later on February 3, 1913, only a month before Woodrow Wilson's inauguration, Wyoming became the 36th State to approve Aldrich's amendment and it became the 16th amendment to the Constitution.

Please Send Check

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives a very fine editorial which was published in the Mansfield News-Journal, an independent daily newspaper at Mansfield, Ohio, on Thursday, April 6, 1961. I am sure that the message it conveys will come through clearly to the reader and I know you will agree that it represents more that the satirical quality which obviously commends it well. It pierces with clarity the illusion of "something for nothing" which seems to be a major national pastime for some of our citizens and indicates the real fallacy of the welfare state.

The editorial follows:

PLEASE SEND CHECK

The SECRETARY,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

HONORED SIR: I understand you pay people for not growing things. How much will you pay me if I do not plant my garden this year? Usually I have a dozen tomato plants, some sweet corn, a row or two of beans and peas. I've had pretty good luck with squash, too, but my potatoes are generally just mediocre.

I'll be glad to discontinue this effort. I began it during the war when it was considered patriotic. Now I can see how it adds to our national surplus and cuts the market for what other people grow.

If you pay me enough so I can buy these things I usually grow, why naturally I'll be happy to collaborate. As my uncle says, it's silly to work for something when you can get it for nothing.

You will have no problem with me. Just write out a check for what you think my vegetables would be worth and I'll put the garden in the soil bank or let my wife put

it in flowers. (She won't sell any, but she'd like to know if it's all right to give some of the glads to the neighbors? If they are sick?)

Where you may run into trouble is with my cousin. He's a knucklehead. He says he never did grow anything and never got paid for it either. He threatens to stake out a garden and start growing things unless you pay him to not.

Somebody told him you get the best deal for not growing rice, cotton, and wheat and he would like you to please advise if this is correct so he'll know which seed not to buy.

It has been carefully explained to my knucklehead cousin that he can get paid for growing things as well as for not growing them, if he'll just go along with your regulations.

He says this sounds like an even better deal.

So please send the regulations on how to get paid for growing things as well as for not growing them.

That is for my cousin, you understand.

All I want is one check for my nongarden.

Sincerely,

E. G. R. BEAVER.

P.S.—Would I also be entitled to compensation for not working in my garden? I'm not pressing you. It's just a thought.

Field Day for Sharpies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the other day the House passed the so-called distressed areas bill and except for the neccesary adjustments to be made in conference, it will soon be the law of the land. However, the Chicago Sun-Times in an editorial entitled "Field Day for Sharpies," on April 3, 1961, offered some sobering thoughts to those who advocated this latest brazen raid of the Treasury at the taxpayers' expense:

FIELD DAY FOR SHARPIES

When President Kennedy proposed, shortly after his inauguration, that Federal money be spent in economically distressed areas we commented:

"If an area has economic potential, business can be attracted without Federal help. If the area is hopeless, Federal efforts to pump private enterprise life into it will provide only a field day for politicians, bureaucrats, and business sharpies out to make a quick buck."

We had in mind coal mine ghost towns or rural areas that have no appeal for business investment because of location, lack of raw materials, or other reasons.

Republicans obviously had this thought in mind when they tried to squeeze the pap out of the administration's distressed areas bill in the House last week. They were willing to make Federal loans available to areas with economic potential and to provide funds for retraining unemployed workers in distressed areas, but they drew the line at providing $100 million for industrial loans and $75 million for public facility grants for rural depressed areas, virtually all in the South or border States.

The Republicans called this fund a "bribe and a boondoggle." Pouring money into rural areas that are not suited for economic or industrial development won't hasten the end of the current recession or promote national prosperity.

Representative ALBERT RAINS, Democrat, of Alabama, frankly admitted that the money for rural areas was included in the administration bill to get votes of Southerners for it. And that's the way it turned out. A GOP substitute minus the Southern comfort was voted down and the bribe and boondoggle bill was passed.

Since the Democratic Senate has already passed a similar bill and President Kennedy is ready to sign the measure, a raid on the Treasury in the name of helping the unemployed will soon begin.

We suggest that the Members of Congress with respect for the taxpayers' dollars scan closely each proposal to lay out Federal money in backward areas. It should be possible to put the finger on the politicians, bureaucrats, and business sharpies out to make a quick buck.

In the long run, of course, prosperity is promoted by individual effort and private enterprise, as Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, Republican, of Illinois, tried to tell the House in reciting the bootstrap accomplishments of Danville, with a long history of being a distressed area. But the House wasn't interested in how private enterprise built up Danville and how it can help other communities willing to help themselves; it was hellbent for a Treasury raid and it voted one.

Pennsylvania School Study Council Signally Honors Dr. A. Bruce Denniston, Superintendent of the Altoona, Pa., Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting of educators at the Pennsylvania State University, the Pennsylvania School Study Council honored its retiring president, Dr. A. Bruce Denniston, superintendent of Altoona, Pa., schools, by selecting him as recipient of its first award as "Administrator of the Year."

Dr. Denniston is completing 42 years of dedicated service in the field of education and has richly earned the great honor bestowed upon him because of the indelible imprint he has made as an educator in the Keystone State.

Altoona, which is my own hometown, has benefited greatly the past 11 years from the progress made in the public school system during Dr. Denniston's tenure as superintendent. He is recognized as an able administrator with the happy faculty of being able to inspire initiative and leadership in his associates. The result is that members of the staff and faculty have evidenced their great respect for Dr. Denniston and their wholehearted desire to emulate him in his dedicated efforts to advance the best interests of the Altoona Public School system.

Dr. Denniston, in addition to being elected recently as president of the Altoona Rotary Club, has long been active in civic affairs among the most outstanding citizens of Altoona, and one whose exceptional ability and sincere efforts have touched many facets of community life.

In extending my sincere congratulations to Dr. Denniston, I wish to include in my remarks the following editorial from the March 25, 1961, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror as it is a deserved tribute to an outstanding educator:

DISTINGUISHED HONOR

A most appreciative honor, a brandnew title and a laudatory acknowledgment of extraordinary service in the field of education came to Dr. A. Bruce Denniston, superintendent of the Altoona schools, this week and this community is rejoicing, along with the recipient, in the award of the designation "administrator of the year," bestowed at a meeting of educators at Penn State University.

Dr. Denniston so richly deserves the distinction designated by the Pennsylvania School Study Council. The award has an added interest in that it was the first ever presented by the council and selection of the Altoonan is highly complimentary and greatly valued as an endorsement of the educational advancement as promoted by the superintendent.

The award carries with it a bronze plaque and, in addition, provides financial aid by a scholarship to a graduate assistant in the field of educational administration at Penn State.

Dr. Denniston's career in education covers 42 years, classroom teaching, director of secondary education at Slippery Rock and 12 years as superintendent of the Greenville schools and 11 years as superintendent in Altoona.

His accomplishments as a leader in professional and lay groups has been noted, his long-range improvement of the Altoona School District being lauded. He has also given of his time for various community enterprises and his service as president of the Pennsylvania School Study Council the past year was highly praised as he was designated an inspirational leader, a dedicated schoolman and educator.

The Altoona School District, the community and teachers generally, most cordially congratulate their educational head for the high honor attained, being profound in their thanks for the excellent services, which reflect most encouragingly the high standard of the schools and the city generally. Altoonans are most grateful for the action by the council, which certainly made no mistake in honoring Dr. Denniston and recognizing his vast abilities.

Hope for the Sick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Massachusetts Committee for Project Hope, I respectfully request your attention to the following editorial:

"HOPE" FOR THE SICK

The floating medical center *Hope*, dreamed up in a great splash of publicity, has gone about its business in the Far East in a quiet and effective way. The *Hope* is a World War II Navy hospital ship, refitted as a floating

clinic and instruction center, and operated by the American President Lines for the People-to-People Health Foundation that runs it as a privately financed undertaking.

The ship has been serving in the ports of Indonesia. It carries some 15 doctors, 20 nurses, and 30 medical technicians, and is outfitted with closed circuit television and classrooms, as well as 3 operating rooms and 230 beds, so as to give instruction to native medical personnel. But despite its up-to-date facilities, the *Hope* often sends its staff ashore to set up what turn out to be primitive clinics. News of the ship's arrival travels fast, and the sick are brought from far inland.

It costs $3½ million a year to keep the *Hope* running, and it is expected that eventually other ships can be sent to Africa and South America. The *Hope* itself is going to spend the summer along the coast of South Vietnam.

Those who have worked on the *Hope* report that the people it has served in Asia are deeply impressed to learn that it comes, not from the U.S. Government, but from the private effort of American people. This allays suspicions of political motives in areas still very sensitive about colonialism and subject to steady Communist propaganda.

In emphasizing medical instruction over stopgap medical services the *Hope* leaves a continuing service behind to a certain extent, whenever it leaves an area. Any such program that encourages the self-sufficiency of people in various kinds of need deserves applause.

Student Returns From Year in Brazil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article. I believe that in view of the President's recent statements regarding the need for the revamping of our policy toward Latin America in general, this article would be of some interest not only to the Members of Congress, but also to the policymakers of our Government. I am therefore delighted to submit this article for the RECORD:

LOCAL STUDENT RETURNS FROM YEAR IN BRAZIL

(By Clayton Willis)

A University of New Mexico graduate just back from a year in Brazil has great hopes that new Brazilian President Janio Quadros will do much to curb inflation there.

Jan Smith, 23-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Mike Smith, 3124 San Pedro NE., said she thinks President Quadros is going to help the economy of Brazil because of the austerity program he has outlined.

"As Governor of Sao Paulo State, Quadros was very successful with his austerity program," Miss Smith said.

She was in Brazil on an Inter-American Cultural Convention grant which is given for study and research.

"When I left Brazil in early February the cost of living and the inflation was going up so much that I didn't see how the lower class could live," she said.

The 1959 University of New Mexico graduate says education is the thing Brazil needs most. She said that only 52 percent of the population is literate.

"I don't think the lower classes are going to be able to better themselves without education. And education is too expensive for them," the former University of New Mexico major in inter-American affairs said.

"And the upper classes don't care whether the lower classes educate themselves or not," Miss Smith observed.

She said that there is little public school type education in Brazil. What education there is is mostly of the private school kind, she noted.

The attractive Albuquerquean attended classes on a noncredit basis 5 months at the National University of Brazil in Rio de Janeiro. She also lived in the Atlantic coastal port city of Salvador 5 months.

Miss Smith spent the remaining 2 months of her year in the Portuguese-speaking country traveling through the interior of Bahia State. There she recorded folk music and visited several cattle ranches in this northeastern part of Brazil.

Four other observations she made in an interview at her home:

1. Communism is practically nonexistent in the part of Brazil she saw;

2. Students at the National University of Brazil gave her a somewhat cool reception as an American. But the university's professors were very helpful;

3. The Brazilian sees the typical American as someone with a lot of money who drinks and smokes and goes to a lot of parties (the impression they get from third-rate American movies they see, she said);

4. Brazilians were surprised that she spoke Portuguese. "But when the merchants found out I was an American, you could see the dollar signs lighting up in their eyes," Miss Smith said.

A Sensible and Timely View of a Certain Constitutional Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take satisfaction in presenting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few passages from "The Life of Col. David Crockett," by Edward S. Ellis, published in 1884. Colonel Crockett's treatment of the constitutional question involved in congressional appropriations for charitable purposes is, I submit, both valuable and timely today.

A SENSIBLE AND TIMELY VIEW OF A CERTAIN CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

From time to time, Congress has appropriated money for charitable purpurposes. The following account of Crockett's experience, while in Washington, is in that line, and is therefore timely and instructive. The narrator says—

While Crockett was in Congress I had business which required me to spend several weeks in Washington City. Waiting upon one of the departments, or rather one of the chief clerks, for my turn, I had much leisure upon my hands; for, though my business might have been dispatched as well in 2 hours as in 2 months, yet I had to wait. I had made up my mind that I would not leave until my business was settled. My only regular employment was to go every day to the office to learn that it could not be attended to that day.

Crockett was then the lion of Washington. I was a great admirer of his character, and, having several friends who were intimate with him, I found no difficulty in making his acquaintance. I was fascinated with him, and he seemed to take a fancy to me.

I was one day in the lobby of the House of Representatives when a bill was taken up appropriating money for the benefit of a widow of a distinguished naval officer. Several beautiful speeches had been made in support, rather, as I thought, because it afforded the speakers a fine opportunity for display than from the necessity of convincing anybody, for it seemed to me that everybody favored it. The Speaker was just about to put the question, when Crockett arose. Everybody expected, of course, that he was going to make one of his characteristic speeches in support of the bill. He commenced—

"Mr. Speaker, I have as much respect for the memory of the deceased, and as much sympathy for the sufferings of the living, if suffering there be, as any man in this House, but we must not permit our respect for the dead or our sympathy for a part of the living to lead us into an act of injustice to the balance of the living. I will not go into an argument to prove that Congress has no power to appropriate this money as an act of charity. Every Member upon this floor knows it. We have the right, as individuals, to give away as much of our own money as we please in charity; but as Members of Congress we have no right so to appropriate a dollar of the public money. Some eloquent appeals have been made to us upon the ground that it is a debt due the deceased. Mr. Speaker, the deceased lived long after the close of the war; he was in office to the day of his death, and I have never heard that the Government was in arrears to him. This Government can owe no debts but for services rendered, and at a stipulated price. If it is a debt, how much it is? Has it been audited, and the amount due ascertained? If it is a debt, this is not the place to present it for payment, or to have its merits examined. If it is a debt, we owe more than we can ever hope to pay, for we owe the widow of every soldier who fought in the War of 1812 precisely the same amount. There is a woman in my neighborhood, the widow of as gallant a man as ever shouldered a musket. He fell in battle. She is as good in every respect as this lady, and is as poor. She is earning her daily bread by her daily labor, and if I were to introduce a bill to appropriate $5 or $10,000 for her benefit, I should be laughed at, and my bill would not get five votes in this House. There are thousands of widows in the country just such as the one I have spoken of; but we never hear of any of these large debts to them. Sir, this is no debt. The Government did not owe it to the deceased when he was alive; it could not contract it after he died. I do not wish to be rude, but I must be plain. Every man in this House knows it is not a debt. We cannot, without the grossest corruption, appropriate this money as the payment of a debt. We have not the semblance of authority to appropriate it as a charity. Mr. Speaker, I have said we have the right to give as much money as our own as we please. I am the poorest man on this floor. I cannot vote for this bill, but I will give 1 week's pay to the object, and if every Member of Congress will do the same, it will amount to more than the bill asks."

He took his seat. Nobody replied. The bill was put upon its passage, and, instead of passing unanimously as was generally supposed, and as, no doubt, it would, but for that speech, it received but few votes, and, of course was lost.

Future Homemakers of America Look Toward New Horizons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the period of April 9 through 15 has been set aside this year as National Future Homemakers of America Week, and it gives me a great deal of pleasure at this time to commend the over 500,000 members of this fine organization. They fully deserve our recognition for the outstanding job they are doing in preparing themselves for the vital role they will have in the future of this Nation.

The Future Homemakers of America, which is a national organization for high school students studying homemaking, was organized in June 1945 and now has 10,000 chapters throughout the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Cosponsors for the organization are the Home Economics Branch of the U.S. Office of Education and the American Home Economics Association. The Commonwealth of Kentucky was the first State to charter the Future Homemakers of America, and in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky, which I have the honor to represent, members of local chapters of the FHA are extremely active and well organized. Their participation in civic projects, their willingness to be of assistance at all times, the skills they have acquired through FHA activities, and their sense of good citizenship make them highly valuable members of their community. These young women are ably assisted in their endeavors by their home economics teachers and other interested women who appreciate and understand the importance of training these girls in the art of homemaking.

Members of the Future Homemakers of America through their chapter and individual activities work toward four objectives: To develop potential abilities; to develop a better understanding of family members and to contribute to their well-being; to interpret the value of home economics as a basic part of total education; and to promote good will through getting to know neighbors at home and abroad. It can readily be seen that concentration on these four objectives will ultimately bring the girl to the maturity required of a successful wife and mother.

The young woman's innate abilities and talents must be recognized, encouraged, and developed so that she will be able to contribute the full potential of which she is capable to her family and community.

By learning early in life to be aware of others and their problems will enable the future homemaker to care for her family with an understanding and intelligence she might otherwise lack.

Certainly the value of a thorough knowledge of home economics as a basic part of total education has been well established as evidenced by the many courses offered in this subject at our colleges and universities. No longer is the modern wife and mother considered simply a household drudge concerned only with the traditional duties of homemaking such as marketing, cooking, cleaning, and child raising. The American housewife is now expected to be an accomplished hostess, chauffeur, nutritionist, educator, psychologist, practical nurse, and efficiency and budget expert. While all these skills are important to the smooth functioning of the modern home, the most essential quality of a successful homemaker is the ability to bring love, harmony, and a knowledge of God to the family unit.

In order to promote better understanding with young people of other nations, FHA'ers read books, entertain foreign visitors, hear guest speakers and exchange letters with youth overseas. In addition, they make contributions to other nations directly and through other agencies which give material and technical aid.

Mr. Speaker, the members of this national youth organization deserve our commendation for preparing themselves to be better citizens of tomorrow, and not only do the Future Homemakers of America look "toward new horizons," but they "face the future with warm courage and high hope."

Reality and the Electrical Company—Sherman Act Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the electrical company conspiracy cases have been somewhat in the news of late. Not nearly enough, however.

For years we have been submitted to an unrelenting barrage about the glories of the competitive price system. In every book on economics, every financial page, the marketplace has been extolled as the all-inclusive answer to our economic ills.

Yet, for anyone with a grain of curiosity the fact is that there has been no price competition in many key industries for a long, long time. Competition, in the public understanding of that term, has been an old wives tale, suitable for sophomore textbooks. What is so astonishing about the electrical cases is the open mouthed outrage expressed in periodicals like Life and Time. Where have they been since Mr. Luce went to Yale?

Administered prices have been part of the game for many years. The trial and conviction of a few electrical executives is not going to halt the trend either. In one guise or another the noncompetitive price is the order of the day, and will continue to enlarge throughout a broader and broader spectrum of American industry.

This is the reality of modern corporate life. The moralizing on the subject is well-nigh insufferable.

In many ways the real censure belongs not to those benighted officers who were punished with jail sentences, but the highly placed critics who refuse to look the facts squarely in the eye.

We cannot live in a hypocritical world which deals with facts as though they did not exist. Citizens cannot come to any meaningful decisions if they are given only half the basic presumptions. Congress cannot function when it must deal in terms of unreality, the nonexistent world of price competition, for example.

The real conspiracy is not a few electrical executives meeting clandestinely in hotel rooms. The real conspiracy is a continuing one of long standing—the reluctance of Time, Life, U.S. News & World Report, and the other mythologists to start giving people the facts of life.

I include an article by Bernard Nossiter appearing in the Washington Post:

LEGAL PRICE FIXING NEW SHOCK THERAPY
(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Some business leaders have found a new answer to the electrical machinery price-fixing scandal which would drastically alter traditional American ideas of a competitive economy.

At this point, most businessmen make conventional remarks about the meaning of the case. They talk of the need to take a closer look at what their subordinates are doing to insure that they are complying with the law.

But another idea is growing among a few business leaders. It is based on a much more realistic image of how the economy works. To be sure, this image is not cast in terms of a chamber of commerce speech. It would also disturb the mythmakers who picture ours as an essentially competitive economy.

In blunt terms, here is the solution some businessmen have suggested to the problems raised by the electrical machinery case: Let us legalize cartels, making lawful the very price fixing and market sharing for which the seven electrical machinery executives went to jail.

Most executives, toying with this idea, would simply let each industry on its own agree on prices and division of the market. A few acknowledge that token Government supervision would be a political necessity.

The historian will find nothing new in this. It has echoes of syndicalism, the corporate state and the techniques of much modern business in Europe. The New Deal's brief experiment with the NRA was a conscious effort to fix prices and allocate the market with Government sanction.

But for those who think there are values in a purely competitive economy or those who believe that competition is the dominant mode of the American economy, such an idea is repugnant.

Nevertheless, it is very much in the air as this reporter, an occasional visitor to executive suites, can testify. A knowledgeable vice president of one big corporation was thinking out loud the other day about the electrical case.

"Suppose," he said, "that unrestrained competition prevailed in the heavy equipment industry. What do you think would happen? It wouldn't be long before all the smaller, weaker companies fell by the wayside and one strong dog ate up all the other dogs.

"What is the end result? The very pursuit of unfettered competition would lead to one

firm in the industry or monopoly. Isn't this a paradox?"

The Trade press has been voicing this same theme with increasing frequency in recent weeks.

Item: A cement company publicly deplores plans of a rival to build a new plant. The venture, said the Marquette Cement Manufacturing Co., could lead to "an unrestrained competitive scramble for business in the Northeastern States along with severely reduced prices."

Item: A shipping news writer notes that some Congressmen are taking a dim view of steamship conferences—a device which enables competing lines to fix prices legally. "To the confirmed steamship conference man," the knowledgeable writer says, "the absence of a conference means rate wars and chaos."

The frankest expression of the renewed interest in legal cartels comes from a sophisticated investment advisory service called the Value Line. Published in New York by Arnold Bernhard, it sells for $144 a year. This price alone means that it would be inelegant to call it a stock market tip sheet.

From time to time the Value Line runs Bernhard's analyses of current problems. His views deserve attention on two counts:

His service is held in high esteem by Wall Street and reaches an influential investing audience.

His statement of the meaning of the electrical machinery case has been reprinted by one of the largest of the convicted firms for distribution to selected offices.

Bernhard's thesis is comparatively simple. It parallels the ideas quoted above and runs like this: If laws against price fixing were enforced to the hilt, they would "actually bring about monopoly." Large firms generally have lower unit costs of production than small ones. The big firms could continue to cut prices until the small firms in their industry disappeared. Even if the small firms were more efficient, they couldn't sustain an unlimited price war.

"The big corporation, like General Electric, can sustain a loss in one of its many divisions and offset this loss against the profits of its other divisions, thus reducing its taxable profit." The corporate tax rate is 52 percent, so, the U.S. Government assists the big fellow by absorbing half his loss while the little fellow engaged in only one particular business sustains his full loss without offsetting profits from other divisions (which he simply does not have)."

In fact, the analysis goes on. "The free enterprise system in which prices are free to fluctuate without restraint has not existed for a couple of hundred years." Typically, Bernhard says, price leadership (or administered prices) prevails. That is, the biggest producer in an industry announces or confirms a price and the smaller companies follow its lead. The price is an umbrella held high enough to permit the least efficient produced to make a profit.

This technique sets prices, Bernhard observes. But if products and prices are identical, how do you assure each producer a share of the market?

"Here is where the conspiracy comes in, and in practice has got to come in," the analysis says. "It usually works out that definite percentages of the market are allocated to particular companies by the sellers themselves; they make their bids in such a way as to assure the division of the market according to the prearranged agreement."

While deploring the methods of the electrical machinery makers ("their conspiratorial practices were carried on with the sophistication of teenagers"), Bernhard argues that they had some unique and sticky problems.

He contends that they sell to informed customers—utility company purchasing agents and governments—who would quickly catch on and object to ordinary price leadership. The fact that so many didn't catch on to identical bids for so long makes this a dubious contention, however.

More importantly, perhaps, is that much of the machinery is tailor made for a unity or a government power company. You can't post a uniform price on a product that is changed for each order. So, in effect, the electrical machinery makers were driven to their teenage conspiracy methods.

Bernhard also observes that fixed prices operate legally in many areas of the economy. Floors are set under the price of labor (minimum wage), farm products (price supports) and some retail products (fair trade laws).

Unions are a legal device to fix labor prices, specifically exempted from antitrust laws (unless they are engaged in collusion with employers).

Bernhard argues that there is a contradiction between a government putting a floor under labor's price and prosecuting business for doing the same thing—a point some alerted editorialists are beginning to make.

For now, the argument is left at this point, but its logic is clear: Let us permit market-sharing and price fixing to avoid chaos, rate wars, and the destruction of smaller firms.

Left unanswered is the question of power. Who is to decide what prices shall be and how markets are to be allocated? An instinctive industrial reaction would be, Why us, of course. But this is political fantasy. If cartels were legalized, the cry would inevitably follow that the public interest must be protected, that the Government must have veto power at least over cartel decisions.

Calling the Turn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the April 3 issue of Barron's entitled "Calling the Turn" by Dr. John H. Hoagland, associate professor of management, Graduate School of Business Administration, Michigan State University:

CALLING THE TURN

(By Dr. John H. Hoagland)

EAST LANSING, MICH.—Purchasing surveys now indicate that the business upturn will begin before mid-1961. A business recovery should begin within a few months and the current recession should prove to be relatively short and mild, according to the latest monthly change in indexes of purchasing business surveys. These were the salient conclusions of reports on the January and February surveys made by the National Association of Purchasing Agents. As expressions of confident forecasting, they ran well ahead of most official and private analyses of leading economic indicators. That confidence, in turn, rested securely on the knowledge that for a decade or more, NAPA's surveys successfully have called the turn on the ups and downs of business.

For example, in early March NAPA indicated that order backlogs were shrinking substantially less than in the preceding 6 months; new orders were declining less than in the 1957–58 recession; curtailment in output remained relatively mild; declines in employment were slackening in most areas; industrial inventories were being liquidated at a slower rate; prices remained fairly stable; sellers were offering somewhat faster deliveries; and buyers were tending to stabilize their forward commitments.

At first sight, such developments might seem difficult to appraise. In recent years, however, NAPA data have yielded a gage which, instead of trying to weigh the aggregate of a large number of business indicators, focuses on the changes. For example, the surveys ask purchasing agents to state whether inventories, new orders, production and employment are higher, lower or unchanged; NAPA then tabulates the responses in percentages of the total number of those surveyed.

By easing an index on the monthly changes in such seemingly simple data, a first-class forecasting device has emerged, the usefulness of which has been affirmed time and again. For example, monthly change indexes, based on NAPA reports, clearly revealed the presence of the 1951–52 recession, which was known to every businessman but ignored by official observers. Similarly, early in 1953, these indexes pointed to the subsequent recession. They also indicated that the 1957–58 setback, which followed the 1955–56 recovery, represented a reaction which was delayed by the Suez crisis of 1956–57.

Contrariwise, in the bleak winters of both 1954 and 1958, the monthly change indices suggested the likelihood of recovery, just as they proceeded to do again early this year. Successful experience thus appears to justify the confident conclusions stated in the NAPA reports of early February and March.

A major reason for the conviction carried by the surveys, and the indices based on them, is the honesty and seriousness with which purchasing executives provide accurate information. Moreover, since NAPA conducts its surveys during the third or fourth week of each month, and tabulates and publishes the results by month's end, its data lead all other indicators by weeks and even months.

In the latest recession, according to the monthly change indices, the business decline reached its peak rate in the final quarter of 1960. The slope started flattening in December, and subsequent trends point toward a general upturn in the near future. Whether the indices supply clear evidence in that respect for March or April matters little besides the discovery that recovery clearly is in sight.

The NAPA business surveys thus have proved to be helpful tools of business analysis. Beyond this achievement, they have given rise to useful observations regarding the business cycle generally. For example, in determining business trends, industrial purchasing agents often carry more weight than consumers' demand. Purchases, after all, are the largest cost element in the industry; manufacturers on average spend twice as much for goods as for wages and salaries. By their decisions and their policies, purchasing executives exert an important influence on their firms' profits. Their combined actions, in turn, have a major impact on the business cycle.

As intermediate consumers, industrial purchasers in the aggregate commit their employers to outlays of $10 to $15 billion a month. Changes in such commitments clearly carry great weight. Between periods of business expansion and contraction, the average forward commitment of industrial purchasers has varied by as much as 1 month, thereby shrinking, or adding to, order backlogs by $10 to $15 billion per year. On certain occasions, the shifts have been much greater.

Business sentiment, in turn, usually reflects rational considerations. When vital channels of supply are threatened, for instance, purchasers of necessity will seek protection for their concerns. Thus, in

anticipation of the 1959 steel strike, some purchasing executives in the fall of 1958 began accumulating inventories. In the winter of 1959, steel buying swelled to such dimensions that order taking became chaotic, and many buyers did not know when to expect delivery. As a result, they resorted to duplicate or multiple ordering, in the process building up a very large inventory of metal in the first half of 1959. Moreover, in advance of the shutdown, steel parts and products also were hoarded.

Thus, the anticipation of a strike pushed business activity to unprecedented peaks. Owing to the purchase and inventory imbalances, moreover, the effects of the strike carried beyond the settlement. In 1959, when the impact of the strike on delivery schedules and prices was uncertain, many purchasers placed large steel orders for post-strike delivery; indeed, most steel shipments made last winter filled orders of this kind. Such prior commitments, then, prevented purchasing executives from shifting their policies quickly.

By last April, however, many firms found themselves with excessive stocks of steel. Drastic shifts in buying policy and substantial reduction of steel inventories proved necessary. As these shifts persisted through 1960, they made a major contribution to the recession.

The latter also reflected a widespread misunderstanding of the "strike anticipation boom" of 1959, which caused excessive optimism for 1960. After the strike, the reasoning seemed to run, business will take up where it left off in mid-1959. This author, however, forecast a recession starting during the second quarter of 1960. He had noted that within 12 months of the steel strikes of 1952 and 1956, a business recession developed, and he expected history to repeat. By the same token, it now seems likely that a strike threat in steel for mid-1962 will stimulate business activity late this year and through the first half of next year.

From a study of the monthly change indices of the NAPA business surveys, it thus is clear that major strikes, and threats of strikes, have affected both the timing and the magnitude of business ups and downs. Obvious though it is, however, few economists have studied or even recognized the effect of strikes on the business cycle. Moreover, since strikes upset long-range business planning, they also tend to interrupt economic growth.

It surely is no accident that these insights have resulted from a close study and analysis of NAPA's monthly business surveys and the monthly change indices. While most official statistics are collected and interpreted by agencies subject to political influence, the NAPA is interested only in supplying its members with a tool for understanding business conditions. Like many disinterested intellectual efforts, the NAPA's surveys have succeeded in achieving more than their primary aim. As a byproduct, they have furnished the Nation with a reliable gage of the business cycle and its turning points.

Just To Be Friendly?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Reds and the Chinese and other participating governments are pursuing the cold war with all their normal vigor. A pertinent commentary on the dropping of espionage charges against a Red official is appropriately discussed in the March 28, 1961, issue of the Chicago American:

JUST TO BE FRIENDLY?

As explained by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and the State Department, the Government's decision to drop espionage charges against Igor Y. Melekh makes no sense at all. Since they're not normally given to talking nonsense we conclude, hopefully, that the official explanation isn't the real one.

Melekh, a Russian employee of the United Nations, and his codefendant, Willie Hirsch, were accused of trying to obtain aerial photos of Chicago, presumably for potential use by Russian bombers.

Friday, on orders from the Justice Department, U.S. Attorney Robert F. Tieken moved to dismiss the charges against Melekh, on condition that he gets out of the country. Federal District court Judge Edwin A. Robson had no choice but to let Melekh go.

Robert Kennedy explained that Secretary of State Dean Rusk had urged this move in the hope that it would "contribute toward improving our position as regards the protection of U.S. citizens in Russia." If Rusk genuinely believed that freeing Melekh would somehow make the Russians feel obligated to do something for us in return, he is astoudingly naive.

Soviet foreign policy is not run on the basis of vague impulses toward charity. The Russians will offer us concessions when and if they consider it advantageous to them, and for no other reason.

Frankly, we're unwilling to believe Rusk and Robert Kennedy are such innocents as their explanation makes them out. We assume that something concrete was gained through this move; possibly a break for U-2 pilot Francis Powers. Whatever the trade may have been, it's a shame that justice for Melekh had to be short-circuited for it, but in any deal with the Russians justice usually is the loser.

Symbolism and the Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech given before the Fraternal Order of Eagles in North Adams, Mass., Saturday, April 8, 1961, praising the Eagles and giving the historical origin and the symbolic importance of the eagle:

It gives me great pleasure to be here this evening. It is always a particular source of gratification, and an honor, for me to address a group of those with whom I share common ideals. In this case as a brother Eagle. Therefore, you will appreciate that I am going to speak in a fraternal manner, because we understand and believe in the great ideals and noble goals of this organization.

While I was contemplating what I was going to say this evening, an interesting thought crossed my mind. I thought of the name and symbol of our order—the eagle. My meditations took me back through history, some ancient and some quite recent. I began to consider the many different meanings which this great bird has represented to many people at certain periods of recorded time.

The eagle was used as an art symbol by the early Assyrians and Egyptians. The Persians used the eagle on their ensigns. The armies of Rome carried the eagle as their standard, and so, the legions were known by that name. During the Roman Empire, the eagle was used to represent the deification of the Roman emperors. In ancient times, too, the eagle was often considered as a symbol of the soul's flight after death. Christianity uses the eagle to represent the evangelist, St. John. In this case it symbolizes his wonderful divine vision and spiritual flights. In the days of chivalry and knighthood, heraldry employed the eagle as a symbol used on coats of armor, shields, or standards.

Napoleon Bonaparte used the eagle as a symbol of his empire and his armies carried it into battle on their uniforms and flags. The Austrian Empire of the Hapsburgs, and the German Empire under the Kaisers used an eagle with twin heads, which referred to their assumption of power both east and west. In recent times, this noble bird had come to have even another and more sinister meaning. The Nazis adopted the eagle, clutching a swastika in its claws, as the national emblem for Germany. Mussolini too, hoping to imitate the ancient Caesars in his dream for empire, had the eagle holding fasces in its talons.

But throughout the years in which man has often seen the eagle stand for alien ideologies, we have also had our proud American eagle—a symbol of hope and not despair—a representation of freedom not oppression—the manifestation of right rather than might. Indeed, for us and for free men everywhere, the eagle is a noble bird and not one which means hate, fear, or tyranny.

If I may, I would like to give you a brief account about our adoption of the eagle which is the central figure of the Great Seal of the United States.

The Founding Fathers, feeling that the new Nation needed a symbol to express its sovereignty, adopted a resolution providing "that Dr. Franklin, Mr. John Adams, and Mr. Thomas Jefferson be a committee to bring in a device for a seal for the United States of America." Six years were to pass and two more committees were to work on the job, however, before the Congress, on June 20, 1782, approved the design of the Great Seal.

As you know, for the central figure of the seal, the designers chose a bird. Not just a bird, but the American bald eagle—the mightiest of birds, a high-flying bird that overcomes all obstacles for its young or dies in the effort.

As I mentioned, throughout history, the eagle has been used to denote strength and power. Since the hopes and aims that the men who planned the Great Seal had for our Nation have been borne out, they could not have chosen a more apt bird to express the ideals of this country. We soar high in ambitions and intentions, and our history has shown that we fight not so much for ourselves as for the rights and freedoms of others.

Another interesting fact you might not know. In the eagle's tail the designers placed nine feathers, not because this is the actual number of feathers in an eagle's tail, but because of the meaning of the number nine. Nine is the square of three, the Trinity of the Christian God. Nine would thus indicate a super accentuation of God, indicating that the very foundation of our Nation is God.

So far, I have discussed with you the symbol of the eagle. But a symbol is important only insofar as it represents something. It can speak for an entire philosophy of life or government, as well as particulars.

It is not the physical appearance of the symbol itself which has any merit or value for it does not live, does not believe nor act. What is important, however, is the philosophy which lies at the very fundamental cause for its existence. This is a fact which we as Americans and Eagles must always bear in mind. We have used the noble eagle to represent those ideals and goals in which we believe—we have stated our purpose quite clearly under this symbol for all to see—but it remains a dead symbol unless those who use it translate its philosophy into positive action.

Our order, for example, is called "fraternal." The word itself means "brotherly" and that we are bound together in mutual respect for one another and for our fellow men. This forms the basis for the eixstence of our organization. But while we all subscribe to this lofty ideal, we will be judged, nevertheless, only as to how we place it into practice.

As Americans, we know that we are faced with the symbols of a new tyranny—the Red star and the hammer and sickle. We know exactly what they stand for. But we must also remember that millions of human beings are dedicated to the advancement of the philosophy and way of life they represent. All over the world, in every field of human endeavor and activity, they are putting their corrupt beliefs into action. They are willing to make any sacrifice, even death, to achieve their objective of world domination. They will not cease in their efforts until the hammer and sickle have replaced the cross, the star of David, and our bald eagle as the universal symbol to be worshipped and to represent the sole hope and aspiration for all mankind.

True, you might say, but then ask the question about the many millions more for whom this symbol of communism represents terror and slavery—what about those poor helpless people? How can their example, strong and powerful that it is, still not deter others from accepting the doctrines of the Reds? Because, there are still those who have faith in the perverted ideals of communism. Despite this inhumanity, for all to see, these apostles and disciples are willing to give of themselves totally to its worship and practice. It is this dedicated mass of people, burning with the fervor of faith, carrying their symbol and their bibles by Marx and Lenin who are presenting to we, who live under the noble eagle, the serious and great challenge.

The lessons which we can draw should be quite clear—we must not only match their devotion and their willingness for action, but we must surpass them. There are millions of humans, some free and others in bondage, who look toward our American eagle as the symbol for their hopes on earth.

As members of this great fraternal order, we already know the true meaning of brotherhood. We are conscious of the noble ideals which are the objectives and which afford us guidance. In other words, by belonging to this organization, we have the great foundation from which we can spring into action. We are, in this respect, very fortunate indeed.

Having such a firm basis, assisted by our belonging, we are better able to understand our responsibilities and to appreciate the rights and privileges which our way of life guarantees. Therefore, to counteract the evil force pitted against us and dedicated to our destruction, we must first practice our high ideals among ourselves and our fellow men. And, second, we must always keep in mind that our actions must be related directly to our faith. By so doing, we shall have strengthened our position from within our minds and hearts, and we shall have also dealt apathy and indifference, our own worst enemies, a crushing blow.

Then, without any fear of failure whatsoever, we can present a solid wall of power which no enemy can breach. At the same time, we shall have carried our symbol forward, in progress and action, to hold its virtues before all men.

If we belong to the Fraternal Order of Eagles keeping this in mind, and if our organization fulfills this need as it certainly does, then availing ourselves of its sources for guidance and strength, we can contribute them to our national life—in our community and State—bringing new vigor and power of conviction. Thus, we shall be performing our duty to our great Nation and shouldering our share of the responsibilities. Being true members of this order is synonymous with being good American citizens. By doing all these things, men the world over will have cause for continued hope and faith that they, too, may someday enjoy the same freedoms and way of life, which is our good fortune to have as members of the Eagles living under the bald eagle.

Multiple Benefits on the Shakopee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Robert S. Anderson, of the Soil Conservation Service, Montevideo, Minn., points out the many benefits which are becoming evident from the Shakopee watershed program in Minnesota. This article appeared in the April 1961 issue of Soil Conservation:

MULTIPLE BENEFITS ON THE SHAKOPEE

(By Robert S. Anderson)

Shakopee Creek is a principal tributary of the Chippewa River in western Minnesota. The Shakopee watershed, which includes about 205,000 acres of farmland, is part of the Chippewa tributaries and Hawk Creek pilot watershed protection project.

Flood prevention, erosion control, and reduction of sediment damages to farmland were the principal objectives outlined in the work plan for the Shakopee watershed. But developments have proved that waterfowl, upland game, and other wildlife also are principal beneficiaries of the watershed program as it nears completion.

Structural measures, including two floodwater retarding structures and 25 miles of floodway improvement, have been completed on the Shakopee. Land treatment measures in the upper part of the watershed are being applied by farmers at a stepped-up pace and are proving effective in controlling runoff and erosion. Flood and sediment damages to the lowlands were practically nonexistent in 1960.

The floodway, completed in 1959, not only controls flooding of adjacent farmlands, but also provides an outlet for farm drainage ditches. The two large floodwater retarding structures have, up to now, kept floodwaters down to the capacity of the floodway; and, in addition, they have created permanent lakes from formerly intermittent lakes and greatly enhanced their value to waterfowl and other wildlife.

The storage reservoir in the upper floodway is Swan Lake in Kandiyohi County. It has a surface area of approximately 700 acres and temporary storage capacity of 3,000 acre-feet. The storage reservoir in the lower floodway is Shakopee Lake in Chippewa County. This lake has a permanent pool of about 300 acres and has a temporary storage capacity of 2,000 acre-feet with a surface area of approximately 500 acres at flood stage.

The water control structure at the outlet of each lake consists of an earthfill dam and a concrete drop spillway. They contain neither gates nor valves. These control structures maintain a stable pool level in the lakes throughout the summer. The water rises only during periods of heavy runoff from heavy rains in the watershed.

In the fall of 1958, there was less than 5 acres of water in Shakopee Lake. The control structure, completed just before freezeup that winter, maintained a constant water level in the lake throughout 1959 and 1960. Even with less rainfall in 1959 than in 1958, there was 300 acres of surface water in the lake that fall.

There is a small local hatch of ducks, mostly teal, in both Swan and Shakopee Lakes. The chief advantage of the lakes to waterfowl is a stopover or resting area during the spring and fall migrations. In the falls of 1955, 1956, and 1957 there were up to 5,000 mallards feeding out of Shakopee Lake during the migrations. Needless to say, duck hunting was tops in the lake and the surrounding cornfields.

In 1958, due to the drought, there was only 5 acres of water left in the lake and this was used only by a few great blue herons and wilson snipe.

In 1959 the big northern mallards returned. Again thousands of them used Shakopee Lake as a stopover during their southern migration. The 300 acres of shallow water provide just the spot for the ducks to use as headquarters between their daily trips to the neighboring cornfields. They remain here until the lake freezes, then take off for the South. Escape cover and nesting areas plus winter protection are provided for pheasants all along the shoreline of the lake. This makes the area ideal for the permanent production of pheasants and other wildlife.

Wildlife enthusiasts and sportsmen are happy with the new Shakopee Lake. The farmers in the watershed benefit from the controlled water and managed soil. The people in the cities downstream on the Chippewa River know that their flood problem has been greatly decreased.

Only the United States Has Power To Stop Reds in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in view of the gravity of the present situation in Laos, I should like my colleagues to have the opportunity to read the following excellent article from the Minneapolis Star of April 7, 1961:

ONLY THE UNITED STATES HAS POWER TO STOP REDS IN ASIA

(By Keyes Beech)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"If I were a Communist general I would be celebrating right now. Why wait?"

This statement, by a three-star Western general, underlines something of more than passing interest—the Communists are rapidly taking over southeast Asia.

The United States, and only the United States, has the power and prestige to stop them.

Whether the United States, or more specifically the Kennedy administration, is willing to take the risks and pay the price is the key to whether the Communists succeed or fail.

For it seems clear that the United States must commit American troops to check Communist ambitions in this part of the world. Whether the Americans will have to fight depends on the Communist response.

But they must be prepared to fight. The time for bluff is past. The most potent weapon in the Red arsenal today is Western fear of war, even a limited war.

The thought of American boys slogging through the jungles of southeast Asia and dying for places with names like Sala, Phou Khoum, Ding Dong or Binh Hoa is far from agreeable to a peace-loving and affluent society.

But it's a project, if not yet a reality, that must be faced. If it comes to that, Americans will not fight alone.

Thailand will fight. It's generally forgotten now but Thai soldiers died on Pork Chop hill in Korea.

With Communist lapping at their borders in neighboring Laos and their very survival threatened, the Thais have all the more reason to fight again.

The South Vietnamese would fight. They are fighting right now less than 30 miles from the air-conditioned hotel where this is written.

The Philippines will fight.

The Laotians won't fight but they might if they knew the Americans were willing to fight alongside them.

Britain, although London denies it, has pledged a brigade if the worst comes to the worst.

Australia will fight because its own security is at stake.

Massive intervention on the Korean scale isn't considered necessary at present by qualified military men. It might come later. That would depend on Communist response.

However, a landing of battalion or regimental size combat units in northeastern Thailand, near the Laotian border, might give the Communists cause for reflection.

There are obvious hazards to this sort of operation, not all of them military.

Screams of "American imperialism" would reverberate through the Communist world. They already reverberate.

A bold, determined American stand—backed up by American troops as well as arms—might conceivably reverse the tide in southeast Asia.

Burma has necessarily made its peace with Red China because it must get along with China the way Finland gets along with Russia.

Roughly the same thing can be said of neutralist Cambodia.

Cambodia's shrewd Prince Sihanouk made his peace with Peiping because he believes the Chinese will ultimately dominate, if not occupy all of southeast Asia.

A stiff American stand might cause him to change his mind.

Certainly nothing else worked.

The Russians and their puppets were notably unimpressed by the landing of a marine helicopter unit in Thailand.

Nor did they recoil in terror from the paper missile hurled at them by the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization during its recent Bangkok conference.

Nor did they cringe with fear at all the tough talk relayed by the U.S. State Department through gullible correspondents, including this one.

Unless the Russians agreed to a cease-fire in Laos in 3 days, newsmen were told, the United States was going to move for immediate military intervention.

The Russians went blithely ahead with their airlift, refusing the United States even a crumb of satisfaction.

They agreed to a cease-fire in their own good time on their own terms—a 14-nation conference which will include Russia and Red China.

There isn't much time.

The Communists already own or control roughly half of Laos. Neighboring South Vietnam is being bled to death by Red subversion and warfare.

Whatever happens at the 14-nation conference, one thing seems reasonably certain. The Communists aren't going to give up what they have.

A neutral sovereign Laos, primly aloof from either side in the cold war, is fine in theory and dear to the hearts of the good-natured, peace-loving Lao.

But it won't work. When American officials talk about Austrian-type neutrality for Laos, they omit two vital factors: Laos isn't Austria and Lao aren't Austrians.

In the opinion of most competent observers, a neutral Laos will inevitably mean a Communist Laos.

With all or most of Laos in Communist hands, South Vietnam will be isolated from anti-Communist southeast Asia.

Neighboring neutralist Cambodia offers no comfort.

On the contrary, it shelters Communist guerrillas when things get too hot for them in South Vietnam.

With Communist cadres assured of free passage through Laos, it is difficult to see how South Vietnam can long stand under the battering it is already getting.

From this point, it's only a matter of time before Thailand begins to make its own arrangements with Red China.

Physician Cites Medicine's Challenges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, an address recently was printed in the Bulletin of the Academy of Medicine of Cleveland which was delivered by Robert A. Hingson, M.D., professor of anesthesia at the Western Reserve University School of Medicine, and director of anesthesia at the University Hospitals of Cleveland, Ohio.

This is an outstanding statement of the challenges facing medicine today, and under unanimous consent, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

CLEVELAND MEDICINE CHALLENGED BY OUR CITY, OUR COUNTRY, OUR CHANGING WORLD

The 2,300 physicians within the Cleveland Academy of Medicine, and the 1,300 dentists in the Cleveland Dental Society, have through the years rendered a service to the scores of thousands of our citizens in the metropolitan area and also through the city's outstanding clinics and hospitals to additional thousands referred for diagnosis and treatment from the entire Midwest. This service involves medical, obstetrical, surgical, and dental treatment of almost a million patients annually, of which almost 200,000 are for surgical operations, 40,000 obstetrical deliveries; several hundred thousand for medical, diagnostic, and dental problems. Of equal importance has been the application of preventive and public health medicine in millions of immunizations against poliomyelitis, the childhood diseases, and the fast disappearing contagious diseases. Outstanding among the medical accomplishments of the area has been the development of unexcelled facilities for the treatment of the chronic debilitating diseases of the aged in our world-renowned Highland View and Sunny Acres Hospitals.

Even though the U.S. Public Health Service Section on Vital Statistics has reported that for the Nation as a whole the Negro maternal mortality is 3.9 times that of the white, Cleveland with its 20 percent Negro population, from its largest general hospital, was able to report between the years 1954 through 1957, 5,000 consecutive deliveries of Negro mothers without a single maternal mortality from any cause during the hospital stay. Significantly, this occurred in a series of 12,000 births to mothers of all races without a death.

For the national and world community Cleveland's Western Reserve University trains approximately 100 medical school graduates and 80 dental school graduates annually. Its 30 hospitals provide advanced training for more than 1,000 interns and residents and research fellows. These physicians supply much of the required medical demands of Ohio's other cities and smaller communities and also those throughout the entire Nation. At least 20 physician graduates of Western Reserve University are serving as medical missionaries in many of the underprivileged countries of the world. Other scores of Cleveland citizens and graduates of other medical schools are serving in similar capacities. The Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing and other nurse training programs have sent hundreds of nurses to mission hospitals and to International Cooperative Administration projects in major capacities of responsibilities.

At the present time more than 500 physicians from other countries are completing advanced graduate training in Cleveland's hospitals and from them the scientific and technical advances of Cleveland medicine are being daily used around the world. In 1958 in Moulmein, Burma, our interdenominational medical mission survey team for Asia and Africa found 12 Cleveland doctors and nurses on duty in one city.

This type of dedicated medicine has been a major factor in expanding the longevity of the U.S. population to its all-time high of 70 years, and in making Cleveland one of the most efficient health centers and one of the healthiest cities of the world.

These are our resources—the safeguards of our city for its future.

NOW THE CRISIS

In these days, still under the shadows of the summit collapse, at the time when the world's eyes too frequently focus on the "ugly American," Cleveland medicine has an opportunity to strike a real blow for world betterment and world peace through medicine. This is in complete accord with former President Eisenhower's people-to-people program, and President Kennedy's plan for using a professional youth army for world peace through service. Our Academy of Medicine has in action a committee to consider specifically what can be offered and delivered immediately in alleviating medical disasters, and perhaps through an alert forward-reaching program in preventing medical disaster.

This committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Robert A. Hingson, with Drs. Eugene Ferreri, Leon Dembo, and John Dingle, has at its fingertips the facts of two recent world medical surveys in Asia, Africa, and South America. It combines the abilities of both clinical and academic medicine in several fields. From its contacts in these areas it is able to develop recommendations for Academy approval, where requested, both con-

sultation and active direction in recruitment of supplies and personnel in international emergencies.

The committee believes that this assistance should be integrated properly through a nonsectarian, humanitarian plan in the highest American tradition, and offered as a part of an American Medical Association cooperative program with our State Department's consultation and channelled as indicated through the World Health Organization. The American Medical Association in its November 1960 Washington mid-year clinical meeting supported this view and is developing a foreign division for consultation and education. It furthermore approved the Oregon resolution to implement this program, under Dr. Frank Yoder, as follows:

"RESOLUTION 9

"Resolution by American Medical Association on emergency medical services to foreign mission fields

"Whereas the house of delegates of the American Medical Association at its 1959 clinical session declared itself to be in sympathy with resolution No. 9 introduced by the Oregon State Medical Society to help American physicians serving abroad in mission hospitals; and

"Whereas the past three presidents of the American Medical Association have recognized and made it a principle of their tenure of office to increase the influence of American medicine abroad; and

"Whereas the mission hospitals are established in every uncommitted country in the world; and

"Whereas they have established a good base in every country in which American medicine can work, even in the presence of political unrest; and

"Whereas the vacuum created in the Congo by the flight of 420 out of 441 physicians has created a desperate need for medical care; and

"Whereas our mission physicians in the Congo have developed plans for using the services of volunteer physicians to meet this need; and

"Whereas we believe that there are American physicians who would be willing to volunteer for such service; therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Medical Association shall immediately investigate the feasibility of developing a mechanism whereby members of the association may serve in the foreign mission fields on a temporary basis when emergencies arise and shall then seek volunteer physicians to serve in such capacities."

One example of such a need was transmitted to the committee from Dr. Glen Tuttle, director of an international pioneer project in the new nation of the Congo. Dr. Tuttle indicates that as many as 200 volunteer doctors are needed immediately. Since the withdrawal of the Belgian doctors who had just completed last year the splendid buildings for a modern medical school, a standard equipped 200-bed tuberculosis hospital, and a general hospital of major proportions with 15,000 obstetrical deliveries each year. The latter ranks as the world's fifth largest. Significantly when our medical survey team held a clinic there in 1958, there were 12 Cleveland-made incubators in the pediatric nursery. Modern X-ray equipment, laboratory facilities and huge modern diet kitchens and tremendous wards were observed by us. Now the entire medical staff has left en masse, leaving almost only the outer shell of a university medical school temporarily in the hands of Dr. Tuttle, from Minnesota, who had to leave his own tremendous medical mission center 160 miles away at Kimpese in the hands of assistant doctors (practical nurse technicans). In 1 day last month these workers performed two cesarean sections in lifesaving emergencies.

Already the Cleveland Academy has through this committee distributed 6,000 syringes and 12,000 needles from the 1958 polio program to Dr. Tom Dooley and Medico, to the Congo, Nigeria, Korea and Burmese interdenominational missions.

The auxiliary of the academy with Dr. Hingson collected and distributed to oversea missions 600 pounds of drugs and medical instruments in 1959.

The Negro physicians of Cleveland and their wives provide Dr. Hingson with 200 medical texts, already received and in use in an interdenominational center in the Congo.

There are three influential and most significant groups in our population who could without challenge or obstruction negotiate the majority of these steps now because they speak the universal language in which people in all countries are in universal agreement. These groups are: (1) Our physicians, (2) our educators, and (3) our women. They are capable of supplying man's most basic needs through improving his health, education of his mind, and maintenance of his inner security and nutrition in his home.

First, let us look at the Nation's doctors: More than 240,000 of them, representing in America's 6 percent of the world's population more than 20 percent of the world's physicians. They are banded together in more than 1,800 county medical societies and through their efforts have extended our health and longevity for the first time to 3 score years and 10 in our most recent estimate from the Bureau of Vital Statistics of the U.S. Public Health Service. This is a striking achievement, in startling contrast to the average longevity of 29.3 years in the nation of Burma; 27 years in Korea; and 22 years in the villages of central Africa. Our doctors through their medical societies at the county, State, regional and national levels within the framework of the American Medical Association and the World Medical Association, and within the framework of each specialty, have a definite responsibility, a challenge and an opportunity toward the alleviation of the world's suffering and in making the most meaningful contribution toward world peace.

As a start, each local county medical and dental society (there are more than 100,000 dentists in the United States, constituting more than 30 percent of the world's total) could adopt one single medical mission or foreign national clinic or hospital and supply it with continuing provisions of medical texts, instruments, and drugs. The immensity of the task should not ensnarl us in the whirlpool of attempting too much through dispersion of our efforts too far, too soon. There are 2 billion people in Asia and Africa and South America, or more than 10 people in urgent need for every single person in the United States. The majority of these people are under the domination economically or politically of "enlightened" European powers. A tremendous and dangerous vacuum is developing with almost one-third of Negro Africa achieving independence this year. In these nations there is only an average of 1 physician for each 30,000; one dentist for each million; and less than 100 college graduates per country among the native population.

As America tackles the problem of the world in such projects as the Great White Fleet of mothball hospital ships privately manned, with the initial ship *Hope* already in Indonesia, in peoples' to peoples' programs, with Medico, with the foundations, and with denominational missions (even though each of these is important in the long-range ultimate objectives), there should be established first certain priorities and proving grounds and trial flights for reassessment and planning additional phases in the light of developing world events. These are just as necessary on the world scene as the steps in our space program have been in Cape Canaveral.

There is a developing resource within our medical profession capable of reinforcing any significant world health program. It is represented by our Flying Physicians' Association, in which there are already 3,500 physician pilots who own their own plane. These physicians have offered themselves to our Government and to the Red Cross for sudden national disasters and catastrophies from natural causes such as floods, fires, earthquakes and attendant epidemics, and in industrial blasts. From my own experience in the bush and jungles of Africa and from making a few flights with members of this association, I know that this association could be of inestimable value in ridding these developing countries of endemic diseases through mass inoculation programs and therapy excursions. For example, through cooperation exercises with such friendly nations as Liberia in West Africa, where English is understood throughout even the villages, as few as 40 volunteer flying physicians over this little country, no bigger than Ohio and with only a few more than a million citizens, could be freed from both smallpox and yaws by total inoculation and simultaneous penicillin injection at the village level, within a short 2-month period. Fortunately, already Liberia under President Tubman's leadership has constructed small and usable airfields in all parts of a little country whose natural resources of rubber and iron are contributing so much to the economic health of America. The needleless jet injector in its present form is capable of innoculating 1,000 people per hour per instrument. For 15 years I have tested this instrument in more than a quarter of a million injections against diphtheria, leprosy, tetanus, tuberculosis, typhoid, cholera, poliomyelitis, and influenza. With one physician assistant I inoculated 90,000 as only one part of our service in Asia and Africa.

Second, let us examine the field of education. At the present time there are more than 200 million children of school age who have never learned to read and write. In Liberia from the Secretary of Education we learned a new term "the functional illiterate," of the child who has been attending school for 5 years who is still unable to read or write. So inadequate has been the number of available teachers in this and many other countries that even where compulsory education is in effect there are insufficient teachers to do the job effectively. Most American teachers would be excluded from their profession in most countries by language barriers. However, there are thousands of capable teachers of retirement age in America who would be welcomed for short- and long-term assignments in the Philippines, Burma, British Africa, and Liberia, where English is the prevailing language in the schools. In the field of education, the greatest needs and the greatest opportunities I observed in the world to offset the Communist dynamic foreign Leadership University being developed and already in operation in Moscow for Asian and African nationals, who can attend tuition free, would be the development of two Government-supported universities and medical schools to offer educational scholarships for Asian, African, and South and Central American students.

One of these for Africa and Latin America should be built in San Juan, P.R., which is ideally situated as 1,000 miles nearer these areas than most of our American centers. The other, for Asia, should be erected in Honolulu, in a city and State long recognized for its wholesome and unprejudiced acceptance and assimilation of all races, with predominant proportions already familiar with the languages and customs of all these people. The ideal climate, the friend-

liness of the inhabitants, the economic and geographic advantages of these two welcome mats to continental America in such a field of host educational centers would become invaluable assets in a most needed area.

Finally, the third group of Americans with the largest numerical strength and with the greatest combined influence is 50 million women with the key to standards of living—the home. Stuart Cloete, the British journalist and novelist, declared by Time magazine to be the man "who probably knows more about black Africa than any other white man alive," has written in the African Giant: "The civilization of the women with the corollary that a civilized man must come from a civilized home. This is the key to all African progress." In other words Africa, regardless of medicine and missions and education, will remain backward and substantially savage as long as young Africa grows up at a savage mother's knee. Perhaps, it is the American women with the most sensitive outreach toward our neighbors. In the past 2 years I have addressed more than 250 groups of them in study and mission organizations. They know the stakes are high—that a political vacuum is developing and that the future of the developing countries must be bound to the West at the fireside of the home if it is not to pass into the hands of the Communist East.

Hospitalization for Alaskan and Hawaiian Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to speak of much needed veterans' legislation now pending in this body, which is couched in general terms, but which would have specific application to America's veterans living in Alaska and Hawaii. Since these veterans have come from all our States and fought for all of us, I seek the consideration and support of my colleagues for my bill, H.R. 2923.

This legislation, with regard to which I have already testified before the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, would allow the Veterans' Administrator to make contracts with private hospitals for the treatment of veterans with nonservice-connected disabilities, if said veterans reside in States not having a Veterans' Administration hospital or in States not having such facilities within 500 miles of their borders. In practical effect, this bill, if enacted, would apply only to the States of Alaska and Hawaii.

It is the purpose of this legislation to effectuate a simple and inexpensive solution to a defect in the Veterans' Administration program, having to do with Veterans' Administration facilities in Alaska and Hawaii.

Let us start with the fact that there is no Veterans' Administration hospital in Alaska and none in Hawaii, and there never has been. During the years when Alaska and Hawaii were territories, this situation was no problem because existing law—section 601(4) of title 38, United States Code—then authorized and still authorizes the Veterans' Administrator, among his other functions, to contract with private hospitals for the care of veterans with non-service-connected disabilities or ailments in a territory, commonwealth, or possession. Now that Alaska and Hawaii are States of the Union, however, the Veterans' Administration has lost its general authority to provide contract hospital care in Alaska and Hawaii in such cases.

Admittedly this authority so exercised by the Veterans' Administrator in a territory, commonwealth, or possession, and which he previously exercised in Alaska and Hawaii, is an exception to the general rule allowing hospital care for nonservice-connected disorders only in Veterans' Administration or other Federal hospitals on a beds available basis. The reason for the exception is stated in the Administrator's report on the legislation now before you, as follows:

Historically, the exception to permit hospital care in private facilities for war veterans with non-service-connected conditions in a territory or possession was based upon special considerations. These apparently included the factors of great distances from the mainland, difficulty in transferring patients to the States, and the relatively small volume of patient demand in the territories and possessions.

These words are well spoken and they apply to Alaska and Hawaii today as much as they did during the days of territoriality. Alaska and Hawaii are just as far away from the other States as they were then, transportation difficulties still persist, and the patient demand is too small to justify the great expense of constructing and operating a VA hospital in Alaska and one in Hawaii. Since neither Alaska nor Hawaii have sought VA hospitals, and are not about to become that kind of a burden on the General Treasury, I am offering and urging the simple, equitable, and comparatively inexpensive solution contained in my bill, H.R. 2923. I also point out that the savings in transportation which would be effected by my bill would constitute a substantial offset to the cost of hospital care in private local hospitals.

May I now speak of that portion of the Administrator's report which says:

We have beds allocated for VA beneficiaries in hospitals of the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In Hawaii beds are allocated for our use by the Defense Department in Tripler General Hospital. We believe that the needs in both Alaska and Hawaii are being met to a reasonable and proper extent by the use of these Government facilities.

This statement sounds good on its face, but does not work out in practice in Alaska. To be sure, there is a military hospital at Elmendorf Air Force Base near Anchorage and one at Fort Wainwright near Fairbanks, which meet the needs of the veterans in the rail belt.

The Health, Education, and Welfare Hospital at Anchorage plays little part in this picture because it duplicates the care available at the Elmendorf Air Force Base Hospital in the cases with which we are presently concerned. Since the rail belt is about midway between Ketchikan near the southeastern extremity of Alaska and the most westerly part, the problem still remains as to the greater part of the great area of Alaska. Veterans in Ketchikan and Juneau and other communities in southeastern Alaska are an average of about 1,000 miles from Anchorage at the southerly end of the rail belt and a like distance from Fairbanks at the northerly end. In other words, they are as far away from the hospitals on the rail belt as they are from the VA hospital at Portland, Oreg. Veterans at Nome are 500 miles from the rail belt and those of Bethel, Dillingham, and other places farther west a comparable distance, but with less frequent plane service. Right at hand in the communities I have named are good local hospitals where the lives of our veterans can be safeguarded instead of jeopardized by waiting for the next airplane departure, and then suffering the rigors of getting to the plane, aboard the plane, and disembarking therefrom in all kinds of weather.

Some of the private hospitals with which the Veterans Administration made contract arrangements during the days when Alaska was a territory are at such widely scattered locations as Ketchikan, Juneau, Sitka, Wrangell, Petersburg, Cordova, Glenallen, Anchorage, Seward, Kodiak, Palmer, Nome, and Fairbanks.

Because of the vastness of Alaska and its great distance from the nearest State, it is apparent to me that for the welfare of the veterans involved these cases arising in communities distant from the rail belt should be cared for locally in private local facilities. I also suggest that because of these great distances and transportation difficulties, Alaska can readily be distinguished as a State apart from the usual situation in the southerly 48 States, and that the Administrator may forget the fear he has expressed that this legislation, if enacted, might become a precedent for extending the idea to all the States. I sincerely urge that this legislation be considered on its merits.

To strengthen the statement which I made to the subcommittee, I submitted for the record of the hearings supporting documents which I recommend to your attention. These documents consist of a strong statement of Alaska's Governor, William A. Egan, an urgent joint resolution of the Alaska Legislature, detailed facts and figures provided by Ernest E. Lincoln, manager of the VA regional office at Juneau, and statements and telegrams from veterans' organizations throughout Alaska.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that Alaska's veterans, numbering approximately 15,000, who are so far away from VA hospital facilities but who did so much for America in times of national peril, will be granted the benefits which would be authorized by my bill.

Mrs. Nellie M. Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, my home city of Norwalk, Conn., suf-

fered a very great loss in the death of Mrs. Nellie Thomas, president and publisher of the Norwalk Hour. She was a lady of countless charities whom a grateful community will sorely miss. In tribute to her I should like to have the obituary and editorial on her that appeared in her paper, the Hour, printed in the RECORD:

MRS. NELLIE M. THOMAS

Norwalk today mourns a leader in philanthropy and the Norwalk Hour its owner, president, and publisher in the death this morning at the Norwalk Hospital of Mrs. Nellie M. Thomas.

Mrs. Thomas' death came as a terrific shock to the community. She had fallen at her home, 17 Berkeley Street, Wednesday and was admitted to the hospital Thursday with a fractured arm and hip.

Mrs. Thomas had directed the Norwalk Hour since the death of her husband, Edward J. Thomas in 1933 and under her guidance the Hour grew steadily and prospered.

Mrs. Thomas took an active interest in community projects and was a generous contributor to the Norwalk Hospital, churches, and scores of charitable projects. Only recently she made a substantial gift toward the furnishing of the recreation room in the new police building at Veterans Park. At the Norwalk Hospital there is a room called the Nellie M. Thomas Room, honoring her for her substantial contributions to the institution.

The host of Norwalkers and others who knew of Mrs. Thomas' philanthropic deeds sadly mourn her passing.

MRS. NELLIE M. THOMAS DIES—OWNER, PUBLISHER OF THE HOUR; ALSO WAS PRESIDENT OF NEWSPAPER; NOTED FOR HER PHILANTHROPIES; FUNERAL SERVICES TO BE HELD 11 A.M. MONDAY

Mrs. Nellie M. Thomas, owner, president and publisher of the Norwalk Hour, died suddenly at 9:30 this morning in Norwalk Hospital.

Mrs. Thomas was admitted to the hospital Thursday morning, after suffering a fall in her home Wednesday night in which she fractured a wrist and her hip. Mrs. Thomas resided at 17 Berkeley Street.

Mrs. Thomas, noted for her support of civic and church endeavors, had been directing the activities of the Hour Publishing Co. since the death of her husband, Edward J. Thomas, in 1933.

AIDED MANY CHARITIES

After the death of her husband, who purchased the Hour in 1901, Mrs. Thomas took over direction of the newspaper. Mrs. Thomas' brother, the late Charles E. Kellogg, joined the newspaper in that year as a bookkeeper.

He served in several capacities with the paper, advancing to advertising manager and later general manager. As general manager, he carried out the operation of the paper under his sister's direction after the death of Mr. Thomas. When Mr. Kellogg died, Sidney A. Bedient, then managing editor, was named editor and general manager by Mrs. Thomas.

Mrs. Thomas took a keen interest in many community activities. Although many charities were the beneficiaries of her generosity, she was particularly interested in the benevolent funds of the police and fire departments, and recently aided in a financial campaign to furnish the dayroom in the new police building at Veterans Park.

Her interest in the two municipal departments was stimulated by her late brother's activities as a fire commissioner and later as police commissioner.

For many years, her support was vital to the success of the kiddies' Christmas party for the benefit of the city's less fortunate children.

A member of Norwalk Methodist Church, to which she gave substantial support, Mrs. Thomas also was generous in her assistance to other churches in the community, regardless of faith.

The Nellie May Thomas room in the new community pavilion at Norwalk Hospital stands as a reminder of her unflagging support to that institution.

Mrs. Thomas is survived by a niece, Mrs. Marjorie Kellogg Mather, a grandniece, Mrs. Donald Sala, the former Melinda Kellogg Mather; a great grandnephew, Mark Mather Sala, and two cousins, Miss Beatrice Hunt, who lived with her in Berkeley Street, and Mrs. Lou Strauss, of Long Island.

Mrs. Thomas was the daughter of the late Martin and Jennie Pooley Kellogg. Her father was Norwalk's street commissioner.

Funeral services will be held at 11 a.m. Monday in the Norwalk Methodist Church, with Rev. Barton Boyce, pastor, officiating. Interment will take place in Norwalk Cemetery, Union Avenue. Friends may call at the Raymond Funeral Home, 5 East Wall Street, Sunday, from 3 to 5 p.m. and 7 to 9 p.m.

The Russian Beachhead in Berkeley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lucius Beebe which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle of April 3, 1961:

THIS WILD WEST: THE RUSSIAN BEACHHEAD IN BERKELEY

(By Lucius Beebe)

A good deal of comment has been accorded in recent weeks to the uncommonly handsome issue that Holiday magazine devoted to San Francisco, and to the fidelity of its overall picture to the image San Franciscans like to believe the city projects. Seldom has such an ornately framed and flattering mirror been held up for a community's self-admiration, which is a very abundant quality indeed around the Golden Gate. That Holiday may have painted so rhapsodic a picture as to oversell the town is a hypothesis that can be pretty well discounted. As the late Arthur Brisbane used to say, "repetition is reputation."

Quite aside from its joyous impact on San Francisco itself, this is even more of a promotional triumph if it is widely accepted as the veritable likeness of San Francisco and northern California generally, for, whether or not folk hearabouts realize it, the nationwide image of San Francisco isn't as favorable and gracious as it might be.

In an age of rapid communications and detailed news analysis of matters that a few years back would have been strictly parochial, San Francisco in recent years has acquired a celebrity that is quite as unwholesome as that of Little Rock, albeit of a different sort.

Its reputation outside of the West is that of a nest of subversionists, pacifists, defeatist whiners and Communist fellow travelers. It has the name of being a haven for crackpots and agitators of every hue and complexion and a sounding board for every degree of defeatism, treason, and Red-petting. Its universities have a name as campus cells for the expression of Russian ideologies and its press and some of its legal practice as apologists for Communist tendencies under the tiresome and by now putrescent banner of liberalism.

The rest of the country knows, even if self-satisfied San Francisco does not, that open hostility to the House Un-American Activities Committee, and the activities of liberal subversionists, influential publicists whimpering over atomic annihilation, and self-styled legal luminaries championing everything Russian, are not just playing along with the enemy. They are devised and implemented by the enemy. Liberalism has long since in the United States ceased to mean anything but active treason. The Russians took it over long ago.

This unfavorable image of San Francisco had its inception back in the thirties and if San Franciscans are prone to forget the general strike of that period and condone Harry Bridges as a tame Communist, the rest of the country doesn't go along with it. The Chessman business, which through the chemistry of subversion somehow turned from a case of legal jurisprudence into a liberal cause with anti-American demonstrations in places that had no least imaginable concern with the matter, marked the image still further.

Chessman's advocates and supporters locally were recruited from one of three categories—professional exhibitionists, professional crackpots, and professional subversionist agitators, with the latter predominating. So far as the rest of the United States is concerned the Chessman agitation was simply additional proof of the overall Red infiltration of the California consciousness. It wasn't his crime, but his friends that made his elimination mandatory.

The current tendency of completely irresponsible publicists to condone the recent Communist-led, Communist-organized, and Communist-conducted riots at city hall and to disparage the official films documenting them as such doesn't speak well for the San Francisco press.

Neither does the much-publicized stand of the president of the University of California permitting the appearance on his campus at Berkeley of a well-identified Communist agitator sit well with what remains of the responsible element in the California community or with the country at large. It's all very well to invoke the memory of President Lowell of Harvard in retaining German in his curriculum in 1916. Harvard and President Lowell enjoyed a secure position in the community not shared by President Kerr or the University of California.

These are elements in the San Francisco image outside of San Francisco that don't jibe with the stately pleasure dome devoted to the abundant humanities depicted by Holiday's word painters. There is a fairly widespread belief that behind its affluent front San Francisco harbors a tainted core of ideological putrescence, a whited sepulcher with treason nesting in its vitals. Fellow traveler college presidents, student subversives, and the American Civil Liberties Union do not, in any realistic appraisal, add up to the Augustan Age of music, fine art, bountiful gastronomy, and suburban splendor that San Francisco likes to imagine for itself.

As the multiple crises of Russian devising build up to the inevitable open conflict that Russia wants, these people and attitudes must be identified for what they are: Subversives, Communists, defeatists, and the enemy. The University of California campus, as long as President Kerr traffics in fraudulent "liberalism," is as much an outpost of Russian aggression as Laos or the Congo. So is the Governor's mansion in

Sacramento. There is no room in the world any more for the obsolete thesis of "liberalism." You are on the side of civilization or on the side of Russia, and the Russians long ago made what may once have passed for "liberalism" part of the apparatus of world conquest.

Federal Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, there are many ramifications to the problem of Federal controls. The problem raises many questions. Should there be more control? Or, should there be fewer controls by the Federal Government in its relationship with the various States? These are questions that are difficult to answer. In my own mind, I feel that the Federal Government should operate with as few controls as possible.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include an editorial that was published April 1, 1961, in the Port Angeles Evening News, entitled "Fund Control." This newspaper is published daily at Port Angeles, Wash., in my district and often presents editorials that give new outlooks to old problems. I believe this editorial is worth reading and presents a conclusion that deserves study.

FUND CONTROL

Important examples are turning up which indicate that the various States have recently been more successful than some of us realize in resisting Federal control in aid programs.

A prime instance is the interstate highway program, where the States put up 10 percent or less of the money but dispense 100 percent of it.

Some veteran observers of U.S.-State relations see this as an open invitation to carelessness, if not deliberate waste and corruption. Inquiries by a congressional group and others found exactly this, on an astonishing scale.

Fear is now being expressed in some quarters that another big door may be opened to trouble if the aid to education program retains its present control features. As drafted, it gives the States the option whether to spend aid money on school construction or teachers' salaries.

Since school buildings are more enduring monuments to the particular State governments involved, the feeling is that many will succumb to the temptation to weight construction heavily, even though salary needs may be acute.

On top of that, they will be subject to the same sort of pressures from potential political contributors that appear to have brought scandal to the highway program. The bright chance for private gain is thoroughly clear.

The whole issue is delicate. The danger of the Federal Government overstepping reasonable bounds of authority is always present. But knowledgeable men in the intergovernmental field believe that lawmakers and Federal officials in recent years have leaned too far backward in an effort to avoid this peril.

One experienced official, whose sensitive position limits him to private comment, thinks it is always a grave mistake to dispense large sums of Federal money with loose strings on it. He believes that control and responsible use of funds go together.

Where State resources do not permit a matching of U.S. funds, as in the interstate highway program, this theory inevitably leads to a larger Federal say in matters.

But in this official's view this need not be destructive of State rights and interests. He believes experience shows that the technicians who carry out these joint programs work in a cooperative spirit respectful of both U.S. and State concerns.

The question deserves a fresh review. For it seems obvious we must somehow find a narrow path between too much Federal control and too little.

Automakers' Switch of Car Window Glass Touches Off a Feud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, during hearings recently before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on my bill, H.R. 1341, testimony was given relative to the type of glass used in automobile windows.

An article of interest on this subject appeared in the Wall Street Journal recently, and under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 7, 1961]

AUTOMAKERS' SWITCH OF CAR WINDOW GLASS TOUCHES OFF A FEUD—GLASS DEALERS CONTEND NEW CHEAPER GLASS IS UNSAFE; AUTOMEN DENY THE CHARGE

(By Jack Hanicke)

DETROIT.—Harry A. Pratt, a 170-pounder, suspends a square-foot sheet of automobile glass between two boards, steps on it and jumps up and down—without effect on the glass.

Stepping off, he picks up the glass and strikes it with a sharp steel punch. It shatters completely into small fragments—leaving several small cuts in the palm of his hand.

Mr. Pratt, sales manager of the Glass Division of Shatterproof Glass Corp., a Detroit manufacturer of replacement auto glass, is trying to prove a point: That the type of glass that goes into the side windows of nearly all new automobiles is unsafe. This charge is hotly denied by the carmakers.

THE BIG SWITCH

Until recently, laminated safety glass, made by sandwiching a plastic sheet between two plates of glass, was used in most car windows. The plastic is used as a binder to prevent shattering. However, for their 1961 models, all car makes except Cadillac have adopted solid tempered, or hardened, safety glass in car side windows although they continue to use laminated glass in windshields.

The tempered glass now being substituted is akin to that used in the heavy, frameless all-glass doors used in many stores and offices. Typically, such glass is formed into the desired shape and then hardened by first subjecting it to heat and then to a blast of cold air. This gives the glass an extremely hard surface, much as in metals that are case hardened. It also has tremendous strength against blows from dull objects.

But such glass also has the characteristic of breaking up into small pebble-sized pieces, once the hard surface has been penetrated. The pieces either remain in place, making the glass opaque, or fly out with considerable force. Automakers claim these small pieces do not have sharp edges and are less dangerous than the large chunks into which laminated safety glass divides when it is broken.

This is disputed by companies such as Shatterproof and trade groups such as the National Auto and Flat Glass Dealers' Association, which represents many of the Nation's 10,000 glass dealers. In addition to tempered glass' alleged greater vulnerability to flying stones, they say this glass' toughness against blunt objects greatly increases the danger of head injuries to auto passengers and makes escape difficult for them if they are trapped in a car.

A WIDENING CONTROVERSY

The clash between the automakers and glass dealers is rapidly widening to include Congress, State legislatures, labor unions and a large number of trade associations. Here are some of the developments so far:

Bills that would ban tempered glass in side windows have been introduced in a number of State legislatures. The States include California, Kansas, Massachusetts, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Washington.

A congressional committee is pondering a proposal that automakers be required to use laminated glass in side windows. The proposal is part of an overall auto safety bill that has been under consideration for some time, and also is included in a bill setting up safety requirements for cars purchased by the Federal Government.

The American Standards Association, which serves as a clearinghouse for many industries and Government agences by establishing uniform national—and industry-wide—standards that guide both manufacturers and lawmakers, in currently reviewing its code on automobile glass. Sighs Cyril Ainsworth, its secretary, "There is a tremendous controversy going on."

The switch to tempered glass was made by the auto manufacturers with little of the fanfare that usually accompanies such changes. Chrysler Corp. was the first to use tempered glass on all side windows of all cars; the change was made on its 1958 models. American Motors Corp. made the change a little later. Ford Motor Co. and General Motors Corp., however, did not use tempered glass extensively until the introduction of their 1960 compact models. By the time the 1961 models were introduced, however, all major U.S. makes, except Cadillac, had made the switch.

The automen claim both types of safety glass, while having different characteristics, are equally safe. They also claim tempered glass gives more mileage to auto owners because of its greater hardness. This is disputed by critics who insist that tempered glass loses much of its strength with aging.

Automakers don't deny that one of the main advantages of tempered glass is its lower cost. According to one estimate, tempered safety glass is between 10 cents and 15 cents a square foot cheaper than laminated safety glass. This means a minimum manufacturer's saving of about $1.50 a car. This is a sizable saving when spread over the millions of cars built in the United States each year.

The economics of the change can have a major impact on the profits of glass dealers, who supply replacement windows for autos. Laminated glass side windows can be cut from standard sized sheets according to easily stored patterns. But tempered glass must be formed before it is heat treated. Dealers fear that within a few years they will have to stock different sizes for each year and make of car, much as they do windshields now. At present, most tempered glass win-

dows can still be replaced with laminated, but dealers say automakers are beginning to attach parts, such as lock devices, directly to holes drilled in the glass before it is treated. Laminated glass cannot be used to replace such windows.

Suppliers to auto and glass companies also have an interest. Monsanto Chemical Co., a major producer of the plastic used in laminated glass, has made a movie showing what it considers the advantage of laminated glass. Du Pont, another maker of the plastic, also has published studies on the merits of this glass.

Major glassmakers, caught in the middle of the squabble, have been largely silent. However, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co. has announced it will lay off more than 1,000 workers in Toledo, partly because of the switch to the automakers' glass preferences. In its 1960 annual report, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co. blamed lower sales in part on the growing use of the cheaper glass.

American Bourbon Whisky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the following article:

At a time when few international meetings result in accord and agreement, I should like to bring to your attention an occasion when representatives of Old World nations paid their respects to a tradition of the New.

At the annual meeting of the Federation Internationale des Vins et Spiriteux in Paris, this distinguished body of recognized authorities of wines and spirits gave international testimonial to a tradition as old as our country's Constitution—American Bourbon whisky.

In adopting a resolution proposed by the Bourbon Institute, representatives from 14 European nations granted the "Appelation d'Origine" to this historic American spirit. The name "Bourbon" can be applied only to whisky produced in the United States under U.S. Government standards.

Unfortunately, there have been several attempts by foreign concerns to apply the name to certain spirits produced abroad in hopes of marketing them here and capitalizing on Bourbon's trademark. The agreement binds members of the federation to assist the Bourbon Institute in protecting the name of "Bourbon," should the institute take legal action against overseas distillers who would attempt to thus mislabel their products.

The resolution should dissuade any firm from attempting to deceive that most abused figure—the American consumer.

We live in an era when international travel and trade restrictions are subjects of great concern. In this instance, however, the American traveler has been afforded protection. During his visits to European nations requests for Bourbon will be answered through service of the same whisky he consumes at home.

As a Representative of the State of Kentucky, which has given this product to the world, I note that the official body of the great wine and spirit houses of Europe has given Bourbon whisky the same recognition accorded to the Scotch whisky of the United Kingdom.

I should like to commend the Bourbon Institute and its president, Vice Adm. William J. Marshall, U.S. Navy (retired), a native of Henderson, Ky., for taking the lead in establishing this international protection for American distillers. As the representative member from the United States, the Bourbon Institute is the spokesman for the American distilling industry in the Federation Internationale.

By proposing the resolution and pressing for its adoption, the Bourbon Institute proved that a responsible presentation of evidence can still result in agreement among the international trade community.

The Federal Excise Tax on Jewelry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is a resolution passed by the Kansas Retail Jewelers Association in convention on March 18 and 19, 1961, in Wichita, Kans. I commend this resolution to the attention of all Members of Congress.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the 180 members of the Kansas Retail Jewelers Association request that the Federal excise tax on jewelry be transferred from the retail to the manufacturers' level in order that they may eliminate the unfair competition and discrimination against the products they must sell to sustain a livelihood.

Whereas there is a definite relationship between those taxed products which the jeweler sells, competing with other items sold as gifts in substantial quantities which are untaxed, and taxed at the manufacturers' level. These items, therefore, discriminate against the jeweler. This tax acts as a deterrent to sales. The effect of the increase of the cost of the taxed article to the consumer, acts as a brake on sales. This was, in fact, the original purpose of the tax. That is, it was intended to cut down the sales of certain items in a wartime economy. The need to curtail sales has long passed—the present need is for more production and consumption to fit the needs and to expand our economy. This tax acts in exactly the opposite way.

This tax is difficult and costly to administer. Not only is a hardship placed upon the small retail jeweler who ordinarily does not have a complete accounting department to calculate, collect, and remit this tax on behalf of the Government; but it is extremely costly for the Government to administer this tax since there are so many outlets from which this tax must be collected. Manufacturers ordinarily have complete bookkeeping departments to calculate, collect, and remit. Therefore, transferring this tax to the manufacturer's level would not only grant relief to the small jeweler, but would also simplify collection on the Government's behalf because of the relatively small number of retailers and so-called wholesale retailers from which this tax is collected. Therefore, this would not only reduce the costs substantially, by saving the Government money administering the tax, but would plug many loopholes on the literally thousands of items where the tax status is doubtful, and the collection of the tax often has led to arbitrary practices. This would also increase revenues by plugging the loopholes in tax collection by taxing the article at its source—the manufacturer's level, thereby eliminating many items sold through certain outlets, etc., on which the tax is overlooked: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Retail Jewelers Association and its 180 members respectfully request and urge the Honorable Congress of the United States of America to take immediate action toward transferring this 10-percent Federal excise tax on jewelry at the retail level to a 10-percent Federal excise tax at the manufacturer's level thereby:

1. Eliminating unfair and discriminatory competition.

2. Removing sales deterrents placed in wartime for the duration and 6 months, to discourage sales of jewelry; thus fulfilling a need for more production by encouraging consumption, providing a much-needed expansion and employment in our economy.

3. Lowering administrative costs to the Government, giving needed savings of tax dollars.

4. Removing loopholes to increase revenues by taxing the article at its source.

5. Relieving the hardships placed on the small businessman by removing from him the responsibility of calculating, collecting, and remitting this burdensome tax.

Time Saved for What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the caption given these remarks has been taken from an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Bulletin on April 7, 1961, and poses a question that has always inrtigued me; namely, "What use are we making of all the leisure time we are supposed to accumulate through a shortened workweek and the supersonic speeds that are now being reached in air travel?"

The editorial properly underscores, in my opinion, some skepticism as to just what real benefits will accrue to humanity from the exploration of outer space, save perhaps the satisfying of our curiosity. But the real issue raised by the editorial cneters in, Just what do we plan to do with all of the time we will have saved when it becomes possible to span the continent in an hour and a quarter or perhaps circumnavigate the globe in half a day?

We are told that aerial transportation has shrunk the world to half its original size and all I can do is to plaintively ask, "And in what way has that benefited humanity or improved international relations?" As a matter of fact the closer we come in hours to our global neighbors the more our friendship worsens, and we have largely ignored the old axiom that "strong fences make good neighbors" with the result that we are increasingly getting into each other's hair.

In my opinion we would be a happier people if we were all back on the 44-hour week which is routine for most Congressmen. And most of my congressional colleagues would be a lot happier and live a lot longer if their districts were not so readily accessible via the airplane. In the old days of rail travel, which is still my favorite mode of transportation, the home folks in the districts remote

from Washington did not expect to see their Representative until the Congress had adjourned, whereas now they expect him to return for each clambake regardless of the fact that it means neglecting his strictly legislative duties, to say nothing of the out-of-pocket cost of his airplane fare. Instead, from that standpoint most Congressmen would be doing a better job and saving a bit more out of their annual stipend if the Wright brothers on the day that they invented the airplane had simply "stood in bed."

Too much spare time, too much saved time, too many opportunities to get into trouble and spend money we do not have. Instead of increased speed, instead of engines with greater thrust, instead of missiles with greater reach, what is needed is increased attention to the braking system, the development of measures that will slow us down. Life can be beautiful if we will only take time to look at it. But assuredly we cannot appreciate nature or our own capacity for brotherly love if we continue to hurtle through space at 2,000 miles an hour.

The article that prompted this outpouring is appended to and made a part of these remarks and I hope that you will agree with me that the writer makes a lot of sense.

The editorial follows:

TIME SAVED FOR WHAT?

Scientific curiosity motivates plans to investigate the Moon, Mars and other occupants of limitless space. But what is the urge behind plans to build a plane that can fly between New York and Los Angeles in 76 minutes, with corresponding schedules to foreign airfields?

When man is able to travel at 3½ times the speed of sound—the objective of planning due for fruition by 1970—what is he going to do with the time saved? Is it really so desirable—for other than military objectives—to knit the world's centers of population still closer together? Recent years have disappointed many hopes that closer contact would bring greater understanding.

We are no better off in our relations with other countries than we were when, by the clock, they were much more distant. To point this out is not to decry the merits and gains of present-day air travel. But is there to be no limit?

If time saved were sure to be put to productive uses we could justify our yearning for speed, speed, and more speed. But will it be? What does the officeworker-commuter do with the few seconds saved by standing up in the aisle of his suburban car long before it reaches the station, so as to be among the first off the train? Do we not save time largely to waste it?

The Peace Lobby and the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in the court of world opinion American disarmament proposals often have seemed to pall when compared to Russia's.

Jerome Spingarn, in a recent article appearing in the Washington Post, has astutely pointed out that this has important implications both for our Government and the American peace movement.

Disarmament is certainly one of the vital issues of our time, and this well-balanced analysis of one important aspect of this problem deserves the attention and consideration of my colleagues.

A new U.S. Disarmament Administration is now functioning in the State Department, John McCloy is serving as the President's disarmament adviser, and in the Pentagon an elaborate pattern of offices deals with disarmament for each of these segments of the Defense Establishment.

Concomitant with this growth of governmental competence has been a parallel growth of concern with the disarmament problem in private centers and graduate schools of international affairs.

What does all this activity mean? Is the rose of arms control about to be plucked from the thistle of H-bombs?

It would be rash to predict this, but it is clear that defense, peacekeeping, and the leashing of armaments are receiving more serious and more sustained attention here in the United States than they have ever received anywhere before.

Jules Moch wrote the famous Anglo-French disarmament proposal (which Nobel Prizewinner Philip Noel-Baker characterizes as the great "moment of hope" in the search for peace and disarmament) in a London hotel in one evening in 1954. It was still a collection of jottings on hotel stationery when it was passed around a breakfast table and received French Cabinet approval.

The Quai d'Orsay has been content to give Jules Moch wide powers because "he makes beautiful music." The Kremlin apparently feels the same way about Nikita Khrushchev. And music—the appeal to the minds of men—has always been a very important aspect of arms control proposals.

The chances are that a highly organized, well-staffed (American) program will not make good music, which is almost always a matter of individual, rather than staff, effort. The products of the new and highly organized effort may seem uninspired and overintellectualized. But they will be more carefully designed to serve the common needs of competing nations.

The disturbing factor in the present picture is the fact that there is no evidence whatever of parallel activity in the Soviet Union.

They refuse, even in off-the-record conversation, to talk in realistic terms about existing weapons systems, about the specifics of warning and detection systems, and about initial measures to frustrate surprise attack. They feign horror when it is proposed candidly to discuss evasion techniques.

The Americans, on the other hand, discuss gory details quite openly. Just as medical students, who are devoted to a life of healing, traditionally indulge in a gay and macabre humor, so arms control strategists use military jargon in a clinical manner which often disguises their genuine zeal for peace.

The public, unfortunately, does not always see this as candor versus deviousness. Too often it just sees nice Russians speaking about brotherly love and sunlight, while Americans talk about sneak attacks, thermonuclear destruction, military strategy, and clandestine tests in dark caves.

The result is that thousands of well-meaning people demonstrate for unilateral disarmament in England and many Americans, in churches, in universities, and elsewhere, while mistrustful of the Soviets, believe that the Soviet complete disarmament proposal is sound and honest. They demand policies that reflect Western hopes for the perfectability of man. And they denounce as bloodthirsty ogres those who try to make an objective analysis of thermonuclear strategy.

When the Kremlin can get so much mileage on a vague and superficial proposal for complete and general disarmament, it feels little pressure to come to grips with Western first-step proposals for inspection or for surprise attack prevention. Why should they bother?

There is a lesson in this for the American peace movement, and there is also one in it for the American Government. The peace movement must remain aware of the fact that the Russians are an indispensable party to arms control, and that it is just as important to place pressure on the Kremlin as on Western governments, more important, in fact, because there are no local peace movements to do the job in Russia.

For the new administration there is also a lesson in the need to season highly technical and intellectualized proposals with an appeal to deeper aspirations.

We will know that we have turned the corner when the Soviets begin to talk more candidly about the modern weapons that must be controlled, and when disarmament talks are moved out of conferences where there is no temptation to grandstanding.

Dollar Devaluation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, some time ago, an abortive gold speculation on the London market did not worry some of us much for what it actually was, but for what it indicated. It could not have helped but reflect a questioning of confidence in the dollar. It resulted in a rash demand for devaluation of the dollar by marking up the price of gold. We were happy that the administration stood firm and the threat evaporated.

However, recent events have rather shocked us into an appreciation of the seriousness of the situation regarding confidence in the dollar. We had been accustomed to believe that evaluation is a matter that we ourselves could control. The marking up of the German mark, vis-a-vis the dollar, and the probability of the readjustment of the Dutch guilder and, perhaps, the Swiss franc and others in dollar revaluation rather startles us.

To be learned again is the lesson of fiscal responsibility and fiscal sanity. Thereby, and only thereby, can we retain the confidence of the other 47 nations—those are pegged to the dollar which means to the price of gold. For as long as we remain firm on the price of gold, so long will the dollar be the measure of the value of world currencies. A most interesting article by J. H. Kelleghan appeared in Money Trends the financial bulletin published by Money Research Associates of Chicago which by unanimous consent is inserted herewith:

THE DOLLAR PROBLEM THAT WON'T SHOO AWAY

(By J. H. Kelleghan)

The new administration in Washington, like the one it succeeded, refuses to face up to the realities of the persistent dollar problem. Like the dog that followed the little

boy to school, it just won't shoo away. The dog's name, by the way, is Dollar Devaluation.

President Kennedy and his financial advisers have been throwing sticks and stones at the little beast, insisting that the doggy dollar problem really isn't as bad as it looks, but the pesky animal simply retreated a respectful distance waiting to continue its pursuit when the administration turned to other problems.

Hence, it was not a little startling when the canine turned up in West Germany and was firmly tied up there.

The dollar problem which Washington chose more or less to ignore, was not treated so casually in Europe. When West Germany and Holland raised the par value of their respective currencies in relation to gold and the dollar, they officially recognized the devaluation that has taken place in the dollar in relation to the mark and the guilder.

It now takes only 400 marks to buy 100 U.S. dollars, whereas it previously required 420 marks, a devaluation of the dollar amounting to 20 marks per $100. This, moreover, represents a permanent change in the "parity" value of the mark in relation to the dollar, recognized by the International Monetary Fund. A similarly permanent devaluation of the dollar in relation to the guilder has been established by Holland. In fact, most of the European currencies, except the British pound sterling, are showing strength against the dollar, indicating that there may be further currency "revaluations."

Apparently most of us Americans are still under the impression that dollar devaluation must take place as it did in the past with a reduction of the gold content of the dollar. Actually, we now have to look for evidence of dollar devaluation in the relative values of foreign currencies with respect to the dollar.

What we Americans have failed to realize is that the postwar arrangements entered into with other nations through the International Monetary Fund have completely altered the nature of dollar devaluation. It is no longer necessary or possible to accomplish devaluation by changing the gold content of the U.S. dollar. That is permanently fixed. Devaluation is now accomplished by altering the gold content of the currencies that are presently tied to the U.S. dollar, the only major currency in the world that remains freely convertible into gold at a fixed price.

Instead of having 48 free currencies, each tied independently to a free gold standard as in the past, we now have 47 nations tied into a planetary system of parity values around the U.S. dollar as the base and anchor. In this system the U.S. dollar is not free to change its base in any degree with respect to the other 47 nations, but these 47 nations are free to change their parity relationship with the U.S. dollar if they do it through the International Monetary Fund.

This is what has happened. The dollar is tied to a fixed gold price under international agreements and, therefore, its value is no longer free to fluctuate except in terms of other currencies. Foreign currencies, however, are free to fluctuate within stated boundaries with respect to the dollar (1 percent upon or down from "parity"). Foreign nations may change this "parity" relationship to the dollar by clearing the change through the International Monetary Fund.

This all sounds quite complicated and, in fact, it is. Nevertheless this does not diminish its importance. We Americans on the whole have not paid much attention to the dollar shenanigans taking place outside the United States. The postwar monetary arrangements which this Nation entered into with the International Monetary Fund with the approval of Congress replaced the old arrangements completely. At the time, in 1945, it all seemed too complicated and remote to merit attention. Now we suddenly find that these new arrangements have an immediate bearing on the soundness of the U.S. dollar and therefore on our national welfare and can hardly be ignored any longer. We find the dollar being devalued in a way we do not understand and had never expected.

As a people we do not realize apparently that devaluation of the dollar is rarely a deliberate decision on the part of any monetary authority as it was in Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration. Such authorities do not deliberately adopt a course that is certain to downgrade a monetary medium. A debased dollar is the involuntary consequence of abuses of long standing. The monetary authorities officially recognize the fact and reality of dollar devaluation only when it has become so obvious it can no longer be denied. The U.S. dollar has already been devalued by excessive issues but the authorities are not yet being forced to acknowledge it.

So it has become apparent that if we Americans are going to save the U.S. dollar from ultimate ruinous devaluation we had better make up our minds to keep informed of what is going on.

It is difficult to describe the structure of the postwar world monetary arrangements in simple terms. The International Monetary Fund was set up to facilitate the rehabilitation of foreign currencies after the war and to provide the means of maintaining sound and stable currencies when restoration had been achieved.

The International Monetary Fund consists essentially of an agreement signed by 48 nations to establish a parity value for their currencies in terms of gold and dollars binding for their foreign exchange as well as their gold transactions. The U.S. dollar is the only one of the 48 currencies that is directly convertible into gold. The par values of the other currencies are expressed in terms of gold or in terms of the U.S. dollar and its fixed price in gold.

Foreign central banks are free to exchange their currencies into dollars which they can use to buy gold from the U.S. Treasury at its fixed price. The U.S. Treasury has agreed to sell or buy gold on demand from the other 47 nations. By the same token the 47 nations are required to buy dollars when the value of their currencies rise one percent over parity value in dollars or sell dollars when values decline one percent below parity value in dollars. The dollar is thus used as a leverage by other nations to raise or lower their currency prices in foreign exchange markets. Each nation, of course, acts separately and independently.

Operating within the narrow range of two points, this arrangement assumes an impregnably strong dollar and vulnerable foreign currencies. Hence, it is easy to imagine the consternation of the world's money managers when the gold price of the dollar began to fluctuate wildly on the free London gold market. It was immediately attributed to the work of nasty old speculators, but the evidence of dollar weakness was too strong and too sustained to give this smoke screen much substance.

The 48 central banks of the various nations each with its separate and complete banking system, are tied together through the International Monetary Fund to what has been called a gold exchange standard. This means that these 48 nations have returned to the gold standard but in a modified structural form. Gold for the most has been made captive by the central banks which use it as bank reserves. It is estimated that 90 percent of the world's gold is held by the central banks. The ordinary citizen is no longer able to use gold as a monetary medium. Actually gold does not sell at a genuinely free price. The price of gold has been fixed by one government and then another for more than a century and a half; first by the British and then by the United States. The gold price in the free market in London fluctuates only in terms of the fixed dollar price. The bank reserves of international Monetary Fund member nations may also include United States dollars and British pounds known as international reserve currencies.

Until the explosion of gold prices in the London market made the dollar's decline agonizingly clear, its steadily depreciating value was concealed by the huge dollar purchases in foreign exchange markets made by West Germany, Holland, Italy, and other nations.

A major part of these huge dollar acquisitions was converted into gold and accounted for most of the heavy loss of gold by the United States in 1959 and 1960. A central bank bearing the responsibility for the banking welfare of its nation could hardly be expected to retain large balances of a currency that is steadily depreciating in value.

When West Germany and Holland officially raised the parity value of their respective currencies with the International Monetary Fund, they simply gave official recognition to the fact of dollar devaluation in relation to their currencies.

Thus, the pesky canine is being released and may be expected to show up again in Washington soon to pursue its worried masters.

It Should Be the Morgan Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, John Tyler Morgan, of Alabama, spent several years of his life attempting to stir up interest in the need for a sea-level canal at Nicaragua.

The late Senator Morgan's proposal is as timely today as it was when he first presented it. Attesting to this is an editorial which appeared recently in the Anniston (Ala.) Star. Col. Harry M. Ayers, editor and publisher of the Star, has been a consistent promoter of the Nicaraguan route and his editorials cogently point out what such a canal could mean to this country.

The editorial follows:

[From the Anniston (Ala.) Star, Apr. 2, 1961]

IT SHOULD BE THE MORGAN CANAL

Ever since the late Walter E. Edge of New Jersey, noted as a businessman of acumen, as an editor and banker and Senator, plus Ambassador Extraordinary to France, wrote a series or articles in the Saturday Evening Post some 40 years ago in advocacy of another interoceanic canal, this paper has kept up the fight toward that end.

Senator Edge said that we might just as well have but one battleship on the high seas as to have but one canal. Sink the ship or sobatage the Panama Canal and we then would become more or less land-locked, and without the military and commercial value that the Panama Canal is and has been to us since 1914.

It is of interest to note, therefore, that the Kennedy administration has revived the issue of a new isthmian canal. And according to an informative article in the

March 28 issue of the Wall Street Journal, the President "is thinking of restaging a drama from the days of Teddy Roosevelt."

But as much as we admire the old Rough Rider as he is pictured to us in history, and as much as we needed a man of his courage and decisiveness during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, any new interoceanic canal should bear the name of John Tyler Morgan of Alabama.

But while it is true that Teddy brought to bear practically the entire U.S. Navy in order to force Colombia to release her claims on Panama and to sell her interests in the isthmus to the United States on our own terms, it was Morgan who led the fight in the Senate that made the Panama Canal possible.

Morgan did not favor Panama originally, as he fought for the Nicaraguan route and a sea-level canal. And in so doing he carried his point on the floor of the Senate four times in spite of the opposition of the railroads, the French interests, and so forth, and had to come to the rescue of the Panamanian group when they got bogged down over technicalities.

We might go further in the field of nomenclature, and state that but for the ability, courage, and pertinacity of three other Alabamians besides Morgan—General Gorgas and General Noble in the field of medicine, plus the engineering genius of General Sibert—there might not have been any canal at all.

Morgan had an encyclopedic mind, and it was after years of careful study that he saw the advantages of a sea-level canal, which would not only be safer, more economical and nearer to our coastline, but one that also would be of advantage to the whole United States, and to the entire civilized world.

The wisdom of that great Alabamian, highly acclaimed by Chauncey Depew, Henry Cabot Lodge and other great Senators who served with him in the Senate for many years, although of a different party, has been proved in many ways since his death; and it is nothing less than foolhardy that we have not followed his advice.

As to the necessity of another interoceanic waterway as advocated after Morgan's great battle, we have the example of Japan in getting England and France to cooperate during the Russo-Japanese War by the closing of Suez to the Russians, who then had to make the longest naval voyage in history, and thereby to meet with defeat by the Japanese fleet.

Moreover, still later history as to Suez should convince any doubting Thomases as to the inadvisability of having too many stockholders in any new international waterway that should be constructed. For our present experience with NATO shows how onetime friends will fall out when most needed.

A few years ago, President Figueres of Costa Rica wrote to this paper that he would be favorable to a contiguous sea-level canal, as did President LaGuardia of Nicaragua. But President Jiminez of Costa Rica is not so favorable. And we do not know just how much trouble Castro of Cuba has wrought in the last few years.

Panama, too, who is almost wholly dependent upon the Canal for her livelihood, has become infected with the Communist virus and she probably would be gobbled up by Colombia again if we should stop feeding her. Hence, it has been suggested that we give Panama the present canal in the event we should rebuilt elsewhere.

Be all this as it may, however, Gen. William E. Potter, who recently retired as director of our Panama operations, is quoted as saying that "the time is not only on us, but we're in a rush position as far as committing ourselves to building a sea-level canal is concerned."

According to information furnished this paper by Yale University experts, we are almost wholly dependent upon foreign countries for raw mineral material, most of which comes through the Panama Canal. And that which we get from Africa will hereafter become a doubtful product.

The canal originally cost $375 million, but it is not stated whether or not that included the cleaning up of the miasmic conditions then existing in Panama. It is now proposed to do the necessary blasting with nuclear charges, however, and it is believed that this can go so far down as to eliminate any recurrent danger.

All in all, it is heartening to know that we now have in the White House a man who can "see life steady and see it whole;" and one who when he takes hold of a big problem like the canal, which means so much to our lives and our continued prosperity, will not give up until a new canal is built at a cost of about $1,250 million.

The State of Washington To Oppose Northwest Railroad Merger Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, according to reports in the press, Attorney General John J. O'Connell and Gov. Albert D. Rosellini, of Washington, have both announced that the State is planning to fight the proposed merger of the Great Northern, Northern Pacific, and Burlington railroads into a sprawling network of unprecedented size, covering nearly 25,000 miles of track. The Attorney General is quoted as saying that a petition has been sent to the Interstate Commerce Commission asking leave for the State to intervene in and oppose the application for authority to carry out the merger, which was recently submitted to the ICC by the railroads involved.

I am happy to support this action by the State of Washington, which is one of some 17 States that would be affected adversely if this proposed merger is permitted to go through. It is my understanding that other States in the areas served by these railroads also are filing similar protests with the Commission, and certainly many communities also have protested, as have a large number of civic bodies and individual citizens.

It is my sincere hope that their protests will be properly weighed by the ICC when it acts upon the merger applications. I know that the alarm and concern of the people of Washington and the other States served by these railroads is great and significant, and rests upon valid fears over the future transportation facilities which would be available to them if the merger were to be approved. Both the house and senate of the Washington State Legislature are reported to have reflected this concern by passing a resolution opposing the merger.

In order to bring before the Congress some of the reasons for the opposition of the people and State officials of Washington, under unanimous consent I include several articles which have appeared about this subject in Washington newspapers in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Yakima Herald, Dec. 11, 1960]

RAIL MERGER PLAN HAS UNIONS UNHAPPY

Railroad unions are staring unhappily at a proposed merger of four northern railroad lines, especially in view of the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission has never denied a merger application of this type.

Principally the 17 legally recognized unions are concerned with job losses, but they claim a great many communities will be "hurt irreparably by the drying up of rail services, loss of payrolls and taxes." Railroads involved in merger talks are Northern Pacific, Great Northern, Burlington Lines (C.B. & O.) and the Spokane, Portland, and Seattle system. Edward Kermit, Yakima, a legislative representative for the Order of Railroad Conductors and Brakemen, pointed out how the proposed shift may affect Yakima.

Freight shifts: Railroads which are suggesting the merger have announced that, between Spokane and the west coast, all freight traffic south of Tacoma will move over the existing S.P. & S. tracks. All freight traffic north of Tacoma will move over existing Great Northern tracks. Result: Yakima will become a branch line operation, losing all four of its daily through freights. Robert MacFarlane, president of the Northern Pacific, said passenger service via the North Coast Limited and the Mainstreeter will be as at present, and freight service will be geared to giving the best and quickest service to the shippers of the area.

Yakima loses: But Kermit noted that loss of ranking as a division point will cost Yakima financially. As a division point, traincrews on through freights lay over at Yakima. Crews beginning work at Auburn west of the Cascades end their day at Yakima; crews starting at Pasco also end their work shift at Yakima on NP's east-west route. These people eat, stay overnight, and make purchases in Yakima, Kermit said. Additionally, as a branch line, Yakima may not be entitled to as many employees or as many railroad facilities as at present although the exact changes have not yet been determined.

Trucks hurting: MacFarlane, in a statement to employees of Northern Pacific, declared, "Highway competition has been particularly devastating" to railroaders' efforts to show a profit "and with the rapid expansion of interstate highways truck competition is steadily growing more difficult to cope with." He said no important changes in passenger service are anticipated. In addition, consolidation plans do not provide for any important or substantial abandonment of freight lines. In their statement, the unions claim the railroads are better off financially than the airlines, truck lines, or inland waterways.

Profit ratios: In 1958, for instance, railways spent $16 million to gain a net income of $1 million. Airlines spent $34 million for the same profit, truck lines $71 million. Waterways had an income ratio slightly under that of the railroads, the unions declared. They said railroads had an average net income, after depreciation of $233 million a year more in the 1950's than in the previous decade, which included the war years. According to figures of the railroad companies, 8,100 jobs will be affected by the merger. In about 2,900 of these the position would remain but the place of employment might be changed from one area to another.

Few jobs: Approximately 5,200 jobs would be discontinued at some stage in the consolidation, over a 5-year period, McFarlane said. The time spread would permit the consolidated company to place men in positions made vacant by attrition or death or retirement. So, MacFarlane noted, of the men in the 5,200 jobs, some 4,250 eventually could be reemployed at the same locations as now. "This would leave about 950 men who probably would have to transfer to fill vacancies. But our studies indicate clearly that there will be jobs somewhere on the railroad for everyone presently employed," he declared. Unions believe the loss is grossly underestimated, on the basis of checking how the merger will affect individual areas. Cited as a possible big loser is the Tri-Cities area.

Impact noted: "The impact of this displacement of employees should not be overlooked, considering the fact that $3,500,000 annually in railroad wages is spent in the Tri-Cities area," the unions declared. "They [the companies] promise better service to the communities, yet they will reduce the number of through trains from Spokane to Seattle via Pasco from approximately 16 to 18 trains a day to one time freight a day in each direction. If this is better service we certainly fail to see it." And a last word from NP's MacFarlane: "From the proposed consolidation will emerge a dynamic new transportation system which is destined to provide such an improved and expanded service that it is bound to command a greatly increased volume of business, thus creating additional jobs and making an increasingly important contribution to the economy of the vast territory it serves."

[From the Tri-City Herald, Dec. 3, 1960]

IMPACT STUDY POSSIBLE

(By Charles Lamb)

Effect on the Tri-Cities of the impending railroad merger will be discussed Tuesday night by the Pasco and Kennewick city councils, the Herald learned Saturday. The discussion will lead to appointment of a committee to study the proposal of the Northern Pacific Railway and the Great Northern Railroad to merge, it was indicated. Mayors Ray Hicks of Pasco and Glenn N. Felton of Kennewick said discussion of the merger would be on the council agendas because of the possible loss of payrolls.

S. R. Bichsel, general chairman of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers for the Northern Pacific and other national railroad union officials, recently estimated as many as 300 of the 750 Northern Pacific Railway jobs in Pasco would be threatened by the merger. It was said the merged lines would route most westbound traffic to Seattle over the Great Northern route, missing the Tri-Cities entirely. The unions also said the merger would result in establishment of an $11 million electronic switching yard in Spokane. Tri-City railroaders believe Pasco's $7 million retarder yard, one of the area's industrial strongpoints, then would greatly diminish in importance.

Both Mayor Hicks and Felton said they favor a special committee of Tri-City leaders to ascertain impact of the merger on the Tri-Cities and to protest to the proper agency—the Interstate Commerce Commission—which must approve mergers. "I have talked to many railroad men and they are rightfully concerned," said Mayor Hicks. "I believe the merger would be harmful to the whole Tri-City area by depriving the area of several hundred thousand dollars annually in payrolls—not to mention individual hardship to the affected employes themselves. I for one, think that Kennewick, Pasco and Richland city councils should pass a joint resolution opposing and protesting the merger." Mayor Felton said the Tri-Cities should work as hard to retain all its railway industry as it works to land a new one. "We've always advertised the hump yard and other railway facilities—even bragged about them. Now they're worth fighting to keep." He added, "Anything that hurts Pasco hurts Kennewick," and that while the majority of NP workers live in Pasco, many also live in Kennewick and Richland.

Mayor Joyce Kelly, Richland, said he would hesitate to join in a protest against the merger, despite his reluctance to see the Tri-Cities lose payrolls. "We must have the railroads and if a merger will keep them from going bankrupt, then we must live with it." He pointed out that three big rail mergers have occurred in the east and more will follow because of increasing competition, operational costs and other factors.

[From the Tri-City Herald, Dec. 11, 1960]

TRI-CITY RAILROAD EMPLOYMENT MAY JUMP FROM MERGER

(By Charles Lamb)

A proposed merger of four railroads should not jeopardize the present Tri-City railway employment level and may possibly increase it, officials of the Northern Pacific Railway said Saturday. The "trump card" in keeping local railroad employment at its present high level will be the increased use of the Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway if the merger is achieved. Not one switch engine assignment will be pulled out of the Pasco hump yard, they declared.

The merger, which the railroads hope will go into effect in mid-1962, involves the Northern Pacific, S. P. & S., Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, and Great Northern. Assurance on the local job situation was given by N. M. Lorentzsen, Spokane, superintendent of the Northern Pacific's Idaho division, following a meeting in Spokane Friday with C. H. Burgess, operating vice president of the Northern Pacific. Burgess met with Lorentzsen and other officials of the Idaho division. One of the officials was R. C. Webb, Pasco, assistant Idaho division superintendent. Both Webb and Lorentzsen reported Burgess told them no present Northern Pacific employee in Pasco will be displaced by the merger—contingent upon satisfactory negotiations with railway management by operating and nonoperating railroad labor organizations. In addition, Webb stated that Pasco would become headquarters for a new division—to be named Pasco Division—which will be created when the 25,000 miles of mainline track under the four railroads become one major system.

Besides boosting Pasco's prestige, its division—point status would involve between 25–40 new jobs and may require a new division building in Pasco. Although Northern Pacific through traffic as it is known today would drop drastically, Northern Pacific operating crews thus affected would be picked up to operate trains over the present S.P. & S. line to Portland, Lorentzsen said. Pasco would continue as their home station. Under the merger, through trains to coastal areas north of Tacoma which now go via the Northern Pacific through Kennewick would bypass the Tri-Cities by going the Great Northern route. But, said Lorentzsen, freight to and from areas south of Tacoma will use the S.P. & S. route. This would swell Pasco traffic to commensurate for the decrease expected over the present Northern Pacific route.

Burgess' report conflicted somewhat with impressions received by union heads of all crafts on the four lines when they met in October with management of the Northern Pacific, Great Northern, C.B. & Q. and S.P. & S. Pasco railway union representatives have predicted a drop in through-train movements in Pasco to affect 102 train-crew jobs. They expect a loss of some 300 cars of freight daily, resulting in an additional force reduction of Pasco of some 150 switch crew members, carmen, clerks and others. Lorentzsen said the figures might be true on the basis of Northern Pacific mainline traffic reductions. But the increased traffic through Pasco over the S.P. & S. will balance the picture again, he said. "There will still be fruit trains, other freight service and passenger trains on present Northern Pacific tracks to Yakima and Ellensburg areas, but no more through freights," he explained. Both Lorentzsen and Webb asserted that "Not one switch engine assignment" would be pulled out of the Pasco hump yard. They said the yard will continue to make up east-bound fruit trains and will assemble freight trains bound for Minneapolis and St. Paul.

The executives' assurance of continued, or increased, Tri-City railroad employment volumes was based, however, on successful negotiations between management and the unions and willingness of present Northern Pacific crews to work on the present S.P. & S. route. "We feel the employees can do better by negotiating with management than by seeking relief through the Interstate Commerce Commission," said Lorentzsen. He added, "We know what management will do—we don't know what the ICC will do."

The merger plan is expected to reach an ICC hearing by February 1961 with a possible decision to go ahead in mid-1962. Webb said the four-system rail "marriage" will take about 5 years to implement.

[From the Columbia Basin News, Dec. 15, 1960]

ORAL COMMITMENT ISN'T ENOUGH

Oral commitment by Northern Pacific and Great Northern that Pasco would become a division headquarters has only slightly altered Tri-Cities viewpoint toward the proposed merger of the rail lines. Officials of the railroad brotherhoods would like to see a firm commitment in writing. Their fears that Tri-Cities would become a secondary rail point, causing layoff or transfer of many employees, have not been soothed even though Northern Pacific representatives said they do not anticipate that any Tri-Cities employees would be adversely affected.

Stickler in the Northern Pacific announcement was reference to the working status of operating and nonoperating crafts would need to be agreed upon. This can mean many things, and in some cases for reclassification could be a polite term of demotion. Railroad union representatives are taking a wait-and-see approach. They won't need to wait long, since the Interstate Commerce Commission is expected to begin examination of the proposal next February. A decision probably won't be forthcoming until the middle of 1962.

When it was first anticipated that Pasco would be downgraded as a rail center, Columbia Basin News suggested that railroad spokesmen make their position as clear as possible, spelling out in specific terms what the merger would mean to Tri-Cities and other communities now served by the four lines involved in the merger. Last week three top officials of Northern Pacific did dispel some of the fear that Tri-Cities would suffer drastic reduction, but they left important points open to discussion. The entire proposal necessarily will be presented in detail to the ICC in February, and naturally the railroads will be unequivocally committed to whatever plans they submit. Railroad officials have said that yard and road operations should increase as a result of improved rail service, and that this would directly affect the Tri-Cities area. But this is only speculation. Tri-Cities cannot support the merger until it has more substantial evidence that the plan would not work to the area's detriment.

[From the Tri-City Herald, Dec. 21, 1960]

RAIL UNION OFFICIAL DISPUTES THAT MERGER TO BENEFIT PASCO

(By Charles Lamb)

Sacrifices by the Northern Pacific Railway, its employees and cities along its route for the benefit of three other railways involved in a proposed merger were predicted here today by J. S. Turrell of St. Paul, Minn., general chairman of the Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen for the Northern Pacific.

Conferring with members of local 260 in Pasco, Turrell said, "Let's face it. The Northern Pacific would become a secondary line and Pasco and a number of other traditional Northern Pacific towns would suffer. In most cases, however, the positions of the Great Northern, Spokane, Portland & Seattle, and Chicago, Burlington & Quincy railways would be enhanced," he said. His view is almost opposite of predictions made in Spokane December 9 by C. H. Burgess, operating vice president of the Northern Pacific. Turrell said his opinions are based on information, "however meager," the company has put out to employees in St. Paul. Burgess said Pasco would become a division headquarters, would lose no payroll and that "not one switch engine would be pulled out of the Pasco Northern Pacific yards." "I wish I had that in writing about the switch engines," Turrell declared. He recalled one company estimate that the merger would cancel 49 switch-engine assignments in S Paul and Minneapolis alone every 24 hours. "You say it wouldn't affect one of the 19 engines in Pasco?" he challenged.

Turrell was also skeptical about a division headquarters in Pasco. "Since 1920, railroads have been lengthening divisions. Why now would they create new divisions in between old ones?" he asked. Aside from local freight trains arriving from the Yakima-Ellensburg area, Turrell expects not more than one or two freight trains would have to stop in Pasco a day for switching. Mainline freight from Tacoma and North would miss the Tri-Cities on the Great Northern route and S.P. & S. trains going East from the Tacoma South coastal area would probably come no closer to Pasco than the roundhouse curve, Turrell said. "Why would the combined line use the Pasco hump yard when 150 miles away it will have an $11 million electric switching yard at Parkwater near Spokane?" was another question Turrell posed.

He said the mayor of St. Paul inquired if the 13-story Northern Pacific and Great Northern general offices operation would stay in St. Paul after the merger. "He was told that the company didn't know. The Northern Pacific wants the unions to 'come in and negotiate,' but it hasn't given us any information to work on." Consequently, Turrell said, "We must draw conclusions from the facts we have." Among these is that 5,200 jobs in the existing Northern Pacific and Great Northern lines will be eliminated—an 8-percent reduction. "We think that 8 percent is conservative, since history shows mergers usually affect some 25 percent of the jobs. They claim their plans are not definite enough yet to tell what categories of work the reductions will affect," he said.

Turrell and local members expect Pasco to bear its share of the announced $40 million annual cost reduction the railroads expect from the merger. "Much of this will be payrolls and taxes—both of which support communities along the Northern Pacific line," the union official said. As an example, Turrell said Mandan, N. Dak., will lose 57 percent of its present $69,000 bimonthly payroll.

He said Northern Pacific President Robert MacFarlane has predicted "everybody will have a job inside of 5 years." Turrell said, "The way that works, the 5,200 jobs being reduced will be attrition through retirement and death with no replacements." He also predicted many young railway employees with little seniority will be dropped. Turrell said MacFarlane will be chairman of the board and Ralph Budd, present Great Northern president, will be president of the as-yet-unnamed rail combine. Turrell said the stockholders of all four lines must be polled by vote before the merger can come off. "I seriously expect many stockholders to balk," he predicted, pointing out that because Northern Pacific has oil wells and timber operations in addition to rail operations, its stock is more valuable per share than stock of the other three lines. "Funny thing," Turrell concluded, "all four companies are making money and none are in financial trouble. And most of the changes being considered could be achieved without merging. Why they have to merge at all is beyond me."

Some Crimson for the Republicans Also

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal satisfaction that I have noted the outstanding notices being received by Advance, the journalistic venture launched in February by an up-and-coming group of young Harvard Republicans. It is high tribute, indeed, when a distinguished journalist of Arthur Krock's stature heralds such an endeavor, and I would like to share his words of praise with my colleagues. The article follows:

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

SOME CRIMSON FOR THE REPUBLICANS ALSO

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 13.—The appearance of a periodical of opinion designed to promote the political fortunes of the Republican Party deserves the rating of an event. Among the foremost of these reasons is that for years the principal interest of many of the ablest editors and writers in the periodical field has been to promote the political fortunes of the dominant group in the Democratic Party.

But the launching of this journal of opinion has claims to being catalogued as an event beyond its general—though not undeviating—purpose to replace Democrats in office with Republicans. It has no financial backing or organization cachet in that party. It is a campus product by undergraduates. And it originates on a campus where the voice of Democratic liberalism has largely prevailed: the celebrated Yard of Harvard College.

Advance is the name the young publishers and editors have chosen for this duckling among a brood of cockerels whose ambition is one day to grow into great political gamecocks like Schlesinger, Jr., Galbraith, and Harris. It is to be published five times a year from Quincy House, Cambridge, Mass. In its first issue—that dated February 1961—Advance expresses the belief that "a new philosophy, not yet fully articulated, will mostly likely evolve within the Republican Party" and "most likely * * * will emanate * * * from the progressive Republicans." To help develop this philosophy, from that source, is its announced mission.

The psalmist has not yet made good his prediction that the meek shall inherit the earth. But the young, or at any rate the comparatively young, have certainly inherited the executive power in this Nation. And, since—without any noticeable signs of meekness—they are governing their inheritance in the name, and for the political longevity, of the Democratic Party majority, it is in the national interest of the future that other unmeek young shall arise to contest that future with them. The odds are very obvious and very great in favor of the group in power. But that is the best possible reason why the challenge, as yet so small, should be recorded.

The Harvard collegians sound it on no uncertain trumpet. "We are Republicans," they announce, with "no apology of any kind" for a party and its candidates after an eletcion in which, "though registered Democrats held a substantial majority."

Nixon and Lodge came very close to capturing the popular vote and the Republican delegation in both Houses of Congress was significantly increased. It would thus be unrealistic as well as cynical to assert that the Republican Party could profit by adopting Democratic programs or tactics. But it would be equally unrealistic to fail to reassess our position in the light of 1960 Republican defeats.

This reassessment leads Advance to the conclusion that progressive or—with important qualifications—liberal Republicans formulate any successful party program for the 1960's. And several articles which follow make clear that the undergraduate editors of Harvard identify such progressives with Senator CASE, of New Jersey, Senator COOPER, of Kentucky, Governor Rockefeller and Representative LINDSAY, of New York; and also that they are disposed to exclude Senator GOLDWATER from the category. Yet some of the lines GOLDWATER would draw to enable a bewildered electorate to differentiate between the central groups in both parties, and some on the left fringes of each, seem to appear in shadowy outlines in these extracts from the definitive editorial.

As the Democratic Party grew big it also grew ideologically flabby. Many of the Democrats who today call themselves liberals seem to equate liberalism with reckless spending and steady aggrandizement of Federal power. We are conservatives in our dedication to the traditional freedoms which permit individual realization.

On the issue of overriding certain vetoes by President Eisenhower, based by him on this same asserted dedication, several of the new magazine's preferred Republicans voted to override and GOLDWATER voted to sustain. But such crossovers occur in both parties on promptings that range from principle to pressure from special interest groups. And it is to be hoped this will not discourage the young staff of Advance in their gallant attempt to show that "atque ex Harvard semper aliquid novi."

What's Wrong With America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay which was written by a young constituent of mine, Miss Linda Beatty, a student in the seventh and eighth grade class at Our Saviour Lutheran School, Kansas City, Kans. The principal of the school, Mr. Robert C. Stebbe, sent this essay to

me, saying that he thought it represented a succinct statement, from the viewpoint of a Christian child, of what is wrong with America.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH AMERICA

(By Linda Beatty)

There are many things which can be said about America that are considered wrong and yet there are many things that are said about America that aren't true.

The most important thing that is wrong with America is that there are not enough believers in Jesus Christ. Of course there are many who know there is a God, but they don't believe there is a Triune God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost; they don't believe that God the Father sent his son, God the Son, to die and save people from their sins.

There are other things wrong with America like, I think people should think more about the poor people and the needy people. People should try to get Bibles and pastors to the poor so they also can get the teachings of Christ.

Electric Power From the Pick-Sloan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star of March 23, 1961. The editorial speaks for itself—points to an alarming situation involving a conflict between public power interests and the Pick-Sloan program, and one which I respectfully urge my colleagues, to note by reading this editorial:

ELECTRIC POWER FROM THE PICK-SLOAN PLAN

The effort of the upstream public power crowd to blow up the whole cooperative plan of Missouri basin development comes at a time when the production of public power at Pick-Sloan dams is expanding rapidly. This is a move to destroy the plan that is showing results for the whole Missouri basin. And the most impressive gains are being made in the States that are now trying to seize all the benefits of the Pick-Sloan program except flood control.

In the early 1940's when W. Glenn Sloan of the Interior Department proposed his river plan, he suggested construction of facilities to produce 758,000 kilowatts of electricity. Today the current capacity of four big upstream dams—Fort Peck, Garrison, Fort Randall and Gavins Point—totals 905,000 kilowatts. And much more is coming.

The ultimate capacity under the Pick-Sloan plan of cooperation calls for 2,048,000 kilowatts, nearly three times the original proposal. Next year, the first units of a new 595,000-kilowatt installation will be available with completion of the big Oahe Reservoir. Big Bend, to be completed in 1964, will provide additional capacity of 468,000. It is interesting to observe that Big Bend originally was planned as a 100,000-unit operation. But changes were made and a new site selected to provide for a far greater capacity. Thus two new dams will more than double the present power output.

Of course, water is required to run the generators. It is true that for several years precipitation in the northern areas has been less than normal. Still, the reservoirs aren't about to run dry. And it isn't a case of using separate, distinct quantities of water for each dam. The same flow runs through all generating facilities. The main additions will come from more generators, not from a huge storage of water.

People up and down the river have supported power development—together with the other essentials of basin development, flood control, navigation and irrigation—for 17 years. But if the public power interests now intend to press their demand for sole benefits from the river, they can hardly expect the continuing cooperation from people interested in the industrial growth of Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and Iowa.

It strikes us that this is a poor time for the power group to move to wreck the very foundations of the succeeding Pick-Sloan program.

Resolution by State of New York on Trade Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLETON J. KING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, both the Democratic and Republican Party platforms of 1960 pledged to seek an end to trade restrictions, blockades, blacklists, and the cessation of discrimination against Americans on the basis of religious beliefs. In keeping with these pledges, the Senate and the Assembly of the State of New York, has recently adopted a resolution memorializing the Department of State of the United States to take steps to discourage and nullify the effects of trade restrictions and boycotts by the nations comprising the Arab League against American citizens of the Jewish faith.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted in the Senate of the State of New York on March 24, 1961:

RESOLUTION 131

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Department of State of the United States to take steps to discourage and nullify the effects of trade restrictions, blockades, and boycotts by the nations comprising the Arab League against American citizens of the Jewish faith and against American companies controlled or managed by such citizens

Whereas Arab nations, including the United Arab Republic, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Libya, Sudan, Tunisia, and Morocco, functioning as the Arab League, have been conducting a boycott of American citizens, business and industry; and

Whereas the Arab League has blacklisted all American ships which have touched at Israeli ports of call; and

Whereas American firms doing business with Israel are cut off from trade with Arab countries; and

Whereas most American companies controlled or managed, partially or wholly, by Americans of the Jewish faith are not permitted to establish commercial relationships with countries that are members of the Arab League; and

Whereas American service men and armed force employees of the Jewish faith are not permitted to serve at the Dhahran airbase in Saudi Arabia; and

Whereas American citizens of the Jewish faith are generally not permitted to disembark on Arab soil, by land, sea, or air; and

Whereas approximately 500 American business firms during 1960 received warnings through the U.S. mails from Arab boycott officers in Damascus and Kuwait that if Americans have commercial dealings with Israel, they must forego doing business with Arab countries; and

Whereas individual Hollywood motion picture stars have also been blacklisted; and

Whereas American citizens of the Jewish faith are generally excluded from private employment in any capacity in any Arab owned or controlled company; and

Whereas the U.S. Navy reserves the option to cancel the charter of any vessel carrying Navy cargo, if any Arab country refuses to allow the vessel to load or unload cargo, because the ship's charterers or owners have previously done business with Israel; and

Whereas with the approval of the Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation, and the U.S. Navy, contracts for the shipment of U.S. surplus wheat to the United Arab Republic provide that the vessel may not have traded at Israeli ports; and

Whereas the Democratic Party platform of 1960 pledged the protection of the rights of American citizens to travel, to pursue lawful trade, and to engage in other lawful activities abroad without distinction as to race or religion; and has further pledged to oppose any international agreement or treaty which by its terms or practices discriminate against American citizens on grounds of race, or religion; and

Whereas the Republican Party platform of 1960 pledged to seek an end to transmit and trade restrictions, blockades and blacklists, and further pledged to secure freedom of navigation on international waterways and the cessation of discrimination against Americans on the basis of religious beliefs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Department of State be and is hereby respectfully memorialized—

(a) To take a firm position against Arab interference in the conduct of the affairs of American citizens and businessmen.

(b) To abstain from any cooperation with Arab League boycott activities and policies.

(c) To resist any efforts by Arab nations to maintain or widen its boycott activities in the United States.

(d) To exert all possible efforts and utilize its resources to the fulfillment of the spirit and purposes of this resolution; and it is further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purposes of this resolution.

By order of the Senate:

WILLIAM S. KING,
Acting Secretary.

Concurred in without amendments in assembly:

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

Big Dialing Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in my district there are new com-

munities with the same name as great cities of the world. One of these happens to be the city of Newark and recently communication history was made when a direct distance dialing system was installed in my district which allows citizens of Newark, Calif., to contact their fellow citizens in Newark, N.J. This accomplishment was highlighted by the conversation recorded in the following newspaper account which appeared in the Fremont News-Register of March 29, 1961, and I am happy to extend these remarks for your interest:

BIG DIALING STEP

Mayor Leonard Lucio of nearby Newark, sitting behind his desk last Friday helped make communications history when his telephone rang and he answered it—Mayor Leo P. Carlin of Newark, N.J., was on the other end of the line.

Their talk marked the inauguration of direct distance dialing in the New Jersey metropolis. Newark, Calif., has had it since 1958.

Students Hike Future Earnings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the first of a series of newspaper articles by Mr. Robert N. Kelso, a reporter for the New Orleans States-Item, on the current federally financed student loans at New Orleans universities and colleges appeared in the RECORD. Today, I am pleased to include the second of these fine articles which describe in detail what New Orleans institutions of higher learning are doing to aid young students to continue their education through the National Defense Education Act. The second article follows:

STUDENTS HIKE FUTURE EARNINGS—LOANS HELP COVER RISING COSTS

(By Robert N. Kelso)

Educators figure that the average college graduate earns $100,000 more in a lifetime of work than a person with only a high school education.

However rough this estimate may be, it is certain that the unskilled or partially trained worker comes out at the short end of the horn, moneywise, in this world of rapidly expanding expertise, technology, and automation.

Brainpower trained in specialized channels draws the premium pay.

But it is also costing premium amounts to turn out this brainpower—in many cases more than a talented youngster and his parents can afford.

This situation was recognized by Congress in 1958 when it passed the National Defense Education Act to provide for student loans, along with specialized training and research programs, in the Nation's colleges and universities.

The act authorizes institutions to lend able and needy students up to $1,000 a year, for a total of $5,000, while they complete their training.

Some 1,400-odd institutions are participating in the national defense student loan program, enabling more than 40,000 students to continue their higher education.

In Louisiana, 15 institutions are administering such student loans. Six of the 15 colleges and universities are in New Orleans.

Approximately 1,000 students in New Orleans are now getting at least part of their college education on a learn-now-pay-later basis.

The bulk of the money for student loan programs here is that appropriated by Congress. Participating institutions put up $1 of their own money for every $9 they get from the Government.

How does a student go about getting a loan?

As far as the loans underwritten by the Government are concerned, the procedure at all schools is similar.

The procedure at Loyola University, which now disburses loans only under terms of the National Defense Education Act, is typical.

Anyone eligible to attend school as a regular-enrolled, full-time student is eligible to apply for a loan.

Special consideration, under terms of the Federal law, is given to two categories of students:

1. Those with superior academic backgrounds who state they want to teach in elementary or high schools.

2. Those whose backgrounds indicate superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering or modern foreign languages.

Such students have loan priority.

But so long as the priority groups are taken care of, loans are also available for other capable students who can demonstrate financial need.

Demonstrating need requires the applicant to supply detailed information on his own and his parents' financial resources.

This information, which is held in confidence, includes items on the net taxable income of the father and mother, or guardian, along with the value of their bank accounts, investments and real estate holdings.

Allowance is made for obligations and special situations—such as sickness—which may be a drain on the family income.

University authorities administering student loans want a clear idea of what the family can reasonably afford to contribute, and the families are expected to come up with their fair share.

The applicant himself is asked to supply a proposed budget for the duration of his loan.

This is to compare his anticipated expenses with his available resources—his personal savings, estimates of his earnings during vacations, part-time earnings during the school year, aid he expects from his parents, guardian or relatives, and any financial help he will get from scholarships, veterans' benefits, or other sources.

He is also required by Federal law to sign a loyalty oath.

This requirement created a furor when educators learned it had been tacked onto the congressional bill authorizing student loans. Campus critics contended it was a blow to academic freedom.

Several institutions—among them Harvard and Yale—pulled out of the loan program when congressional opponents of the requirement (one was the then Senator John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts) failed to get this restriction lifted.

The loyalty oath, as such, was not the chief target of the critics.

It merely required the applicant to swear he bears true faith and allegiance to the United States of America, and will support and defend the Constitution and the laws (of the United States) against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.

What really irked campus critics was an accompanying affidavit the applicant also has to sign.

It requires the applicant to swear:

"I do not believe in, and am not a member of and do not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

Faculty members on many campuses bridled at this, perhaps because they were still smarting from a postwar campaign to get college teachers themselves to sign loyalty oaths or be fired.

But prospective borrowers from the Federal student loan fund have been less antagonistic to the requirement.

No student seeking a loan at Loyola University, says Father Robert L. Boggs, dean of students and loan administrator, has balked at signing the oath and affidavit.

At Tulane University, Dr. Joseph E. Gordon, associate director of admissions and loan administrator, declared:

"Our experience has been that no borrower has complained or refused to sign the oath.

"We officially registered our unhappiness with the requirement, but have not chosen to deny students the benefit of the Federal loans, because we object to the oath."

Tulane has disbursed $500,000 from the Federal student loan fund in the 2 years since the program got into full swing. Loyola has parceled out $203,000.

Other New Orleans institutions participating in the national defense student loan program include Dillard and Xavier Universities and St. Mary's Dominican College.

Louisiana State University in New Orleans, which charges no tuition and fees of only $80 a year, has participated in only minimal fashion through its parent institution at Baton Rouge.

Few students are allowed to borrow more than tuition costs at their schools, because of the relatively high number of applicants.

Tulane and Loyola set no maximum to tuition, but other participating schools here do.

How many New Orleans students are getting their education with the help of pay later loans underwritten with Government funds?

Here is a rundown on the figures, compared with full-time enrollment at the school and its tuition charges.

Tulane: 550; enrollment, 4,500; basic tuition, $990.

Loyola: about 100; enrollment, 1,600; tuition, $600.

Xavier: 101; enrollment, 850; tuition, $400.

Dillard: about 100; enrollment, 900; tuition, $450.

Dominican: 21; enrollment, 309; tuition, $600.

LSUNO: about 15; enrollment, 1,805; no tuition.

This total does not include students receiving financial assistance through other loan programs conducted at the schools.

Tulane, for example, has another 100 students getting aid from the university's own loan funds.

The tabulation shows that from 11 to 12 percent of students enrolled full time at Tulane, Xavier and Dillard have gotten loans through the Federal loan program.

The percentage at Loyola is 6 percent, at Dominican 7 percent, and at LSUNO, less than 1 percent.

This is by no means the percentage at each school who are receiving some kind of financial aid, however.

Scholarships and part-time jobs provided by the institutions are assisting hundreds more.

An estimated one-third of Tulane's 4,500 full-time students are getting financial assistance through loans, scholarships and part-time employment.

Amounts disbursed this year under the national defense student loan program were:

Tulane, $250,000; Loyola, $100,000; Xavier, $40,000; Dominican, $29,707.

Authorities at Dillard declined to reveal the total of Federal funds disbursed. The figure at LSUNO, which doesn't do its own bookkeeping on the program, was not immediately available.

Institutions are permitted to apply for Federal loan money totaling up to $20 per full-time student enrolled.

They may ask for more, but must give justification on such grounds as the high cost of tuition and fixed expenses to students on their campuses.

Figures on the total amount spent in the Federal program this year aren't yet available, but the tally last year hit $58,340,000.

New Orleans administrators of Federal loan funds say they could use more money. A majority of them expect prospective borrowers to show up in greater numbers next fall.

An Open Letter to the President in Response to His Housing Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the President by the editors of House & Home magazine following his housing message. It points up the problems connected with the housing goals so "devoutly to be wished."

The letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT IN RESPONSE TO HIS HOUSING MESSAGE

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: House & Home could not agree more wholeheartedly with all the objectives urged in your eloquent and moving housing message—the strongest, longest, and broadest message in many a year.

Like you, we find it shocking and shameful that in the richest nation on earth so many families are still ill housed. Like you, we want a good home for every American, poor or rich, city or farm, young or old. Like you, we deplore urban slums and suburban sprawl.

We agree that the Federal housing program should put more emphasis on urban needs. We share your wish for better planning on an area scale. We share your desire and impatience to remodel our cities, to improve our patterns of community development, to provide for the housing needs of all segments of the population. Who could question your statement that "meeting these goals will contribute to the Nation's economic recovery and its long-term economic growth. * * * A nation ill housed is not as strong as a nation with adequate homes for every family. A nation with ugly, crime-infested cities and haphazard suburbs does not present the same image to the world as a nation characterized by bright and orderly urban development."

And of course we welcome your concern for the depressed state of homebuilding (which is America's biggest industry) and the effect of the depression on all the industries dependent on homebuilding. We welcome your concern for its high rate of unemployment—the highest rate of unemployment in any major American industry. We welcome your call for a steady and progressive increase in the rate of homebuilding, beginning now. And we are more than pleased that you believe a construction rate of at least 2 million new homes a year will soon be required.

You first made manifest your deep concern for better homes and better communities by the high caliber of the public servants you chose to work and advise with you on these needs. You made your concern manifest a second time by your prompt attack on mortgage interest costs, for last year's tight money hit housing first and worst of any industry. Now you have emphasized your concern by making housing needs the theme of your most far reaching special message to Congress on any strictly domestic problem.

Because we share your housing hopes and purposes so deeply, because we welcome your concern for housing and homebuilding so gladly, and because we regard your housing advisers so highly—for these very reasons we are all the more disappointed to find that, although many suggestions in your message are indeed very important (like speeding up urban renewal processing, developing new tools to finance home improvement, providing better statistics on the market), the multibillion dollar program you propose is far too small to cure the vast needs you state.

If, as you say, 14 million families (26 percent of the Nation) are still ill housed, your plan to subsidize another 100,000 public housing units would meet just two-thirds of 1 percent of their needs; and giving Fannie Mae another $500 million for special assistance loans to consumer co-ops, nonprofit associations, and limited dividend corporations could barely rehouse even one-third of 1 percent.

If, as you say, we must provide good homes for millions of elderly couples living on less than $3,000 a year and for still more millions of widows living on less than $2,000, your plan to earmark another $50 million for direct loans to the aged and to reserve 50,000 of the added public housing units for their use would meet less than one-half of 1 percent of the old folks' need you dramatize.

If, as you say, almost one-fifth of the occupied houses in rural areas (they totaled 14,300,000 in 1950) are so dilapidated they must be replaced and if hundreds of thousands of others are far below adequate standards, extending the $200-million-plus unexpended balance of the 1956 farm housing credit as you suggest would meet hardly 2 percent of the need you state. It would provide less than a $75 loan toward the cost of each needed replacement, even if nothing at all is spent on the other substandard homes.

And if, as you say, we need a broader and more effective program to remove blight, your plan to spend another $2.5 billion to buy up slums at prices three and four times their reuse value would not go very far. New York City alone might need every cent of that money to reclaim its 7,000 acres of blight and decay, for New York slum prices are so inflated by overcrowding and undertaxation that redevelopment purchases have averaged $481,000 an acre.

As for your other two major proposals—selective credit controls to induce builders to build low-priced houses and Federal funds to buy land reserves now for future suburban development—we are sorry to have to say we believe these two programs could do as much harm as good, because:

First effect of no-down, 40-year financing for new homes priced under, say, $13,500 might be to break the price or weaken the market for 22 million reasonably good existing nonfarm homes now priced below the ceiling (not counting 6.7 million that are dilapidated or lack a private inside bath). This in turn would make it difficult or impossible for owner-occupants to sell their under-$13,500 homes and so get their equity out to buy the better homes many of them can now afford. So the more cheap new homes are sold to first-time buyers by the no-down financing you propose, the fewer better homes can be sold to second-time buyers trading up.

As the shelter shortage disappears, used-house prices are falling, so low income buyers in more and more markets are finding they can get more for their money in existing houses than in new homes built at today's costs and today's wages. In these markets the No. 1 reason why lower income families still buy new homes when they could get more house for the same money second-hand is that the new homes (which are financed wholesale) can be bought for $300 or $400 cash, whereas existing homes at the same price (which must be refinanced one at a time) are likely to require $2,000 or $3,000 cash.

Concluded Dr. Louis Winnick's excellent research report to Action on rental housing: "The problem is not likely to be solved with making the trade-up process work better." Your proposal would almost inevitably make it work worse.

First effect of Government spending to buy land reserves at today's sky-high prices might be to bid suburban land prices still higher, thereby driving builders further out into the orchards and cornfields to find land they could afford to build on. This would spread suburban sprawl and premature subdivision over added miles of open country.

Stockholm's land-reserve plan worked so well mainly because the land was bought with pre-World War I kroner before the automobile started suburban land prices soaring. That is something quite different from starting to buy reserves at the peak of today's land inflation.

Combined cost of the programs you propose has been estimated at more than $5 billion for open or concealed subsidies. If $5 billion can meet only 2 percent or at most 3 percent of the need you dramatize so eloquently, what clearer demonstration could there be that America's need for better homes can never be satisfied by subsidies?

This is a very tough problem, for which there is no quick or easy solution. It cannot be solved by a liberal program (meaning, by today's definition, liberal with the taxpayers' money). It can be solved only by a radical program (meaning, literally, a program that attacks the problem at its roots).

So we wish your message proposed to attack basic causes instead of relieving symptoms.

We wish you had said even one word questioning why slums in so many places are still spreading faster than new homes can be built to replace them, why private enterprise cannot meet the need of better housing for low and middle-income families in big cities, why cities are disintegrating in suburban sprawl instead of expanding in a plannable way, why good new housing costs too much and why home improvement costs still more, why, slums are the most profitable property anyone can buy, why urban expansion consumes four times as much land as it uses, why homes that cost $12,000 around some cities cost $18,000 to duplicate in others, why city planners and regional planners are so often helpless and frustrated, why the profit motive is harnessed backward to better land use in cities and suburbs alike, why cities subsidize slums by undertaxation and penalize improvements by overtaxation.

Or perhaps it would be better to combine all these questions into two: (1) What are the roadblocks and impediments that still make it impossible for the dynamics of private enterprise to meet all our needs for better housing (just as the dynamics of private enterprise meet our needs for almost everything else); and (2) what can and should be done to remove those roadblocks, so private enterprise can do the job.

We believe there are five major roadblocks. All of them are caused or perpetuated by some Government failure at the Federal, State, and/or local level. Your help is urgently needed to attack them. They cannot be removed by bigger subsidies or more liberal spending, but they can all be eliminated or minimized at no cost to the taxpayers by new fresh thinking and new vigorous leadership—the kind of new thinking and new leadership you promised us when you proclaimed the New Frontier.

1. THE HIGH COST OF CODE CHAOS

Conflicting and archaic building codes add a thousand dollars to the cost of a small house, partly because so many of their requirements are as useless as they are costly, partly because their differences frustrate the vast economies offered by standardization and industrialization. Around Washington, for example, some builders have to build under 12 different local codes and find their costs varying from jurisdiction to jurisdiction by as much as $1,000 per unit, with even the lowest cost inflated by the impossibility of standardizing their production.

Under our form of government, code responsibility is delegated to the local authorities, but it is wishful thinking and close-to-nonsense to expect local authorities to meet this responsibility without Federal help. They cannot afford the testing needed to keep their codes abreast of new products and new technology. They are not strong enough or informed enough to stand up against the powerful interests—local and national—that profit by code confusion (including the sponsors of the proprietary model codes that have to be kept different to be salable). And how can any local government bring its code in line with national standards when there are no national standards to get in line with?

Canada has shown the way to solve this problem by buttressing local authority with Federal assistance. Through the Canadian counterpart of FHA (the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation) Canada is preparing a domain code for housing—a code all local governments will be urged to adopt by reference, a performance code that will meet every local requirement (just as the New York State code provides for tropical hurricanes on Long Island and Arctic snows in the Adirondacks).

By instructing FHA to prepare, service, and promote a similar national code recommended for coast-to-coast adoption by reference in every U.S. community, you could lay the foundation for cutting the cost of building better homes by more than a billion dollars a year—at a yearly cost to FHA of less than a million dollars.

2. THE HIGH COST OF REAL ESTATE TRANSFERS

Archaic closing costs (not including prepayments) cost the buyers of new and existing houses more than a billion dollars a year. They discourage new-house sales by often taking more cash than the downpayment. They choke used-house sales by almost doubling their selling cost (trade-ins usually mean accepting 15 percent less than the appraisal value of the house). They thereby create the illusion that lower priced homes are in short supply, whereas the Census Bureau's housing inventory indicated that there are far more reasonably good nonfarm housing units priced under $12,400 than there are nonfarm families who could not qualify FHA to buy a more expensive home. The No. 1 reason more low-priced units seem to be needed is that so many millions of low-priced homes are still occupied by families who could afford to pay an average of 71 percent more.

Our whole system of real estate transfers and title searches is a hangover from the days when all land was royal (i.e., "real") property. The king has been gone for 185 years next July 4, but we still perpetuate the legal fictions of feudal tenure. This archaic system of real estate transfer may have been good enough in the days of the old homestead passed down from generation to generation. It is too costly an anachronism now that homes are resold once every 7 or 8 years.

What we need is a new legal fiction to make house transfers as quick and inexpensive as car transfers or security transfers. And the precedent of cooperative housing with proprietary leases backed by stock ownership or trust certificates of beneficial interest suggests how this need might be met if you provide the leadership and enlist the constructive cooperation of the American Bar Association.

Cooperative housing units can be sold and resold without a penny wasted in legal fees, title searchers, and closing costs because, like stocks and bonds, they are transferred as personal property instead of real property. Nominal ownership in the actual land and buildings remains unchanged in the proprietary corporation or trustee, so the real estate title and the all-important title insurance are not affected by the sale.

Project homes are already being sold as cooperatives under FHA section 213. Next two steps to make a new legal fiction workable might be: (1) A new FHA title to insure chattel mortgage loans backed, not by real estate, but by the security of stock ownership and proprietary leases, and (2) similar authorization from the Home Loan Bank Board to let Federal S. & L. S. lend on this type of security.

As you know NAREB has long advocated FHA insurance for individual mortgages inside cooperatives.

3. THE HIGH COST OF UNDEPENDABLE FINANCING

Ever since 1951 homebuilding and homebuilders have been tossed from boom to bust and bust to boom by the alternation of too easy and too tight money (which inevitably hits homebuilding first and worst). This uncertainty about money makes it dangerous if not impossible for builders (and others) to make the long-range investment in equipment and personnel needed to rationalize homebuilding costs at a lower level.

The need for a bigger and better central mortgage facility to help stabilize the flow of mortgage money has been clear as far back as the presidency of Herbert Hoover, who sponsored the establishment of the Federal home loan bank. So here we will only say we were disappointed that your long message included no mention of this need and no proposal to meet it.

4. THE HIGH COST OF LAND IN CITIES

This is the No. 1 reason (and perhaps the only reason) why private enterprise cannot meet the need for good low-income housing and good middle-income housing in big cities. A builder who pays too much for city land is then forced to compound his problem by building high rise to spread his land costs—and building high-rise costs twice as much as building walkups or townhouses.

The No. 1 reason city land costs too much is that city land is so underassessed and undertaxed. So the owners (including, most notoriously, the slumlords) can capitalize the too big spread between the rents they can collect and the taxes they must pay, translating the spread into too high prices.

Said the 1960 report of the mayor's special adviser on housing in New York: "The $2 billion public housing program here has made no appreciable dent in the number of slum dwellings. No amount of code enforcement will be able to keep pace with slum formation until and unless the profit is taken out of slums by taxation."

5. THE HIGH COST OF LAND IN THE SUBURBS

Since 1950 building material prices have risen 24 percent, building trades wages have risen 60 percent, but suburban land costs have risen an average of at least 300 percent. High land costs are now the No. 1 problem of the homebuilding industry, the No. 1 factor threatening to price new houses out of the market. Home buyers balk at paying $2,000 more and $3,000 more when all they get for the higher price is a higher price tag on a farther-out lot.

Once again the No. 1 cause is undertaxation, which makes it easy for land speculators to hold millions of acres off the market, including much of the close-in land that should be developed first. This creates an artificial shortage which sends prices skyrocketing and sprawls the suburbs farther and farther afield as builders move out to find land that is still cheap enough to build on.

Local governments subsidize land speculation by underassessing and undertaxing underused land; States encourage land speculation by setting low limits on land taxes; the Federal Government subsidizes land speculation by letting speculators deduct their costs from ordinary income taxes and then cash in their profits as capital gains.

Land-price inflation inside the cities and outside the cities is no longer a local problem. It is a nationwide and a national problem, for land prices are now swollen to the monstrous total of nearly half a trillion dollars ($500 billion)—much more than the national debt, much more than the resources of all our financial institutions. They threaten not only the building industry, but the whole national economy as well.

If local governments are powerful to meet the problem, it is high time the Federal Government took a hand. A stiff Federal tax levied ad valorem on today's market price of land (like the land tax levied five times in the first 100 years of the Republic) would almost certainly be constitutional if the receipts are prorated back to the States. This levy would offer the two fold advantage of (1) deflating land prices before they are too deeply involved in the Nation's credit structure, and (2) providing more than enough money to minimize the need and pressure for further financial assistance to State and local governments.

A land tax is almost the only practical tax that can be counted on to lower prices and stimulate consumption instead of raising prices and inhibiting production.

Whatever you may decide to do or not to do about the five basic impediments that make it hard for private enterprise to assure every American a much better home at a price he can afford, we wish your program for tomorrow's housing were aimed at tomorrow's needs—not yesterday's.

We are disturbed that your message talks and plans so poor about housing when you talk and plan so rich for the economy.

You have criticized the Eisenhower administration again and again for not expanding the economy faster; you have undertaken to double this rate of growth. But if incomes rise throughout your administration no faster than they rose under your predecessor, the entire net increase in nonfarm population from now to 1965 or 1969 will be families who could qualify FHA to pay at least $17,500 for a good house, and more than half the increase will be families who could pay at least $23,000. Conversely, by 1969 there would be 4 million less nonfarm families than there were in 1957 who could not afford to pay more than $13,500.

Why then do you say that the great need is for still more cheap houses? Why do you say "selective credit devices must now be used to encourage private industry to build more housing in the lower price range"—a price range whose upper limit you set far lower than the new ceiling your administration has just set for subsidized public housing for the very poor?

You cannot raise the American standard of living by forcing more new housing into a low-price market that would already be oversupplied if so many millions of families were not underliving their incomes by staying on in homes much cheaper than they can now afford.

The New Frontier for housing is not the minimum house; we have already built too many minimum houses since the war.

The New Frontier for housing is the quality house—a house so much better than yesterday's best that yesterday's best is as obsolete as yesterday's car. The New Frontier for housing is a home that takes all the drudgery out of housework, a home that is cool in summer and warm in winter, a home that is well lighted day and night, a home with big enough rooms and ample storage, a home that costs much less to heat and much less to maintain, a home planned for more enjoyment of the land, a home in a better planned community.

And if you will help the housing industry save the money now wasted on the chaos of codes, the money now wasted on closing costs, the money now wasted on the discounts necessitated by uncertain financing, and the money now wasted on land-price inflation, the housing industry can build and sell those quality homes at prices so attractive that millions of families will want to buy them and housing can once again be a great growth factor in our expanding economy.

Criticism of House Un-American Activities Committee Rules Invited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I hope the statement made yesterday by our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. DOYLE] did not escape the notice of the six Members of the House, who voted a month or so ago against the resolution to allow funds for the House Un-American Activities Committee.

This statement was to the effect that all Members of the House are invited to make suggestions as to changes in the committee rules which will govern the operation of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the rules of this important committee protect witnesses who appear before the committee and that every precaution has been taken to safeguard those whose names are mentioned in committee hearings.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that great care has been exercised in these matters and that a committee of the American Bar Association, after studying certain hearings in which the House Un-American Activities Committee was engaged, reported favorably as to the conduct of hearings during the period of study.

However, I doubt if the public recognizes the fairness of these rules or knows of the careful screening and annual review of Congress that has been practiced each session by the committee so as to avoid any basis of criticism.

As pointed out by our colleague [Mr. DOYLE], for several terms of Congress the committee rules have not only been studied and appropriate changes made, but these rules are printed so every witness or his attorney can have them.

Certainly it is a good time, when these rules are being reviewed, for critics of this committee to suggest to Members of Congress any improvements to protect individual rights as guaranteed by our Constitution. I do not know of any changes I would make recognizing the responsibility of Congress to investigate internal subversion.

However, I think any Members who disagree should speak up now, rather than saying later on that witnesses before the committee were not treated fairly.

Physican and Burning of Rome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, in the magazine American Practitioner and Digest of Treatment, volume 10, No. 10, there appeared an editorial by Dr. Robert A. Hingson, who is professor of anesthesia at the Western Reserve University School of Medicine, and director of anesthesia at the University Hospitals of Cleveland, Ohio.

It is entitled "The Physician and the Burning of Rome," and I think Members will find it interesting and informative. It is exceptionally well done.

Under unanimous consent, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

THE PHYSICIAN AND THE BURNING OF ROME
(By Robert A. Hingson, M.D.)

In the first century A.D., a Roman emperor with a callous conscience observed the collapse of the acme of civilization in the burning of the Eternal City. Historians record that Nero fiddled as the flames consumed Rome.

During the past year, in a 45,000-mile journey a periglobal survey of medical missions and national hospitals of many faiths and sects was completed. Our team of 16 specialists in medicine, nursing, and nutrition, with hospital supply executives, paused in 32 countries of the outer rim of Asia and Africa to observe and record; and in some instances to render medical treatment. We found a world in which more than one-third of its occupants were being destroyed by the flames of disease. We knew that the world was sick—but it was much sicker than we thought.

As we, representing the specialties of anesthesia, medicine, obstetrics and gynecology, pediatrics, public health, and surgery, examined the hospitals, clinics, public health stations, and schools manned by the thousands of selfless and dedicated missionaries as our most tangible and consistent examples of concern for our neighbors, we came face to face with mankind's greatest enemy, disease. We observed its vectors, its tragic onslaught upon the economy of many nations, and its devastating and paralyzing effects upon men of all races. We who had observed the effects of World War II at close range became convinced that war ranks a poor third behind famine and disease in its destructive force.

After conferences with ministers of health and government officials in each of these nations; after study of the health statistical reports of each; after seeing the patients in the overpopulated city slums, in the villages, in the jungles and in the bush of these countries of more than 2 billion human beings; after immunizing 90,000 of them by American gift vaccines against poliomyelitis, cholera, or typhoid, we tabulated and estimated the disease problem in these nations. The 10 major diseases as we found them were:

1. Malaria, 200 million new cases each year.
2. Tuberculosis, 75 million cases.
3. Malnutrition, including severe anemia, Kwashiorkor, starvation, 50 million cases.
4. Intestinal diseases of cholera, typhoid, dysentery caused by bacterial flora and amebas, 50 million cases.
5. Intestinal parasites and worms, 150 million cases.
6. Trachoma, affliction of eyes, 50 million cases.
7. Bilharzia or snail disease, 50 million cases.
8. Infectious diseases of the skin, yaws, jungle rot and smallpox, 50 million cases.
9. Severe mental apathy inconsistent with self-sustenance, 25 million cases.
10. Leprosy, 20 million cases.

One of our surgeons remarked to the writer after participating in this experience: "To consider one of the world's major health needs as surgery would be the same as fiddling while Rome burns." Indeed, in these days when many plans are being proposed by statesmen, physicians with limited experience in only one or two countries, neophytes of problems of monsoon, jungle and desert, specialists who plug a hobby, and textbook specialists in disease and international politics, we are getting ahead of reason in translating our emotions into action.

First there is a need for factfinding surveys in bilateral concert with the agricultural, educational, medical, engineering, sociologic and political leaders of the indigenous peoples toward whom we are directing our assistance. Only then can we tie man's resources intelligently to man's need in an acceptable form. Educational assistance can be offered when we are ready to carry through a continuing plan. The exchange students now in most of these countries and our country can pave the way.

The physician who has rendered such a creditable service in making America the healthiest Nation in the World has much to share through coordinated effort, but he has much to learn too. Our medical schools which have geared their training to combating the diseases of our prosperous country to Main Street, U.S.A., can learn too through sending members of their faculties in rotation to assist in neighboring, friendly, and receptive underdeveloped countries. Teams of medical students in their free elective quarter, and young physicians in training, can be taught the principles of vaccination and immunization, and loaned to a specific area in which there has been prearranged transportation, sustenance and supervision and planned direction. Such would be a rewarding experience for the medical student, the physician in training and the responsible medical faculty as well. Such experience would enrich the institution and personnel who sponsor it toward becoming important factors in a world community. This loan of personnel could be effectively correlated with the splendid lifesaving gifts of supplies and food through our national philanthropy of CARE and our Christian medical mission programs.

The medical society at the county, State, regional, and national levels within the framework of the American Medical Association and World Medical Association, and within the framework of each specialty, has a

definite responsibility, a challenge, and an opportunity toward the alleviation of the world's suffering and in making the most meaningful contributions toward world peace. As a start each local county medical and dental society could adopt one single medical mission and supply it with continuing provisions of medical texts, instruments, and drugs. The immensity of the task should not ensnarl us in the whirlpool of attempting too much through dispersion of our efforts too far, too soon. There are 2 billion people in Asia and Africa alone or more than 10 people in urgent need for every single person in the United States. The majority of these people are under the domination economically or politically of enlightened European powers. As America tackles the problems of the world in such projects as the Great White Fleet of mothball hospital ships privately manned, in people-to-people's programs, with the "Medico," with the foundations, and with denominational missions (even though each of these is important in long-range ultimate objectives), there should be established first certain priorities and proving grounds and "trial flights" for mastering the same lessons that have been learned at Cape Canaveral, in the World Health Organization, in the United Nations, and in the historic contacts with the recipient nations themselves.

The Philippines, our most tested and trusted ally in the Pacific and a courageous lighthouse for democracy there, is in great need from a public health, educational, and economic viewpoint—particularly in the southern islands. The West African nation of Liberia under the forceful and statesmanly leadership of President Tubman, which had its origin and its recent stimulus for development in the American system of freedom for the individual and for progressive enterprise of industry, at present contributes significantly to our rubber and steel requirements. Liberia's health needs were greater per capita than those observed in any other nation in our survey, exclusive of Korea. Liberia furnished an essential landing field for 170,000 military flights during the launching of attack through North Africa into the captive citadel of Europe in World War II. Liberia would welcome our professional and our cooperative denominational help. With concerted action on the agricultural, educational, economic and health fronts we could immediately achieve the lasting friendships of people in great need in these countries in which there are no entanglements in European politics. Our present very laudable point 4 programs in southern Asia, in Indonesia, in the vacuum of India, are achieving commendable results on an unprecedented scale through multimillion-dollar Federal assistance programs.

As we preach democracy and salvation we should keep our eyes on the fundamental health needs of Asia and Africa (all beginning with the letter S): (1) Sanitation, (2) sewers, (3) sprays, (4) screens, (5) schools, (6) soup, (7) shots, (8) shoes, (9) self-respect, and then only (10) salvation. We should first demonstrate in two areas mentioned above with 20 million in the Philippines and a possible 2 million in Liberia that we can be faithful in a few things before we become ruler over many things. Indeed, the needs of the world are primarily public health and nutrition.

The development and application of the Salk vaccine has taught us the lesson that with all of our propaganda, all of our medical and scientific knowledge and skill of our physicians, we have protected only less than one-half of our population. Our needles, syringes, sterilization, transportation processes, and available personnel were simply not enough to tackle the social impediments of our well organized America. Twenty-six preparation minutes per injection through this approach has not eliminated poliomyelitis in America, now in its worst outbreak in 6 years, nor will it eliminate the millions of other pestilences which beset the world. For the past two decades the author of this editorial has developed the principle of jet inoculation, and now adapting the repeat jet principle from immense reservoirs we proved in inoculating 41,000 children and employees of the U.S. post office in Cleveland, and 90,000 on our world journey within a space of 4 months, that we can deliver one immunizing injection each 6 seconds without resterilization.

It will take such total mobilization of planned effort and mass volunteer teams of indoctrinated physicians who will donate their time to join other concerned Americans and world citizens of many nations and of all religious faiths who can provide transportation, equipment, diplomatic international contacts, education and simultaneous agricultural and engineering assistance, to make lasting contributions in the vital field of world health and world peace. To dissipate effort in tackling all the world's problems at once is competition and out of step with the British and the French and the Belgians and the Dutch and the Russians, would be the equivalent of "fiddling while Rome burns."

Public health, improved nutrition, and education are the basic needs which must be supplied before the medical specialties of surgery, radiology, anesthesia, pathology, and physical therapy can be intelligently and effectively developed in these countries. Never before has the welfare of two continents presented itself before such a capable and scientific medical profession with such a limited timetable. We, the physicians, can and must extinguish the flames of mass disease and suffering in the vanguard of civilization's most promising era.

Massachusetts Port Authority Recommends Creation of Office of International Travel in Department of Commerce

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement of Frank E. Hickey, Washington representative of the Massachusetts Port Authority at Boston, before the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, relating to several pending bills to establish an Office of International Travel in the Department of Commerce:

STATEMENT BY FRANK E. HICKEY

The Massachuetts Port Authority has directed that I submit the following statement to your committee in support of H.R. 4614 and related bills, and to present some facts relating to the progress that has been made in expanding the various transportation facilities under its jurisdiction.

The enabling act that created the Massachusetts Port Authority is covered by the following: chapter 465 of the Acts of 1956; as amended by chapter 599 of the Acts of 1958 and chapter 476 of the Acts of 1959 and chapter 525 of the Acts of 1960:

"An act * * * creating the Massachusetts Port Authority and defining its powers and duties; providing for the issuance of revenue bonds of the authority, payable solely from tolls and other revenues, for * * * refinancing * * * the Mystic River Bridge and refinancing and improving the State-owned airports and Port of Boston facilities; and providing for the transfer to said authority of said * * * bridge, airports and port facilities."

Under this trusteeship the authority sold on February 17, 1959, a revenue bond issue of $71,750,000. These funds are to be used for operating expenses and the expansion of facilities at the Port of Boston, Logan International Airport, Hanscom Field and the Mystic River Bridge.

Boston is one of the oldest ports in the United States. However, the facilities and equipment have been maintained and modernized to meet the technical and physical requirements of our expanding economy.

After World War II the taxpayers of the Commonwealth invested approximately $30 million for the improvement of the Boston waterfront. In addition there was expended $70 million for the construction of airplane, automobile, and truck facilities at the Logan International Airport.

At the present time the passenger accommodations and facilities in Boston are adequate to meet the present demands. However, new construction is now being completed and additional contracts will begin in the immediate future and will be sufficient to handle the program that is planned under H.R. 4614.

The Logan International Airport is considered one of the finest airports in the country. It is adequate at the present time to handle the largest jetplanes. Plans have been in progress for an additional passenger terminal at a cost of $6 million. It will accommodate 49 new plane positions close to shelter areas. Work is now in progress on four finger piers, to be air conditioned and will include several lounges to accommodate approximately 100 people each awaiting departure of their planes, and removed from the congestion of the ticketing area. This construction includes a $1,500,000 International Terminal, consisting of 98,533 square feet which is more than three times the present area. The International departure area will include 27,414 square feet, and the International arrivals area, a total of 36,305 square feet. The finger pier to serve International passengers will have 34,825 square feet of floor area.

From July 1, 1959, to July 1, 1960, the total of international plane arrivals and departures was 8,152, and 127,435 International passengers. At the present time there are approximately 4,000 employees at this airport, with an estimated annual payroll of $18 million.

Commonwealth pier, designed to accommodate passengers as well as cargo, is a 2-story steel and concrete structure with access to both levels direct from main highways. This pier is considered to be one of the finest of its type in the world. It is approximately 1,200 feet long and is capable of accommodating the largest passenger ships afloat. This present year there are approximately 40 scheduled sailings from this pier.

If passengers bring their automobiles for the purpose of touring the country, they would have easy access to highways north and south, as well as the Massachusetts Turnpike which connects with the New York Thruway. There are continuous superhighways as far west as Chicago. These are intersected by numerous highways north and south. Massachusetts has a large construction program in progress at the present time, to augment the existing highways systems.

Boston is a natural port of entry, being the nearest port on the Atlantic coast to European ports and the east coast of South American. Traffic can be easily funneled through New England and all points to the Middle West and the Pacific coast.

There are many attractions in Metropolitan Boston and the whole New England area, having great appeal to foreigners coming to this country. In addition to the natural scenic beauty, it has an abundance of historical attractions and is known also for its educational and cultural centers. During the past generation it has been referred to as one of the world's great medical centers. Students come to this area from all over the world, and attend Harvard University, the oldest in the United States, and one of the world's greatest technological institutes, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. To name a few, of the universities in this area, there are Yale, Amherst, Williams, Boston University, Boston College, Tufts, Dartmouth, Wellesley, Radcliffe, Smith and Mount Holyoke, all having an international reputation. There are many other internationally known educational institutions with many international exchange students in attendance.

During the last 20 years there has grown up a concentration of research organizations which draws from the various technical schools in this area. Located in Massachusetts are the largest electronics manufacturing and research industrial developments in the country. Another interesting development in modern science is the atomic powerplant which has recently been placed in operation in western Massachusetts.

The aforementioned are only a few of the interesting attractions for the foreign tourists, many of whom combine business and pleasure on trips to the United States.

The Massachusetts Port Authority is continually planning for the anticipated increase in transportation of freight and passengers by plane, ship, rail, truck and bus, and is prepared to take any additional action necessary to cooperate in making this international tourism a success.

The Massachusetts Port Authority strongly supports and recommends the passage of this proposed legislation to create an Office of International Travel in the Department of Commerce, for the purpose of strengthening foreign and domestic commerce, the improvement of the foreign payments position, and to facilitate international travel.

An Unfortunate Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week Governor Swainson of Michigan, issued an order forbidding the Michigan State police to continue public showings of the film "Operation Abolition."

While I do not question the authority of the Governor to issue this order, I do very seriously question his judgment in acquiescing to pressures from persons and groups who vehemently oppose anyone showing the film.

I reject completely the charge that the film is a distortion of the events which occurred in San Francisco last May during the hearings of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and I deeply regret that the Governor of Michigan accepts this view of the film.

The Governor's action is all the more unfortunate because he has given no specifics as to the alleged distortions and because there is no evidence that members of his staff who recommended the action had at any time consulted with any member of the committee, any member of the committee staff, or with the Federal Bureau of Investigation regarding the happenings at San Francisco.

Fortunately, there are numerous individuals and organizations throughout the State of Michigan, as elsewhere in the Nation, who are continuing to make the film available to citizens interested in learning about this Communist-organized and Communist-led attack on a committee of Congress.

The finest comment on the Governor's unfortunate action which has come to my attention is an editorial which appeared in the April 8 Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer and News. Under permission to extend and revise my remarks, I include the full text of this editorial:

A QUESTIONABLE ORDER

Governor Swainson's order prohibiting the Michigan State police from showing two controversial films on communism is open to considerable question. There is no doubt but that the Governor's motives were well intentioned, but this does not preclude the belief that he could have been mistaken in his judgment.

The Governor's action is disturbing in his admission that he, personally, had not seen the films—"Operation Abolition" and "Communism on the Map"—before he issued the order. Instead he acted on the advice of several staff members who, according to Mr. Swainson, "confirm criticism that the films are inaccurate and distorted and thus harm, rather than advance, the purpose of an intelligent anti-Communist campaign."

Mr. Swainson further said that his order to State police was issued after many people in the State brought the films to his attention.

From all these facts, we can only infer that Mr. Swainson has succumbed to pressure from certain groups that appear to be as ill-informed as he about one film in particular. We, personally, have not seen "Communism on the Map," therefore we are in no position to comment on it. But, we have viewed "Operation Abolition," which is a documentary film on the Communist-instigated student riots at hearings by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in San Francisco last year. Admittedly, the movie has been edited to depict precisely what it is intended to show—howling mobs of misguided young people swarming through the San Francisco city hall and disrupting not only the House hearings, but regular court proceedings as well.

In some strange manner, which we strongly suspect was an outgrowth of ultraliberal attacks on the House committee, itself, many intelligent people who normally would refuse to accept such reports without first-hand confirmation, have eagerly swallowed the charge that the film is distorted. Few among this group could have possibly witnessed the riots. How can they, in justice to their own consciences, charge inaccuracies and distortions in something of which they have only hearsay knowledge?

On the opposite side of the issue, we have the word of Representative AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, who was at the San Francisco hearings, that the film is not distorted. In his support we offer the report of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which confirms that the students did cause a riot and that they were led by known Communists.

We prefer to accept the latter statements, rather than those of people who were not at San Francisco or who have not even seen the film.

"Operation Abolition" was prepared to show how Communists have tried to destroy the committee and to portray how the Reds can infiltrate American college campuses. It, therefore, does serve a valuable purpose in helping to inform the public of how the Communists work. For the first time, the average citizen has had a chance to see Communists in action in America, and he is rather appalled by what he sees. And, the Communists, themselves, know that the film is making their work harder.

Under Governor Swainson's order, however, the security investigation squad can no longer show the movie. Thus, the State's "little FBI" has lost a valuable instrument in the fight against subversion. While private groups can continue to show it, the Governor's order is certain to cast a shadow over its value.

We recommend that if Governor Swainson has not already persused the Hoover report on the San Francisco riots, that he do so forthwith. And if he has, we call on him to explain how he can accept charges of distortion in the film against the facts offered by Mr. Hoover.

We earnestly urge the Governor to reconsider his decision in this matter.

Crash Program Needed To Save Waterfowl Wetlands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if our dwindling duck population is to be saved, Congress must act soon to speed up the purchase of lands for migratory bird refuges and waterfowl nesting areas. In 1954, I exposed the diversion of the bulk of income from Federal duck stamp fees to purposes other than wetlands acquisition, for which purpose hunters had voluntarily accepted the fee in the first place. During the next 4 years, I battled for legislation to insure that all income from the stamps would go to provide more refuges for migratory waterfowl. This legislation was enacted into law in 1958.

However, even though all duck stamp money is now earmarked for the purchase of wetlands, it will take years for the program to reach the anticipated goal of 4,500,000 acres. Meanwhile, many areas marked for acquisition will have been drained or converted to other uses, and land prices will most likely have become prohibitively high. The next 10 years are the critical period. Wetlands must be acquired now, or it will be too late to save continental flights of waterfowl.

As every duck hunter knows, waterfowl hunting has grown poorer in recent years, and fewer hunters have taken to the field. As a result, duck stamp sales have lagged. During the 1960 fiscal year, only 1,628,365 Federal duck stamps were sold. This figure is 741,575 below

the number sold during the peak year of 1955.

Mr. Speaker, with fewer duck stamps being sold, less money has been available for purchase of new refuges. This, in turn, has resulted in poorer hunting, fewer hunters, smaller duck stamp receipts and a further lag in the acquisition program.

In order to break this vicious circle, I have joined my colleagues, Congressmen HENRY REUSS and JOHN DINGELL, in introducing a crash program for wetlands acquisitions. The measure authorizes a loan of $150 million over the next 10 years to purchase the needed property. Starting in 1971, the money would be repaid to the U.S. Treasury from duck stamp revenues.

This buy-now, pay-later plan will enable the Nation to safeguard its valuable wetland resources during the critical decade of the 1960's. Thereafter, full repayment of the loan will be made from funds contributed by the duck hunters themselves. By creating the wetlands, we shall also be creating the means to repay the purchase-loan money.

Matzke Claims Africans Need Aid From United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Lawrence Daily Journal-World of March 31, 1961, telling about a talk given before the Lawrence Kiwanis Club by Dr. Howard Matzke, professor of anatomy at Kansas University, and one quite familiar with the African continent and its people. In his talk, Dr. Matzke pinpointed several situations and problems with which the United States is confronted, and with which we must deal, concerning Africa and her quest for independence. Because Dr. Matzke favors real and vital help for Africa, and because his considerations make a great deal of sense to me, I am pleased to call this article to the attention of my colleagues:

MATZKE CLAIMS AFRICANS NEED AID FROM UNITED STATES

"Africa needs our help, not American companionship," Dr. Howard Matzke, Kansas University anatomy professor, said Thursday in a talk to the Lawrence Kiwanis Club.

Dr. Matzke, who returned in January after completing a research project in the Congo region, viewed America's volunteer Peace Corps—which he labeled Kennedy's Kiddie Corps—as an impractical attempt to help the Africans.

He also termed a recent utterance by G. Mennen Williams, new U.S. envoy in Africa, of the slogan "Africa for the Africans" as "one of the most stupid statements ever made."

The word "Uhrhu"—Swahili for independence—is on the lips of many Africans now. Yet few Africans understand what independence means, Dr. Matzke said.

"I asked some of my African medical students what independence means to them," he said. "They replied, 'freedom'—but they did not know freedom from what. They are not aware of the increased responsibilities of independence."

Dr. Matzke said that America can best help Africa by sending doctors, engineers, teachers, and other capable persons to Africa, to work with Africans on the spot in order to best learn their needs. He cited mass illiteracy, strong tribal loyalties, and a lack of public moral concepts as Americans understand them as major obstacles to African self-government. At best, he envisioned a loose federation of tribal states, with most of the governing power remaining in local hands.

"We must be very patient, and help as much as we can," he said. "We must not just send money, we must send real help for the African people."

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the third in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter.

The article follows:

ALL COUNTY HEALTH SERVICES ARE USED BY MIGRANT WORKERS

"What happened to your foot Jerome?"

"I give it a little down by the washhouse."

"I see, you drove a nail in it down by the washhouse. What did your mother do for that?"

"Put some alcohol on it."—"Harvest of Shame."

Belle Glade physicians, aware of the needs of the community, soon will open their third clinic for indigent persons.

A spokesman for the doctors said a new "morbidity clinic" might be put into use this week or next.

"It will be free for all indigent patients, including migrants," the doctor said. "Patients will be examined at Belle Glade Memorial Hospital from 12:30 to 2 p.m., Mondays through Fridays."

Actually, he said, migrants are expected to make up the largest number of the patients.

"They may report for treatment of anything not covered by our two other clinics," he said. "It might be pneumonia, tonsilitis, ear disorders, or even surgery. Nobody who is indigent will be refused treatment."

The doctor said physicians of the area are concerned that "Harvest of Shame" producers saw fit to show only the negative side of the migrant health picture.

"Much has been done for the health of Palm Beach County's migrants," he said. "As a matter of fact, our county was one of only two in the entire Nation to receive commendation from the President after a national study was made of migrant health."

Working at Memorial Hospital, the physicians maintain cardiac and obstetrical clinics for the indigent.

"The hospital provides its equipment free of charge—including the electrocardiograph apparatus—and medicines are supplied by the Palm Beach Heart Association," the doctor said.

The cardiac clinic functions once each 2 weeks. Up to 20 patients report for aid each day.

"Some are required to attend each day. Others report in every 3 or 4 months," the doctor said. "There is no charge."

The obstetrical clinic is open each Wednesday and provides a low-cost maternity plan. For $80, the patent is provided both the physician's services and the hospital's facilities.

Laboratory work is done by the Public Health Service. Physicians rotate to deliver the babies. Up to 30 patients per week are handled.

"It is not necessary for the patient to pay anything at the time of enrolling," the doctor said. "That can be arranged later."

Actually, migrants receive considerable medical aid outside the clinics, the doctor noted.

"A tremendous number report to the hospital to have wounds and lacerations patched without cost," he said. "There always is a physician on call or present at the hospital to care for these people, and we are proud that nobody ever must wait more than 5 minutes to have a doctor's service in an emergency."

Who began the service?

"Nobody in particular wants credit for it," the physician said. "It is just something that developed to meet the needs of the community."

Palm Beach County's migrants also have access to other free or low-cost medical service and advice.

The county maintains health centers at 1024 Northwest Avenue D in Belle Glade and 612 East Main Street in Pahokee.

Dr. C. L. Brumback, who is in charge of the centers, said money for emergencies has been made available through voluntary contributions in addition to governmental appropriations and other sources.

"Continuous efforts are being made to adopt services to the special conditions of these people. Over a period of years, certain clinics have been held at night in order to be available for migrants after working hours," he said.

"Mobile clinics and other programs have been taken out into migrant areas. Free transportation has been provided to clinics not available in rural areas."

If migrants can't afford private medical care, they are eligible for low-cost maternity programs, immunizations, well-baby conferences, tuberculosis and other communicable disease services, and consultation or referral for many other health problems, Dr. Brumback said.

Hospital care also is available, he indicated.

Physicians and dentists work unselfishly in behalf of the indigent, Dr. Brumback reported.

"This is a county where our physicians have provided care to indigent patients in hospitals without remuneration," he said.

Many hours of service have been given, too, in various outpatient clinics such as obstetrical, well-baby, dental, pediatric, orthopedic, tuberculosis, venereal disease, cancer,

heart, and general illness by private physicians and dentists, Dr. Brumback said.

The State as well as the county maintains special services in Palm Beach County, Dr. Brumback noted.

In addition to providing bedside nursing care, the nurses refer patients to appropriate agencies for care, school health programs, mental health nursing service and communicable disease services, the physician said.

"Welfare workers offer consultation and referral services and assist in obtaining medical care. Nutritionists give advice and help toward obtaining an adequate well-balanced diet within financial resources," he added.

A number of other services for migrants are provided in this county by the Florida Vocational Rehabilitation Service and such voluntary agencies as the Visiting Nurses Association of Palm Beach County, Tuberculosis and Health Association, Heart Association, Cancer Society, and Mental Health Association, Dr. Brumback pointed out.

"A big problem in providing health services is lack of understanding of the need for these services or sufficient motivation to seek help when problems arise," the physician said.

"The solution lies in appropriate education, and this has been the subject of considerable study and research with some hopeful results," he added.

Research by the Belle Glade Chamber of Commerce shows the community during a 5-year period charged off a $318,777.81 hospital bill accumulated by indigent patients.

"Most of this was for migrants who did not qualify for county welfare aid," the chamber reported.

At Belle Glade, the chamber said, seven persons in public health service work are employed at the health center with county personnel.

And from 1957 to 1959, the two groups examined in family clinics about 850 patients. Of these, more than half were migrants, the chamber found.

In 1958, the chamber said, about 7,000 migrants were given blood tests and chest X-rays and provided with health records.

"We are cognizant of the health problems of Palm Beach County, and progress is being made," the chamber said. "We shall continue to direct our efforts toward the protection and promotion of the health of all people in our county."

The Shame of Poor Government Rests on Voters Themselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, my hometown newspaper, the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, has been performing an outstanding service by editorially tapping the knuckles of citizens who are inclined to let the reins of good government slip through their hands. One of the Sun's recent editorials, which appeared on Easter Sunday, particularly merits the attention of the House of Representatives. Under leave to extend my remarks, I now insert it in the RECORD:

THE SHAME OF POOR GOVERNMENT RESTS ON VOTERS THEMSELVES

On this Easter day as the Christian world is observing the joy of the resurrection of Christ, it is fitting that the people of Massachusetts should give some thought to the problems besetting the Commonwealth and the low ethical standards of too many of our elected officials.

Ethics has to do with the science of moral duty, and one of high ethical standards is one who lives up to the best in exercising his moral duty, be it in politics, in business or in the home.

On the Friday before His resurrection Christ gave to the world the best possible example of ethics when His moral duty compelled Him to suffer death on the cross rather than to yield to the easier way out of His problems—and His example has come down through the ages as a guide to mankind.

We do not expect our elected officials to have the courage or the moral stamina of Christ, but neither do we expect them to stray so far from existing ethical standards as to jeopardize the continued success of the Commonwealth for the sake of a mess of pottage.

Regardless of how an elected official votes on any proposal, so long as he is voting according to the dictates of his own conscience, he is exercising his prerogative as it should be exercised.

By the same token, when an elected official allows material or any other gain to influence him to vote other than his sense of right dictates, he is not living up to the ethical standard which we should expect of all who take public office.

The Democratic or Republican officeholder who bows to the dictates of his party leadership to vote for any issue which he honestly believes is not in the interests of good government is violating the self-same code of ethics of which we are writing, for he is acting not according to his sense of moral duty but merely to win for himself party support when the next election comes round, or for personal advancement within the party.

That there should be any talk of a need for a legislated code of ethics in this or any other State is in itself a confession of moral weakness, for there are few in or out of public office who do not recognize right and wrong, and this can be the only true guide.

But it is not sufficient to hold only elected officials to a code of ethics, or rather to ethical behavior in their public office.

We must remember at all times that all elected officials are selected by the voters—by you and by me—and their continuance in office depends entirely upon the will of the voters.

If we, as members of the electorate, would base our selections at election time on the simple fact that we believe the one we vote for will serve in the best interests of the town, city, county, State, or Federal Government, we shall have accomplished more than all the codes of ethics written in the lawbooks ever shall accomplish.

If we, at election time, close our ears to the blandishments of the skilled orator and weigh only what he offers against what we believe the office he seeks requires in order to raise the level of government, we again shall have done more than such a code could ever hope to accomplish.

Each and every elected official is answerable at election time to the people who have sent him into office, and if we would turn thumbs down on the man who has played politics regardless of the good of the city, town, or State, we would have done more to elevate the level of government than anything else could accomplish.

We as citizens have the answers right in our own hands.

If we live up to a decent sense of moral standards at election time, and let our conscience rather than anything else dictate our choices, we would not have to hide our faces in shame when questionable practices in Government rise into view.

Good government rests with each individual voter. We can have good government without a legislated code of ethics if we, ourselves, would exercise the same sense of moral duty at election time which we want our elected officials to exercise when they are serving in our town governments, in our city governments, or at the county, State, or Federal level of government.

That there is any need for a code of ethics regulating our lawmakers is more a reflection on us, the voters, than on anyone else.

Salem Editor Charles Sprague Urges Community College Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent column which has been reprinted in the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin, Editor Charles Sprague of the Oregon Statesman urged action in our State to expand the system of community colleges. Although Editor Sprague was primarily concerned with proposals before the Oregon State Legislature, the points which he makes regarding the need for an expanded community colleges system are not relevant only in Oregon. They are basic points and indicate some of the reasons for my sponsorship of H.R. 16 to provide Federal assistance to States such as Oregon which are attempting to meet the pressing need for additional education beyond the high school level through the community college institution. I believe that the following excerpts from Editor Sprague's column will be of interest to my colleagues:

[From the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin, Mar. 16, 1961]

SALEM EDITOR CHARLES SPRAGUE URGES COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROGRAM

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following commentary on junior colleges was written by Charles A. Sprague, editor and publisher of the Oregon Statesman, in his page 1 column "It Seems to Me." Mr. Sprague is a former Governor and former educator who is eminently qualified to speak on education.)

(By Charles A. Sprague)

The community college idea has been kicked around a lot in Oregon, especially at the legislative assembly. It isn't just an Oregon problem; other States are wrestling with the same thing. In California the community college program has grown like Jack's beanstalk. Most everywhere the idea originates at local levels, in cities which have no institutions of higher learning, yet feel the need for providing education beyond high school.

In Oregon the idea of local 2-year colleges has had more kicking than action. The only city which has experimented with such a college is Bend where it is administered by the school board. That college has survived for over a decade, but not without struggle—and its struggle wasn't ended with provision of State aid for one-third the operating expense. Other cities which have had some aspirations for a community college are Coos Bay and Astoria. It happens that there are three separate bills in the present legislature dealing with community colleges, each

having as chief sponsors, legislators from Clatsop, Coos, or Deschutes Counties.

There is a pressing need for additional education beyond the high school level, and this justifies a community college system. First, there are many youth whose interests and capabilities do not run to those best served in the 4-year colleges. Second, there are many youth who can't afford to go away to college but who would profit from another year or two of instruction. Finally there is the very real need for upgrading the preparation of young men and women for the world into which they will enter. This means more of elementary science and mathematics and English and social studies. It means more, much more in vocational guidance and training. I am not limiting this to trades. Trades are still important, but with advancing mechanization, old trades suffer from declining demand. This mechanized age calls more and more for those with mental alertness and manual dexterity to run and service machines. Vocational training should include courses enabling youth to adapt themselves to varied employment situations. Statistics show that the ratio of common labor to all labor is declining. As a result those who lack qualifications above the common labor level are apt to be surplus save in times of full employment.

SUGGESTS THE ANSWER

How can we get these community colleges or educational centers? The extension division of the State system of higher deucation is providing many and varied courses all over the State. They are mostly part time, and are not usually oriented to vocations. We can have community colleges either by joint local-State support or by having the State assume the burden. The system just can't exist with only local property tax support plus tuition, or even with one-third support from the State. The best plan would be for the State board of education to set up and run the schools, at State cost over tuition. For the intermediate period local government with State support of at least one-half or two-thirds may have to serve.

Sure, the system is going to cost—but, if these institutions are infected with a serious purpose and well staffed, they will pay rich dividends in the later attainments of their students. This legislature should face right up to the problem, for time is wasting for hundreds of Oregon young men and women.

Traffic and Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following excerpt from the April 10, 1961, issue of City Club Comments, a publication of the City Club of New York. Traffic, particularly commuter traffic, is an increasingly difficult problem for the city of New York. The problem we face and some suggestions as to possible solutions will be found in this article. It should be particularly interesting to those concerned with urban planning and mass transportation:

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORATION—COMMUTATION AND FRUSTRATION

When William Reid, who has served our city well in such top administrative posts as deputy mayor, city treasurer, chairman of the board of transportation, and now, chairman of the housing authority, received our club's award of merit last month, his response stressed that "a more perfect city" must be based on a solution of the transportation problem.

Commissioner Reid praised the planning commission for its decision not to build parking garages in the already congested central business district of Manhattan and criticized the Port of New York Authority and the Tri-Borough Bridge and Tunnel Authority for their narrow interest in revenue-producing vehicular traffic without regard to its effect upon the city.

(We regret that we were not able to get sufficient copies of the planning commission's report, "Proposed Municipal Garages for Midtown Manhattan," to mail one to every member but copies may be obtained by writing direct to the commission, 2 Lafayette Street. We think every serious student of municipal problems will want to read this paper.)

Councilman Stanley M. Isaacs, who also was honored by the club, commented that our city needs plans of a size and scope to capture the imagination. He cited the fact that the planners of our subway system, starting 60 years ago, boldly extended it into the far-off Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens, into areas where few families and fewer industries were located, confident that the existence of adequate transportation would assure growth.

Both men taxed as timid souls those who today build bridges to Staten Island and New Jersey for automobiles only, because they believe only the automobile driver will pay the cost.

Unfortunately, it is easier to agree that automotive transportation is inefficient in New York than it is to figure out how to organize and pay for a more efficient system.

In connection with the troubles of the New Haven Railroad, the suggestion was made by a Federal official at a recent public hearing that the road go into bankruptcy as a preliminary to reorganizing on a more efficient basis. Later someone offered the corollary suggestion to place all commuter railroads serving New York under a Federal court receivership, throw in the New York subway system, the Port of New York Authority, the Tri-Borough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, the commuter buslines, the city and State park departments, and the New York City Planning Commission.

Laugh all we want, that's the true size of the commuter problem, and all the engineering schemes ever dreamed of will never mean much until there is a way of coordinating the businesses and agencies which must work together if the problem is to be solved. Most of the previous, ballyhooed studies of transportation and traffic problems have been designed to serve one or another of the competing transportation interests or have been simply expensive political boondoggles with various lawyers and engineers filling paper to justify fees. Obviously, few politicians would turn the job over to those not identified with their political persuasion, and no business group would hire a consultant who wasn't precommitted to support its financial interest.

THE PROBLEM

Simply stated, the transportation problem is that travel by any means into New York City, especially Manhattan, is becoming slower and more expensive. At the same time, automotive traffic within New York City has become denser and slower, as more large trucks and private cars seek to use the city's streets, not only to move on but to park on. The more efficient forms of transportation are losing out to the less efficient forms. The enormous growth of auto ownership and use has had the effect of slowing down movement within the city and raising the cost of numerous city services. However, because no one wants to get rid of the automobile, an effort must be made to effect a satisfactory accommodation to it.

THE OBJECTIVES

The objectives of a program for traffic and transportation should be:

1. To provide for rapid, economical mass transportation from all existing commuter areas and from new centers of population, such as Staten Island and northern New Jersey, into New York City and efficient distribution of commuters within the city.

2. To provide adequate offstreet parking at reasonable prices both convenient to commutation facilities and in peripheral areas within the city.

A POSSIBLE PROGRAM

To achieve these objectives, most or all of the following ideas may have to be used:

1. Coordination of all existing commuter rail facilities into an effective system, tying in at logical crossings or transfer points with the subway system serving New York City.

2. Construction of new rail facilities to serve areas not now adequately served. This might require provision for suburban transfer points from rubber to rails and use of the George Washington and Verrazano-Narrows Bridges for rail as well as automotive traffic.

3. Use of major parkways, now closed to bus traffic, for higher speed, longer haul bus transportation. If busses ran on the parkways, more cars could be left at home.

4. Tolls on present free crossings to discourage casual auto traffic into Manhattan and to help provide revenue for the rest of the program.

5. Construction of large scale public garages in renewal areas outside the central core of Manhattan to be rented at very low cost, and, if necessary, subsidized, in order to permit the city to enforce stricter no-parking regulations. Such garages should be large enough to accommodate, on a permanent basis and at a modest price, everyone who owns or operates a car in Manhattan. The problem is too big for the city to be greatly concerned with the matter of competition with the commercial garages, which will, in any event, have the advantage of better location.

6. The strict requirement of off-street or night loading in congested areas, with strict enforcement of no-standing regulations for trucks as well as private cars.

The relocation of whole industries into renewal areas where traffic control can be planned.

DIRECTION AND PLANNING

Although we suspect that such a program, considering its scale, would not be too expensive and might come near paying for itself, we somehow doubt that it will ever be undertaken on a realistic basis without Federal intervention, or at least Federal leadership. It seems to call for a scale of thinking and coordination of which cities alone, or even cities, States and private industry working together, have not been capable. But if man is capable of recognizing a problem and visualizing a solution, it should not be impossible to carry out a program.

In Washington today, urban problems are being considered really seriously for the first time. Can cities be made more livable? How shall we handle the complex jurisdictional questions which arise when cities spill out in all directions, across State lines and other lines of political jurisdiction and must still somehow be served as if they were single political organisms?

We must welcome the growing interest in urban problems. Some day, soon we hope, there will be a need for gigantic peace programs. Compared to our present socially wasteful expenditures for military purposes, the cost of properly renewing our cities, even if expressed in billions, will be insignificant.

We emphasize, for the benefit of any Federal planners and thinkers who may read this comment, that the transportation and traffic problem in the New York area is no petty problem. We are talking about 16 million people, 10 percent of the Nation, possibly 20 percent of the Nation's productive capacity.

Socialism Would Be a Strange Export for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Saturday Evening Post of March 25, 1961:

SOCIALISM WOULD BE A STRANGE EXPORT FOR THE UNITED STATES

In announcing the appointment of a new member to the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, President Kennedy urged that organization to "study ways in which the lessons it has learned in the Tennessee Valley may be exported abroad." While few dispute the accomplishments of TVA as an engineering achievement, it would be less than accurate to send abroad the impression that only by tax-consuming, semisocialistic projects have we taken long leaps forward.

Actually, the most striking progress in this industry, as in most others, has been made by private-investor companies. Despite taxes and interest rates which favor public power, with more to come in the new administration, at least 80 percent of our electric power is produced by private-enterprise companies. The Idaho Power Co.'s Hell's Canyon dams add enormously to the power resources of the area and, incidentally, pay $10 million in Federal, State, and local taxes. Experimentation in the use of nuclear fuel for electric-power production is being carried on—with the money of American savers and investors—by a number of power companies. Seventeen nuclear plants are in construction at a cost of about $700 million.

Obviously a vast publicly financed and virtually tax-exempt enterprise like TVA can produce electricity, but the message which one might expect an American Government to send abroad is the fact that the most significant American economic progress, including that in the electric power industry, has been made by private corporations and individuals. Sometimes one is tempted to believe that many American politicians have forgotten this fact. On the other hand, it is difficult to find much public support for socialized industry. Last November in the so-called public-power States in the western part of the country—despite the effort of Democratic candidates to make public power an important campaign issue—Republicans won in most of these States. It is not insisted that efforts to plug public power account for the defeat of Democratic candidates in these States—only that the alleged issue did not generate enough steam to elect them.

It is curious that politicians should place so much emphasis on public power and public projects generally when in other countries the passion for Socialist adventures is fading. Great Britain's exercise in denationalizing its formerly nationalized industries has given that country a new birth of economic freedom which has left the Labor Party with no issue worth fighting for except getting the Americans and their Polaris missile off the island. New Zealand has retired its Socialist regime of many years' standing, and West Germany, whose prosperity is driving the Communists crazy, is well launched on a series of privatizations of its government-owned industries including Volkswagen.

What the West Germans have been doing ought to be of great interest to Americans, because it suggests a page out of our own "people's capitalism." In the recent denationalization of Volkswagen, investors were limited to those with incomes of no more than $3,200 a year. They were encouraged to hang onto their stock by promise of a big dividend after 2 years. The program, worked out by Economic Minister Ludwig Erhard, is called Eigentum für Federmann (property for everybody) and up to now has been an enormous success. Already some 216,000 Germans own pieces of Preussig, a mining-and-smelting firm long owned by the government. They bought the shares for $34 each and, according to the Wall Street Journal, the recent price is about $75. The Volkswagen deal went through in January and resulted in the distribution of ownership of Hitler's prize state corporation among probably 500,000 people. This, of course, isn't everybody, but after all, investing isn't compulsory.

Coming soon will be a public offering of stock in Prussian Electric, the nearest thing in Germany to our TVA. A few years back former Senator Edward Martin of Pennsylvania proposed a similar disposal of TVA, arguing, among other things, that this would give the Government and local authorities a chance to tax TVA revenues and properties. The German Government appears to lack that reason for denationalizing Prussian Electric, for that power complex in 1958 paid 37 percent of its gross revenues in taxes. This compares with an average of 23 percent paid by American investor power companies and, of course, distances TVA completely.

If the New Frontier wants to do something handsome for other countries, why not let them in on some of the things our people have been doing for themselves without bureaucratic interference? Actually delegations from all over the world visit our private powerplants, as well as TVA, to get ideas on engineering, management, and finance. It looks as if some other countries have done their homework on this subject and may wonder why the capitalistic United States should attempt to educate them on the virtues of socialism.

SECONDARY BOYCOTTS HAVE BEEN A HEADACHE; NOW THERE'S A MOVE TO MAKE THEM LEGAL

The beginning of an effort to whittle away the legal protection against secondary boycotts by labor unions takes shape in the introduction in the House and Senate of bills which would legalize common-situs picketing by building-trades unions.

What this amounts to is that, if a subcontractor on a building job in New York were involved in a dispute with a union, say, in Pittsburgh, perhaps as the result of an effort to pressure workers into a racketeer union, all the hundreds of painters, carpenters, plumbers, electricians, and so on, on the New York enterprise could be called off the job.

Under the Landrum-Griffin law such picketing is not permitted. The power the new law would give to union bosses—including some of the worst racketeers—is easily imagined. The harassed general contractor would be tempted to throw up his hands and demand that the subcontractor submit to the union demands, whatever they were. He might be compelled to force his men to join the union whether they wanted to, or whether they were satisfied with the union they already belonged to.

Secondary boycotts have already plagued our defense installations. A plumbers' union shut down Cape Canaveral for 15 days. Other secondary boycotts occurred at two Atlas bases and a Titan base in Kansas, three missile bases in Wyoming, and an Air Force base in Missouri. The new bills provide that military installations and missile bases shall be warned 10 days in advance of a strike. But there is not even this modest protection for the private contractor or the already thoroughly plucked homebuilder.

The Landrum-Griffin Act prohibits picketing for extortion, picketing which interrupts deliveries or service to an employer, and other unfair picketing. It also bars secondary boycotts. These operate to deprive thousands of the right to work, as happened in the recent tugboat strike which put thousands of railroad men off the job at the bidding of a few hundred tugboat employees who had been declared surplus.

Those who defend this change argue that it gives the building-trades unions privileges which industrial unions already enjoy. They insist that industrial unions may picket a factory site, but that construction unions cannot do so because a number of employers are involved. This argument ignores the fact that industrial unions are not permitted to impose secondary boycotts—that is to say, tie up a plant because of a labor dispute somewhere else. The real necessity is to tighten the restrictions on secondary boycotts rather than to assist the union bosses in an effort to break through existing limitations.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the second in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter.

The article follows:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

GOVERNOR BRYANT WRITES

The producers of "Harvest of Shame" did a great injustice to the many Floridians who have worked long and hard to improve the lot of the migrant worker.

Local committees, leaders of the Florida Legislature and officials of concerned State agencies have done much to better housing conditions and to make available to the migrant workers who flock to Florida each year the supplies of foods and medicines which are necessary to a healthy and productive way of life.

Perhaps the greatest injustice, though, was done to the migrant workers themselves.

These individuals who for years cared as little for their surroundings or their way of life as did the majority of people with whom they came in contact, have responded to the interest taken in their well-being by concerned groups with a fine spirit of cooperation and a desire to obtain self-betterment.

They are beginning to take pride in their surroundings and in the recognition of their human worth being given them by employers, the governmental officials who seek to help them and citizens generally.

There are improvements yet to be made. There is more help to be obtained, and indeed there are the occasional tragic stories of starving and penniless families which make headlines. These serve to remind us of the work yet to be done, and the diminishing number of such headlines is a source of pride in the steps toward a better tomorrow we have already taken.

The "Harvest of Shame" is over and done with. We should look now to the day when a new documentary is prepared and produced, telling the story of Florida's migrants and their harvest with pride.

Jack Williams—Editorial Commentary for March 16, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, one of Arizona's finest editorial commentators is Jack Williams, of radio station KOY in Phoenix. Mr. Williams is a former mayor of Phoenix, and for years has been a favorite radio personality of the people residing in a large portion of Arizona. Jack Williams has always opposed bigotry of any form, and from whatever direction it might come. I think his commentary of March 16, 1961, is particularly good, and under leave previously granted to extend my remarks, I wish to share it with my colleagues in the Congress:

A friend said to us the other day, that the precise moment that the Communists take over this country—if they do—would pass unnoticed at the time.

I have pondered that remark ever since.

We are prone to think that the Communists' takeover would be to the accompaniment of guns and mobs in the street, and torches to the shops.

Actually, he who controls Washington, almost controls the country now; and with the drift toward a centralized state, will control it soon. The transition from a free republic will be accomplished by the citizens themselves who pervert the very goals that seem attractive to some today.

Through a relaxation of our freedoms, and especially our first 10 amendments, these perversions will be easily accomplished because we will be accustomed to them. All political parties will be outlawed except those we consider proper. And ultimately, there will be but one party, the union of free American patriots. Some of us will protest, but it will be too late to ask why we can't have a Republican or a Democratic Party. And a law will have been passed and properly approved to remove all firearms from citizens unless proper licenses are secured for possessing same. And only free American patriots can have guns of course.

There is a special kind of oath that everybody takes swearing not to work against the Government in any way whatsoever and by means of this oath, anybody who doesn't belong to the patriotic party is judged.

A lot of us are pretty concerned because we think that all of this is unconstitutional, but we are told that the Constitution is a flexible thing and when we protest too much we are hauled into court and following a session of brainwashing, we find ourselves admitting our own guilt by association. In fact, the infamous fifth amendment was repealed in a burst of enthusiasm; this was the amendment that all those crooks used to hide behind, and now anybody can be forced to be a witness against himself. They use this brainwashing deal but some folks say that an old-fashioned rack and thumbscrew in the basement of the White House is quicker.

Does what I say tonight sound farfetched? There isn't a thing I've discussed that hasn't been advocated and some of the actions have been already put into effect.

The freedoms our forefathers fought for, we're apt to lose simply because we have failed to read history and understand it.

Communist Hemispheric Conquest Via Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in numerous addresses in and out of the Congress, which are based upon careful research, personal observations, and extensive consultations with many persons of experienced judgment, I have repeatedly described the growing dangers to the south from Communist penetration, infiltration, and subversion, particularly in the strategic Caribbean.

It is indeed fortunate that we have in our country some who are endowed with the combination of ability, experience, and courage to present the picture of what now faces us with clarity and insight, at the same time outlining a course of action to meet the challenge.

In the March 10, 1961, issue of Duluth Publicity of Duluth, Minn., there appeared a highly revealing address by Hon. Spruille Braden, one of the country's leading authorities on the diplomatic problems of Latin America.

To make Dr. Braden's penetrating analysis and suggested program available to the Congress and the Nation at large, I quote the entire text at this point in the RECORD, and commend it for study by all concerned with the security of the Western Hemisphere.

THE COMMUNIST PATH TO CONQUEST OF WESTERN HEMISPHERE IS VIA CUBA

(By the Honorable Spruille Braden, former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba and numerous South American countries, in a speech delivered at the annual Founder's Day luncheon of the National Society of the New England Women, January 25, 1961)

For more than three decades, the Communists have been seizing the favorable opportunities afforded by peaceful coexistence for subversion, class struggle, and sabotage everywhere and for revolution wherever and whenever they could get away with it, as they now have in Cuba.

Eudocio Ravines, former Peruvian Communist, tells of a Moscow meeting during 1934 of several Latin American and Russian Communist leaders. It was suggested that actual insurrection might be provoked in Brazil, but that any advances in the other American Republics should be made through "popular front governments" and subversion. Ravines objected that the United States quickly would suppress by force any attempted uprising in Brazil. Dmitri Manuilsky, who was presiding, sarcastically replied:

"Our dear comrade would be right if the United States were to dispatch its ships and troops to Brazil. Clearly, we could not ask the people to fight with clubs or orchids against cannons. But, happily for us and for the luck of the world proletariat, we have resolved the problem far in advance. Comrade, the International has concerned itself not with controlling cannons and warships, but influencing and absolutely controlling the finger which would press the magic button, the one which would make the fleet sail."

Manuilsky then detailed the great Communist accomplishments in penetrating the highest, most important and powerful spheres in the United States—the fundamental positions of "the high command of capitalism."

ALARM SOUNDED

Based on several personal experiences, I can attest to the existence of this penetration.

In 1954 I testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that while serving as Ambassador to Argentina, in early July 1945 I sent two top secret cables for the President and the Secretary of State who were about to attend the Potsdam Conference. I referred to a long list of telegrams, dispatches, memoranda, and reports in person to the State Department made over a period of several years on Communist activities throughout this hemisphere. I told how Peron was playing hand in glove with the Communists. I urged in the strongest terms that Truman and Churchhill at Potsdam lay it on the line with Stalin, that these machinations and subversions must stop immediately.

As I discovered years later, someone in the State Department or somewhere along the line so contrived that those extremely urgent messages never reached the President and Secretary of State. Who pressed that magic button? The question never has been answered.

Among the many alarms I repeated through the years, both in and out of Government, as to the Communist danger in this hemisphere, I specifically warned about the Communists' attempts to control Bolivia and Guatemala—but all to no avail.

CASTRO, CHAOS, AND COMMUNISM

I testified on July 17, 1959, before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that on October 4, 1957, I went out of my way to warn the top echelons of the State Department that if they continued their present policies, they would bring Castro, chaos, and communism to Cuba. I was assured that my message had gone to the very top. Yet 1 month later, on November 6, the Secretary of State in a press interview, declared that the United States did not consider Communist activities in Latin America as dangerous [sic].

The time has come to find out who deceived and kept the truth from the Secretary of State. Was it only the result of stupidity, or did someone control the finger that presses the magic button?

WHAT GOES ON?

The State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency should have had far better

knowledge than I—as a private citizen—about Castro and his Communist background; what he had done and planned to do; what was happening and going to happen. If they did not, why not? Actually, we know they were informed. Why then did they fail to protect the United States? Why was aid and comfort given to Castro and the Communists?

This state of affairs is all the more shocking, because there never has been any secret about Fidel Castro and some of his government colleagues being all-out Communists.

CHRONOLOGY ON CASTRO

In early 1943, along with other young Communist league members, Fidel was known to have been put through a course of instruction by Gumer W. Bashinov of the Soviet legation in Havana. In the university, Castro was recognized by both professors and fellow students as belonging to a Communist apparatus.

In 1948 he was sent by the party on a vitally important mission in Colombia. There he may have had a hand in the assassination on April 9, 1948, of Gaitan, a leading Colombian presidential candidate.

There is positive testimony by the Colombian chief of national police and others that Castro incited, and actively participated in the rioting and looting, incendiarism, and murdering during the Bogotaza which was planned and directed by international communism, and which destroyed that capital city. There are responsible accounts that Castro boasted of having killed three priests.

When, during 1955, Fidel, his brother Raul, Che Guevara, and others were being trained for guerrilla fighting by the notorious Spanish Communist, Colonel Bayo, in Mexico, our Embassy in Mexico City officially reported to the State Department that Castro was a Communist.

SOMETHING VERY WRONG

It appears that this report and often others from the CIA, the FBI, and the State Department's intelligence staff were not even read. The officer in charge of Mexican, Central American, and Caribbean affairs in August 1959 was unaware, or claimed to be unaware, of an analysis of Castro and other Cuban Communist governmental leaders which had been prepared by the State Department's research staff.

Castro's revolution, generally called the 26th of July movement, is the direct offspring of, and includes much of the same membership as, the "Buro del Caribe" (Bureau of the Caribbean) which was a section or branch of the Comintern. This bureau was in existence when I served as Ambassador to Cuba from 1942 to 1945. Its chief, Fabio Grobart (a Polish Red who traveled under 9 different nationalities and 11 aliases) directed all Communist activities throughout the hemisphere except for propaganda aimed at the colored people around the Caribbean which was directed from Harlem in New York City.

WRONG U.S. POLICIES

Fidel's conduct of the revolution from the Sierra Maestra was characteristically Communist—typified by his kidnaping of U.S. citizens and a group of Marines from our Guantanamo Naval Base. After suffering from this indignity, we humiliated ourselves by sending two consular officers to negotiate with Raul Castro for the release of these U.S. citizens.

Instead of demanding their release, we treated the Communist bandit as if he were the head of a sovereign power. This unprecedented self-abasement reinforced the conviction—already created by previous stupidities showing utter ignorance of Cuban psychology—that the United States was backing Castro against Batista.

Of course, many Cubans who had become fed up with long years of corruption, were desperately anxious to get rid of the old type government. So, not unnaturally, they stumbled into supporting Castro. Even so, they primarily are responsible for their present desperate straits. But the U.S. Government must accept its share of the guilt. With a little commonsense diplomacy, Batista could have been eliminated and replaced by a reasonably honest, constitutionally elected, representative government. Instead, either we committed one of the most grievous and costly blunders of our history, or some finger pressed the "magic button" and thus helped to bring the Communists to power in Cuba in what may turn out to be the worst catastrophe ever to strike this hemisphere.

COMMUNIST SCOURGE

The bloodthirsty Communists have scourged and defiled Cuba, destroyed decency and obliterated every right and freedom. The extent of their property confiscations from Cubans is rivalled only in part by the more than $1 billion of U.S. investments they have seized. They have corrupted the young; set children to spy against and denounce their own parents, and condemned and punished the innocent. They have made thousands of Cubans homeless and jobless. Weeping mothers, wives, widows, children, and orphans testify to the imprisonments and slow death in the Isle of Pines and in other prisons. Worse than all these barbarities has been the searing of Cuba's soul and the scorification of her spiritual values.

It would be inhuman of us to abandon our Cuban friends to Communist slavery and Soviet-Sino domination. Over 18 months ago, at a press conference in Chicago, I said I had been praying to God that the Cubans might rescue themselves. I am still praying, although the record shows that no people ever have been able to overthrow a Communist police state without strong assistance from abroad. The Communists are entrenched so strongly in Cuba that liberation becomes more difficult with each day that passes.

The Cubans must have our allout moral support, arms, and money. To give them these things now would not be giving something for nothing; it would be self-defense.

We cannot tolerate a Communist satellite state on our very threshold, controlling the Caribbean and the approaches to the Panama Canal and the Mississippi Valley. The last bulwark in the defense of our territory and the Western Hemisphere is at stake.

WE MUST STAND FIRM

We must fight. Only by our vigorous and courageous stand can we attract other nations to our cause and induce them to make themselves strong in order to fight at our side. Such a stand will help to restore confidence in our loyalty to our friends. Too often the U.S. Government is distrusted, because it turns against friends and allies and goes along with the enemy, as in the case of Suez. Finally, resolute and brave action now will show that all our vacillations, weaknesses, and faintheartedness in the United Nations and the Organization of American States were merely passing phases in our international conduct.

Castro and his accomplices frankly proclaim their intention to become the Mao Tse-tung's of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States. They are propagating communism among the Cuban workers in Florida and appealing for Negro sympathizers all over the United States. (Witness Castro's planned hocus-pocus in moving to a Harlem hotel during his last visit to New York City.)

In recent years, the Chinese Reds have become increasingly active in the subversion of this hemisphere. They seemingly inspire more confidence among intellectuals and students, even in the secondary schools, than do the Russians, Czechs, or Poles, perhaps because the Red Chinese are not so well known.

CUBA'S RED AGENTS EVERYWHERE

Now the Cuban Government is spreading its Red agents over the entire hemisphere; they are financed lavishly and are proving to be far more effective than agents of any other nationality, including the Chinese. They travel in the garb of diplomats, cultural, trade, or labor delegations, or of simple tourists.

Cuban Communist attempts at subversion have induced Peru, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Paraguay, and the Dominican Republic to break diplomatic relations with the Castro regime. Other nations, such as Uruguay and Panama have expelled the Cuban Ambassadors and other Communist diplomats.

CARIBBEAN UNDER ATTACK

The Caribbean is in danger of becoming a Red lake. The Communist Cheddi Jagan, is top man in British Guiana. The French islands, such as Martinque, are represented in the Paris Parliament by Communists. Betancourt's government in Venezuela, while admittedly leftwing, has barely escaped from being upset by the Communists, and might fall at any time. Panama is weak, and the comrades are infiltrating there as they have been trying to do again and again throughout Central America. Trinidad grudgingly permits us to retain our military base at Chaguamaras; but other bases in the West Indies have been, or will be, abandoned.

Of all the Caribbean republics, by instinct and experience the one which should be least influenced by totalitarianism is Colombia. Yet, since 1948 it has suffered continuously from Communist inspired and directed guerrilla bands operating in outlying districts. As a result, in these areas the national economy has been disrupted and agriculture paralyzed, thus raising the cost of living.

The terrorized peasants have had to seek refuge in the cities where they can find no work. The ensuing chaos has broken down law and order and eased the way for communism. Two Red enclaves, Viota and Sumapaz, exist in the interior of Colombia. They collect their own taxes, run their own schools and fly the hammer and sickle as their flag. Colombian officials and troops must obtain permission from the Communist leaders to pass through these districts.

PROPAGANDA SHOW

Two tons of Communist propaganda are flown daily from Havana to the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City. Former President Cardenas of Mexico, always an extreme leftist, recently returned from Moscow and Peiping and again is exercising an evil and powerful influence behind the scenes.

He is organizing a Latin American Conference to condemn the United States as the despoiler of Cuban liberty, justice, and peace. In Mexico, and throughout the hemisphere, the Communists are poisoning public opinion and arousing hatred and demonstrations against the United States by every conceivable means.

They have a receptive audience among the intellectuals. For instance, there are 55,000 students in the University of Mexico, and it is estimated that 90 percent of the professors are Communists. In contrast, our propaganda and defense are insignificant and inept, dated and uninspired.

Parenthetically, I am sorry to admit that one of the largest U.S. foundations presently is financing to the tune of several hundred thousand dollars a notorious European Communist professor in Latin America.

Were Mexico to fall under Communist control, the conditions would not be within the relatively mild limitations set by President Lopex Mateos, when he declared a few months ago that his government was "of the extreme left, within the constitution."

The Mexican situation would be more serious than that in Cuba due to a population four times as large and a 2,000-mile frontier along the United States.

COMMUNIST CUBAN TACTICS

Presently, the Communists probably do not control or even have the sympathy of, more than 15 to 25 percent of the Cuban people. However, the Communists always are a small minority. Even in the Soviet Union, they constitute not more than 4 percent of the population. They hide within other political parties and are hard to detect or expose.

Communists, to gain temporary benefits, will enter into a united front with anyone—with reactionary dictators, nationalists, or sworn anti-Communists. They try to create new conflicts and to deepen those already existing. They gladly reverse themselves, sacrifice and kill their own agents, and always will go back two steps in order to take three forward. Fidel Castro could become expendable and be wiped out by his comrades overnight—just as was done to Beria in Russia.

Playing both ends against the middle, Communists often pretend to have intraparty disputes with one group supporting and the other opposing a particular government. This situation developed for a time vis-a-vis Peron in Argentina.

COURSE OF ACTION

Based on the circumstances I have described, during the last 2 years I have urged, publicly and privately, the following course of action:

1. Inform the other American republics that:

We now expect them, belatedly though it may be, to fulfill their solemn commitments in cooperation with us "to take the necessary measures to protect their political independence against the intervention of international communism, acting in the interest of an alien despotism." These words, from the Declaration of the Organization of American States, exactly fit existing conditions in Cuba and the Caribbean.

If they fail to take collective action with us against this Communist attempt to seize the Western Hemisphere, then for its own security the United States will be forced into unilateral action. The other republics and not we will have destroyed the OAS and hemisphere solidarity. The responsibility will be theirs.

Fortunately, we still retain the inherent right to collective and individual self-defense under the U.N. and the OAS charters. But, far more important, it is our patriotic duty to save our Nation.

NOT INTERVENTION

Action by the United States, strictly speaking, would not be unilateral. On the contrary, it would be at the earnest behest of all anti-Communist Cubans. It would not be intervention.

Since October we have had as Assistant Secretary of State for American Republics a man of courage and intelligence, Mr. Thomas C. Mann. Given adequate authority, he may be able to lead us out of the Cuban morass. Already Mr. Mann has brought about the break in diplomatic relations with the Cuban Communist regime. Our next steps must be:

2. Recognize a responsible Cuban government in exile, just as we recognized the Free French and other regimes in exile during World War II.

3. Give that government our full support, morally and materially with arms and money.

4. Invoke a pacific blockade of Cuba, to halt trading by the Communist nations. Incidentally, some of our NATO allies and the other American republics who want to increase or at least continue business as usual with Cuba, should be induced to desist.

5. Continue U.S. cooperation and guidance after the Communists have been driven out of Cuba in order to rehabilitate it and bring it back to freedom and constitutional representative government.

If speedily enacted, such a program could succeed. Although several of my Cuban friends insist that, in addition, the United States will have to help with its armed forces, both to throw out the Communists and thereafter, as a simple humanitarian measure, to preserve order and save Cuba from a horrible blood bath. I pray they are wrong, but I fear they are right.

Taxes and Spending Can Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to place in the RECORD an article written by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] which appeared in the April issue of the magazine Nation's Business. The gentleman's knowledge and interest in the field of government spending and taxation are well known. I believe that this article is well worth the attention of the Congress and the country.

The article follows:

TAXES AND SPENDING CAN BE CUT

(By Representative BRUCE ALGER)

In pushing ahead to new legislative frontiers, the Government should offer greater opportunity for the individual to improve his own condition with his own resources.

We can meet not only our goals of more economic growth and employment, but also the threat of communism, by:

1. Recognizing the need for major reform of our Federal tax system.

2. Adopting a tax program which will strengthen our capitalistic private enterprise society.

3. Enlisting the support of 60 million taxpayers in this reform through a widespread awareness of the potential savings as well as tax reduction involved.

FAULTS OF TAX SYSTEM

The present tax system stunts personal ambition by denying just rewards for individual effort.

Through capital-starvation, it has made the American dream of going into business for oneself more difficult to fulfill.

It has reduced the job opportunities which only a free flow of investment funds can make possible.

It has helped to feed inflation by smothering the rate of savings and destroying accumulated capital.

It has slowed the rise in living standards which depends on capital formation.

The cause of these national blights is the involuntary diversion of savings—the only source of private capital—from their natural flow toward urgently needed investment fund reservoirs to the Federal Treasury.

It is about time that we got tough fisted about a problem that has consistently resisted solution through a more restrained appeal.

There is no sound reason why we should accept the inevitability of the present tax system.

Even more important, we must be careful that much-talked-of future reforms are revisions that encourage private incentive.

As compelling as are the domestic reasons for tax rate reform, the situation is even more critical in view of Russia's threat to bury us in a production race.

We cannot win playing it the Communist way, the way of government control. We became the foremost Nation of the world through free enterprise and individual initiative and we can maintain our position only if we continue to grow through that philosophy.

Soviet planners are aware of the way our tax system is retarding our economic growth and they are banking more on our weakness to defeat us than on their strength.

For more than 12 years we have poured billions of taxpayer dollars into the economies of free world nations—and encouraged huge private investments—in order to build up their supplies of capital and stiffen their resistance to communism. At the same time we have ignored at home the very lesson we are striving to teach abroad, that adequate capital funds are vital to the stability and growth of a free economy.

ROLE OF BUSINESSMEN

In an international economic war, the businessman is the frontline soldier because the achievements of those engaged in commercial activities largely decide the rate of our economic growth.

Yet we are, in a sense, demanding that our business community demolish Russia's challenge without permitting it to use the only weapon that can effectively turn the tide. That is a steady flow of investment funds for starting and expanding business enterprises.

We must unshackle the business community so that it can meet the Russian thrust on more equal ground. If we are to show the world the genuine flowering of free enterprise, we must first achieve an enlightened transformation of the tax system.

How can we ever expect to get the recipients of foreign aid funds off our fiscal backs unless we demonstrate, by our own example, that the true path to the full rewards of a free economic system is a sound tax program? Failure in this could mean that we will be committed to keeping recipient nations on American taxpayer-dollar doles from now on.

The most comprehensive program for reform of Federal tax rates and methods is now before the Congress in several bills. The legislation is best known as the Herlong-Baker bills. My colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee—Representative A. S. HERLONG, JR., a Florida Democrat, and Representative HOWARD H. BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee, are the chief sponsors. After studying the Herlong-Baker bills I have introduced an identical bill. (In the House each Member has his own bills.) The legislation would reduce both individual and corporate income tax rates over a 5-year period; defer taxes for individuals on long-term capital gains as long as the taxpayer reinvests his holdings; reduce the rates of tax on estates and gifts, and establish more realistic depreciation rules.

HOW TAXES WOULD DROP

The top rate of individual income tax rates would be brought down, by the end of the fifth year of application, from 91 to 47 percent. The first bracket would be reduced from 20 to 15 percent and there would be corresponding reductions in all the interim rates.

Let me cite a few examples. The $8,000 to $10,000 bracket of taxable income would be brought down from its present 34 percent to 19 percent; the $16,000 to $18,000 bracket from 50 to 23 percent; the $50,000 to $60,000 bracket from 75 to 31 percent for single taxpayers.

The top corporate rate would be reduced from 52 to 47 percent through annual reductions of one point each year over the 5-year span. The linkage of the top rates of individual and corporate taxes is an especially enlightened move, since 85 percent of the total business population is composed of unincorporated firms. In fairness they should not be taxed at higher rates than corporations.

Over 5 years, a reduction of 25 percent would be made in the time during which businesses could charge off the cost of depreciable property. Estate tax rates would be reduced from a top of 77 to 47 percent and the top rate of gift tax from 57.75 to 35.25 percent. All lower rates of both taxes would be reduced in proportion.

These bills strike at the crux of the tax problem which is the sharp climb in the graduated rates in the middle-income brackets. This is the bottleneck that has slowed the flow of investment funds, especially the risk venture variety, since our capital availability is firmly tied to the rate at which savings can be accumulated.

None can refute that we must look to the savings, principally of those in the middle and upper brackets, for the venture funds to create jobs, start and expand businesses, make products available at prices within reach. Even though we sometimes forget or turn away from it, every material need, every benefit, every business advance, every rise in living standards has a common progenitor, and that is capital. When tax reduction is mentioned it tends, sometimes, to produce twin fears in the minds of many Americans, not excluding those who appreciate the need for action.

The first of these concerns is based on the apprehension that deficit spending would result. The second, and allied fear, is for the revenue effect of the reductions.

Our bills have provisions which completely dispel both fears.

POTENTIAL FOR SAVINGS

A built-in safeguard eliminates the possibility that the bills will cause deficit spending. This safety valve is a provision that permits postponement of rate reductions in any year in which an unbalanced budget is threatened. Certainly this should allay the fears of even the most stanch budget balancers.

As to the revenue effect, the authors of this legislation believe that any loss will be more than offset by the increased revenue resulting from the greater economic growth made possible by the unleashing of investment funds.

This appraisal is based on the calculation that each 1 percent annual increase in the rate of economic growth will produce $1 billion in additional Federal revenue. As the revenue effect of our bills would average out at less than $3.5 billion annually, or the equivalent of a 3.5-percent rate of economic growth, a 5-percent average rate of growth over the next 5 years would not only offset the revenue effect but provide an excess of $1.5 billion.

Over and above these benefits is another that could prove to be the most important of all.

This is the postponement feature, which can be the launching pad for the greatest and most dynamic offensive against Government waste that our country has ever witnessed.

Over the years the Federal Government has been growing rapidly at the expense of economic growth, upon which it depends for revenue. This process has gone unchecked because there has been no competing claims for the use of the revenue overlap. Our bills fill this void by setting up an effective counterclaim.

Every one of the country's 60 million income-tax payers would be enrolled automatically as a watchdog of the Treasury. Taxpayers are bound to insist that the Government exercise every possible economy because their anticipated tax reductions will depend upon it.

When the people have a clearly defined choice between tax reform and increased Federal spending, you don't need a crystal ball to predict which they will choose.

The collective weight of this pressure for economy is guaranteed to have a restraining effect on the size of public expenditures. As a Congressman, I know that Members of both Houses will be loath to vote for appropriations that would tip the scale of budgetary balance. The executive branch should be just as fearful.

No one would invite the wrath of taxpayers who did not receive tax reductions upon which they had counted. The economies resulting would in no way restrict military and other essential expenditures.

We have in this legislation, then, dual forces for impressive and lasting public betterment—the urgently needed tax-rate reform and a checkrein on Government spending.

The Spirit of NATO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, to any who may have reservations about the effectiveness or the spirit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, I call attention to the article "This We Will Do." Written by Adm. Charles R. Brown, the article appeared in a recent issue of the Vigilance supplement of the Fifteen Nations magazine which is published in Holland by Our Army, a Royal Netherlands association. This publication is financed entirely by the Our Army Association without assistance from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The story of NATO, as presented in the article "This We Will Do," is told by an expert on the Organization. A native of Tuscaloosa, Ala., Admiral Brown is currently commander in chief of Allied Forces Southern Europe, the NATO command responsible for the defense of Italy, Greece and Turkey, the alliance's right flank. The air, sea, and land forces serving in the area are Admiral Brown's responsibility—a responsibility he has accepted with fortitude and determination. He describes his defensive bulwark as "a formidable barrier to Soviet aggression," but he adds the warning that "we must never allow ourselves to become complacent."

Recognized as one of NATO's most vigorous leaders, Admiral Brown has a long and outstanding naval career to his credit. Among other assignments, he has served as a naval instructor, held the post of deputy commander in chief of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, and for the past 4 years he has been stationed in the Mediterranean area, first as commander of the U.S. 6th Fleet and presently in his NATO command. He holds the record for the naval aviator with the longest tour of service on flight duty, as well as the record for perfect naval aerial gunfire.

Among his decorations are the U.S. Navy Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star and the Presidential Unit Citation. In addition, he has received many honorary awards from his own country as well as from nations overseas.

I believe every Member of Congress will enjoy reading Admiral Brown's interesting and informative article which follows:

THIS WE WILL DO

(By Adm. C. R. Brown)

Living and working behind the 1,700-mile arc of rugged land masses, plains and waterways separating Resia Pass in Italy and Mount Ararat in Turkey, are approximately 84 million free men and women and their children—the latter learning to assume their future roles as responsible citizens in those portions of the world where liberty, dignity of man and the individual's choice of a way of life are still richly treasured rights.

These are the people of Italy, Greece and Turkey, 3 of the 15 nations belonging to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. To these 84 million people the Allied Forces of Southern Europe owe two solemn obligations:

First, to prevent involvement in a war. This we are striving to do.

Second, to defend these countries if—and pray God it doesn't—aggression should occur. This we will do.

The two responsibilities I mention are common to each of the commands in our great Atlantic Alliance: to prevent war, or, if aggression occurs, to defend the NATO nations. All of us who wear the uniforms of the various NATO nations are dedicated to the accomplishment of these basic tasks.

In Southern Europe, French, Italians, Greeks, Turks, British and Americans serve on staffs or in units of the armed forces committed to the Alliance. Sharing in the tremendous responsibilities confronting us are the major army and air units of the three countries situated behind our 1,700-mile defense line; the U.S. 6th Fleet, in its NATO role of Striking and Support Forces Southern Europe; sizable elements of the U.S. Air Force; the U.S. Army's Southern European Task Force; and a component of the British Royal Air Force. Combined, they provide an overall capability ranging the entire military scale from the foot soldier to modern missiles.

Soldiers, sailors and airmen comprising these forces are imbued with high spirit and grim determination. We will discharge to the utmost of our ability the solemn obligation we owe to the men, women and children who have been entrusted to our care. This we will do.

It may be noted that no reference has been made to the navies of five of the six countries supporting the mission of my command. This is because ships and men of the navies of France, Italy, Greece, Turkey, and the United Kingdom assigned to NATO in the Mediterranean area are under the operational control of our neighbor on Malta, Allied Forces Mediterranean, whose commander in chief presently is British Admiral Sir Alexander Noel Campbell Bingley.

Joint planning between Admiral Bingley's staff and my own is carried on constantly so that cooperation, coordination, and mutual support would be effected immediately should aggression occur, and so that free use of the sealanes of communications will be maintained in the event of aggression. In time of need, too, we would have the support in this area of heavy bombers of the United Kingdom and the United States; planning is being carried on constantly to insure that

maximum utilization will be made of these units in this area. There is complete understanding between these naval and air forces and my own command. Everything at our disposal can be applied anywhere, against any aggressor who dares transgress any portion of the area.

But back to Allied Forces Southern Europe.

Direction, guidance, advice, and operational control flow from my headquarters at Bagnoli, near Naples, down through four principal subordinate headquarters. Italian Army units available to us, and the U.S. Army's Southern European Task Force are under the operational control of Land Forces Southern Europe or Landsouth, commanded by Gen. Antonio Gualano of the Italian Army, with headquarters at Verona, Italy. Greek and Turkish Armies are under the Land Forces Southeastern Europe of Landsoutheast, commanded by Lt. Gen. Harry P. Storke, U.S. Army, at Izmir, Turkey. All air elements—Italian, Greek, Turkish, British, and American—are under Allied Air Forces Southern Europe or Airsouth, commanded by Lt. Gen. Ralph P. Swofford, Jr., U.S. Air Force, with headquarters here at Naples.

The Striking and Support Force Southern Europe (Strikforsouth) is commanded by Vice Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., who remains at sea with his fleet, but maintains a planning staff in Naples under his deputy, Rear Adm. Ralph Sperry Clarke, U.S. Navy.

Numerous and complex problems, which must be taken into account in everything we plan, confront our command as a result of geographical and other considerations peculiar to southern Europe:

The terrain requires that we provide for land operations in four distinct areas: Italy, northern Greece, western Turkey, and eastern Turkey. The Russian satellite, Bulgaria, faces two of our nations, Greece and Turkey. Albania, another satellite, is in our very midst. Soviet Russia borders directly on Turkey. Obviously, measures must be taken to protect against any enveloping movement toward the Middle East which would outflank our forces on the right.

The principal means of communication between Italy, Greece, and Turkey are the Mediterranean and adjacent waterways connecting with the Mediterranean. It is of paramount importance that the free use of these sea lanes of communication be available to us at all times to insure proper logistic support, movement of forces, and the like.

Directly facing us, too, is a large number of Soviet and satellite army divisions; thousands of modern combat aircraft of the U.S.S.R. and her satellites; and a good portion of the Soviet Navy—second largest in the world. The Soviet fleet, including that segment which is deployed in the Black Sea, is well balanced with cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. The Soviet submarine force is the largest in world history—many times the size of the German U-boat force which terrorized the seas during the two great wars. This force is the Soviet's principal offensive naval threat.

The defense of Italy's rugged mountainous northern and northeastern frontiers rests in the hands of Landsouth. The importance of Italy to the defense of Western Europe cannot be overemphasized. In the words of the then General of the Army Eisenhower, when he was Supreme Allied Commander Europe: "Italy, projecting into the Mediterranean, offers us a strong lateral position and sea and air bases of tremendous value."

Supporting the Italian armed forces is the U.S. Army's Southern European Task Force (SETAF). In time of war, this force would be responsible to the commander, Landsouth. In time of peace, it is administratively responsible to Headquarters, U.S. Army, Europe, located in Heidelberg, Germany.

Within SETAF is a missile command—the first such command organized overseas. It is a medium missile outfit, which means that it employs the Honest John rocket and the Corporal guided missile, both medium range weapons. The missile command is at Vicenza, a few miles east of Verona, where SETAF headquarters is located.

The commander of Landsoutheast is responsible to me for the overall conduct and coordination of land operations from the eastern mountains of Turkey to the western shores of Greece. Izmir was selected for reasons of its locality, communications, transportation, and weather conditions. A small advance headquarters, capable of being expanded rapidly in the event of war, is located at Salonika, Greece. In Landsoutheast, there are two assistants to the commander, a Greek general and a Turkish general.

When Greece became a member of NATO, the Western democracies plugged one of the last Balkan gaps through which communism might flow. Bulgaria and Albania were already Red satellites, but Greece's adherence to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization stalled the Soviet steamroller on her border.

Today Greece has one of the toughest armies in NATO. It is, furthermore, an army rich in tradition and esprit de corps, led by veteran combat officers who saw service in World War II, in guerrilla action, and in Korea. And it is firmly, unequivocally anti-Communist.

The hard core of the Turkish Army is composed of professional soldiers—officers and noncommissioned officers trained in leadership. But Turkish strength is in some 400,000 men, most of them hardened by the rugged life of farm and plain, who are performing their 2 years of military service. Their loyalties are unquestioned. They are steadfastly opposed to communism and Communists.

Turkey's modern armament was improved greatly last year with the completion of negotiations for construction of an intermediate ballistic missile range. The IRBM's, which have a 1,500-mile range and which can be armed with nuclear warheads, could be fired against any of the European territory of the Soviet Union and against a large part of central Asia.

In each of the three countries of the southern region is a balanced force of atomic strike, conventional fighter bombers, reconnaissance, air defense, and transport aircraft. In each zone we have also various surface-to-air missiles, the control and operation of which are integrated with that of the aircraft. These forces, assigned to Airsouth, are aircraft organized in two Tactical Air Forces—the 5th, based at Vicenza, Italy, and the 6th, based at Izmir, Turkey.

Under the 5th ATAF is the Italian 56th Tactical Air Force, at Vicenza. Under the 6th ATAF are the Greek 28th TAF, with headquarters at Larissa, Greece and, in Turkey, the Turkish 1st TAF, at Eskisehir, the Turkish 2d TAF, at Ankara, and the Turkish 3d TAF, at Diyarbakir.

The Italian Air Force was a charter member of Airsouth. Even before the formal activation of the present 5th Allied Tactical Air Force, on October 14, 1953, Italian fliers performed ATAF functions on an interim basis. Today, the Italian Air Force has reached a strength of 50,000 men, servicing and flying several hundred jets, interceptors, and fighter-bombers.

A substantial addition to the potential of Afsouth—and of NATO general—is the Italian aviation industry. The Fiat G-91R, an Italian-built jet aircraft, was selected recently to be the NATO lightweight strike reconnaissance aircraft. This was the first major item of equipment designed especially for use by NATO forces.

The Royal Hellenic Air Force has a strength of about 20,000 men. During the past 10 years, it has undergone a remarkable evolution in which obsolete propeller aircraft have been replaced by jets; new airfields designed for modern craft have been constructed; radar warning and control systems, and modern means of telecommunications have come into being.

The fighting squadrons of the Royal Hellenic Air Force are equipped with F-84 and F-86 aircraft, guided missiles of the Nike type, and all-weather fighters.

When Turkey entered the NATO alliance she committed immediately all three of her newly organized, tactical air forces to the cause of Western freedom.

Air coverage of this great land of 300,000 square miles, with its 1,000-mile land and sea border along the "Iron Curtain," is of vital importance to NATO defenses. Turkey is probably the most exposed NATO country.

The Turkish Air Force fighting squadrons are equipped with F-84, F-86, and F-100 type aircraft and Turkey has more than a dozen excellent air bases.

The sea power of this command is provided by "Strikforsouth." As I have mentioned already, Strikforsouth is the U.S. Sixth Fleet, a modern, well-balanced naval force which includes an attack carrier striking force, an amphibious landing force and a variety of auxiliary ships, which enable the fleet to operate indefinitely at sea without shore bases. It is always battle ready.

The fleet normally consists of about 50 ships, manned by 25,000 men and carrying about 200 planes.

Exercises are conducted periodically each year by these forces to insure that every available man and weapon may be brought to bear as quickly as possible to defeat any aggressor as soon as possible. This is the aim of any military commander, and, of course, it is what we are striving for, too.

Our aim is to attain perfection in operational planning—perfection in the execution of plans drafted and approved—and to test our ability to revise and improvise these plans under unexpected conditions and unforeseen developments. Our exercises are directed also toward testing the combat spirit, the effectiveness and flexibility of all units; the adequacy of supplies for any emergency; the adequacy of training; and the effectiveness of communications.

There are still problem areas, of course, for the purpose of all operational exercises is to uncover weaknesses, to reveal the needs for further training, better coordination, improved planning and further study. However, on the whole, we are gratified by the tremendous progress that has been made since this command was activated by Adm. Robert B. Carney on June 21, 1951, on the U.S.S. *Olympus*. At that time, only one southern European country, Italy, was a member of the alliance, and there were few military and naval units committed to NATO. One year later, however, Greece and Turkey joined us, and there is now a strong organization of fighting men ready and able to provide support.

During the past decade, impressive advances have been made in training, in planning, in operational readiness, communications, construction and supply, and especially in our understanding of each other's methods and in our ability to work together as a smoothly functioning organization. Our building program has included airfields, naval bases, oil pipelines, and storage systems and sites for air defense missiles. In the recent fall exercises, our performances in air defense, air support of ground forces, the operation of amphibious forces, communications, and antiaircraft and antisubmarine defense measures met, or exceeded, our highest expectations.

Much still remains to be accomplished, but the strides which have been made in southern Europe and in NATO generally are

evident. The accuracy of this statement is readily borne out by the fact that in this area, as elsewhere throughout NATO, we continue to thwart the primary objective of the Communists, which is to destroy the Atlantic Alliance. It is inescapably obvious that this is the first step in their campaign to crush and govern the world.

When NATO was established in 1949, it was an association founded largely on hope and faith. It has fully justified both. Determination, hard work, dedication and countless sacrifices have achieved a degree of solidarity within NATO never before attained by any alliance during peacetime. It is an alliance that is unique in that it possesses permanent forces-in-being as contrasted to the paper organizations of other alliances which, in the event of aggression, must first form and then act. The prospect of facing the dedicated people of NATO and our forces in being requires pause and deliberation by any would-be aggressor before he decides to trigger a war that could result in self-destruction.

Much of what takes place in the world today transpires in an atmosphere of tension created and deepened by the dangerous practices of Communist leaders' intervention and meddling in already serious situations with the ever-prevalent possibility that their tactics will incite a war of catastrophic dimensions. Their tactics are calculated to destroy everything liberty-loving people revere and represent.

However, it is my conviction that the stature of the men who represent us in the conduct of NATO business insures the greatest protection possible in these tenuous times, and that their wisdom, supported by our potentials in manpower, industry, and commerce, by our scientific knowledge and by our great spirit, will deter the Communists from intentionally inciting war. No one is going to take over the entire world, and especially that portion of it protected by our alliance. We intend to remain free and we will remain free.

It appears obvious that the determination, vigor, and spirit of NATO's people serve as a major deterrent to any overt act on the part of the Communists—determination, vigor, and spirit which have exerted a stabilizing influence not only on the Soviets but on all free nations everywhere. These free nations have taken heart as a result of our firm stand, which has not yielded 1 inch of NATO territory to Soviet domination since the signature of the Atlantic Treaty nearly 12 years ago.

Spirit is the one thing we have in abundance in Southern Europe. This is something in which we acknowledge no peer. I never cease to be moved by the great spirit I observe everywhere in my travels throughout this area. No one country and no one region of any country of the area has a monopoly on these expressions and evidences of this great spirit, but it is probably epitomized by the following remark made to me by Lt. Gen. Athanasios Frontistis, Chief of the Hellenic National Defense General Staff:

"This poor land with its many problems and difficulties is our lot and our love. We always have and we always will defend it against all aggressors. We want your help, we expect your help, and we are grateful for your help. But, with or without your help, we will always fight to defend Greece."

Despite repeated Soviet diplomatic threats, Greece has remained steadfast in its support of NATO. It is this type of spirit, prevalent everywhere in southern Europe, which convinces me that I am right when I speak of our responsibilities and our determination to defend this area, and say:

This we will do.

One of the missions of all NATO commands is to press for the victorious conclusion of any war that may be forced upon us.

This, too, we will do.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

2406

Appendix

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by the Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, last Saturday, in Nashville, I was privileged to join nearly 3,000 of my fellow Tennessee Democrats in hearing a most heartening address by the Vice President of the United States and the Presiding Officer of this body, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Vice President JOHNSON had just returned from a trip to world capitals in Europe and Asia; and his first public report on his tour was to the effect that the tide is running for the United States, not against it, in the hearts of the peoples of the world.

The Nashville Tennessean, published by our mutual friend, the Honorable Silliman Evans, Jr., on Sunday published the text of the Vice President's address. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

WE MUST NOT LOSE THIS GOLDEN MOMENT

I know of no place I would rather be tonight than here in Nashville—among some of the oldest, most cherished, and most devoted friends any man ever had.

I have a story to tell. I am glad to tell it here for the first time. It is a story that will thrill and excite all Americans—as it does me—without regard to party. But remember what you will never forget of Tennessee's past 30 years ago, having seen the miracle you have seen wrought along this valley of the Tennessee, you will feel a very special enthusiasm—and a very special pride.

Only 24 hours ago I returned to the United States. For 7 days I had been flying 13,000 miles on a mission for our country—a mission requested by the President of the United States. I had flown to San Juan, Puerto Rico, to Dakar, Africa, to Geneva, Switzerland, and to Paris, France. I flew at the request of the President of the United States—to carry the message of America's determination to build strength for freedom and hope for peace.

I left with many messages. I returned home with a far greater message than I carried abroad. I came back with a message from the people of distant lands echoing in my ears—a message of a great and new outpouring of trust and enthusiasm and faith in America.

SHOWCASE FOR DEMOCRACY

It began in the Latin world of Puerto Rico—that marvelous island showcase for democracy where men who have chosen the way of freedom are surging forward to a prosperity and social justice undreamed of a generation ago. My coming was unannounced. But when I arrived, we began to visit in the humble homes of workingmen, walked through the slums they are clearing away, went through the factories of their Operation Bootstrap, visited the young people on the campus of their university.

As the car passed, men and women and children would shout "Viva Kennedy, Viva Kennedy."

The next day we flew across the Atlantic to Dakar in the proud new Republic of Senegal. Twelve hours earlier the plane bearing the delegate of the Soviet Union, Mr. Jacob Malik, had landed, and there was no greeting. We landed in the hours after midnight. There at the foot of the ramp—in long white robes—stood Senegal's brilliant Prime Minister, Mr. Dia.

HE EXTENDED HIS HAND

Behind Mr. Dia were the members of Senegal's famous Red Guard—in flowing red capes with swords drawn. The Prime Minister extended his hand and said:

"Mr. Vice President, there are kinships between the Senegalese people and the American people—the ardent love of liberty is characteristic of your people and my people. Now that we have recovered our liberty, we wish to be more than ever the champion of that liberty and democracy. We know that in this struggle we can count upon the American people with President Kennedy at their head. You are in a friendly country, among friends."

The next day day we presented our credentials to the new nation's President, Mr. Senghor. We went back to the automobile and began riding through the streets. Along the curbs thousands were gathered and as they saw the car coming—with the American flag on it—they crowded into the streets, reached out to shake hands, reached out to touch, shouting: "Long live the United States, champion of independence."

THERE IN THE DARKNESS

Three days later we landed after nightfall in the great world city of Geneva, Switzerland—far from Africa's heat in the great snow-covered Alps. There in the darkness stood a great crowd of friendly, smiling men and women—waiting patiently for hours so they, too, could cheer your country.

The next day it was Paris—and once again the same. At the headquarters of our NATO forces—our old and trusted allies from Western Europe gathered round wherever we went to express the warmth and faith they felt for the United States, and for the new administration. On the streets and along the boulevards, whenever we were identified, spontaneous cheers came forth again from our old and cherished allies, the French.

In the important and decisive duties at Paris—both as Ambasador to France and Ambassador to NATO—two great Americans of the highest intellectual abilities serve their country at great sacrifice. There are no two men of more outstanding character or higher attainments in their field than General James Gavin and Thomas Finletter, the former Secretary of the Air Force.

STRONG REPRESENTATIONS

These two men—together with General Lauris Norstad, Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe—constitute one of the strongest representations that this country has had in our old ally of France since the days of Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin.

With this strong representation America is serving notice on those who would divide the Western alliance that we are placing new and great strength at the heart of Western Europe to add new strength to the alliance on which freedom has stood for so long. With Americans leading the way, the strong democratic nations of the Western World are going to reach out to help create in new nations the rising levels of opportunity which we in these countries enjoy and want all free men to enjoy with us.

On and on I could go. What I heard from the lips of the people, I saw mirrored in the eyes of their leaders—leaders from more than 70 nations I met during the week. There was hope. There was trust. There was optimism. There was confidence, confidence in America.

THE RUNNING TIDE

I want you to know—and I want all Americans to know—that this is happening, I say to you, the tide is running for the United States, not against it, in the hearts of the peoples of the world.

The greatest and grandest opportunity to lead the world toward peace and toward freedom is opening before this generation of Americans. We must not, we shall not fail that opportunity or lose this goldern moment.

I do not say that the trials are past or that the tests are over—because I know they are not. But I do know that the world of men who want to be free—the world of men who want justice in their times and opportunity for their children—the world of men who want to build instead of bicker—that great world is looking to America with a faith not seen in many a long and barren season.

WHY IS THIS SO?

Why is this so? It is so because the world believes that America has now the leadership to bring our great strength alive once more—leadership to make America young and confident again—leadership that personifies American faith rather than preaching doubt. The world knows, the world likes, the world trusts the President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

That is one reason I am proud to be here with you for this first report on this first mission into the world. It was here in Nashville, 8 months ago, that the Democratic campaign began. I shall be grateful to you for that wonderful evening. Ten thousand Democrats filled the park. From throughout the South, great Democratic Governors—Hodges of North Carolina, Combs of Kentucky, Collins of Florida, Patterson of Alabama—came to stand beside your own Buford Ellington.

Together they took their stand behind the Democratic Party—and stood their ground all the way. From that night on, I never doubted that Democrats would win.

NO PARTY LINES

But feeling as I feel tonight, I do not find it in myself to speak of party concerns. For peace is not a partisan work and freedom has no party lines. The work before Americans today—the challenge before Americans today—the opportunity before Americans today knows no partisanship, gives no favors, tolerates no division.

This moment of opportunity is so great—and so rare—that unity and only unity is the response of responsible Americans.

When I was with you last summer, at the start of our campaign, I said then what I would repeat now. Wherever I go, whatever I may do, I shall never speak as southerner to southerners, Protestant to Protestants, or white to whites, but only as an American to my fellow Americans.

AS AN AMERICAN

Tonight I speak only as an American when I call to all Americans—of all regions, of all races, of all religions—to lay down divisions of past and party and take up the cause of supporting the man who speaks for America in the world: the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy.

America at this moment stands at the center of the world's stage.

The world's eyes are upon us.

The world's ears are listening to us.

Rarely have Americans had so splendid a moment to lead toward the goals in which Americans all believe.

At stake is the future of your children—and mine—and Jack Kennedy's. The world those children will live in is being determined by how Americans respond to the world of today. The burden of decision—the burden of leadership—rests upon one man: our President.

DAYS OF TRIAL

The first 75 days have proved John F. Kennedy.

These trying days have proved his capacity for greatness.

He has met the Communist threat in Laos—and all Americans approve. He has met the challenge of alliances in disrepair—and he is mastering them. He has raised the sights of Americans—and raised the hopes of the world.

Let all of us—of all parties—say now, at this hour, as our President said: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you will do for your country."

AMERICANS AT WORK

I saw Americans out doing for their country this week.

I saw a quiet, modest young man living with his family in Africa—a man named Jack Vaughn—going among the people of Senegal and other lands seeking to start them up the same road to a better life men have walked here in Tennessee.

I went beside him into the village of Kyar—40 miles from the city streets of Dakar in the brush of Africa at the edge of the great Sahara. There men live their lives on $6 a month or less. There the practice of medicine is older than the birth of Christ.

There blind children play about in the mud and filth of an ancient society. There illness afflicts nearly every person, young or old—illiteracy blights their lives—and their horizon is no greater than the eye can see.

TO IMPROVE LIFE

I asked the chief of the village what he most needed—what would he like to have to make life better for his people? His answer was not a great loan or a great gift. He wanted one thing: a motor for a boat to help his tribesmen in their trade of fishing. I didn't wait to pass a bill through Congress—I told him when I got home I would send him one.

I talked to their President and he told me he was dedicating his new government not to building great arms, not to embarking upon strange doctrines and philosophies, but to one goal: putting every child in a classroom in 10 years.

I talked to their Prime Minister. He told me that his government wanted no gift, no giveaway. His government has planned an orderly 4-year program to raise the people upward—and for that program, he said, they want loans to repay, not gifts to take.

FOR HIS COUNTRY

Yes, far from Africa, in Geneva, I saw another American—a wealthy lawyer, a corporation lawyer, relinquishing his practice, relinquishing his opportunity for personal gain and even financing activities for the benefit of his country out of his own pocket.

Why was he in Geneva? For his country, for mankind. Mr. Arthur Dean is there working every day to develop a treaty with the Soviet Union to end tests of nuclear bombs—a first step toward peace for our children.

Mr. Dean is a Republican—but politics matters not to him as it should not dominate any of us. He is there to carry out the wish of your President that the United States go as far as it can go, try as hard as we can try to bring agreement on this important subject.

I want you to know that your Government will do everything—repeat, everything—that honorably can be done to make this step toward peace. If these efforts do not succeed, the failure will not be on the conscience of freemen.

THESE INSPIRING STORIES

On and on I could go with these inspiring stories of the great works being performed by responsible and self-sacrificing Americans everywhere. All these stories only underscore what I know your President believes: that this generation in this country is ready and willing to go to work proudly for their country's cause.

In this world today, the cause of your country is little different from the cause of your country 30 years ago in the valley of the Tennessee River. Over much of the world, men live now as Tennesseans themselves were living not long ago—living in poverty, living in sickness, living without schooling, living without real hopes for a better life.

But where men live in such fashion—whether in Africa or Asia or Latin America or elsewhere—there is about them the resources of nature to make their lives better as life here has been made better.

THE WORLD AWAITS

People who have done here in the Tennessee Valley Authority what Americans have done can offer to the world the leadership the world awaits. We are ready to try—and try we must.

That is the challenge of your President today.

Try for peace, try for freedom, try for a stronger alliance among free nations, try for better relations with old allies and for good relations with new nations.

We know the road is long, the way is hard, the turns are many. We know that before success is finally achieved there will be disappointments to endure. We know there are threats that will require steel nerves and opportunities that will require warm hearts—and America has both.

The times can be ours—if we are equal to them.

THE RALLYING POINT

That is the demand pressing down upon us: to see if we are big enough to lead history's biggest cause—or only so petty the cause is lost in partisanship.

As a Democratic President—Grover Cleveland—once said: "It is a condition that confronts us, not a theory." A condition confronts us in the world today—not a theory. The world needs desperately those basic things we take for granted casually, and both first and last the need is for leadership.

This administration is on the way to becoming the rallying point for freemen everywhere. For sake of country—never for sake of party alone—we must not fail.

MESSAGE TO AMERICANS

Let me conclude tonight with this message—a message not to Democrats alone, but to all Americans.

It has been said that those who would forget the past are condemned to relive it.

In our past history, our most tragic national experiences have come when partisan divisions among us were misinterpreted by those who were against us.

THE KAISER MISREAD

The Kaiser misread the close elections of Woodrow Wilson and made the move for world domination which precipitated World War I. The Japanese war lords misinterpreted the divided Government in 1930 and moved into Manchuria. Mussolini did the same 25 years ago amid a period of partisanship here and moved into Ethiopia. Hitler did the same 20 years ago and moved into Poland.

When Americans divide, the world is open to warmakers. When Americans unite, the world is open to the peacemakers.

This we must not forget. This past we must never relive.

Blind partisan divisions are a threat to the peace of our world. Blind partisanship is a folly this generation of Americans cannot afford. Such partisanship is America's greatest danger to its own peace and security today.

RAISE THEIR VOICE

Americans who love their country, love peace, love freedom, must raise their voice against the folly of those who try to tie the hands of the men who lead our own land.

I call upon you—Republicans as well as Democrats—to make it clear that the only acceptable partisanship in these times is construtcive partisanship which respects America's position in the world.

Thomas Jefferson said to his countrymen when he was elected by the smallest of margins—"We are all Democrats. We are all Republicans."

ACCEPTS NO DIVISION

As with our party's founder, so with our President today. President Kennedy accepts no division among our people—not divisions of party, of religion, of race. It is to this work of maintaining the Nation's unity that Democrats must now dedicate themselves.

If our President is to do the work American leadership must do in the world, we who are members of the President's party must do our work at home.

By our conduct in political affairs we must show the world's new nations what mature responsibility means. To keep the peace, let all of us declare war upon the partisan divisions among us and send our President into the world with the support of a fully united America.

The Practical Nurse Training Extension Act of 1961

SPEECH

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides an appropriation of $40 million; does it not?

Mr. GIAIMO. Five million dollars per year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Forty million dollars; is that right?

Mr. GIAIMO. For how many years?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This bill—this is a comparatively simple question, I hope—authorizes an appropriation of $40 million; does it not?

Mr. GIAIMO. I am under the impression it authorizes $5 million a year for 4 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. For 8 years.

Mr. GIAIMO. A total of $20 million.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It provides $5 million for 8 years; does it not?

Mr. GIAIMO. Five million dollars for 4 years—a total of $20 million.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Where does the gentleman get the four? In the bill does it not say eight?

Mr. GIAIMO. I may say to the gentleman we are asking for an extension of the program for 4 additional years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Section 201 reads:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each of the next 8 fiscal years a sum not to exceed $5 million.

Mr. GIAIMO. That was the original bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is $40 million in my book. Is it the purpose to substitute the Senate bill?

Mr. GIAIMO. It is the purpose to substitute the Senate bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why?

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say that that has already been done. The gentleman from New York moved to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why?

Mr. GIAIMO. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think that is all.

Loyalty Oath on the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an editorial from the Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, Wis., under date of April 10, 1961, as follows:

LOYALTY OATH ON THE NEW FRONTIER

Wallace L. Mehlberg, a Pierce County farmer, is new chairman of the Wisconsin Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation (ASC) Committee.

That's the agency that administers the farm programs from Washington. Its authority comes down through counties and on to the township level.

Addressing his ASC county committeemen and office managers last week, Mehlberg declared:

"The ASC is not and shall not become a political organization. However, we all realize the extreme difference of direction we are now taking in the field of farm legislation.

"We need and we shall find people who are and will be dedicated in the promotion of this new approach. Let there be no doubt about that."

He further noted that all ASC personnel had the duty and responsibility "to take a personal inventory of your activities in the past 8 years and conscientiously determine if you are an asset or liability to the progress and promotion of the liberal farm legislation which people in your offices and areas can administer in a dedicated and efficient manner."

The 8 years he referred to were those under former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson.

The chairman said that he contended that "ASC personnel who wholeheartedly supported and promoted the programs of the past administration owe it to themselves and the farmers of Wisconsin to step aside or do a complete about-face if they are to place themselves in a position to sell Secretary Freeman's feed-grain bill and all legislation now in the process of enactment."

The implication of Mehlberg's remarks is that a Government employee in the ASC organization could not do a job for one Congress and still carry out a program that is coming from about the same kind of Congress.

This kind of talk does not reflect the situation in Wisconsin—and does not help agriculture. ASC office managers and county committeemen have done a job that even Mehlberg should be proud to commend.

The real gain in Wisconsin's program has been the increasing cooperation of all agricultural agencies.

Mehlberg has nothing to condemn except his own political approach to a nonpolitical program.

He might recall how Wisconsin voted in the past election. And he might think twice before telling Federal employees to sell programs hatched by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman.

Tribute to Ronald W. May

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a moving tribute to Ron May, Washington correspondent for the Madison, Wis., Capital Times, was written by Ed Koterba, United Features Syndicate columnist Tuesday. It appeared in the Washington Daily News of April 4. May died Monday morning of a heart attack.

Mr. President, Ron May was a diligent, imaginative reporter. He was a hard, conscientious worker. He had a sensitive heart for the little people, and indignation against injustice and arrogance. His book—with Jack Anderson—"McCarthy, the Man, the Senator, the Ism," was a courageous and useful exposé. May wrote many a revealing, informative story for the Capital Times on the misuse of power in this capital of the free world. My sincerest sympathies go to Rons' lovely wife and family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled, "There Is an Empty Space in the Gallery," from the Washington Daily News for April 4, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THERE IS AN EMPTY SPACE IN THE GALLERY
(By Ed Koterba)

In the U.S. Senate press gallery, opposite this desk, stands an empty typewriter.

In the afternoons over the years, as I'd sit at my machine, trying to make it say something, I'd glance over at Ron May at that other machine. I envied his capacity for work, the way he poured out reams of copy hour after hour—all of it good.

The other boys marveled at his dogged, diligent attitude in digging out the "cover-up" stories. A reporter's reporter, always on the go.

BIG BREAK

His biggest break came just a week ago. Ron was vibrating with wound-up emotion. "Life magazine," he said, "is planning to buy my story." He had been working on it for a year. "I'm meeting with their people tonight," he said.

Hard work paid off for young May. He had just moved into a new home in suburban Maryland (at 4809 Middlesex Lane, Bethesda), then he and his wife were blessed with their second child.

Ron, tall and lean, had been saying he was going to spend more time with his kids. It was amazing how he was able to keep so many news irons going in his never-ending blaze of journalist endeavors. He corresponded regularly for a half-dozen newspapers. Then he freelanced for others. He was always pounding away.

HAD TIP

Last weekend, he bubbled over to my desk. "I have a terrific tip for a column for you," he said. He spelled out the story and was to supply a key name from his files at home.

"I'll have it to you first thing Monday morning," he said. If it all checked out, it would make a fascinating story.

Monday morning, I was at this desk, scanning the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, awaiting young May's breezy entrance. Instead, Joe Wills, superintendent of the gallery, came up from behind. He said:

"Ron May just died at his home—of a heart attack."

(Services will be held tomorrow at 2 p.m. at the Ft. Myer Chapel. Burial will be in Arlington Cemetery.)

PENALTY

This fine young lad, though his name had not yet carried the fame of an O. O. McIntyre, Arthur Brisbane or Ernie Pyle, had paid the penalty too often assessed against our world of promising, hard-working newspapermen.

My friend, Ron May, had, in death, kept his promise to me. Among his last words to me were: "I'll give you a column to write." I wish it hadn't been this one.

The Duties of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, a young student at Washington-Lee High School in Arlington, Va., Mr. Jay Kelly Wright, has been declared winner of the American Legion high school oratorical contest in my 10th Congressional District.

I have read Mr. Wright's oration and think it excellent. I am proud, indeed, to present it for inclusion in this RECORD so that my colleagues can have the benefit of the sincerely patriotic reflections of a fine northern Virginia youth:

THE DUTIES OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Jay Kelly Wright, winner, 10th Congressional District of Virginia American Legion high school oratorical contest)

On September 17, 1787, the Constitution of the United States was submitted by the Constitutional Convention to the 13 Original States for ratification. After nearly 4 months of considerable disagreement among the delegates, sharp debate, and compromise, the honorable statesmen who were delegates to the convention agreed upon a plan for the establishment of a new Government for the United States. The document they produced was a blueprint of the structure of this new Government. It divided Federal governing authority among three branches, defined and limited the powers of the Federal Government, and clarified the position of the State governments. It provided for its own enforcement, interpretation, and amendment, so that it might have the proper amounts of both rigidity and flexibility necessary for it to be effective as the Supreme Law of the Land not only at the time it was written, but also in the years to follow. The Constitution was, in short, a plan to secure permanently for the citizens of America the inalienable rights and privileges with which all people are endowed. In the words of the preamble, it was designed "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."[1] The Constitution, then, in defining clearly and precisely the powers of the Government, insured the protection of the rights of each American citizen.

Today one hears a great deal about the rights granted by the Constitution. There are arguments concerning the relative rights of the Federal and State Governments and, more often, disputes involving an individual's rights in relation to those of the higher governments. Most American citizens seem to know something about their constitutional rights. Although they are not students of the law they nevertheless have some knowledge of their basic liberties, such as freedom of speech or the right to assemble. At any rate, they are quick to sound off about their rights and profess such knowledge, especially when they feel they have suffered infringement of their legal privileges. Unfortunately, much of the citizens' comment about rights is misdirected, for although many Americans are very concerned about the rights which the Government grants them, they have little thought for their responsibilities, in return, to the Government.

It is possible that some Americans have never considered their responsibilities to their Government. Perhaps they do not know that the Constitution not only grants rights but also imposes upon each individual certain obligations—the obligations of good citizenship. But here again, the many Americans are somewhat confused, for they are not certain of the meaning of the term "good citizenship." Perhaps they have always defined a "good citizen" as a law-abiding man. If so, they have been mistaken, for good citizenship involves more than mere obedience to the law. The democracy which the Constitution established is based on the sovereignty of the people, and its strength therefore depends upon an active, interested populace. If the people exercise their rights vigorously and intelligently, self-government is effective; but if the people neglect their government and allow it to deteriorate, poor government is the result. It is obvious, then, that the success of any democratic system requires that the citizens take an interest in their Government. It is also evident that a good American citizen is one who demonstrates such interest.

The good American has been generally defined as one who is interested in his Government. But what does this mean? In practice, what is a good citizen?

First, he is one who learns what is happening in his country. In America there are many media through which citizens can become informed about current events. The responsible citizen takes advantage of them. In newspapers and magazines, through radio and television he can learn about news event. In our modern world there is indeed little excuse for any citizen's ignorance about current happenings.

Second, a good citizen forms his opinions intelligently. After learning about controversial issues, the good citizen carefully weighs and considers the facts, then develops his opinions. He makes his own decision upon the facts, independent of the views of others. He does his own thinking, rejecting conformity, prejudice, or tradition as bases for judgment. His views having been formulated, the intelligent citizen constantly reexamines them in the light of new ideas or more recent evidence. His is a continual process of challenging his own views, then defending or rejecting them. He is always prepared to reverse his opinions should new evidence prove them incorrect. He never stubbornly clings to outmoded beliefs which have been discarded. He is prepared to move with the growth of his country.

Third, a good citizen is one who works to see that his ideals are carried out. He expresses his will through the ballot, or he participates in civic organizations to help to bring about implementation of his ideas. He works to campaign for the political candidate of his choice or he supports a community reform project in which he believes. He does not watch others take care of his responsibilities.

There are, then, three general duties of good citizenship which the Constitution, in granting rights, has placed upon every American. These are becoming informed, formulating opinion, and carrying out ideals. The citizens who do not fulfill these are obstructions to effective democracy. The man who reads only the comic or sports sections of his newspaper, the man who is too busy with his business affairs to attend an important school board hearing, the man who is afraid to be the sole member of his community to speak for integration, the man who believes that America should return to the doctrine of isolationism, the man who votes a straight party ticket simply because his father and grandfather did so, the man who couldn't choose between Mr. Nixon or Mr. Kennedy, the man who feels that his vote simply doesn't count—all of them are detriments to democracy.

Today, as perhaps never before, it is vital that the citizens of America take a continuing interest in their Government. Without such interest our individual and collective security is threatened. America is engaged in an arms race and a cold war. At a time when the formidable bloc of Communist countries threatens the security of every free nation, America must be able to give undivided attention to maintaining her high position among the world powers. This she cannot do if she is plagued by the indifference, the lack of interest, and the unconcern of her citizens. Americans all must work with and give support to the Government if our country as we know it today is to survive.

One hundred and seventy-three years ago our forefathers established this democracy. Today it is the responsibility of each one of us, the citizens of America, to guard this gift and to keep it functioning. Indeed, it is the solemn duty of every American to meet fully his obligations of citizenship. If each of us will take the time and effort throughout our lives to study the issues, to keep an open mind, to express our views, to cast our votes, then we can be more assured that "government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."[2]

[1] From the preamble to the Constitution of the United States of America.

[2] From Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

Canada and the United States—A Traditional Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the week of April 23–29 has been designated by Kiwanis International as United States-Canada Good Will Week. The forthcoming observance of this week has been noted by the Kiwanis Club, North Ridgeville, Ohio, of which Mr. John C. Vopat is president. Kiwanis Clubs throughout the world, especially in Canada and the United States will emphasize the traditional friendship between these two neighbor countries.

It is appropriate, therefore, Mr. President, that there be given broad recognition of United States-Canada Good Will Week. A review of the long and unbroken period of peace and friendship between these two neighboring countries stands out in today's troubled world as a lesson, a guide—yes, an example—that should enlighten all nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my further comments on this subject be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES—A TRADITIONAL FRIENDSHIP

The traditional friendship which exists between Canada and the United States cannot be too often emphasized. Since the United States first emerged from the Revolutionary War there has been a mutual effort to promote good will and cooperation between the two countries. These efforts must never flag. The good relations must never be taken for granted. No condition remains static.

Before the eyes of the world our two countries have set an example of peaceful boundaries, happy relationships, and a common effort at understanding. We must not let that image fade. Complete accord is not always possible between two sovereign and independent nations. No two friends are constantly likeminded but differences of opinion need not alter friendly relations; indeed they may enhance them. For a willingness to arbitrate differences, and a distinct effort at mutual understanding may weld loose ties of acquiescence into strong bonds of cooperation.

The mutual desire of Canada and the United States to cooperate is evidenced by the fact that they have concluded nearly 200 treaties and agreements on a variety of subjects ranging from amity to weather.

Basic to our mutual good will and most renowned of our treaty arrangements is that

concerning the boundary between the United States and Canada, the unfortified frontier. Provision for the abolition of armed forces on the Great Lakes and along the land frontier stemmed from the peace negotiations following the American Revolution. Effected by the Rush-Bagot Agreement of 1817–18, the undefended border by a series of treaties has been extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a stretch of almost 4,000 miles (3,987). Added to this are 1,540 miles of boundary between Canada and Alaska—a total of over 5,500 miles bearing witness to a mutual desire for friendship and understanding.

Another milestone in the history of the good relations between the United States and Canada was the treaty of 1909. By this agreement all of the waters along the international boundary were to be used for the benefit of both countries. The import of this provision may be inferred when one considers what a large proportion of the boundary consists of water. Of the 3,987-mile stretch from the Atlantic to the Pacific only 1,789 is land, and 2,198 is water. Another 183 miles of water and 1,357 of land mark the Alaskan boundary. In order to insure the effectiveness of this arrangement the treaty also provided for a permanent International Joint Commission—United States and Canada. It was established and has operated harmoniously for over five decades, resolving the innumerable problems which inevitably arise when the peoples of two great nations share the thousands of miles of water resources along the common border.

More specific arrangements concerning the use of particular bodies of water along the boundary have also been momentous in the development of mutual benefits and understanding. The treaty relating to the uses of the waters of the Niagara River, signed in 1950, took the place of earlier ones and provided for a vast increase in the power output of the Niagara River, but with safeguards to preserve the scenic beauty of the famous falls. An equal diversion of the waters available for power, without disturbing the unbroken crestline of the falls, made it possible for both countries to provide for large areas of their population a source of cheap power and development, at the same time preserving for posterity the world-renowned grandeur of the natural scenery.

The culmination of decades of effort to resolve the question of the joint use of the whole of the great St. Lawrence was realized finally with the signing of the treaty of 1954. It provided for the construction of facilities for navigation which were to open up to ocean-going liners passage through the giant seaway stretching from the mouth of the St. Lawrence to the westernmost tip of Lake Superior. This massive cooperative project was also of immense importance to the future development of electric power. Above all, however, the significance of the treaty lay in the fact that the United States and Canada, looking together toward the protection of world peace, and with mutual concern for any situation that might arise, gave evidence of a really effective working partnership between two independent and sovereign nations.

The most recent treaty between the United States and Canada is likewise a momentous one. On January 17, 1961, the two countries signed the Columbia River Treaty. It represented the solving of difficult and complex problems by resourceful collaboration. At the signing ceremony the Prime Minister of Canada, Dr. Diefenbaker, said, "[It] is more than a blueprint for technical and economic cooperation. * * * It is a symbol of intelligent partnership. * * * Indeed, there could be no more impressive evidence of the capacity of the United States and Canada to pioneer in new methods of cooperation to their mutual advantage."[1]

The magnitude of this vast cooperative undertaking can be only faintly conceived when one considers that of some 24 separate projects listed in the treaty, one alone involves the mighty Grand Coulee and another the enormous Bonneville Dam, and that there are multiple aspects to each project of collaboration.

The opening up of the St. Lawrence Seaway has already meant that the ports on either side of the Great Lakes have had a phenomenal increase in exports. They have set records for oversea and total tonnage. In the harbors, docks and facilities are being rapidly expanded to keep pace with the Seaway traffic development.

Canada and the United States are the greatest trading neighbors in the world. Not only are they each other's best customers, the volume of trade is such that the United States is the third largest and Canada the fourth largest of the trading nations around the globe.

This large scale contact in business and commerce bears witness to the good relations between the United States and Canada in the economic field. There must be both mutual understanding and forbearance between countries to maintain good will. For joint economic, commercial and business interests not only create benefits. They promote rivalries and create problems as well. We find Canada and the United States making definite and concrete concessions in order to insure that the relationship is not only pleasant but mutually beneficial. There is vigor in the effort of the two countries to find solutions to difficulties; and this effort engenders approval and appreciation.

The volume of travel between the United States and Canada is tremendous and constantly increasing. Of the 27,329,000 persons traveling from Canada in 1957 (the latest available figures) 99.6 percent went to the United States. The total number of Canadians crossing to south of the border was 27,209,000. 26,619,000 citizens of the United States went to Canada that year. This figure represented 97 percent of all of Canada's visitors in 1957.

The expenditure of these U.S. citizens in Canada during that year was $325 million. That of the Canadians in the United States $403 million. The latter figure represented an increase of about 400 percent over the previous 10 years.

Travelers to and from Canada and the United States went by automobile, rail, boat, aircraft, international bus, local bus, and on foot. By far the greater number, about two-thirds, traveled by auto on short-term visits, under 48 hours.

Travel facilities between the two countries are well coordinated. The courtesy with which Americans are treated while traveling in Canada is memorable for those of us who have been there. The customs officers perform their tasks with tact and the minimum of inconvenience to the visitor. It is to be hoped that our Canadian visitors are equally happy with the treatment they receive at our hands.

The coordination of transportation between the United States and Canada is a matter of great importance to the vital field of defense, in which the two countries are inevitably and inextricably associated. In the realm of defense Canada and the United States have gone even beyond cooperation. There has been voluntary integration of many defense measures.

What is known as Norad—North American air defense—was formally established in 1958. Many cooperative steps in defense were already under way. Not since the first coordination in 1941—for World War II—had there, in fact, ceased to be consultation and preparation for joint defense. The present setup of Norad is, however, on a more extensive and more closely integrated scale than ever before. It includes the DEW line, a joint radar system for distant early warning. It stretches for 3,000 miles, across northern Canada to the Aleutian Islands, Alaska, and the Baffin Islands at the Northwest Passage.

Norad includes also the mid-Canada line, the Pinetree system, a number of radar extensions and observation posts, and SAGE. SAGE—semiautomatic ground environment—is an information-gathering system for air defense purposes. Eventually the entire United States and the more densely populated areas of Canada will be linked in one defensive network.

There is the Ground Observer Corps, made up of Canadian civilian interceptors, spotting planes that might fly too low for radar warnings. From the hilltops and the valleys they act as air-defense protectors.

There is coordination of defense production on a scale which would astonish the rest of the world, could the full story be told.

In the matter of civil defense there are regular exchange visits between the U.S. Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and the Canadian Civil Defense authorities.

There are many fields of cooperation between the United States and Canada which I have not even touched upon. Of enormous importance and of as long standing as the two countries have been cognizant neighbors are their combined and adjusted fishing arrangements. Both bilateral and international agreements involving other countries such as Russia and Japan have been in effect since the 19th century and earlier, to regulate, preserve, and coordinate the various fishing interests of joint concern. There are many other economic as well as social and cultural fields of endeavor in which the Canadians and their American neighbors south of their border have combined their forces and their wits.

Good relations between the two countries cannot, however, rest upon the laurels of past peaceful policies. Nor can they be complacently regarded as permanently established, even in view of the many gratifying evidences of current collaboration. The maintenance of good relations for which these neighbors, Canada and the United States, are justly famous is dependent upon continuing effort, understanding, and initiative on the part of both.

To this end there has recently been established another very important bond between us. It is one of tremendous significance and potential efficacy. It is the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, composed of a number of the representatives of the people of both countries. It has been in existence about a year and a half and has periodic meetings to further cooperation, to discuss the common problems and means of settling inescapable differences with amity, mutual trust, and constructive understanding. One commentator has spoken recently of the treasured partnership between the United States and Canada. Another has said, "The unity, fellowship, and common dedication to the heritage of freedom is to the peoples of the United States and Canada a living thing."[2]

---

[1] Canadian Weekly Bulletin, Jan. 25, 1961, p. 5.

[2] Canada. Statements and Speeches, No. 59/27. Ottawa, 1959.

United Nations Military Aggression Against Katanga Government in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Knock Ourselves Out," by Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of the Indianapolis Star, which appeared in that newspaper on Sunday, April 9, 1961.

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

WE KNOCK OURSELVES OUT

Criminal folly—that's the only way to describe the United Nations military aggression against the Katanga state government in the Congo. The most alarming feature of the aggression is the fact that it has been made possible only because of U.S. Government support. This means that the United States in actual fact now is engaged in aggressive military operations against the constitutional and legal government of a nation which has done no harm to America and whose government is one of the very few African governments that openly proclaims its friendship and loyalty to the United States and the West.

Katanga is the southern, richest and best governed state, or province, of the Congo confederation. It is the only part of the Congo which never suffered any serious internal disturbances. The ruler of Katanga, President Moise Tshombe, is a well-educated, moderately conservative leader who has organized an efficient government and a small but well disciplined national army. He is supported by a democratically elected parliament and has not had any serious opposition to his regime since the Congo became independent in the summer of 1960.

Tshombe is, however, intensively hated by the Communists as well as by the "neutralists" represented in the Congo by the United Nations overlord, Dayal, an Indian Government official. Tshombe was the driving force behind the formation of the Congo confederation, proclaimed last month by all Congolese national leaders, but not yet recognized by the United Nations.

Tshombe never asked for United Nations troops to be sent to his country. He never asked for any U.N. military or financial assistance. He is on good terms with the former Belgian authorities in Katanga and has retained the services of about 600 Belgian and other European government financial and business experts. Tshombe's government is one of the few African regimes which shows amity toward the white man.

Yet Katanga has now been chosen by the United Nations Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjold, as the victim for "an impressive show of force." Without asking Tshombe's consent, the United Nations has sent several strong army detachments to occupy, by force, strategic points in Katanga, including the important airport of its capital, Elizabethville. Hammarskjold officially boasts in New York that his plan is to send, within the next few days, a total of 7,000 Indian troops to Katanga.

Hammarskjold makes no secret of the United Nations aims in Katanga—he wants the so-called foreign element in Katanga withdrawn. In practice, this means the forceful expulsion of the 600 Belgian and European military experts. But such an expulsion is sure to bring the downfall of the Tshombe regime which badly needs the services of these Western experts. Katanga would then certainly become the center of serious internal strife, after which, presumably, peace would have to be restored by the U.N. Indian troops.

We must also remember that the Indian troops were airlifted to the Congo by the U.S. Air Force at, of course, the expense of the American taxpayer. While in the Congo the Indians are officially paid, fed, and supplied by the United Nations. But, as Uncle Sam foots most of the United Nations Congo bills, it can be said without exaggeration that the American taxpayer is responsible for the operational costs of the Indian troops in Katanga.

The United States has thus been put in a truly fantastic situation. It pays for and supports aggressive military actions aimed at the overthrow of a foreign government friendly toward the United States. The troops engaged in these aggresive moves are under the direction of a "neutralist," Dayal, who hates America and is known to be "neutral" in favor of Moscow. And the political control of all these military operations is in the hands of an anti-American group of states—the so-called Afro-Asian group, which is led by such states as Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Indonesia, and Yugoslavia.

The United States is thus actively involved in aggressive military moves which are directed against America's own interests and which can only harm the cause of freedom and democracy throughout the world. To top it all, these incredible operations are supervised by an organization which has its headquarters in the center of New York and performs its anti-American activities largely with American financial support and in full view of the American people.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks a good deal of discussion has centered around the very controversial issue of Federal aid to education. Many of us have received a good deal of mail with opinions for and against this measure and of recent date I received a communication from Sisters M. Derwa and M. Cyril, associated with the Holy Trinity School at Winsted, Minn. This school has performed a very fine job of providing education in the Winsted community and I represented this area in the State senate for many years, beginning in 1935. With the communication that I received was enclosed an article by Don Raihle, which appeared in a recent issue of the Wanderer, a Catholic publication with wide circulation in the State of Minnesota. This article, in my judgment, presents some very pertinent points and I believe that Members of Congress should have the opportunity of examining in detail the points set forth in this very well prepared article.

The article is herewith appended in full:

WHAT THEY'RE TALKING ABOUT
(By Don Raihle)

"Ribicoff at the outset sought to allay fears that the legislation might lead to Federal interference with the schools. He said a Federal role has been legitimate and accepted since 1790 and these programs he said, have 'been administered without evidencing one shred of Federal control.' "

Background: The foregoing is quoted from a news story in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune on March 9, 1951. Federal rule book—page 4—says: "Administration of Vocational Education: Each State is required to submit a plan which must meet the approval of the Federal Office of Education."

Allen P. Burkhardt, superintendent of schools at Norfolk, Nebr., commenting upon his own experience with Federal money in the field of vocational agriculture and home economics, said this:

"To get this money we have to accept and adopt the course of study outlined and specified by the Federal Government through the State department of education. We have to permit inspection by State employees who receive part of their money from the Federal Government.

"We have to hire teachers whose qualifications are approved by the same groups. We have to send our teachers to conferences designated by those authorities.

"Because we get Federal support for agriculture and home economics, we have to accept courses of study worked out by other people.

"We are told how long our periods of recitation have to be. * * * We are told how large the classrooms and the shops have to be, what type of equipment we have to have, even the type of floor in the rooms. We are told about how much money to spend per student. We are not allowed to use the teachers in those departments in any other fields. If we do, we lose our Federal money.

"If this doesn't constitute control from Washington, then at least it's a reasonable facsimile."

Federal aid-to-education legislation is almost always prefaced with a disclaimer of Federal control as was the National Defense Education Act of 1958. It said: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system."

In spite of this, the act goes on to set forth numerous regulations, requirements, and directives which local school systems must meet and observe in order to qualify for Federal funds under the act.

About a year ago I talked before a group of parents at Hamel, Minn. A high school teacher told me they had obtained an adding machine under the National Defense Education Act of 1958. A short time later a Govenment employee dropped in to look around. The high school teacher told me that he was advised that the adding machine was to be used only in the teaching of science and if it was used for any other purpose—at any time—the Federal Government would take the machine away. That is Federal control.

When Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff appeared before the House Committee on Education and Labor on March 8, 1961, and said that present Federal aid-to-education programs have "been administered without evidencing one shred of Federal control," he either lied or was totally ignorant of the facts. He certainly was not speaking the truth. In either instance he seems to be lacking some of the necessary qualifications for the high office that has been handed to him by the President.

You cannot have Federal aid to anything without Federal control. The U.S. Supreme

Court has said so. The Court says that with every Federal subsidy must go some Federal control. Secretary Ribicoff should know that, and the President should know it very well. To say that we can have Federal aid to education without Federal control is just about the most misleading statement that has ever been concocted for public consumption.

Michael J. Wargovich—Noted American Slovac Fraternalist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, all of us who knew Michael J. Wargovich mourn his recent death. He was one of the great leaders of the American Slovak movement which has made many contributions to American life. Mr. Wargovich was also active in politics throughout his lifetime and served in a wide variety of important poses with the Republican Party.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on this noted American which appeared in the Good Shepherd, official publication of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

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

MICHAEL J. WARGOVICH, NOTED AMERICAN SLOVAK FRATERNALIST

(By John C. Sciranka)

On Tuesday, January 17, 1961, the American Slovaks lost a noted fraternalist and a leader, Michael J. Wargovich, who died in McKeesport, Pa., after a brief illness at the age of 65.

The name Wargovich is known throughout the world where the Slovak people live. He was born in Slovakia and brought to this country as a mere child. His parents after a brief stay in Brooklyn, N.Y., settled in Pennsylvania. McKeesport was the city where the late fraternalist learned his ABC in fraternalism. And since McKeesport has the distinction of being also the domicile of the first American Slovak newspapermen and organizers of a fraternal society—Ján Slovensky and Julius Wolf, who settled there in 1879, "Big Mike," as he was widely known, followed in their footsteps. But his inspiration came from the late pastor of the Holy Trinity Slovak Catholic Church, Father Panuska. Here Mike served as an altar boy 55 years ago to a noted priest during the national convention of the First Catholic Slovak Union of United States and Canada, which is the largest Slovak organization in the world and which the late Michael J. Wargovich headed as supreme president for 20 years. Praiseworthy is the fact the junior order of the union was established then. The priest to whom Mike served was the Reverend Stephen Furdek, known as Father of American Slovaks. This meeting with the famous priest inspired the late Michael J. Wargovich to the dedication of his life to the American Slovak fraternalism.

The writer had the pleasure to attend the first national convention of this the largest Slovak fraternal organization in the summer of 1922 in Bethlehem, Pa., with late Wargovich. It was the first national convention for both of us. Shortly after this convention, the writer became assistant editor of Jednota (Union), published in Middletown, Pa. Michael waited for his chance until 1926, when he was elected supreme auditor at the national convention in Scranton, Pa. This was followed by chairmanship of the board of auditors. Then in 1940 during the Pittsburgh national convention he was elected supreme president and reelected at every national convention, which grew steadily under his leadership. The organization's headquarters are in Cleveland, Ohio, where it was founded in 1890 but it maintains a printery, orphanage and an old folks home at Middletown, Pa., on a large farm near Harrisburg. Pennsylvania has over 60 percent of the organization's membership.

OFFICER OF NATIONAL FRATERNAL CONGRESS

During the past 20 years, Mr. Wargovich attended all the conventions of the National Fraternal Congress of America in which he served on various important committees and also as member of its executive committee. He was also president of the Pennsylvania Fraternal Congress and treasurer of the Slovak Catholic Religious Association, which raised a quarter million dollars under the auspices of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America and the National Catholic Welfare Conference during World War II for the war-torn Slovakia.

He attended and served on the important committees of the Slovak League of America and the Slovak Catholic Federation of America. During that period he visited every State in the Union and all the principal cities of the United States and Canada at various celebrations and functions of his organization.

SERVED UNDER FIVE GOVERNORS

Mr. Wargovich was a stanch Republican and took active part in all Republican activities from the time he started to vote. He served on local and county, as well as State committees. The Republican National Committee recognized his services and he served on its advisory board. He was also national chairman of the Slovak Division of the Republican Party for several years and took part in various campaigns, visiting many States as a speaker. His voice was heard over the air during the last presidential campaign in English and Slovak languages. During the 1960 Republican National Convention in Chicago, Ill., he had the honor to serve as one of the assistant secretaries of this historical conclave, which he considered one of the highest honors. Mr. Wargovich served as district representative of the Pennsylvania State Workmen's Insurance Fund under five Governors. He also served as the treasurer of the Pittsburgh Fraternal Societies.

He was active in civic affairs and served as officer of the local branch 60, of the First Catholic Slovak Union, also was member of the National Slovak Society Assembly 31, which is one of the oldest Slovak societies in America. Also the Knights of Columbus, Council 955, the Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol, Assembly 46, and the Serra Club.

Under his leadership the organization had youth conferences in the principal cities of the United States and Canada and the last such conference was in August 1960 in Washington, D.C., with a solemn mass at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. He arranged the programs for these conferences and the national conventions of the organization which he headed. The writer had the privilege to be temporary chairman of two such national conventions in New York City, the first one in 1928, when the late Patrick Cardinal Hayes greeted the convention and second in 1952, when Francis J. Cardinal Spellman presided at the pontifical Mass in St. Patrick's Cathedral. Similar conventions with solemn pontifical Masses were held during his tenure of office in Chicago, Ill., Youngstown, Ohio, Milwaukee, Wis., New York City, Reading, Pa., and Detroit, Mich., with Cardinals Stritch, Mooney, and McQuigan pontificating and preaching.

The most impressive celebration under Wargovich's presidency was held on Labor Day 1955 in Cleveland Public Auditorium in honor of the centennial birthday of Father Furdek, founder of the union. The late Cardinal Stritch preached the sermon and some 30 American archbishops and bishops took part in the picturesque celebration with many monsignori, priests and all American Slovak fraternal leaders present.

He was in midst of gigantic preparations for the national convention to be held in August 1961 in Pittsburgh, Pa., when death put an end to his prolific fraternal career. He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Mary Lucanish Wargovich; two sons: Dr. Raymond Wargovich of McKeesport, Pa., active fraternalist and Matthew Wargovich of Bel Air, Md., also two daughters, Miss Dolores Wargovich at home and Mrs. Mildred Coffman of Akron, Ohio; two brothers, Joseph and Andrew of McKeesport and a sister, Mrs. Anna Evans of Munhall and seven grandchildren.

In spite of inclement weather, all American Slovak fraternal organizations were represented at his funeral on Saturday, January 21. Rt. Rev. Msgr. Clement J. Hrtanek preached the eulogy and represented Most Rev. John J. Wright, bishop of Pittsburgh diocese and Rt. Rev. Abbot Theodore G. Kojis, O.S.B., celebrated pontifical Mass of Requiem, assisted by local pastor, Father Edward J. Duwell, who officiated at the Calvary Cemetery, Port Vue, Pa.

Msgr. Andrew Biros, supreme chaplain; Msgr. Michael Shuba, organization's supreme chaplain for Canada; Very Rev. Canon Joseph S. Altany, LL.D., editor of Slovak Catholic Federation; Rev. Martin B. Rubicky, former supreme president of the Slovak Catholic Federation; Rev. Louis P. Hohos, supreme chaplain of the Slovak Catholic Sokol and many priests attended funeral. The fraternal leaders were led by John A. Sabol, supreme executive vice president of the organization and the successor of late Michael J. Wargovich from Phoenixville, Pa.

Mr. Wargovich was lifelong resident of Allegheny County and great citizen of Pennsylvania, who preached and lived as a true American Slovak fraternalist, aiding his fellow men for a better tomorrow.

He will always be remembered by his countrymen as a typical American Slovak fraternalist.

National Transportation Week

SPEECH
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman give consideration to the bill I sent over last week?

Mr. CELLER. I do not recall the nature of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not think you would.

Mr. CELLER. If the bill has merit I am quite sure the gentleman will receive every consideration.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will you give it long consideration?

Mr. CELLER. I do not know about long consideration; we will give it earnest consideration.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will you give it any consideration?

Mr. CELLER. We certainly shall.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The Program for Educational Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under our free-enterprise system many business concerns are providing effective and worthwhile aid to our educational system. Oftentimes the educational aid programs financed through business in our capitalistic system are overlooked.

Recently there was called to my attention the outstanding work of the Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co. in support of education. The Procter & Gamble Co. is currently supporting 240 4-year scholarships; certain technical scholarships totaling about 30; payments to all of the 40 State and regional associations of colleges, including approximately 475 different colleges; $20,000 each year to each of the 10 large universities, to be used as the universities may choose; and certain special grants to such organizations as the National Fund for Medical Education and the United Negro College Fund. The total being contributed has now reached $1,100,000 per year.

Recently this concern has embarked upon a new educational program in support of graduate schools of education.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD excerpts from the statement of this company setting forth their new program for educational leadership. This kind of voluntary private support of education is about the finest aid to education our free system can produce. Excerpts from the Procter & Gamble statement covering their new graduate program follow:

THE PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The newest phase in our program of aid to higher education is grants to support graduate schools of education. Beginning in 1961, we are providing $15,000 per year to each of the following graduate schools. We hope to be able to continue this level of support for a total of at least 5 years.

Graduate School of Education, University of Chicago.

Teachers College, Columbia University.

Graduate School of Education, Harvard University.

Graduate School of George Peabody College for Teachers.

Graduate School of Education, Stanford University.

These grants are in special recognition of the fact that the quality of education depends on the quality of teaching—on the knowledge held by the teacher, on his ability to impart this knowledge to others and on his capacity for stimulating thought. As these areas of teaching capability are expanded, education itself is moved forward. Advances here come principally as a result of research and of sharing the results of this research throughout the broad spectrum of the educational system. There are relatively few graduate schools in the country which not only train teachers but which also, through research, advance the art of teaching. The institutions named above are among those which are providing outstanding leadership in advanced education. On a highly selective basis they train those who are to teach and those who are to teach others to teach. In addition they carry on broad programs of educational research, the results of which are available to all other educational institutions. Thus, in supporting these graduate schools, an important measure of support is provided to all education throughout the country.

These graduate schools have another claim to the name of "national" educational institutions. They select their students from all parts of the United States and from an impressive part of the rest of the free world, returning them after training to schools, colleges, and universities throughout this country and abroad. For this reason also, it is appropriate that support of these graduate schools of education should come from organizations which are, themselves, national or international in character and outlook.

Finally, our support of these graduate schools is impelled by the absence of well-to-do alumni of schools of education. In some other fields, successful alumni are in a position to make substantial contributions to the institutions which provided their education. With only a few exceptions, this is not the case with those in the teaching profession, whose earning power is relatively restricted. Unfortunately, this is true not only for the alumni of these graduate schools but teacher-training institutions throughout the country. This fact opens a special opportunity and justification for the exercise of corporate support.

As stated with respect to large universities on our university program, we do not suggest that only these five graduate schools of education are worthy of corporate support. Many others also make heavy contributions to teaching and to the improvement of learning methods. Many others, which do not do extensive educational research themselves but which translate the advances of others into better education of teachers, also deserve financial assistance. It is our hope that other organizations, believing as strongly as does our own in the essentiality of meeting the Nation's need for more and better teachers, will compile their own lists of deserving institutions and provide to them the support they richly deserve.

Wisconsin Backs Resources Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on March 21 I invited the attention of the Senate to the text of Gov. Gaylord Nelson's message on the State's natural resources to the Wisconsin Legislature. The New York Times for Sunday, April 2, reported on the forward-looking program which the Governor is proposing and on the broad bipartisan support it has already received. Governor Nelson is to be congratulated on the leadership he is offering in this vital area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the April 2 New York Times entitled, "Wisconsin Backs Resources Plan," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

WISCONSIN BACKS RESOURCES PLAN—NELSON WINS BIPARTISAN AID FOR PROGRAM TO ENLARGE ENDANGERED OUTDOORS

(By Austin C. Wehrwein, special to the New York Times)

MADISON, WIS., March 31.—Gov. Gaylord A. Nelson has won bipartisan support for a broad, coordinated 10-year program to save and enlarge Wisconsin's vast but endangered outdoor resources.

In terms of need he called it a "crash program" crying for "dramatic and decisive action." But the remedies he has designed suggest more of a "prudent investment" for the future.

He urged that the State be empowered to use easements on a far broader scale than any State has used them. An easement is the right to use a privately owned land for various purposes while the title to the land stays in the hands of the original owner.

Thus, the Governor explained, the State could buy the right to prevent unsightly billboards, or to have access to a lake stream or a beauty spot.

Buying an easement would be cheaper than buying the land outright and in the meantime the land would stay on the tax rolls.

WIDER ZONING SCALE

The Governor could also use zoning on a broader scale to achieve some of the same purposes and, if necessary, purchase land outright.

In general the Wisconsin program is in line with New York State's $75 million park land purchase program but it is broader in concept.

In broad outline, the Wisconsin program would enlarge State park and forest recreation and camp site areas, improve and increase fish and game habitat, set up a youth conservation corps, protect landscapes, build new lakes, aid cities in creating parks on their edges and promote tourism.

The vacation-recreation business is worth $600 million to Wisconsin annually but the Nelson program is directed more at preserving the State's natural beauty than at exploiting it. Nevertheless, it was generally agreed in the areas where the vacation business means dollars in the bank that such a broad program in the long run would be very much worthwhile.

TAX-RISE FINANCE

Long-range plans have been lacking both at the State and National level, Mr. Nelson declared.

To be financed by a 1-cent increase in the cigarette tax, the Nelson program stresses "additions to capital assets" rather than additions to the State payroll, the Governor went on.

It would jibe with existing fish and game programs. But the key to his concept is that the State must plan ahead for the needs of everybody—the birdwatchers, the campers, the family vacationers, and the canoers.

Traditionally, too, conservation programs have been largely paid for from license fees from users. The Nelson program, drawing on a special excise tax, would break new ground in this regard. Fish and game license fees would be restored to fish and game activities exclusively.

TO BE SUBMITTED SOON

The Governor's bill was being drafted by his lawyers this week for submission within a week or two to the legislature.

Mr. Nelson is a second-term Democrat and both houses of the legislature are Republican controlled. Nevertheless his proposed

measure has won stout bipartisan support and chances of passage appear bright.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, wrote to the Governor this week that his Department regarded the program as one of the boldest and most comprehensive put forward by any State. Similar praise came from Francis W. Sargent, executive director of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, a special Federal body created in the Eisenhower administration under the chairmanship of Laurence S. Rockefeller.

Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on March 29, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman addressed the National Water Research Symposium here in Washington. I was impressed and encouraged by the Secretary's remarks. I will willingly support the program he has set forth for watershed, woodland, forest land, and research development.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of Secretary Freeman's address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN BEFORE NATIONAL WATER RESEARCH SYMPOSIUM, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 29, 1961

I feel honored to have the privilege of speaking to this National Water Research Symposium. May I congratulate the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts and the National Reclamation Association for their foresight in organizing this very impressive event.

I think you will understand when I say that I feel a little hesitant in talking about conservation to such a group as this. Some of you were probably actively concerned with conservation before I was born. And I know very well that when the Senate confirmed me as Secretary of Agriculture it did not thereby confirm me as an authority also on conservation.

Nevertheless, I do have some basic ideas on the subject. I firmly believe that conservation is something that happens not only to resources—conservation happens to people. Conservation is for people. It has both intimate and far-reaching effects upon their prosperity, their jobs, their diets, their health, their recreation, their culture; in short, their lives.

As Governor of Minnesota I saw this many times. A year or so ago I went with a party of about 25 Minnesotans who share a deep interest in conservation programs on a 3-day tour of conservation installations and projects around that State. While on the southern leg of the tour we drove through farm areas where some of the tree farms this organization has helped to form are located.

I was amazed to learn that with the help of some very simple management practices, one farmer had sold nearly $2,000 worth of timber from a hardwood tree lot on his farm. He will do this once every 5 years or so. This section of his farm until very recently returned nothing of value.

Now there is a specific case of what I mean in saying that conservation happens to, and is for, people.

You have assembled an impressive team of land, water, and other resource experts, some of them members of the USDA. Their job is to go into the technical aspects of how best to use that drop of water. My task as Secretary of a department with paramount responsibility for much of the Nation's renewable natural resources is to discuss in broad terms the wise use and conservation of soil, water, and related natural resources.

The theme of your meeting—"Better Use of Every Drop of Water Through Research," is most appropriate. It stems from a growing awareness that water is scarce, and that in many regions lack of water has become a limiting factor to further agricultural and industrial development.

Most people think of water as something to drink and as something to bathe in. They would be surprised to learn that only 10 percent of the water used in this country is employed for domestic purposes.

Fifty percent is utilized for agriculture and 40 percent for industrial purposes. When we realize that 9 out of every 10 gallons of water used in this country enter into the production of food, fiber, and manufactured products, we begin to see water as a key factor in further economic development as well as in the production race with the Communist nations. Our watersheds have become a vital element in our national defense.

President Kennedy has made it very plain that we shall attack our natural resource problems with renewed vigor. The challenge he has placed before us, and specifically before the Congress and the executive departments of Government in his messages on natural resources and on agriculture, is loud and clear.

We are a fast-growing Nation. Our national population is rising at the rate of 340 persons per hour, 8,000 per day, 3 million per year. This is a faster rate than that of any major industrialized nation and faster than many underdeveloped countries. Our families today are larger than they were half a century ago—3.2 children as against 2.4 in 1910. As of noon today our estimated population was close to 183 million. If present trends continue, just 39 years from now we will have to provide for twice as many people as we now do.

But the demand for water is growing even faster than population. Now in 1961 we use about 300 billion gallons of water per day. In 1980—only 19 years hence—we will require 600 billion gallons of usable water per day.

That's the size of the problem.

The renewable resources conservation job is tremendous. Congress has charged the Department of Agriculture with the major share of the leadership required to get it done.

Fortunately, our renewable natural resources are also vast.

The land area of the 50 States comprises almost 2.3 billion acres. Prior to the time Alaska and Hawaii jointed our Nation as States our land area was about 1.9 billion acres.

We have, in addition to urban lands, 460 million acres of farm cropland, 630 million acres of grazing lands, 500 million acres of commercial forest land, and 155 million acres of noncommercial forest land. Everyone of these roughly 1,750 million acres is to some degree watershed land.

The responsibility of the Department of Agriculture in providing conservation leadership encompasses more than half of all these lands.

We will work through every appropriate channel to achieve a common goal of abundant water, stable soil, and plentiful renewable resources.

Now what is it going to take to get the job done? The detailed answer to that question you probably know far better than I. But there are, I believe, three elements that are absolutely essential.

First, we must approach this problem with an overall point of view. Water, soil, agricultural crops, forage, timber, wildlife, and outdoor recreational opportunities are all members of a closely knit resource family. What happens to one affects the others for better or for worse.

The day when the forester, the biologist, the soil conservationist, the agricultural extension agent, the hydrologist, or the recreation planner could go it alone is long gone. The only way the conservation job can be done is by cooperation, understanding, exchange of information, and genuine teamwork between State, Federal, and private land resource people working in all areas of conservation.

We must look at conservation in the light of the interdependency of all programs, whether they be in water, forestry, game and fish, soil conservation, mineral development, or recreation.

Second, we must impress upon the citizenry that if conservation is for people, then people have a responsibility to be for conservation.

Resource management, therefore, is an inescapable responsibility of each citizen, as well as of the community, the State, and the Federal Government.

If we, as a heavily industrialized Nation, are to build a civilization which is in harmony with nature, we will have to take from the earth the pure, the useful, and the valuable and return to it the pure, the useful, and the valuable.

The third essential is that we shift without delay from the remnants of the old concept of conserving resources to the new concept of building and improving resources.

Not too many years ago when Gifford Pinchot succeeded in illuminating President Theodore Roosevelt with the magnificent concept of conservation, the primary concern then was to protect natural resources from the destructive wastefulness of people.

The maturing of thought and action in conservation since that time is apparent in the growing recognition that conservation's primary challenge today is to protect man from the consequences of entrapping himself in a self-built jungle of concrete and brick.

What began as a program to protect the forests and the land has now become a program to protect the quality of our way of living.

And if we do not encourage and foster this concept, the grim appraisal of Gen. Omar Bradley may well be realized.

"Year after year," he wrote after a penetrating appraisal of his country, "our scenic treasures are being plundered by what we call an advancing civilization. If we are not careful, we shall leave our children a legacy of billion-dollar roads leading nowhere except to other congested places like those they left behind. We are building ourselves an asphalt treadmill and allowing the green areas of our Nation to disappear."

We in the Department of Agriculture pledge that we will do our part in the immense job of building up natural resources adequate to all foreseeable needs.

We will revitalize the Nation's small watershed program to get more rapid action in meeting future water needs.

We shall accelerate the work of our Soil Conservation Service in providing basic land use practices on farm crop lands.

We shall take strong and positive steps to achieve better management of small privately owned woodlands.

We shall rejuvenate the Forest Service's long-range program for the development and improvement of our national forests.

We shall help develop a sound and full body of scientific data to guide us in soil, water, forest and range conservation programs. While the Department's resource program is a vigorous one, basic research data in this field still fall short of needs. I have directed that we review the requirements and fill in the gaps. This review is now underway.

These are some of the things government can do. But I do not need to tell you government cannot do the job alone. The task of building our resources is a task for everyone—the farmer, the rancher, the woodland owner, the agriculture extension agent, the forester, the soil conservationist, the biologist, the hunter, the fisherman, the hiker, the industrialist, the city man—for all the millions of Americans who use our natural resources and who conscientiously accept the responsibility of leaving to their children a land better, richer, and more livable than they found it.

National Transportation Week

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary if it is now the policy of the committee to approve 2 special days on one date. To illustrate, Congress several years ago approved a bill, which is now a law, designating May 1 as Loyalty Day, and this day is observed throughout the Nation based on sponsorship by hundreds of posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Now I understand a bill is at the White House designating May 1 as Law Day.

Mr. CELLER. It is not the purpose of the committee to duplicate days for commemoration. The particular bill that the gentleman has in mind was approved by all members of the Supreme Court and the various bar associations throughout the Nation. They recommended it.

Incidentally, I have the pen with which our distinguished President signed the bill, so the bill has been signed and is now law. We do not deliberately set more than one commemoration on a particular day.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Did the gentleman's committee take into consideration the fact that May 1 is already Loyalty Day and observed nationwide in accordance with sponsorship of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States?

Mr. CELLER. These bills create a great deal of difficulty for the Committee on the Judiciary. We have a plethora of these bills, and we are at our wits end at times as to what to accept and what to reject. We hope the gentleman will be charitable.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Therefore, I am to assume the committee will follow a policy of duplicating days for commemoration?

Mr. CELLER. No; that is not our purpose.

Address by Hon. Frank P. Graham at the Dedication of the Elizabethan Garden, Roanoke Island, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, at Fort Raleigh, N.C., on Roanoke Island, the Garden Club of North Carolina has sponsored the establishment of the Elizabethan Garden. At the dedication services Hon. Frank P. Graham, United Nations representative to Pakistan and India, delivered the dedication address, which I insert in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

We especially salute today the four State chairmen, Mrs. James Tyler, Mrs. Roy Homewood, Mrs. Glenn Long, and Mrs. Corbett Howard and through them the generous benefactors and coworkers. Their devoted leadership and hard work resulted in this fitting memorial of the gallant women who shared in the great adventure which led to the founding of the British Empire and the American Union.

The Elizabethan Garden, planted and nurtured by the Garden Club of North Carolina, is the precious alabaster box of love and beauty laid in tribute at the feet of the British-American cultural heritage planted on these original shores 373 years ago. From this garden the women of North Carolina wave their flowers of friendship across the seas from the America of Elizabeth the First to the Britain of Elizabeth the Second. These flowers are the symbols of the ties which bind together in freedom the English-speaking nations in our imperiled world.

The birthday of Virginia Dare, which is annually celebrated by Paul Green's majestic symphonic drama, we join in celebrating today. Virginia was conceived in England and born in America. This child became symbolic and prophetic of the spiritual flowering of her heritages and her hopes. She is the symbol of Britain, mother of parliaments, civil liberties, the common law, and a commonwealth of free nations on four continents. She is prophetic of America, mother of religious liberty in the separation of church and state, of a commonwealth of States in a Federal structure on a continental scale, and of the great American dream.

As symbol and prophecy, we see people, with an old courage and a new hope in their hearts, cross dangerous seas, become lost on these rugged shores, and rise from the dead all the way from Maine to Florida. With axes, muskets, and Bibles in their hands and with an unconquerable and sometimes too ruthless will in their souls, they cross a continent and build a more humane America out of the spiritual stuff of their revolutionary, unresting, and immortal dream, unfulfilled but ever unfolding in this age of hazard and hope.

For these men and women and their children, was made the revolutionary American Declaration, the first universal declaration of human rights ever adopted by the delegates of the people. The words of the American Declaration, which, on that memorable day in July 1776 gave birth to a revolutionary political faith, went ringing around the world and down the centuries and are still singing in the hearts of the people in two hemispheres. Across the years we hear the great Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, as he declares for America and all the world the still revolutionary ideas that "All men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." We respond deeply to another noble flowering of the British-American heritage, Robert E. Lee, also grown in the garden of Virginia, brilliant in victories and sublime in the duties of defeat, as his spirit worked mightly for the reconciliation of people in the reunited States. In these perilous and tyrannous times of hydrogen bombs, intercontinental missiles, and outer space, we highly resolve, with the wisely magnanimous and the nobly great Abraham Lincoln, that, "This Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Of such faith and purpose are the soil, the fruits, and the flowers of our Hebraic-Christian-Greco-Latin-European-American Western culture, which, together with the ancient spiritual heritage, the cultural flowers, and the fresh democratic hopes of the great Eastern peoples, make up the foundations, purposes, and programs of the United Nations. In this turbulent world the United Nations by its organic growth, increasing wisdom, and moral power is working against the self-annihilation, East and West, of all civilization.

In this age of engines and gadgets, alarms and perils, the women of the North Carolina Garden Club would remind us that man cannot live by bread and bombs alone. They would teach us that love and reverence, work and worship, truth, goodness and beauty, are the enduring ways to the good life of the great society of the unfolding American Revolution to whose survival and fulfillment for all people on the earth we must again "pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

The Elizabethan Garden and the gardens in all our towns and cities have already given spiritual reenforcement to your sisters on the farms in their home demonstration clubs. These women, also under gallant leadership, work together to make their clubs not only clubs for growing, canning and marketing fruits and vegetables, but also clubs for growing flowers in their gardens and nurturing flowers of the mind and spirit in their homes, churches, schools, and rural neighborhoods, with all their meaning to the State, Nation, and world community, as ways of making living on the farm a productive, satisfying, and beautiful way of life in our sometimes too strident, modern industrial society. These women bring us back to the beauty and the ways of nature, the good earth, the fields, forests, spacious vistas, and the cooperation of sun and soil, air and rain, toward providing the food, clothing, shelter, and flowers for people in all lands.

In the fulfillment of the meaning of the ideas planted in this place, the people of America and the freedom-loving people of both hemispheres, hopefully stand together today. With the reverent faith of their spiritual heritage and the dynamic hopes of their democratic commitments they struggle for equal freedom and enduring peace among all peoples on the earth.

In this world of the precarious peace of deterrent terror, with the alternative between the drift toward universal annihilation and the struggle toward more effective cooperation of nations through a more adequate United Nations, may this commemoration of the pioneer women of Roanoke in a century long gone and the pioneer women on the go in the North Carolina Garden Club today, mean the rededication of us all to things of their venturesome human spirit. May we variously commit ourselves not only to the cultivation of flowers of the earth and of the spirit but also to the cooperation of governments and peoples for equal justice under law and human brotherhood under God in this time of mortal peril and immortal hope for all mankind.

Standards for Movies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there has always been an important place in the motion picture industry for the experimental film as well as the film that deals courageously with current social issues. In the past some of these films have met with success at the box office, more often they have not. Nevertheless their value at home and before foreign audiences has repeatedly been demonstrated.

The place of such films in the public arena is cogently discussed by the well-known producer and playwright, Dore Schary. I ask unanimous consent to print in the Appendix of the RECORD his address on this subject at the 13th Annual Conference of the National Civil Liberties Clearinghouse, March 24.

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

ADDRESS BY DORE SCHARY

The title for our panel discussion seems to be somewhat abbreviated. It occurred to me that it should be "Mass Communications Media and the People's Right To Know—What They Want To Know." This elongation hits at the nub of the problem which is, "What is it that they want to know?"

From the diet of pap served to them in television; from the vast amount of yellow journals still in existence and from the violence, sex and spectacle being bought in huge colored gobs on movie screens, one could conclude that the public is getting what they want and it serves them right.

But such a point of view would be far too cynical for the temper of this meeting. After all, the National Civil Liberties Clearinghouse is an agency with faith in man and it is armed with purpose to help make this place a better haven for all men. To have worked in this field of civil liberties is not only a tribute to their high goals but also to their dogged determination.

Some creators who work in the field of motion pictures have this same high purpose and some also are blessed with the same dogged determination—and, believe me, the livin' ain't easy.

There is an ebb tide and flood tide in audience response to pictures that deal with some brutual realities—and the failure of one film that reaches out to touch the conscience of man stultifies the ambition and closes the checkbook. Forgotten are the commercial successes such as "Crossfire," "Pinky," "Gentlemen's Agreement," "The Defiant Ones," "Trial," "On the Beach," and others. If one labors long in the field of pictures that aim for the objective of man's mind—he is likely to be dubbed a maker of "message pictures." You see, a "message picture" is any picture with a point of view which is a failure. If it succeeds, it becomes a "picture of content."

This ebb and flow is the first barranca and of course it involves audience indifference. During my tenure of over 8 years at a major studio, the boldest film made was one called "Intruder in the Dust." It was beautifully directed and written and expertly played. The critics were ecstatic—the public couldn't have cared less—and in some areas of the country it could not even get bookings. Public indifference murdered it. The fact that William Faulkner wrote the novel probably was one reason we weren't accused in some quarters of being pro-Communist.

This then leads to the second barranca, which is pressure from certain groups and certain areas. A studio or releasing company will in these days of "jackpot" motion picture making view with intense dismay the making of a film that may not be able to play in the South—or may offend someone in the Government—or may provoke the Catholics or the Jews or the Protestants. The sensibilities of national groups such as the Irish-American, Italian-American, German-American, Japanese-American, Polish-American, must also be reckoned with—and I have had letters of concern from architects, lawyers, doctors, Indian Chiefs, motel owners and hearing aid manufacturers. I once had a sharp letter of protest from some society organized to protect the reputation of German police dogs because in one film a dog of this breed bit an actor. As a consequence, films began long ago a basic and theatrical right—the right to offend. Becoming frightened of everything, they decided to be all things to all men—and only the bold and responsible picture maker—with enough bargaining power to overcome some failures—was willing to stick out his jaw—which was instantly clouted by some one.

This circumstance has now been aggravated by the economic pressure on film companies. With television income from sale of old films carrying a major source of profit—the companies are producing huge mammoth films that will stun the audiences with length and breadth and width and height and color and sound. The major promotion is once again related to how much did the picture cost, how long does it run, how long did it take to make and how many stars decorate its main title.

Too often everything is accounted for except the plot. But the audience apparently couldn't care less—they go to the big ones—occasionally to the freak little one—but many pictures of leisurely pace and serious content with some degree of nobility are quietly ignored and quickly hidden away.

There are good pictures finding their way into the art houses and in some big cities they are commanding real attention. That's a good sign. Perhaps soon films in America will again be searching for the special picture—the good little picture—but usually if those stories are submitted today they are brushed off as being "good for a TV show," which is the faintest praise with which one can damn.

Another problem to consider: the foreign market. What image will be exhibited to the world away from the United States of the American personality? I don't dismiss this as an issue—but again, what image do we want to present? Do we stop, or prevent, or inhibit, the production of powerful pictures of protest that might give to the world a view of Americans as a people still in revolt against injustice? Do we inhibit or prevent pictures that would prove that our Nation is so strong, so secure, that absolute freedom of the screen is still a sacred civil liberty?

Or, are we naive enough to feel that vapid pictures that glorify violence and reduce sex to moronic vulgarity are really doing us no harm? Do we really believe that just because the good guys always win (be they cowboys in white hats or policemen or G-men or private detectives), that we can show men and women slapped, raped, slugged, shot, knifed, burned and drowned without damaging our national image?

There is no way to censor bad taste and if there was I'd be against it—but somewhere there must be a way of creating a jury of peers who will judge what is shown abroad not by what the film says or doesn't say—but rather by a standard of whether it's a good picture or a lousy one.

And what's wrong with the concept of making films purely for American exhibition? Nothing, except—it isn't profitable in a complex world that demands that pictures get bigger and wider and are seen by more people than ever before. Someone—some day—will break the trend—but it will need cooperation from creator, financier and exhibitor. Sometime, in the future, major companies and major talents will be willing to spend some effort and time in exploring the fields that present no financial bonanzas of good will and good deeds—the field of educational films, for instance. It would be something to see if skilled craftsmen teamed up with brilliant teachers and started to create a backlog of films for our schools and colleges. Hollywood did a magnificent job in making training films during the war—they could do a magnificent job in peacetime.

But once again—perhaps petulantly, we have the right to ask—what is it that the public wants to know? Even during the war, great documentaries such as "The True Glory" went begging for audiences. Truth was not a good enough substitute for fiction. For the record, I'm not arguing for the abolition of entertainment. I'm arguing that if the public is surfeited with some of the junk that comes under that loose heading of entertainment that they kick up a fuss. Let them besiege the sponsors of TV programs; let them berate the publishers of bad books; let them stay away from the theaters exhibiting tripe—as soon as they make bad taste unprofitable it will cease to exist. And let the devoted worker in all creative fields also try to clean his own house; if he does not he will find himself fighting the battle against censorship in the wrong place, at the wrong time, against the wrong odds.

I'd like to find myself fighting for freedom of the screen by defending the right of someone to make a picture about the bigots in New Orleans, rather than for some cheap, obscene film that might be called "I Was a Teenage Werewolf Who Ate Marihuana in a House of Shame."

But if it comes to that— we will have to fight I suppose. The tragedy will be that the fight will be lost—because the theater will be burning and someone will have the right to yell, "Fire!"

The very term "mass communication" makes a clear definition. A communication aimed at or reaching the mass. Let the masses declare what they are for and what they are against—and let up hope that the tenor of their demand will uplift us and not disillusion us.

They, the people, have the right to know everything—it's a right they can exercise if they choose to and I, for one, hope they do—and I, for one, believe that they, in time, will alter the shape, the sound, the size, and the soul of all our communications.

Thank you.

Address by Hon. John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, at Dedication of the Maurice L. Briedenthal Laboratory, Kansas City, on April 5, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, April 5, I welcomed to my district a large number of distinguished visitors who had come to Kansas City to dedicate the Maurice L. Briedenthal Laboratory, a field station Laboratory of the Communicable Disease Center, U.S. Public Health Service. The laboratory is located on the campus of the University of Kansas Medical Center and has been and will be instrumental in forging the essential link between fundamental research and the frontline battle against fungal and viral diseases in the entire Missouri River Valley. We were greatly honored and, indeed, thrilled, to have Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, address the hundreds of people gathered there in Kansas City for the dedication. Congressman FOGARTY, in a very stirring address, challenged all of us in America to become concerned with environmental research. But this magnificent speech stands on its own, Mr. Speaker, and I commend it to my colleagues in the Congress:

REMARKS BY HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, OF RHODE ISLAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. CONGRESS

This is the second time within the past 6 months that I have been privileged to attend the opening of a new research facility of the Public Health Service. The first was your parent agency, the Communicable Disease Center at Emory University in Atlanta, Ga., a facility in which you and the Nation can take justifiable pride.

We can be equally proud of the field station we are opening today. Like the center's headquarters, it is located on the campus of one of the Nation's great universities—an ideal place for research. The building and the equipment in this station have been designed and selected to give our scientists every advantage in their search for answers to the still unsolved problems of disease.

The university and its friends, whose great generosity brought this building into being, and the people of the Nation who will pay to keep it operating—we all expect great things from the studies that will be conducted in this new research facility. And I know that the men and women who will labor here will do their utmost to see that we are not disappointed.

The study of virus and fungus diseases for which this station was established demonstrates the importance of a much broader research area that we are only beginning to explore; namely, the whole relationship of man's modern environment to his health.

It was at this station, in its old makeshift quarters, that one of the truly great research breakthroughs of this cenutry occurred. I refer, of course, to the work done here on histoplasmosis. Thousands of patients were erroneously treated in tuberculosis sanitaria, tens of thousands of dollars were wasted on such treatment, before your work here revealed that it was a fungus in the soil, not the tubercle bacilli, that was rotting the lungs of so many people in this section of the country.

In the dramatic story of histoplasmosis research I believe there is a lesson that we as a nation will do well to heed.

It was when our scientists began to look for factors in the environment, rather than within man himself, that they found the source of histoplasmosis in soil rich in bird droppings. Isn't it also possible that more intensive study of our environment will yield clues to the prevention of other diseases?

I ask, is it just a coincidence that lung cancer, emphysema, and other respiratory ills are increasing in the areas where there is most air pollution? What is the connection between hepatitis epidemics, broken down sewage systems, septic tank suburbias? Why are heart disease and mental ills such big problems in the urbanized parts of the world and almost unknown in the so-called underdeveloped countries? We can't expect our doctors to give us all the answers. We must study the environment itself.

We are not doing this. Worse, we are not even doing the simple ordinary things we already know we ought to do to protect ourselves in this fast changing world.

Within the next 15 years, we are going to build the equivalent of 12 cities as large as Chicago to take care of our increasing population. If we follow our present pattern, we will do it in a day by day, hit or miss way. Invade more and more farmlands with housing developments and shopping centers. Add new highways when the old ones can't bear any more cars. Bulldoze down more forests to make room for more industries. Sewage and refuse will be handled in whatever way seems easiest and cheapest at the moment. Maybe heavy chemical dosage will keep our drinking water safe.

The only comfort we can take in this hodgepodge is that, because each day's changes are slight, we are saved from the shock of the sum total of change that results in a year, or a decade. The impact of the whole horrible mess we are creating never really hits us.

Yet we have warning signs aplenty that we are following a dangerous road.

In a certain section of Tennessee, you can see a strange sight—a gray, desolated wasteland right in the midst of an area of green flourishing forests. There isn't a bird, or a blade of grass, or any life at all in the wasteland. Why? Air pollution—smoke and fumes and an industrial plant miles away. Is this the air you want to breathe?

That's the effect of air pollution you can see. But there's another kind you can't see and it may be the most dangerous of all. It spouts from the tailpipe of your car. It spouts from 70 million other cars. And you breathe this devil's brew. When a snowstorm hit New York City last February and cars were barred from the city for 2 days, air pollution dropped 60 percent. The auto industry has been mighty enterprising about getting us pushbutton windows and tailfins and a lot of other gadgets we could do without. But what about devices that will stop air pollution? What about the seat belts that would prevent fatal accidents?

It is time and overtime for the auto industry to show that it cares as much about our health and safety as it does about our comfort.

Other industries also are big, are growing, are polluting air, land, food, water. Must these industries pollute as fast as they grow?

Thousands of entirely new chemicals are being used every year with no study of the possible effect of lifetime exposure to them. One of the few chemicals that has been thoroughly studied is the fluoride used in drinking water to prevent tooth decay—a measure found to be entirely safe and beneficial. Ironically enough, this measure has encountered public opposition while, at the same time, there is virtually no public concern over the thousands of unstudied chemicals we are absorbing into our bodies every day.

Radioactivity is another hazard we know little about. The more we learn, the more we realize how careful we must be to cut down unnecessary exposure.

But we aren't doing it. The medical and dental uses of X-ray have increased over 300 percent in the past 20 years. But how many communities have any regular system for checking whether the X-ray machines in doctors' and dentists' offices are operating properly? I know of just one—New York City—and it's just getting started. In 17 States, shoe stores can still use fluoroscopic shoe-fitting machines—machines that are giving hundreds of children unnecessary doses of dangerous radiation.

The Atomic Energy Commission is promoting more use of atomic energy and radioactive materials in industry. That's fine. That's progress—provided it can be done safely. But what worries me is that this same AEC, which is responsible for promotion, is also responsible for protection. That's like putting a wolf to guard the sheep. I, for one, don't like it. Last summer, when a spillover from a uranium plant in New Mexico poured a quarter of a million gallons of radioactive stuff into the San Juan River, the health authorities didn't even know about it until citizens 65 miles downriver reported dead fish floating by. I say our health agencies, Federal, State, and local, should have clear-cut responsibility for the health and safety factors of radiation. But along with that responsibility must go the funds and the personnel to do the job. Most State and local health departments today are doing so little in radiation control it is hardly worth mentioning. I also think the Federal Public Health Service program is too little and too late.

Water pollution is another environmental hazard—an old story to those of you who live along the Missouri River, sometimes called the "thousand-mile sewer." I understand, however, that both Kansas City, Kans., and Kansas City, Mo., have done their part to give the old river a better reputation. Kansas City, Mo.'s overwhelming vote last fall of over 4 to 1 in favor of the bond issue for sewage treatment facilities is an inspiring example of enlightened citizen action. It was almost as impressive as the 6 to 1 vote Kansas City, Kans., gave its bond issue in 1954.

Those were battles well won, but the big war for water is still ahead. Within two generations, there's been a radical shift in our living patterns. Families who used to have five rooms and a path now have five rooms and a bath—or even two or three baths. They also have dishwashers and clothes washers and air-conditioning systems—all taking water. And at the same time that we are using more water, we're polluting more water. Housewives are using millions of pounds of detergents. If you draw a glass of water from the tap on wash day in some communities, it foams like a glass of beer. Industries are using 10 times as much water as they did 60 years ago. We still have some pure streams—but they're pure chemical, not pure water.

My own State of Rhode Island, along with 22 other States, has a big shellfish industry. This industry has been outstanding in its insistence that its fish be raised in wholesome waters. It is proud of its record. But that record is getting more and more difficult to maintain. Even the ocean is getting polluted as we dump more and more radioactive and other waste into it. Recently, down in Mississippi, some shellfish poachers took their crop from a polluted area. This

was quickly discovered and action taken—but not before over one hundred people got hepatitis. As water gets scarcer, the temptation to use unsafe water grows. Last month it was a shellfish poacher in Mississippi. Next month, it may be a farmer, or an industry, and you and I may be the victims.

Where are the health officials, the food and drug inspectors and all the other people we pay to protect us from such hazards? They are on the job, I can assure you. But there aren't enough of them and the problem is growing so fast both in size and complexity that they can't keep up with it.

Maybe you've noticed—I have—the deterioration in the food served on planes, trains, and buses. Maybe you've noticed—I have—that there have been a number of cases of food poisoning on these carriers. There were two or three on airlines last fall; a big one on a railroad in Washington, D.C., a couple of years ago. It's the job of the U.S. Public Health Service to see that passengers get safe food, but how many inspectors do they have? How many to protect the millions of people who are traveling every day? I'll tell you. They have exactly 31. Is it surprising that the food service is deteriorating? I'm surprised that it is safe to eat at all when you travel.

What can you and I and every other American do to make this modern world safe and to keep it that way? What can we do about air pollution, radiation, water pollution, food poisoning and all these other hazards?

One thing we can do is use our specialists, give them a chance to apply their knowledge of how to control pollution and create safer cities. To do that, we must recognize that, for the better or for worse, most of us, and those who come after us, are going to live in about 200 densely populated areas. This means that we must think, plan and act in terms of a whole metropolitan complex, not in terms of each separate city and suburb. No part of the complex can hope to wall itself off from the problems of the other parts. Build a fine home in the suburbs if you want to, but remember you can't shake off the big city and its problems. It is still your city—you couldn't live without it.

So, whatever town or suburb you call home, be prepared to pay for metropolitan living—one way or another. You can pay for it by damage to health, by inconvenience, by ugliness and increasingly unpleasant living conditions if you continue to let matters drift. Or you can pay for programs that will give you and your descendants a decent place to live. The choice is still ours, but we'll have to make it soon, because once buildings are up and pavements are down, it's too late.

The second thing we can do is expand our research program. We need to know the precise effect our rapidly changing environment is having upon our health. We need to find better and cheaper ways of building health protections into our environment.

To get research of the scope needed and at the speed needed, I have proposed that a National Environmental Health Center be established, comparable to the National Institutes of Health, the world's greatest medical research center.

This ceremony, marking as it does the opening of a new facility for studying two hazards of the environment (viral and fungal diseases), seems to me an appropriate time to announce that my proposal for a National Environmental Health Center has now reached the blueprint stage.

This center should have many buildings as fine as this new field station. It should have over 30 different types of laboratories where physicists, chemists, radiologists, biochemists and other scientists would do research. The problems they might solve by such research would help all communities to have better and cheaper control of their environment. The center should be equipped with greenhouses and with a farm of experimental animals so that, by testing pollutants on lower forms of life, we could learn more about their effect on man. Scientists from all parts of the world should be trained in this center.

Like the National Institutes of Health, the Environmental Health Center should be the hub for an expanding national program. It should provide grants to universities and other research installations in all parts of the country. It should serve as a clearinghouse and coordinating unit to prevent duplication of effort and to see that every promising clue is being followed.

The Nation's most productive years of medical research came with the development of our National Institutes of Health. It spurred on the whole medical research movement, producing results far beyond those that can be directly traced to NIH resources.

Similarly, I predict that, if we can develop a great national center for environmental research, it will mark the turning point from neglect to aggressive attack upon the health problems of the modern environment.

Before such a center can move from the blueprint to the brick and mortar stage, however, we must know whether the American people want it. There is no use perfecting our ability to create healthful, beautiful, and convenient cities if we are going to ignore this knowledge and go on creating ugly, Jerry-built, traffic-jammed urban sprawls.

The Congress of the United States, responding to the will of the people, took medical research out of the doldrums. Surgery is safer; diseases and disabilities that used to be hopeless are now curable because we've gone all out for a big national medical research program.

We can do the same to make our environment safer. President Kennedy, in his message on natural resources and on urban affairs, pointed out the danger of neglect. He called for more action on air pollution, water pollution, metropolitanism. But he hasn't spelled out his proposals. Will they be big enough? Will they come fast enough?

We stand at a turning point right now. We can silently accept a future of cancer-laden smog and sewage-burdened waters or we can rise up and demand action, big action, fast action throughout the length and breadth of the land. The choice is ours, but time is running out.

Some of us, some of our children, may already have absorbed the posions that, working slowly in our bodies, will find their fatal targets 10 or 20 years from now. That's how modern pollution works—slow, but deadly.

In this field station we dedicate today, we have taken one step in the right direction. Let us follow it with the giant stride that will enhance the potential of this and of every other center for genuinely productive research.

We Arm Our Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Arm Our Enemies" by Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of the Indianapolis Star, which appeared in that paper on Sunday, April 9, 1961.

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

WE ARM OUR ENEMIES

A victory of some significance was won a few weeks ago when the Department of Commerce, after second thought prompted by congressional inquiry, canceled an export license which had been issued for the sale of American-made ball-bearing machines to the Soviet Union. But this victory only scratched the surface of the problem of arming the enemies of the United States with American tools and American money.

Within the last few days it was brought out that an American firm, on American tax money under the foreign aid program, has been building a steel plant in Poland. Let's say that again.

The United States is building a steel plant in Communist Poland.

It takes a while for the full significance of that to sink in. The threat of war with the Communist empire has hung over the United States continuously since the end of World War II. There were the years when the war was not just a threat but a reality in Korea. Of late there has also been considerable talk of economic war.

Whether the war threat is military or economic, steel is one of its basic sinews.

Poland is a captive nation of the Soviet empire. All the production of all the parts of the Soviet empire goes into the universal program of building the strength of the empire and serving its military, economic, and political objectives.

What this all adds up to is that the U.S. foreign aid program has been used, with the American people's money and with American equipment, knowledge, and skills, to build a direct addition to the war potential of the Soviet conspiracy, directed against the United States as its major ultimate target.

Forestry History Is Made in North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, for the second time within the past decade forestry history has been made in the Eighth Congressional District of my State.

In both instances the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., through its forestry division, has led the way. General Forestry Agent Robert N. Hoskins, directing the Seaboard's forestry program, was in charge of both of these cooperative forestry demonstration field meetings.

As a direct result of the first forestry meeting held in my home county of Anson nearly 10 years ago a tree planting machine was given to the landowners by the banks of Wadesboro, N.C. Recognizing the importance of putting their land back into a productive crop, the landowners planted over a million trees, thus making Anson County the first "million tree" county in forestry history in North Carolina.

On Wednesday, March 29, 1961, a new chapter in forestry was written in the Eighth District, particularly Moore County, as well as in the State of North Carolina and the Nation. A special train was run by the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co. from Raleigh, N.C., to Southern Pines, N.C. This was a seven-car special train with six coaches and a dining car. Included in the distinguished group boarding the train at Raleigh were: 75 members of the North Carolina General Assembly, State cabinet officers, and 180 business and industrial leaders from Raleigh and such outside points as New York City, Washington, D.C., Richmond, Va., and Atlanta, Ga. Upon arrival in Southern Pines this group was welcomed by the top business leaders, Seaboard officials headed by John W. Smith, president of the company, and by one of the fine high school bands in my district—the Southern Pines High School Band.

This assembled group was then taken to the field forestry program in activity buses provided by the Moore County School Board through assistance of Mr. Louis Scheipers, town manager of Southern Pines.

Upon arrival in the woods at W. O. Moss's Mileaway Farm, about 1½ miles east of Southern Pines, one of the most complete forestry demonstration programs ever held in my district was carried out. Joining the 250 passengers from the special train, were 650 other farmers, business leaders, and future farmers.

At this great forestry field meeting the following persons spoke briefly during the morning session: State Representative Clifford Blue, from Aberdeen, N.C.; J. M. Osteen, district supervisor, vocational agriculture, Rockingham, N.C.; Fred H. Claridge, North Carolina State Forester, Raleigh, N.C.; and Douglass A. Craig, assistant regional forester, U.S. Forest Service, Atlanta, Ga.

Following the early morning speakers, Robert N. Hoskins, the Seaboard's general forestry agent, directed the overall field program which consisted of the following demonstrations:

Station 1: Cone collection and nursery production; Floyd M. Cossitt, U.S. Forest Service, eighth region, Atlanta, Ga. Forest genetics; Dr. Bruce Zobel, School of Forestry, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, N.C.

Station 2: Mechanical tree planting and hand planting; Russell K. Hallberg, Bowaters Carolina Corp., Jamestown, N.C. Fire control; James A. Pippin, district forester, North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development, Rockingham, N.C.

Station 3: Insect and disease control; H. J. Green, forestry division, North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development, Raleigh, N.C. Markets and marketing of creosoted wood products; Robert S. Speicher, United States Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Station 4: Hardwood control; Sam Hughes, Riegel Carolina Corp., Bolton, N.C. Service forestry; H. J. Anderson, Halifax Paper Co., Roanoke Rapids, N.C.

Station 5: Fence post treatment and pole barn construction; Johnnye U. Foster, Atlantic Creosoting Co., Savannah, Ga. Pulpwood production and paper manufacturing; J. P. Harper, International Paper Co., Raleigh, N.C.

Station 6: Sawmilling; D. W. House, Southern Wood Preserving Co., Atlanta, Ga. Seasoning of lumber; Ernest E. Graham, tie and timber department, Seaboard Railroad, Jacksonville, Fla.

Station 7: Pole production and classification; Alton H. McCullough, Koppers Co., Inc., Florence, S.C. Cross tie production; E. L. Kidd, tie and timber department, Seaboard Railroad, Jacksonville, Fla.

Following the field portion of the meeting, the group reassembled at which time the Honorable Terry Sanford, Governor of North Carolina, spoke briefly and said:

Forestry is extremely important to the full development of North Carolina's resources. We want to take full advantage of all our possibilities. I am proud of our work in forestry, but we are not using even 50 percent of our possibilities. We can more than double what we have done.

The principal speaker of the day was John L. Tower, vice president, International Paper Co., New York City, who was introduced by Warren T. White, assistant vice president, Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co.

Mr. Tower said:

Over 5,000 different wood products are needed to keep our vast American economy moving and to meet our daily needs. He said the Nation requires 2½ acres of trees per person just to keep us going and demands will increase as the population soars to an expected 300 million by the year 2000.

The wood-using industries of North Carolina employ 18 percent of the State's labor force and annually turn out products with a value of over $750 million.

No other region approaches the South in forest resources. Sixty percent of the Nation's tree farms and 66 percent of its tree farm acreages are in the South. Two-thirds of the wood needed to feed the Nation's gigantic appetite for pulp and paper is supplied by the South.

The State's wood-using industries have provided jobs and income where they are needed most, in rural areas, and on a nonseasonal basis.

After Mr. Tower's speech, airplanes of the North Carolina Division of Forestry gave a spectacular aerial demonstration of the newest methods of controlling forest fires by water bombing with chemicals.

Cooperating on the special train project were the nitrogen division of the Allied Chemical Corp., West Virginia Pulp and Paper Co., Union Bag Camp Co., International Paper Co., Halifax Paper Co., and Regal-Carolina Paper Co.

In recognition of this great educational contribution to forestry in North Carolina, the following resolution was presented by State Senator Henry Gray Shelton, chairman of the senate agriculture committee, and by State Representative J. Raynor Woodard, chairman of the house agriculture committee, and passed by the 1961 general assembly of my State:

JOINT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR THE HOSPITALITY AND CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM PRESENTED BY THE SEABOARD AIR LINE RAILROAD CO., THE FEDERAL AND STATE FORESTRY DEPARTMENTS, AND THE FOREST PRODUCTS USERS AND MANUFATURERS TO MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Whereas the forest products of this State are an important economic asset to North Carolina and the potentials of this crop have not been realized or fully developed, and it is recognized by the members of the General Assembly that the cooperative efforts of the Federal and State forestry departments and the forest products users and manufacturers have accounted for progress in both technological and economic fields relating to forestry, thus greatly augmenting the income of this State and its people through their combined efforts, research, and in the dissemination of information regarding production, handling, usage and marketing of this valuable crop; and

Whereas to further promote sound forestry management in North Carolina, the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., in association with the aforementioned Federal and State agencies and companies, provided a special forest field day train and program, in which members of the General Assembly of North Carolina participated, giving to the members of the general assembly much valuable information through demonstrations and discussions provided for their benefit and entertainment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

Section 1. That the general assembly does hereby extend this expression of thanks and appreciation to the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co. and to the Federal and State agencies and companies for the hospitality, efforts and demonstrated concern for continued progress in the fields of forestry management and development and for the many courtesies extended at the forest field training program.

Sec. 2. A copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to each agency and company taking part in the program.

Sec. 3. This resolution shall become effective upon its adoption.

The Communist Bargain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Woburn Daily Times, an outstanding newspaper in the Fifth District of Massachusetts, which I have the honor to represent, recently ran an editorial which succinctly sums up the latest stratagems of the Soviet Union to ease world tensions. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial:

COLD WAR TACTIC

The Soviet Union has dropped its demand that the United Nations hear its complaint concerning U.S. plane flights over Soviet territory.

The Commies then suggested that the United States might agree to drop its request for U.N. discussion of Hungary and Tibet.

All this would be in the interest of improving Soviet-United States relations.

The comparison between what the U.S.S.R. is giving up and what it would have the United States concede in return evidences again the brazenness of the Red regime.

We are forgiven the flight of the U–2 spy flight if we will absolve the Kremlin of the rape of Hungary and Red China for its overwhelming of Tibet.

The Soviet objective—easing of world tensions and the establishment of better relations with the administration of President Kennedy—is a praiseworthy one.

But what a bargain the Reds offer.

The Constitution and What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TOM V. MOOREHEAD

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, next week 12 young Ohioans will come to the Nation's Capital to visit the historic shrines of the city and to witness the operation of the Government in this Federal City. Each has carefully studied the meaning of our constitutional processes and has expressed conclusions in written form. They are the 1961 State winners of the American Legion Essay Contest.

For the first time in the 27 years this contest has been conducted, two of the winners are students of the same high school. I am very pleased that such distinction has been accorded two young people in my congressional district. Their pride in achievement can be shared by their parents, teachers, and the principal of the Marietta, Ohio, High School, Mr. Fred H. Manning. The essays are by Tim Nice, son of Mr. and Mrs. James C. Nice, now in his sophomore year at Marietta High School, and Beth Wolford, a member of the senior class and daughter of Mr. and Mrs. D. M. Wolford.

I should like to call to the attention of the Congress these two award-winning essays. What these young people are saying as they speak for their generation is a refreshing appraisal and appreciation of our constitutional guarantees and the fabric of American society this living document enriches.

THE CONSTITUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS

(By Jim Nice)

"Divine inspiration" englightened the Founding Fathers at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, in 1787, and a nation found itself.

The growing pains of this new country pointed to the need for a "more perfect union." This Nation was without government—the empty shell of a loose union. The people had joined together to fight for their independence, but as always happens, they found that war had profoundly altered their lives and their thinking.

This drastic change notwithstanding, America hoped to become a great nation. From a population just twice the size of Los Angeles today, came 55 men whose character, ability, and broad mental attainments caused them forever to remain a most distinguished group. The talk of the people everywhere was the need for a workable plan of government. Though his spelling and English left much to be desired, a New England farmer wrote, "We do not need any Goviner but the Guviner of the universe and under him a states Gineral to consult with the wrest of the united states for the good of the whole."

With similar comments for background, and with many misgivings, these men set forth to accomplish their big task. After 3 months of deliberation, the document was complete—the first written Constitution offered to any nation. The American dream was now beginning to come true. These new principles by which the Nation agreed to govern itself were put into effect, and a way of life that granted freedom to the individual citizen was now being achieved by slow and certain growth. In this present age we are still "trying" this new form of government as it stands the test of our times.

The Constitution is the basis of government by which we, the people of this country, live. The first and fifth amendments, sometimes called the "soul" of the Bill of Rights, give us the freedom to make choices and assure us that we may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property "without due process of law." This integral part of the Constitution shows its significant value to us, and when truly obeyed, promises the accomplishments of justice, and liberty, and peace at home and abroad.

A great power stems from our Constitution. It not only insures my rights as an individual, but provides for the orderly function of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. This great system, when contrasted with other governments, is like comparing *Old Ironsides* with the *Guerrier*. Under the Constitution, the powers are divided between the State governments and the National Government, thereby creating a Federal system. Clearly defined are the actions each may take.

The Preamble states at the outset that the Constitution is explicitly a "creature of the people." These words are very important ones, for they establish beyond doubt that this document is not of any one faction, party, or group. Our Government belongs to the people, is administered by the people, and exists for the good of the people.

The glory of our system distinguishes it from every other government in the world. With the needle of dauntless courage, our forefathers wove together a governmental fabric for our freedom and protection. To the degree that we today interpret and adhere to the meaning of the Constitution—to that degree will be seams of its fabric hold firm and fast.

OUR CONSTITUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS

(By Beth Wolford)

The Constitution has a different meaning for every generation, every family, and every individual. When our forefathers founded this country and raised it from a land of forest paths and log houses to cobblestone streets, brick homes, and towns, they proved the Constitution was a working form of government. Every generation since then has had to prove the Constitution would work for them also.

What is this document which has meant so much to so many Americans? It is a manuscript now yellowed with age, carefully placed in a glass-covered case in our Nation's Capital, but it is also a living force in our daily lives. It is the Pilgrims crossing the Atlantic Ocean in the Mayflower; the heritage we have received from them; a group of American patriots who "sounded the shot heard 'round the world"; the men who died during the Revolutionary War that we might be free. It was written by the actions of these early Americans, more than by the goose-quill pen of Thomas Jefferson as he sat in a candle-lit room, putting down the ideas of early Americans.

It was made sacred 100 years ago by the blood of brother fighting brother to keep that Union "one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Today, in that indivisible Nation, this masterpiece is the symbol of all that is dear to the hearts of Americans.

It is our family sitting in church on Sunday morning, helping with the worship service, planning the activities of the church youth group, attending a summer church camp, and learning to know those from other churches.

It is written in the headlines of our newspapers, the chapters of our books, and letters to Congressmen, telling them of our problems and asking for help in finding the solution.

It is paid for when we fill out the income-tax forms to give a certain amount of our earnings to keep the Government going.

It is spoken in the United Nations headquarters when we oppose a program that would hurt another nation and its people, as well as when we propose a plan beneficial to the whole family of nations.

It is "shot off" with every rocket we send to further our knowledge of outer space and with every plane we send on a trial flight.

It is spoken in Congress and whenever the people gather to talk free from the fear of being arrested or otherwise punished. We can discuss dates, teachers, the President-elect, the answer to segregation, and a better foreign policy.

It is freemen working at the trade of their choice, buying the products they make, selling our own goods, and opening bank accounts to keep our money working.

It is engraved on the hearts of men whenever they hear Lexington, Gettysburg, the Battle of the Bulge, or Heartbreak Ridge.

It is found in the heart of a mother as she holds her infant son in her arms and dreams that he may grow up to be the leader of this country.

Look around you, America, and see what this "piece of yellowed paper" has given you. Then thank God that you were born in America.

The Future Role of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, because of the prevailing interest in the problems and the future of agriculture, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a talk given by Sam H. Bober, of Newell, S. Dak., at the soil conservation award dinner held in Buffalo, S. Dak., on March 23. These excerpts are taken from the Bober speech as it was reported in the Valley Irrigator, a leading South Dakota weekly newspaper, published in Newell, S. Dak.

Mr. Bober is one of South Dakota's most successful farmers and businessmen. He has devoted a lifetime to studying agricultural problems and needs. Presently and for some years back, Sam Bober serves as an outstanding member of the Federal Farm Credit Board. I believe my colleagues in Congress will be interested in his experienced observations.

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

BOBER DISCUSSES FUTURE ROLE OF AGRICULTURE

The lifestream of a nation is its agriculture. The management of soil is among the oldest of the arts, but none is changing more rapidly than it. We know more about taking care of soils and conserving water than our fathers and grandfathers did; there is much more that we should know.

Agriculture is the business of clothing and feeding humanity. Our immediate business is to furnish 540 million meals for 180 million Americans to eat every day.

At the moment our farms seem too productive, and some of us wish that our Government would stop spending money improving efficiency while we are producing more than we can use, and instead help us in marketing and disposing of the surplus food where there is an urgent need for it in other parts of the world where people go hungry part of the time.

Surpluses are not necessarily an indication that our techniques are always the best. Egypt raises more cotton, Britain more wheat, and Japan more rice per acre than we do.

Our specialty is raising more food and more fiber per man. Research helped us in this, and no other nation has introduced mechanization into agriculture like the United States has. We have substituted capital for labor in the form of labor-saving machinery.

At the moment we have more land than we can use, and some of the unneeded cropland shuold be retired until needed. Our granaries are overstocked with surplus crops, even though our per-acre yields are low. It's because we have a higher percentage of arable land than most countries.

But let's talk about explosions in today's world. Not about nuclear bomb explosions, but about population explosions. At the beginning of this century we had a population of 75 million people in these United States. Now in 1960 we have 180 million people and in 40 years more, barring wars, we are likely to have to feed 320 million people in this country of ours.

Look at the world. In 1830, only 130 years ago, there were a billion people on this planet. In 1935 the world population had increased to 2 billion. Today, in the year of 1961, the population is 3 billion, and in only 5 years more the population of the world will reach 4 billion people. We are increasing at the rate of 2½ million every 10 days. Think of the increased food we will need to produce for the fast expanding population.

Now we use the production from 3 acres per capita. At the rate we are increasing, it is probable that we will have only 1½ acres per capita available in 30 years from now. The surplus food problem is not likely to continue to be a distressing problem for long.

We can fly satellites to the moon, but we cannot control weather. We cannot prevent a cycle of drought any more than the Egyptions could 4,000 years ago, nor could we our own drought cycle in the thirties.

We have a choice of fostering a healthy growing agriculture or stifling it. For the Nation and the individual, it is cheaper and better to be assured of too much, rather than face the risk of too little. The whole problem of our ability to produce in the future rests primarily with our water and land resources, and our ability to use them wisely.

In the combination of research and field experimentation, and group cooperation from folks like you, lies the hope of meeting the Nation's agricultural needs of the future.

Reality Versus the Myth in Monopoly Pricing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there has been a great deal said about the electrical antitrust cases. For a frank discussion of what many are really thinking about pricing policies in many industries I commend the "Commentary" from the March 13 issue of the Value Line Investment Survey. It goes far to separate myth from reality.

UNITED STATES VERSUS ITSELF—THE ANTITRUST CONVICTIONS IN THE ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT CASE

On February 6 and 7, 1961 Judge J. Cullen Ganey of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, imposed fines of $1,787,000 on 29 electrical equipment manufacturers, most prominent among which were General Electric and Westinghouse, and sentenced seven executives in the industry to prison for conspiring to violate the antitrust laws against price fixing. Twenty-three others received suspended sentences. The executives sentenced to prison, until then respected senior citizens of their communities and Nation, were thereupon manacled like common felons and led off to jail in full glare of the publicity that passes for journalism these days.

Judge Ganey said, "Before imposing sentence, I want to make certain observations * * * what is really at stake here is the survival of the kind of economy under which America has grown to greatness, the free enterprise system. The conduct of the corporate and individual defendants * * * has flagrantly mocked the image of that economic system of free enterprise which we profess to the country and destroyed the model which we offer today as a free world alternative to State control and eventual dictatorship."

General Electric, although it found itself compelled to plead guilty to some of the indictments as a matter of practical expediency, vigorously and on the whole successfully, disassociated itself and its chief officers and directors from its guilty agents in the lower echelons, and clearly proved that it had honestly tried to enforce its own regulations against price fixing upon the executive heads of its more than 100 departments and 20-odd divisions, which regulations were even more stringent in certain respects than the antitrust laws themselves. (The Government brought no charges against the Westinghouse directors and upper echelon executives.)

The whole country was immediately aroused to a high pitch of moral indignation, sensing as it did, that the very soul of America, its free enterprise system, the bulwark against communism and the only alternative to State control and dictatorship, to use Judge Ganey's words, had been betrayed.

The Attorney General, Mr. Robert F. Kennedy, writing on this case in Life magazine under date of February 24, 1961, said, "Our antitrust laws were written in an attempt to control business monopoly * * * but in * * * earlier trust cases the punishment was usually in the form of fines, and after it was over, business went on as usual. The businessman who participated was not treated as though he had really done anything wrong. He was just following the accepted practices of big business in the 20th century, U.S.A. He was accepted as usual at the country club, he was appointed as usual to be the chairman of the community charity drives * * * more and more often, corruption and dishonesty have been excused because 'everyone does it' * * * Judge Ganey's decision had great impact because it showed that somebody is willing to say 'I am not going to accept this. We can do better.'" In the same tone, Life magazine declared in its editorial columns, "* * * The crooks in the electrical industry have set back the progress of the modern corporation toward public acceptance of its claims to wider social responsibility and a quasi-political role"; and then, in a burst of sadistic exultation, published a picture of one of the condemned executives behind prison bars, his downcast, bald head and spectacled eyes a portrait of shame; and it pilloried the other condemned by publishing their pictures for public recognition.

What is the truth of the matter? Were a few little fellows thrown to the wolves to protect the higher ups? Has America's image of a free economy been betrayed by crooks? What about the laws that were so long breached in 20th-century United States without meaningful penalty, thus ascribing to them the sanction of custom?

Unprejudiced examination of this case will, we think, reveal the following:

(1) The condemned did indeed conspire to violate the law against price fixing.

(2) General Electric did, indeed, make every effort that a big company could make at the top to prevent violation of the antitrust laws in its decentralized subdivisions. Westinghouse also had directives designed to achieve compliance with the antitrust laws.

(3) The method by which businessmen attempt to carry out the purpose of the antitrust law, which is to prevent monopoly, and to do so without creating monopoly, draws such a fine line between legal and illegal price stabilization, or price fixing, as to be impracticable in the workaday world.

(4) The Government and the consumers of this country were not, in any meaningful economic sense, defrauded by being sold goods higher in price than would have been paid had the guilty practices to which the defendants pleaded guilty not been committed.

(5) The free enterprise system, in which prices are free to fluctuate without restraint, which is the system that Judge Ganey says America professes to its people and the model which it holds up as a free world alternative to state control and tyranny, has not existed for a couple of hundred years.

(6) There is a large body of law and a long political and economic tradition that not only permits, but even requires, control over price fluctuations.

(7) Finally, and here is the heart of the problem, the law against price fixing through which the Government attempts to control or prevent monopoly, would if enforced to the letter, actually bring about monopoly.

Let us examine these conclusions one by one:

(1) The condemned did indeed engage in a conspiracy to violate the antitrust law. Their conspiratorial practices were carried on with the sophistication of teenagers and the Government investigators had little trouble getting the evidence on them, cold. No need to discuss this further.

(2) General Electric's top management did indeed make vigorous efforts to prevent such violations as the Government charged. It has, and had, a company regulation (20.5) which specifically prohibited illegal price fixing and the head of the company frequently stressed to subordinates the impor-

tance of observing this regulation. In fact, a number of General Electric executives had, previous to the trial, been demoted for breach of directive 20.5. But General Electric is a company whose greatness was built very largely upon a policy of decentralization of managerial control. Its hundred plus departments enjoy a large measure of autonomy, making it difficult for top management to police every detail of each division's business. The remarkable thing about it all from this standpoint is that among the hundreds of executives who might have violated directive 20.5 of the General Electric Co. and the antitrust law of the United States, there were only a handful who could be found indictable.

(3) Business leaders in their effort to abide by the law and also by the intent of the law, which is to prevent monopoly, find themselves compelled to stabilize prices in certain of their markets. Had General Electric's directive 20.5 been followed to the letter and had General Electric and Westinghouse exercised their competitive strength to the full, marginal producers in the electrical equipment industry might have been driven out of existence. The big companies could have cut prices below the costs of their smaller competitors and thus forced them to the wall. Although General Electric and Westinghouse then would have avoided violating section I of the Sherman Act, which prohibits conspiring to fix prices, they would have been guilty of violating section II of the same Act, which makes it a crime to "monopolize or attempt to monopolize." And the latter possibility has and does now appear to be the more imminent.

There is a practical and legal way to set prices in industries where the product is standardized. The industry leader, usually the lowest cost producer, publishes a price list based on his own costs and analysis of the market. Usually the prices are high enough to let the highest cost marginal producer (of significant size) break even. If—in the press for business during cyclical slumps in demand—the marginal producer cut his price, he could be sure that the leader would cut prices also—and still make a profit—so that price cutting would not win the additional sales volume the little fellow desperately needed to absorb his overhead costs. The price cutter would simply get the same share of the market but at a lower price. Under this system of price stabilization or fixing, the industry leader "holds an umbrella" over the marginal producer, and thus protects the small businessman from exploitation and itself from violation of section II of the Sherman Act.

However, this method, although it can legally set a price, cannot effectively divide up the market among competitors who charge identical prices. Where everybody's price is identical and the quality of the product uniform, who is to get what share of the business? Here is where the conspiracy comes in, and in practice has got to come in. It usually works out that definite percentages of the market are allocated to particular companies by the sellers themselves; they make their bids in such a way as to assure the division of the market according to a prearranged agreement. Thus, they deprive the buyers of an opportunity to buy below standard, or fair, price.

This part—the conspiratorial agreement to divide the market—is illegal. But how do you get your share of the business if your price and product are identical with the other fellow's, except through allocation? In actual practice it would be almost impossible to avoid carving up the market. Were the industry leader to take advantage of his lower costs and underprice his competitors, he could increase his volume, lower his unit costs still further, and increase his total profit. Thus, he exercises restraint by pricing at a level above that which would maximize his total profit. Perhaps the most frequently cited example of this pricing policy in action is the automobile industry. As the largest volume, lowest cost producer, General Motors could quite readily force the marginal companies (themselves giants of industry) to the wall and thereby considerably enlarge its already superior profits. An immediate result, of course, would be that the Justice Department would seek to break up GM, a move which the company's management would obviously prefer to avoid. Hence, GM exercises restraint in its pricing policies. Competition in this industry takes the form of quality, styling, accessories, etc., where the size of the manufacturer is not the determining factor.

The advantage that the big producer has over his smaller competitor derives in the first instance from the fact that his actual costs are usually lower. But there is a tax aspect to this problem, too: When the Sherman Act was passed, there were no income taxes on corporations. Today the corporate income tax rate is 52 percent. The big corporation, like General Electric, can sustain a loss in one of its many divisions and offset this loss against the profits of its other divisions, thus reducing its total taxable profit. In that way the U.S. Government assists the big fellow by absorbing half his loss while the little fellow engaged only in one particular business sustains his full loss without offsetting profits from other divisions (which he simply does not have).

Now, why was the presumably legal way of stabilizing prices (by publishing the standard price list of the industry) not used in the heavy electrical equipment markets? For one thing, the dominant factor in the industry, General Electric, has publicly disavowed any intent to exercise price leadership (a stand for which it has been roundly criticized by many executives of its smaller competitiors). General Electric's top management has said, in effect, that its department general managers are not to attempt to "hold an umbrella" over the marginal producers. The company's directive 20.5 is but one manifestation of this attitude. (This directive, and its enforcement, were obviously prompted, too, by the realization that GE is, and long has been, a prime and popular target of the antitrusters.)

As a practical matter, moreover, price leadership in this particular area might well prove impossible. The product mix is far from homogeneous. Posted prices are even more meaningless than those in an automobile showroom. In practice, virtually every item of heavy equipment (as opposed to the many smaller standard items) is sold at a discount from "book." The amount of the discount is quoted in discussions between the manufacturer and the customer (although it will quickly become known, via the grapevine, to other manufacturers and customers). In any case, it would be extremely difficult for GE, or any other company, to meet lower prices immediately on every piece of equipment on which purchase negotiations are in progress. Secondly, the customers for the equipment here referrred to are the Nation's Government-owned and investor-owned utilities—a limited number in comparison to, say, car owners, or even steel buyers. The utility purchasing agents are sophisticated and well informed. Moreover, they are themselves primarily concerned with the prices they pay and, if they grow somewhat lax in this regard, are quickly prodded by their regulatory commissions. Thus, they would be much more likely to press for elimination of the higher prices resulting from price leadership (regardless of the impact on marginal producers) than would the average industrial customer. For these and other reasons, price leadership to "hold the umbrella" over the marginal producer would be very difficult even should GE attempt to exercise it.

Moreover, even if price leadership were possible, we do not believe it would necessarily assure the economic survival of the little fellow. Reason: styling, appearance, extras, etc., have little influence on utilities. If the prices on competitive models are the same, the purchasing agent will buy based on a thorough analysis of the technological advantages, services available, product guarantees, etc. And, in these attributes, the size of the manufacturer is almost as important as are the prices. Thus, stabilized prices would not necessarily assure the small producer of a share of the market as they do in many other industries.

General Electric's corporate policy on these points is quite clear. It believes in free competition and directs its operating managers to exercise its competitive advantages to the full. But, out on the firing line things may look different. For, if an operating manager realized that compliance with policy would force a smaller competitor out of business, would he risk bringing the Justice Department down on GE for violation of section II of the Sherman Act? Moreover, what if the small competitor pointed out his danger and added that his only recourse was an appeal to Washington? We do not imply that this was the case; obviously, the motives of the conspirators were complex and, possibly, conflicting. We simply wish to point out that full compliance with GE's emphatically promulgated corporate policy and with section I of the Sherman Act might well have put the company afoul of section II. Perhaps the latter seemed the more imminent possibility to the operating executives. If so, as explained above, the nature of this industry is such that the only way to "hold the umbrella" was by agreeing (i.e., conspiring) not only to set prices, but to allocate shares of the market.

Despite the conspiracies in the electrical equipment industry, the statistical evidence indicates that the prices of electrical equipment have risen no more—indeed less—than the prices of other equipment in industries where no violations have been charged.

Here, by way of example, are the trends of prices in (a) construction machinery and equipment, (b) metal working machinery and equipment, and (c) electrical machinery and equipment. Prices in the electrical lines went up less than in the others, indicating that the consumer was not disregarded nor the Government defrauded in this market.

On the other hand, consider the violence of the cycle in the electrical equipment industry—a typical "prince or pauper" business, despite the fact, as this chart also shows, that its customers, the electric utilities, have an exceptionally stable sales trend. Were the strong companies to take full advantage of their power to cut prices and survive, the little fellows in the industry, who had less strength and less ability to pass 52 percent of the loss to Uncle Sam, would obviously be forced out of business during the "pauper" period.

Did Judge Ganey in making his observations on the vital issue at stake, namely America's image of a free economy, and did the editors of Life in their denunciation of the "crooks" who have set back the American corporation in its progress toward a more responsible role in social and quasi-political life, take into consideration the fact that a perfectly free price economy, in the Adam Smith sense of the word, has not been in existence for over 200 years? Has our leadership forgotten that America imposed tariffs upon imports long, long ago, for the express purpose of protecting, or putting a floor under, the prices of our manufactures? Are they unaware that we have a law fixing the minimum wage for labor, regardless of supply and demand, and that the present administration, with the assistance of the Attorney General, is trying very hard, and right now, to fix the price higher than before? Is it possible that the editors of Life

are ignorant of the laws to keep up, or raise, the prices of agricultural products, thus defrauding the American public of billions of dollars a year? Has the administration forgotten its avowed purpose of manipulating the short-term interest rate upward while rigging the long-term rate lower?

But hold, you may say. These interventions are Government interventions into the free market. They are sanctioned by law and executed in the public interest. The antitrust laws are designed to control or prevent monopoly precisely because monopolistic control would enable private interests to set prices just as the Government sets prices but without the Government's responsibility for the consumer's interest. Therefore, monopoly and price fixing by private interests cannot be tolerated nor judged on the same basis as price control by Government. Corporations that, to use Life's language, are to progress toward "social and quasi-political responsibility" must have a conscience about these things. They must avoid monopolistic abuses, which means, apparently, that they must permit prices to fluctuate without restraint in the private sectors of the economy.

The first point to recognize here is that because of Government intervention in the markets, especially in such critical sectors as wages, agricultural prices, interest rates, and manufactured goods prices, the free economy that Judge Ganey says America professes to believe in and holds forth as a model to others is a myth. What we mean by a free economy, in reality, is a market economy in which prices are allowed to fluctuate within socially tolerable limits.

What are the socially tolerable limits?

The classical example of free prices that went beyond the socially tolerable limit and also failed to perform their function as a regulator of supply and demand is agriculture, especially during the late twenties and thirties. According to theory, agricultural production should have diminished from 1925 to 1932 because agricultural prices were falling during those years. But wheat, corn, and other agricultural products were not produced in diminishing quantities; they were produced in increasing quantities between 1925 and 1932, not despite falling prices but because of falling prices. The farmer who had debts to pay and an accustomed standard of living to support, worked harder to grow bigger crops in order to compensate for the lower price he was receiving. (The prices he paid for manufactured products, although they too declined during these years, did not fall so rapidly as farm prices, partly because of tariff protection for the manufactured goods.) Now, in time, the lower prices would have liquidated a large portion of the farm population and farm production. Such liquidation would have been in conformity with the law of supply and demand as it expressed itself at the time—and it might have been wise. But it might also have proven unwise in the long run, and besides, the farmer who was about to be liquidated, had no place to go. If he surrendered his farm, he had little prospect of getting a job in the city which was then crowded with unemployed. So the farmers simply refused to allow the mortgage companies to foreclose on their farms. They defied the orders of the court with arms. Their insurrection in 1933 was, in fact, a revolution against constituted authority and an act of open rebellion. Rightly or wrongly, the Government (Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal) decided that in this instance rulings under the law of supply and demand were to be suspended and the liquidation of marginal farm producers enjoined. The socially tolerable limit of price fluctuation had been exceeded. To this day, we have laws which regulate the tolerable limits of price fluctuation in agricultural commodities relative to other products.

We also have laws which set a minimum floor on wage rates. No matter how great the surplus of labor, under law an employer may no longer pay an employee less than the minimum wage. This is a direct contravention of the law of supply and demand and an expression of the conviction that free price fluctuations must be contained within socially tolerable limits.

What would American manufacturers say if tomorrow all tariffs were to be abolished? What would the farmers say if tomorrow price supports on agricultural products were to be removed? What would laboring men say if minimum wage rates were to be abolished? Obviously the question is a reductio ad absurdum. Today nobody really wants prices to fluctuate with perfect freedom.

How then do we meet the problem of determining the socially tolerable limits of price fluctuation in markets other than the labor market and the money market? Tariffs, of course, are an effort to put a floor under the market for some manufactured goods. But that the problem cuts much deeper than can be handled by tariffs alone is proved by the existence in no less than 18 States of laws which compel private industry to recognize price agreements designed for the express purpose of keeping price fluctuations within socially tolerable limits. In over one-third of the States of the Union, a perfectly free price fluctuation is prohibited by law.

During the first 4 years of the New Deal, the NRA was set up for the express purpose of determining fair prices and controlling the socially intolerable fluctuations in prices that might have been brought about by the unfettered play of demand and supply.

For many years thereafter, as the Attorney General attests in the Life article, the efforts of businessmen to stabilize prices, or fix them, if you prefer a harsher word, was sanctioned, or at least condoned, in that the maximum penalty was a slap on the wrist in the form of a fine that did less economic injury to all concerned than the continuation of the violations. Business then went on again, as usual. But the violation was condoned, not because "everybody was doing it". (This is putting the cart before the horse.) Everybody was doing it because it was the only way in which to limit the excessive price fluctuations that nobody wanted.

The heart of the problem is that the antitrust laws, if endorsed to the letter, would have the effect of destroying their own reason for being. General Electric and Westinghouse would, in a relatively short time, become the only competitors in their field. In the case of practically all the major cyclical industries—steel, machinery and equipment, textiles—the entire market would soon be preempted by the strongest company if prices were allowed to fluctuate without control.

The cyclical swings in demand for electrical equipment are extremely wide. When demand falls so low as it does at times in this industry, the economic compulsion, if no price controls are enforced, is to lower the selling price below the cost of production in order to absorb at least a portion of the overhead and general administrative expense that must continue whether the companies are doing a satisfactory volume of business or not. The problem is especially relevant to General Electric, for GE is not one industry but dozens of industries. Some of these industries in fact a majority, make profits in most years. A minority may suffer losses during a cyclical recession. If the loss divisions of General Electric had to operate in a perfectly free price economy, they would drop their prices as low as was necessary to capture the total demand during a cyclical depression. The losses in those divisions would be paid for to the extent of 52 percent by tax rebates on the profitable divisions of the company. The small producer, who had no profitable divisions to absorb the losses sustained in the unprofitable market, would simply have to go out of business. In time, General Electric and Westinghouse would stand alone on the field, the sole survivors, and the giant monopolies that the law had intended to prevent.

Thus, the big fellow in the cyclical industries is on the horns of a dilemma. If he fixes prices or stabilizes them, he may be guilty of conspiracy to violate the antitrust laws. On the other hand, if he observes this section of the law and is governed only by the law of supply and demand, he soon destroys all his competition and emerges as the monopoly power in his field and a violator of section II of the same law. Which horn would Judge Ganey prefer to sit on? Which perch would the Attorney General prefer? Where does the editor of Life think would be the moral seat?

Here, then, is the confusion we actually live in.

In truth, the United States has not been betrayed by crooks, as Life blares, nor has its ideology been subverted, as Judge Ganey charges. Yet the American people are in real danger: their leadership has failed them. It simply has not done its job. Would that it were possible to say merely that the leadership was either hypocritical or ignorant. Were this the truth, the remedy would be clear. Unfortunately, the far more terrifying truth of the matter is that the leadership is probably neither hypocritical nor ignorant, but schizophrenic—that is to say, compulsively determined to believe in a fantasy that is at odds with reality. Naturally, it reacts in blind rage when its dream world is impunged. If the Attorney General truly desires both completely unrestricted price fluctuation and protection of the small businessman, and if the fantasy that America lives in a free price economy is breaking on the rocks of everyday living, before our very eyes, would it not be wiser, instead of striking out in a rage at a few victims of the circumstances, to explore the possibility of writing laws that could govern in reality? Reflective citizens might well say, in the words of the Attorney General, "We will not accept this. We ought to be able to do better."

Keynote Address Delivered at the 1961 Annual State Convention of the South Dakota Young GOP College Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the keynote address delivered at the 1961 annual convention of the South Dakota GOP College Federation, at Huron, S. Dak., on March 25, 1961.

Once in a great while a significant contribution is made in the broad scope and sweep of philosophy, principles, and ideals which in one sense are described as politics but in a broader sense are the great American ideal. Such a contribution was the address by Bob Ruddy, of Aberdeen, a University of South Dakota student, who served as past pres-

ident of the University of South Dakota Young Republican Club of 1959–60.

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

KEYNOTE ADDRESS GIVEN AT 1961 ANNUAL STATE CONVENTION OF SOUTH DAKOTA YOUNG GOP COLLEGE FEDERATION HELD AT HURON, S. DAK., ON MARCH 25, 1961

(Presented by Bob Ruddy of Aberdeen, a University of South Dakota student who served as past president of the University of South Dakota Young Republican Club, in 1959–60 as State chairman of the college federation, in 1960–61 as chairman of region VIII (four Midwestern States) in the national college federation, and who was voted at the recent State convention as recipient of the first annual "Outstanding Young Republican" award presented by the South Dakota College Federation.)

It is significant that we are gathered here today during a period which has a great meaning for all of us. The year 1961 marks an important date in the history of all South Dakotans, for it was 100 years ago that this land in which we live gained the status of a Territory.

Dakota, the wild land, has been conquered. From out of the barren wilderness of the frontier, strong men and women had claimed a piece of land and called it their domain. This was not an easy task. In fact, it was exceedingly difficult.

The problems they faced were legion: harsh winters, hostile Indians, a scarcity of food and water, and the inconveniences and hardships of the Dakota prairies, to name just a few. In addition, they met and solved the ultimate problem that all men who desire to live together in harmony must somehow solve, how to govern themselves.

IN SOUTH DAKOTA POLITICS

Then men and women who accomplished this task were not supermen, but mortal men. As mortal as you or I and with the same traits of greatness and weakness. Nor were they old men, ths eepolitical forefathers. On the contrary, most of them were in their early thirties and some younger still. Yet these men and women blazed a trail in South Dakota politics that I believe should be emulated by us today.

It should be emulated because this State is lacking an important substance, a substance that is lacking now but was present in pioneer days, and—of most consequence at the present time—a substance that is necessary if this State is to keep pace with the rest of the Nation to maintain for this State the one product that it can least afford to lose—youth.

The advance report for the 1960 census shows that, from 1950 to 1960, our State lost 21.6 percent of its population between the ages of 20 and 24, and 22.7 percent of those between 25 and 29. Figures such as these indicate that something is drastically wrong with the health of South Dakota. Young people leave this State because they feel that it has little future. This is wrong.

It is wrong because South Dakota stands on the verge of fulfilling its great promise. It will not be fulfilled, however, until we have restored that missing substance—the substance that will keep the young people here, by demonstrating to them that at least one agency in this State is cognizant of their problems, is interested in them, and will make an all-out effort to realistically solve them.

POLITICAL LEADERSHIP OF YOUNG PEOPLE

That missing substance that we must restore in order to do all of this is the voice and the political leadership of the young people themselves. What we lack in this State is a symbol of hope for the future, an indication of promise and planning that can be demonstrated to others by a forceful, energetic, forward-looking political movement.

Our State discovered, developed, and led by young men and women has seen the pendulum swing to the opposite extreme to such an extent that our youthful viewpoint is rarely expressed, our leadership conspicuous by its absence.

I have been privileged to sit in at times with the leaders of our party. I have watched our State legislators in action. I have examined the various candidates for political office, and always I am bothered by the same questions:

"Where are the energetic young leaders in our State? Why have we seen the pendulum swing the other way? Is our State destined to remain devoid of young leadership? Can we afford to remain this way?"

IF YOU MAKE UP YOUR MIND

The answer is no. It cannot and it will not, but only if you are ready to recognize that the solution to the problem lies within this group. It will not if you make up your mind that it is time the pendulum started to swing back again. The initiative must come from this group, for you are best suited to fill the void that now exists. The initiative must come from this group because every action must have a reaction.

Sometime during the past century—and particularly during the past quarter of a century—the young people of this State let the reins of leadership slip from their hands and we must take up once again those reins so that we will have some influence with the political dynasty of this State.

The initiative must come from this group, because the first move on the downhill slide was made by our age group, so consequently the initial move to start on the road back must also be with our group. As each beginning has an end, each end is also a beginning. This can be the end of one era and the beginning of another.

MY PLEA TO YOU

And so, my fellow students, this is my plea to you. Let us pledge ourselves to restore to the youth of South Dakota the position in State government that it once held, and to which it rightfully belongs.

Let us do this by utilizing once again those qualities that enabled the pioneers of our State to form a territory from a wilderness: leadership, initiative, the courage of their convictions and loyalty to a cause.

To accomplish this purpose, it will be necessary for the college federation to set up a twofold plan of action designed to give strength to our position, for our voice and our leadership will never be recognized unless we speak from strength.

ON BEHALF OF THE PARTY

First, we must step up our activities on behalf of the Republican Party. The past campaign afforded us an opportunity to work for our party, and the response was most gratifying. It was gratifying because we have gained the respect and the gratitude of the senior party, and we can take pride in the fact that we contributed to the Republican victory in this State.

This, however, should not be considered as the end but rather only the beginning. We must be active every year, not just in election years. It was gratifying for another reason, and that is because many of us found that working for a political party is exciting, interesting and educational. In addition to that, it fulfilled a need that we all have—the need to feel that we are doing something to better the society in which we live.

It is upon this basis that I believe we can expand our activities and that, although this year is not an election year, we can continue to seek out means by which we might do our part.

In this area, we should strive to reach a mutual agreement with the Young Republican League as to which projects will be theirs, and which projects will be ours. The keynote should be cooperation and not competition, but we should enter into this agreement with both organizations realistically accepting the fact that we are equals—both dedicated toward the same end.

MUCH EFFORT ON OUR PART

To sit in the councils of the party, and to be accepted by the senior Republicans, will require work and much effort on our part. Our strength will be in proportion to the work we accomplish. We cannot expect to receive the position we desire on a silver platter.

The second part of the plan will be more difficult to accomplish and may take longer because we are sadly lacking in this area. We must educate our fellow students in political philosophy. If our voice is to be heard it must ring with the sound of authority, and authority can only come with knowledge.

The problems that will confront us in our task of educating ourselves will be divided primarily into two groups. You can expect to find some opposition from both our elders and our fellow students.

Unfortunately, we are living in a period when society, and particularly school authorities, have adopted a policy of encouraging coddling rather than maturity—protection rather than stability. Society will not encourage you to speak out, you must take the initiative yourself. We can, however, succeed if we pursue our objective with dignity, thoughtfulness, and honesty.

WE SUFFER LESS

Political apathy is a result of political ignorance. Those that know nothing or understand nothing of political problems care not for political problems. This is a sickness of the body politic that paralyzes all segments of our population, not just the young. In fact, my experience has shown that we suffer less from this malady than do the others.

The tragedy is that we are in the position of being able to do better. What more logical function could our organization have than to stimulate our fellow students in the quest of political knowledge? You will find no greater opportunity for such an undertaking, capitalizing on the atmosphere of learning that surrounds every college campus.

Initiate an informative program that will bring to your members the true principles of our party; discuss political problems from all perspectives; do not hesitate to approach a problem that seems to be controversial; do not hesitate to suggest solutions that differ from those our elders have expressed.

THE CLOAK OF LEADERSHIP

This will take great leadership. You may face disappointment and even ridicule. Success will not come easily, but if you are willing to expend an effort for a cause in which you believe, you will succeed. The cloak of leadership can be tailored to fit anyone who has the desire to wear it. Will you wear this cloak, or will you be content to wear the mass-produced coat of the follower.

Once we have educated ourselves to the problems, we must give body to our solutions. It has been said that "the true object of education should be to train one to think clearly and to act rightly."

Therefore, if we are to follow through this objective, we must meet and discuss—and eventually formulate—a policy that reflects the will of this organization. This task should not be taken lightly, for it can have far-reaching implications.

Today, in our deliberations, we represent the various college Republicans clubs from which we come and yet, in a larger sense, we

represent more than that. We represent the hopes, spirit, and the expectations of all young people.

LIKE A BOAT WITHOUT AN ANCHOR

Do not shrug off these decisions as not concerning you, because, by so doing, you say that young people do not care what course our Government takes. I personally am not willing to believe this is the case, that our generation has no aspirations, believes in no guiding principles, cannot make intelligent decisions, and like a boat without an anchor simply drifts with the tides of time and the waves of events.

I believe that many of us are more aware of the ills that beset our Government than we will admit. I believe that it is much easier to close our eyes to these troubles than to attempt to solve them.

I further believe, however, that you—as well as I—realize this is wrong, that we cannot go on forever with our head buried in the sand, that these problems will not solve themselves, and that we must make an honest attempt to examine them, weigh the alternatives, and select the solution we feel most compatible to our generation.

BORN INTO DEPRESSION

And ours is a generation quite different from all the rest. Many of us were born into depression and raised in war, aware of the fact that our Nation faces a constant crisis. Educated in a world that has changed drastically from that in which our parents and grandparents were raised, our generation will have a different outlook on life.

Today we stand on the threshold of assuming a tremendous responsibility. The responsibility of facing up to, and handling, each new crisis as it arises—and recognizing the fact that what was sufficient in the past may not be adequate in the future.

AS SOUTH DAKOTA'S FUTURE LEADERS

The problems that our generation will be called upon to solve will have long-lasting effects, for we must live with them for many years. As South Dakota's future leaders, it is imperative that you consider long-range solutions. In this day and age solutions built upon expediency many times merely postpone and pile up the problems we must eventually meet and solve.

Our generation will inherit much that is good, in the sense of governmental policies, but also some that is bad. We can profit by the mistakes of the past, but we must be concerned with the future. It is here that our generation will provide the political leadership, the forward thinking, the new ideas, that our State needs from us. Our generation must provide the stimulation for positive action, because it is our generation that will reap the positive results.

All this, however, will not accomplish our purpose of assuring a voice in the councils of our party. For once having strengthened the position of the college federation by our increased education and actual contributions to the party, we must press onward—prepared to fight, if fight we must, for what we believe to be true.

Do not expect to be greeted with open arms by the senior party on all occasions. While the vast majority of them sincerely welcome our participation and our thoughts, there will be those who jealously guard their position and will view us as intruders.

WE SHOULD NOT HESITATE

Nor will our ideas be accepted by the majority of the party at all times, but disagreement within a political party is not unheard of—it is common—and it is not bad, but rather it is healthy. When we disagree with a position taken by the senior party, we should not hesitate to make our disagreement known to them.

Not publicly, if we can to it privately, but we must be active rather than passive. Above all, we must be true at all times to ourselves, for if we fail in this, we have forfeited all rights to call ourselves leaders.

If we have fought and lost, do not become disheartened. At times the decision will be justified because we will not be infallible. However, even when we may feel it is not justified, we must forget our difference and give our wholehearted support to the majority opinion. At this point we must exhibit the loyalty to a cause that is much larger than any one portion of the party.

COOPERATION SHOULD BE EQUAL

To the senior party I would say this: The burden of leadership still lies heavy upon your shoulders, but the spirit of cooperation should be of equal weight. In the past 2 years you have made a noble effort to help our growth, and we are grateful. I say what I say not out of ingratitude, but only because I am concerned for the future greatness of our party in South Dakota.

Do not close your eyes and your minds to our appeals when they come. Do not force us to foresake the State in which we were born, in which we have played, in which we were educated, in which we cherish. Let our voice be heard.

OUR MOST PRESSING PROBLEM

I have deviated somewhat from the general conception of a keynote speech. I did this not because I could not praise our party—for there is much to praise. I did this not because I could not attack the opposition party—for there is much to attack. I did this because I feel that the problem I have just outlined is our most pressing problem, and that it must be solved. It must be solved for the future welfare of the State, and it must be solved by the Republican Party for the future welfare of the party It would have been much easier not to mention these problems, but we must be realistic.

Our party has always been the leader in this State, and I want to make sure that it continues to be so. We will continue to be if we can maintain the political loyalty of our youth. But we must also recognize that South Dakota will soon undergo the political revolution that is now sweeping other States, and that—sooner or later—one party must provide the nest on which the loyalty of the youth of this State will come to rest. It must be the Republican Party.

I cannot accept the argument that our party is not conducive to attracting young people. I am firmly convinced that the basic principles of the Republican Party are those most suited to appeal to young people. All that remains is for us to generate the enthusiasm and for the party to accept our leadership.

This is our greatest challenge * * * to strengthen our party by bringing a new voice and a new spirit into the Republican ranks. The danger to the Republican Party in South Dakota is just as much from within, as it is from without. Our party must be strong inside if it is to withstand the attack on the outside. The new blood and new ideas that you college people represent can be the salvation of our party.

TO A PARTY STRONG

My thoughts are those of a young man about to leave this State, but who some day hopes to return. I want to return to a party as strong then as it is now.

Many of us have labored long and hard to bring the college federation to the position it now holds. We have achieved much of what we set out to achieve, and yet much is left undone. It will be up to you to complete this work.

The future will be up to you. Therefore, strive to build a better college federation in the knowledge that, by so doing, you will build a better party, and ultimately a better State.

A Tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt, American Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt is brought to mind today for two reasons. First, it is the 16th anniversary of his death; and, second, the times are calling forth a demand for statesmanship, a quality for which Franklin D. Roosevelt was justly famed.

Statesmanship is about as rare in this world as a precious diamond. Yet, unlike the diamond, it is essential in the life of a nation. And, again unlike the diamond, it is not consistently appreciated.

In times of tranquillity the statesman is often forsaken by the people. For statesmanlike leadership requires that the people act in unison, and the activity thus evoked is exhausting to everyone concerned.

Yet, as soon as crisis threatens, the people invariably cry out again for statesmanship, and woe betide them if the cry goes unanswered.

At the opening of the present century, our Nation was imperiled by giant industrial trusts and the people called upon Teddy Roosevelt to solve the resulting economic crisis.

Soon afterward, international aggression periled American freedom, and the people called upon Woodrow Wilson to settle that issue for them.

Then came a decade of tranquillity, in which statesmanship was forgotten; and at its close, the Nation stood faced with disaster.

Lack of statesmanship in economic matters had brought us to the brink of economic revolution; Wall Street was in turmoil, millions were unemployed, banks were failing daily and radicals, economic and political, were crying for the head of American free enterprise.

Lack of statesmanship in foreign relations had bred political upheaval in Europe and Asia; democracies were falling right and left and dictatorship was becoming the order of the day.

At this point the American people appealed to Franklin D. Roosevelt, then Governor of New York, to lead them from the swamp of chaos and despair. The issues were momentous: depression at home, aggression abroad, and the ominous threat of national destruction on every hand. But Roosevelt met the tasks before him in the manner of a statesman, with astonishing results.

Mustering the national wealth in behalf of the needy, he provided food for those who were hungry and jobs for the unemployed. Utilizing his knowledge of economic history, he revised the economic framework of the Nation, to bolster and strengthen its capitalist basis with Federal aid and Federal regulation. Critics cried paradox; that the Roosevelt

New Deal would kill off capitalism in America. But instead American capitalism was revived and Roosevelt was vindicated.

In the matter of international relations, Roosevelt again stood forth as a statesman: rallying the support of all the American nations to the common cause; urging the vigilance of the United States; bolstering the Army and Navy, and aiding the valiant British people in their struggle for democratic liberty.

When war came it was violent and terrible, but the Nation, under Roosevelt, was strong enough to meet the foe with a counterattack that carried the day, won the respect of our friends abroad, and established the United States as the leading power on earth.

Such were the exploits of Franklin D. Roosevelt, statesman extraordinary. Faced with two of the greatest crises in American history, he dealt with each in turn and brought his people through to victory. Nothing less than statesmanship could have saved the Nation when he appeared upon the scene. Sensing this, Roosevelt provided what was needed. For so doing, his memory is blessed today in the hearts of millions who worked and fought beneath his banner, and millions more to whom he was merely a name—yet a name symbolic of American statesmanship in action.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame."

The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

THREE MILLION IS FAR TOO MANY

("From towns like this throughout Florida and throughout the South, the 2 to 3 million move out on their annual migration, which ends in late November—"Harvest of Shame.")

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, approximately 400,000 different individuals at some time of the year engage in migratory farmwork.

The American Farm Bureau Federation cited figures supplied by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as grossly misleading, if improperly used without explanation, as in this instance.

The figures show the total hired farm labor force varies from 900,000 in winter to 2,800,000 during the late summer. Those apparently were used by CBS.

"The harvest labor force includes hundreds of thousands of local people—children, high school students, retired people, housewives and others who work a few weeks at harvest period, but who are not a permanent part of the farm labor force, and in most cases, are only interested in temporary local employment," the federation said.

In "Farm Labor Market Developments," the U.S. Department of Labor reported 293,000 was the largest number of seasonal farmworkers employed in a 1-month period (July) of 1960.

In May of 1960, the figure was only 114,000.

What about Florida? What portion of those persons worked here?

The figures are not available. But in May of 1956, 32,654 Florida-employed workers signed up for work in the Atlantic Seaboard States following the end of the Florida harvest, the Florida State Employment Service reported.

Of that number, Pompano Beach led seven cities in this area with 4,089. Belle Glade had 4,006 and Fort Pierce 3,448. Pahokee signed up 2,070, Immokalee 2,082 and West Palm Beach 599.

Under the cooperative plan, 14,577 workers agreed to go to New York and 10,629 to Virginia. Maryland obtained 6,604 and North Carolina 5,226 to lead the others.

Such an arrangement, the FSES said, prevents countless hours from being wasted in the search for jobs.

Food for Peace Program in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most effective programs for peace through the means of humanitarian assistance is that of the food for peace program under the directorship of George McGovern. It is with pleasure that I call attention to this agency's most needed efforts to raise the minimum nutritional standards of the starving people of the Congo, and I ask unanimous consent that an article describing this program entitled "Food To Save 300,000 Sent Congo by United States" in the April 10, Washington Post be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

FOOD TO SAVE 300,000 SENT CONGO BY UNITED STATES

The chairman of the food-for-peace program said today the United States has shipped enough food into the Congo to save 300,000 people from starvation for a year.

George McGovern said that, if need be, his agency stands ready to make additional shipments available.

"There are about 300,000 people in the Congo who are confronted with acute hunger and we're trying to gear our shipments to feed that many people at minimum nutritional standards," McGovern declared.

The director, appearing on a New York State TV program with Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, said Russia and Red China are far behind the United States in the shipment of food to the hungry nations of the world.

McGovern said the Soviets, with food production problems and Communist China, with "a very acute food famine," are physically unable to compete with the United States in the field.

He said that as long as there is hunger in the world and as long as the American people have the capacity to assist, "I'm convinced we will have a food-for-peace program."

McGovern said operations are conducted in such a way that shipments do not compete with the flow of commodities that would normally be handled in commercial channels.

Contributions to Sgt. Alvin C. York To Erase Income Tax Owed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there follows a fine letter from Mr. Melvin T. Weakley, of Dyersburg, Tenn., and an editorial, which are self-explanatory. I think all of these concerned in this matter have certainly done a wonderful job. The letter and editorial follow:

DYERSBURG, TENN., *April 6, 1961.*

Hon. ROBERT A. EVERETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ROBERT: As you probably know, Jere Cooper Dyersburg Post No. 30, American Legion, Department of Tennessee, originated the now apparently successful drive to get Congressional Medal of Honor Winner Alvin York's alleged income tax liability compromised and paid through public subscription.

Sometime prior to the department convention here last June, our post adopted a resolution, which was subsequently adopted at a district meeting and finally adopted as a department resolution at the June 1960, convention. After that, our post commander and other local officials visited Sergeant York on several occasions, contacted Representative JOE EVINS for assistance in procuring a compromise settlement of the alleged tax liability and raised over $2,000 by public subscription long before the compromise settlement was finally worked out and the national fund drive started.

In the March 30, 1961, issue of our Dyersburg Daily State Gazette, Editor Russell M. D. Bruce, World War I veteran and longtime member of the Dyersburg post, published an editorial recognizing the efforts of our post. Having been a member of this local post since the close of World War II and one of its past commanders, I felt that you would be glad to see that a copy of the editorial mentioned, which is enclosed herewith, is inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Our entire post membership will greatly appreciate your doing this for our post and we would like to have you send us a copy after you get it put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN T. WEAKLEY.

[From the Daily State Gazette, Mar. 30, 1961]

BIGGEST CONTRIBUTION

Members of Jere Cooper Dyersburg Post No. 30 of the American Legion must feel very proud of the manner in which the

Nation is responding to the move to raise money to pay off the income tax obligation of Sgt. Alvin York, America's greatest hero in World War I.

Among the stirring moments devoted to the fundraising campaign was the lengthy time given to it Sunday night by Ed Sullivan at the outset of his weekly Sunday evening program.

For years the Internal Revenue Service had dogged York in trying to collect the tax which it was claimed he owed from income on the motion picture, "Sgt. Alvin York," which starred Gary Cooper.

York did not have the money to pay. He had given away practically all of the movie earnings to build schools in his beloved east Tennessee rural country. He had little property left and less income.

For years the efforts of the Internal Revenue Service to collect went on, while the World War I hero, whose outstanding feat, despite the fact that he was a conscientious objector, still amazes the world, grew old and sickened.

Several months ago the Dyersburg post of the American Legion conceived the idea of turning to loyal and patriotic Americans to collect the money and pay off the obligation.

They moved slowly, but succeeded in getting information about their undertaking spread far enough to receive donations from more than half the States of the Union and three foreign countries.

They succeeded in having their fundraising resolution adopted by the district and then the State Department of the Legion while news of their gallant efforts spread across the country and caught the fancy of those who had not forgotten York and those who seemed never to have heard of him despite his outstanding heroic accomplishment.

Finally success was achieved in having the income tax obligation reduced to $25,000, and by that time the idea which originated in Dyersburg was taken over at Washington by national leaders in the Congress.

Dyersburg post tossed in the mite which it had collected to start the movement. It amounted to almost 10 percent of the total, but the biggest local contribution was awakening the Nation to a neglected obligation.

Five Thousand Additional Industrial Jobs Target of Greater Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the most gratifying and highly optimistic news story from the New York Times of Sunday, March 26, 1961, which reports on the highly successful industrial fund drive recently carried out in my congressional district of the Greater Wilkes-Barre area where the target of $1.5 million was exceeded by over $200,000. It indeed gives me a great deal of personal pleasure and satisfaction to insert this news story written for the Times by Mr. William G. Weart.

The indicated news story follows:

GIFTS BRINGS JOBS IN WILKES-BARRE—1.7 MILLION IS CONTRIBUTED IN LATEST SELF-HELP DRIVE OF DEPRESSED REGION

(By William G. Weart)

WILKES-BARRE, PA., March 25.—Once again the Wyoming Valley, center of a depressed anthracite area of northeastern Pennsylvania, is tugging at its own bootstraps.

With $1,703,000 raised in the midst of the recession and the prospect of Federal aid, the Greater Wilkes-Barre area has embarked on a new era of self-help. This time it is after 5,000 additional industrial jobs.

The area, frequently at the top of the Nation's list of economically distressed sections, knows the value of such hometown effort. In the last decade, with $2,088,000 contributed to previous campaigns, the Greater Wilkes-Barre industrial funds have obtained land and buildings valued at $9,375,000, created 8,000 jobs and picked up 6,000 others in service and retail trades.

But even this success, before last year, had not been sufficient to keep pace with the loss of employment arising from the closings of collieries and strip mines. The scars of these enterprises dot the countryside.

"We reached the break-even point in 1960," said Samuel M. Wolfe Jr., chairman of the industrial development committee of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce.

"Twelve years ago there were 30,000 miners in the Wyoming Valley," he recalled. "Now there are less than 900 and mining has become just a part of an economy that is growing more diversified each year."

The goal of the 1961 industrial fund campaign, which is to continue for 3 years, had been $1,500,000. Last week it was announced that pledges solicited from labor and industry had already surpassed that by $203,000.

Previous campaigns had been limited to big contributions, but the latest appeal was communitywide, with labor leaders taking a prominent role. Through payroll deduction workers contributed $331,000 "to get jobs for unemployed relatives, friends and neighbors."

To date the industrial funds have been directly responsible for the establishment or expansion of 30 industries. They attract new industries by building shells and providing financial aid in other ways.

Generally, the funds supply 20 percent of the initial cost and the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Corporation 30 percent, at 2.5 percent interest. Bankers provide the balance in 6 percent loans.

Similar self-help programs are operating throughout the 10-county anthracite region. However, according to Frank W. Earnest, Jr., executive vice president of the chamber, the Wilkes-Barre funds "are unique in that all contributions are outright gifts."

Most business and industrial leaders of the hard coal region are against "handouts" from the Federal Government.

"We're not in favor of giveaway programs," Mr. Earnest observed. "In the Federal program we'd like to be able to borrow another part of the money we need to go along with our own."

As a whole, the anthracite area wants Federal aid in a form that will help it solve its own problems. The Federal Government, it is felt, can help with highways, industrial development loans, urban funds, defense contracts, and decentralization of government.

The population of Luzerne County, of which Wilkes-Barre is the seat, has declined 100,000 to 348,000, because of the migration of surplus workers. Hundred of young job hunters, especially women, have gone to Washington for secretarial and clerical employment.

Decentralization of government, it is claimed, "would stop this migration, and would be of benefit to national defense in an emergency."

Unemployment in the Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton labor market, which takes in most of Luzerne County, totals 17,958, or 14.9 percent of the total labor force. About three out of every four job seekers, are men. Of the total, approximately 58 percent are, skilled or semiskilled.

VA Domiciliary Facility for Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement in support of my bill H.R. 694, to provide for the establishment of a VA domiciliary facility in the vicinity of Boston, Mass., in connection with my appearance before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee on April 10, 1961:

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS J. LANE, OF MASSACHUSETTS, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 694, TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DOMICILIARY FACILITY IN THE VICINITY OF BOSTON, MASS., BEFORE THE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, APRIL 10, 1961

Mr. Chairman, in proposing "the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility in the vicinity of Boston, Mass., and to operate and maintain a convalescent and rehabilitation hospital of not less than 1,000-bed capacity at such facility." I am concerned with the average age of our veterans, and particularly those of World War I.

In meeting their needs, we shall have the facilities in being, to provide for the veterans of World War II, and Korea, when they in turn reach the age where some of them will require the services of "an old soldiers' home" and convalescent care.

The increasing life span of our population, accompanied by the steady increase in the number of private nursing homes to meet the special needs of the aging, is a fact of modern life that we cannot ignore.

Ever since World War I, the Government of the United States has recognized its responsibility to provide medical and surgical care for veterans whose disabilities are a direct, or indirect result of their military service.

Apart from the small number who are the victims of an incurable mental breakdown, it was taken for granted that most veterans, after medical or surgical treatment, would return to their families, their jobs and to participation in the general life of the community.

But, the more than 2 million surviving veterans of World War I, whose average age is between 67 and 68, confront us with a new problem. A few of them, without families and dependent upon public assist-

ance, are living a lonely and threadbare existence in "skid row" lodging houses. A larger number have reached the stage of physical deterioration requiring the care that their families cannot provide for them. This is a problem that will become more urgent month by month.

Mr. Sumner G. Whittier, the previous Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, in a letter to me dated December 21, 1960, replying to my suggestion that more beds be made available for veterans in Massachusetts, made the following comment:

"I would rather not use the phrase 'long term' because it does not quite describe the two basic types of veterans: Those needing hospital or medical care; and those needing only nursing home care. This becomes quite a complicated problem with many ramifications. The States are attempting to come to grips with it; so is the VA. And although the VA would prefer to maintain as its primary aim, the hospital program, next year the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will consider a new program involving intermediate care for veterans which will be a step in the right direction. VA has worked out such a program and had I stayed as Administrator, I would have presented it to Congress. Whether I remain or not, the program will be carefully reviewed because it is a matter in which OLIN TEAGUE has a deep interest.

"Indeed the committee staff and VA staff people here have been working together on this."

There seems to be general agreement that we must work out a new program to provide for veterans who need "long term" or convalescent care, as distinguished from the conventional hospital and medical care.

As concerns the aging veteran, he frequently needs both domiciliary and convalescent care.

The Veterans' Administration has no domiciliary beds in the whole six-State New England area. It is not an adequate excuse to point out that State soldiers' homes are maintained in four of these six States. Such an argument is an attempt to shift the Federal Government's responsibility over to the States.

Massachusetts, for instance, has two veterans' hospitals of its own, at the State (soldiers') homes in Chelsea and Holyoke. They can only accommodate a limited number of applicants. The one at Chelsea always has a waiting list.

This is so because the Federal Government is not fulfilling its obligations to the aging veterans of World War I. They feel, with good cause, that they are second-class veterans in the eyes of their own Government, insofar as entitlement to benefits is concerned. There was no GI bill of rights for them. To compensate for this lack, they believe that the Government should provide care for those of their comrades who cannot look after themselves.

As of June 30, 1959, the Veterans' Administration had 17,395 operating beds for domiciliary care, but not one of them was available within the New England area with its large population of veterans.

With a clearly expanding need for this type of service, top priority should be given to the establishment of a VA domiciliary facility and to operate and maintain a convalescent and rehabilitation hospital of not less than 1,000-bed capacity at such facility, in the vicinity of Boston, Mass.

H.R. 694, the bill I have introduced for this purpose, will authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish such a facility.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS A WEEK—THE KING STORY

"Aleen King, I saw your children yesterday at the Okeechobee Camp. Why don't you put them in the nursery?"

"I don't have the money to pay for it."

"How much does it cost to put them in?"

"Eighty-five cents."

"Eighty-five cents?"

"That's right."

"Tell me, what time did you come out to the field this morning?"

"Six o'clock."

"What time will you get home?"

"About 3:30 to 4."

"From 6 this morning to 4 o'clock this afternoon?"

"That's right."

"How much did you earn?"

"A dollar."

"One dollar?"

"That's right, $1."

"Is that because the beans were of poor quality?"

"That's right."

"How much money does food cost you today?"

"About $2."

"Aleen, how old are you?"

"Twenty-nine."

"How many children do you have?"

"Fourteen."

"Hold old were you when you first started working in the fields?"

"Eight."

"You've been working 21 years in the fields?"

"That's right."

"Aleen, do you ever expect to be able to get out of this work?"

"No sir."—"Harvest of Shame."

As this story of abject, hopeless poverty unfolded before the cameras of CBS, Aleen King's husband, Will King, went about his customary duties as a laborer in a regular weekly job in the Glades.

His regular weekly salary is $83.40.

This would still be a small amount for 14 children, even after adding Aleen's wages, but the truth of the matter is that there are only seven living King children. Seven are dead, with twins having been stillborn.

Two different committees who have investigated some of the scenes in "Harvest of Shame" have singled out this interview as an excellent example of how much misinformation can be implied by leaving out highly pertinent facts.

Members of the Belle Glade Chamber of Commerce committee pointed out that bean pickers just don't get out into the fields at 6:00 in the morning.

"They just don't start picking until after the beans have dried in the sun," Urban Felsing, committee chairman, said.

"There has never been a time when bean pickers made only $1 a day in this area," another member said.

The committee statement of migrant earnings is supported by the American Farm Bureau Federation which says: "The minimum rate for picking beans in the area is 60 cents a hamper."

And most workers have little difficulty in picking two hampers an hour, according to the federation.

A committee of the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, headed by Ruth S. Wedgworth, reported detailed facts of King's employment and of the number of King children to Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, of Florida, and added this paragraph:

"Lest it be alleged that the deceased children were the victims of inadequate medical care due to the 'financial plight' of this family, the record shows that in 1958, the county welfare agency in West Palm Beach paid $943.30 to St. Mary's Hospital for the care of Katherine King (still living), and additionally, over $1,000 in hospital and medical bills have been written off by the local hospital and doctors at Belle Glade in connection with medical treatment afforded the King family over the last several years."

Day-care nurseries giving supervision, a meal and snacks are available to migrants at all large camps, and none charge as much as 85 cents per day.

Although accurate records are not available, it appeared obvious from the findings of the two committees that when the King family heads north each year, they will be leaving a 4- or 5-month period in which the family income has been considerably higher than $100 per week.

Kennedy's Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, will President Kennedy's tax proposals, now awaited by the Congress, offer safeguards against Government's abuse of our tax system, as well as individual abuse? Here is an interesting article by David Lawrence, which appeared this morning in the New York Herald Tribune:

TODAY IN NATIONAL AFFAIRS—KENNEDY'S TAX MESSAGE MAY CHANGE IMAGE OF HIM

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, April 11.—Within a few days the American people will get for the first time some basic information which will enable them to begin to make up their minds whether or not they like their new President.

For what has happened thus far hasn't realy been decisive. It doesn't matter much whether the Kennedy household hires a French chef or whether the Peace Corps is going to convert native Africans to civilization. What does matter is whether the Federal Government is going to collect more tax money out of the worker's take-home pay.

The President is planning to send his tax message to Congress next week. It has been delayed for unexplained reasons, though it is widely suspected that the drafts of the message proposed by the President's "task forces" and advisers—the "theoretical" boys—have run into some penetrating criticism from Members of Congress—the "practical" boys.

It's always wise to have a lot of idea men around. Perhaps, however, the comment of Prime Minister Macmillan in a speech in Britain not long ago apropos of the Socialist Labor Party is worth repeating as applicable to the current situation in this country. Mr. Macmillan said the Socialists have had some "original and sound ideas, but the trouble is that some of the ideas that are original are not sound and some of the sound ideas are not original."

A COMPLICATED AFFAIR

Tax rates and regulations are at present a complicated affair that cannot be defended as either equitable or productive of adequate tax revenues. There isn't, to be sure, any tax system that will yield enough revenue for the "spenders." But the important fact today about new taxes is not whether they are going to be made more equitable as between different classes of taxpayers, but whether forthcoming changes will disrupt the economic stability of the country for a long time to come. Far from being a cure for recession, tax changes can prolong a recession by producing a disequilibrium in the economy.

The average citizen will be affected in many ways and particularly in his purchasing power. It seems ironical that, with all the talk about increasing consumer power to buy, the Government should be considering a tax program that will curtail incomes for many people and many businesses.

Take, for instance, the Social Security taxes which affect almost everybody. Some will go up in a few months, and some will be further increased at the end of the next year. If Congress goes ahead with pension changes and medical care for the aged, the Social Security taxes on the whole program will go up by nearly 33 percent on a person who makes a little less than $90 a week. Thus, the man who earns $4,800 a year or more now pays $144 a year in Social Security taxes, but the amount the Federal Government will take from him will go up to $193.75. This means that the employer and the employee together will pay nearly $100 a year more than they do now. This may subtract billions of dollars in purchasing power.

MORE REDTAPE

Perhaps the most irritating change is coming in the plan to withhold taxes on interest and dividends at the source. Low-income persons, especially retired people who do not have much income, will find their regular monthly stipend decreased. Also, if the companies have withheld more than later will be found due in taxes on certain individuals, a lot of redtape and plenty of time will be necessary before the money improperly collected will be refunded. Likewise, this means more trouble and expense for the businesses concerned. It is not clear as yet whether this procedure will apply to interest on savings accounts, but it does mean a lot more work without recompense.

There's another item that will cause much controversy. It is the proposal to remove the limited tax credit on dividends. The argument against full taxation of dividends is that the citizen is taxed doubly if he puts his money in a corporation but not if it is invested in a partnership or a proprietorship. The argument being made here in favor of it is that double taxation is a myth.

Another plan of the administration calls for an increase in certain taxes which will add to the cost of tires, tubes and the like. This isn't going to help business, either.

"HAVENS" NEED CORRECTION

There are, to be sure, some "tax havens" that need correction, such as those enjoyed abroad by individuals who stay there for relatively brief intervals and get certain benefits anyway. Also, there is need to eliminate abuses in what is defined as "ordinary and necessary expenses" in business. But such a reform process tends to upset many established practices that have long been considered legitimate and equitable but which the Government, in its zest for more tax collections, feels it will have to modify.

All this adds up to painful change—an impact on the economy which may not be felt for some months but would appear to be inevitable.

Once the tax message of the President is sent to Congress, it will be interesting to see what happens to the popularity curve of the President in the Gallup poll.

FBI Figures Refute High Crime Rate Charge in Luzerne County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsstory from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Tuesday, March 21, 1961, the figures in which refute the charge made by a newspaper columnist in New York City that my congressional district has a high rate of crime. It indeed gives me great pleasure to set the record straight on this most vital subject. I wish to compliment Mr. Herman Otto, director, Wilkes College Community Research Center, Wilkes-Barre, for the thorough manner in which he compiled this report.

The indicated news story follows:

VALLEY IS NOT BANDIT RIDDEN—FBI FIGURES SHOW LOW CRIME RATE

Despite the below-the-belt swing taken at greater Wilkes-Barre recently by a New York columnist, the area ranks third lowest in total crime offenses compared with 182 metropolitan areas in the United States, according to a comprehensive report based on authentic figures made public today by Community Research Center of Wilkes College. All data in the report have been extracted from Uniform Crime Reports issued September 16, 1960, by Federal Bureau of Investigation, according to Herman Otto, director, Wilkes College Community Research Center.

Mr. Otto revealed the center's report was compiled to refute a statement made by Victor Riesel, columnist for the New York Mirror, who in his column of February 20, carrying a Wilkes-Barre dateline, wrote: "If you go east by northeast into this corner of Pennsylvania, you roll into some sectors tougher than the bandit-ridden hills of Sicily."

The community research report is based upon surveys by some 7,000 law enforcement agencies throughout the country who report regularly to Federal Bureau of Investigation. These reports, begun 30 years ago, have been constantly refined and improved. They are recognized as the most complete, uniform, and reliable crime statistics available on a nationwide basis.

The purpose of the center's analysis made from the FBI report is to compare the rate of incidence of crime in the Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton area with other standard metropolitan areas of the United States, of 14 Northeastern States and with Pennsylvania.

COMPARES FAVORABLY

Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton's relative position as to the rate of incidence of crime per 100,000 population speaks very favorable for itself.

Compared with 182 metropolitan areas, it is third lowest in total offenses. Compared with 51 standard metropolitan areas in Northeastern United States, it is third lowest in total offenses; compared with 12 standard metropolitan areas in Pennsylvania, it is lowest in total offenses.

Pennsylvania cities used for comparable analysis include Allentown, Bethlehem, Easton, Altoona, Erie, Harrisburg, Johnstown, Lancaster, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Reading, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Hazleton, and York.

Principal cities in the following States are included in the report: Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Ohio. Total figures of the entire United States were also used, but were not broken down into specific areas.

Compared with 182 metropolitan areas of the United States, the Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton area ties for lowest in murder and nonnegligent manslaughter; is 43d lowest in forcible rape; 2d lowest in robbery; 16th lowest in aggravated assault; 4th lowest in burglary; 9th lowest in larceny; and 6th lowest in auto theft.

Compared with 12 standard metropolitan areas in Pennsylvania, the immediate area is lowest in total offenses; lowest in murder and nonnegligent manslaughter; lowest in robbery, fourth lowest in aggravated assault; lowest in burglary; fifth lowest in larcency of $50 or over, and third lowest in auto theft.

LOWEST IN REGION

Compared to Scranton's 1960 population of 232,702, Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton's population of 345,952 shows 296.6 per 100,000 in total offenses as opposed to Scranton's 453.4; Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton's 344.4; Reading's 413.5, and Lancaster's 321.7.

It is interesting to note that Atlantic City with a 1960 population of 157,139 shows 1,521.6 total offenses per 100,000 population as compared with 1,304.7 total offenses for New York City with a 1960 population of 10,545,360; and 927.4 total offenses per 100,000 population for Philadelphia with a population of 4,289,194.

As Wilkes-Barre and the Wyoming Valley have endeavored to develop a new economy based upon multiple industries, the need for research and planning have become ever more essential. Each successive effort for community redevelopment has created a greater awareness of the need for facts and figures. In consequence, Wilkes College and other agencies have been called upon to make a number of isolated studies. These studies have served a limited purpose and then have become useless because no person or office has been responsible for the continued gathering and reporting of significant facts.

Because of this situation, Wilkes College organized and developed the Community Research Center, located in Parrish Hall and supported partially from funds of the Ford Foundation. The foundation also supports

in like manner the Institute of Municipal Government and the Labor-Management-Citizens Committee, all three functioning outside the specific Wilkes College area.

The purposes of the research center are to coordinate studies of community problems; to assure continuity of studies and to make special studies for public and private groups.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the sixth in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter.

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 8, 1961]

SOME MIGRANTS ARE CAPITALISTS

"Some have tried to leave the endless migrant stream."

"I'd like to get on a farm somewhere out away from so many people, where they could attend one church and be interested mostly in one school. In that way, I think they'd all be better satisfied."

"Mr. Parson, do you think this will ever happen?"

"Not at the rate I am going now, no."

"Aleen, do you ever expect to be able to get out of this kind of work?"

"No, sir."—"Harvest of Shame."

In Belle Glade, members of Everglades Progressive Citizens Inc., are looking forward to a good year.

W. C. Taylor, who founded the organization in 1954—largely in behalf of migrants—points with pride to its accomplishments during the 6 years as evidence the community is doing something about its problems.

The group began operation with 13 members, who put up $20 each and agreed to contribute at least $10 per month.

Now the number has grown to 244. The number includes 49 stockholders who were migrants at the time of the telecast.

And 26 still are in the migrant stream, Taylor said after a study of his records.

The corporation pays regular dividends to its stockholders. The story of its success is an amazing one.

Taylor's group recently bought a 15-acre plot on Avenue E for $50,000 and plans to create an FHA housing project of 24 homes. The corporation posted $5,000, and the FHA office has stamped its approval on the work, subject to the city's completion of drainage and sewage plans.

The project can grow, Taylor pointed out, because there is space for 65 homes, and the area is suitable for 12 new places of business.

The corporation has been recognized by lending institutions as qualified for construction work, and it regularly bids against older contracting firms. Right now it has two homes for school teachers under construction and plans to start two others soon.

W. L. Clark is in charge of construction.

He is one of many former migrant workers in the area who have emerged successfully from the stream.

Questioned at the scene of a job, Clark commented with assurance, "You can get out of the stream if you want to."

He was supervising construction of apartments over the Citizens' Service Station at Seventh Street and Avenue E.

The corporation invested $15,000 last year to buy the land and build the station, which also includes a garage.

The station is managed by the corporation president, Ulysses Kerr.

Like Clark, he is a former migrant. He got out of the stream in 1952.

Former migrants are easy to find in the corporation. The board of directors includes seven.

Taylor, a funeral home operator, said the corporation began its investments in 1957 by building the Cozy Queen Diner at Seventh Street and Avenue East at a cost of $9,000.

In 1958, he said, $32,000 went into an eight-unit CBS apartment building at 514 Seventh Street, mostly for permanent Belle Glade residents. These now rent for $14.75 per week.

How did the group come into existence?

As a businessman, Taylor said, he cosigned notes for some migrants, and a few of them defaulted.

"They were not being dishonest," he said. "It was just that they had no education in money matters. They were good people."

But as a result of that, he said, he called the original group together to see if something could be done for their mutual benefit.

"We finally agreed to put up $20 each and contribute $10 a month into a fund from which we could borrow," he continued.

"Many of them at first said they couldn't do it because they didn't make enough money. But we drew up lists of our income and wrote down just where all of the money was spent. From that, we determined just where money was being wasted and what could be done to make the plan possible."

The group was in conference for 5 hours, Taylor said, and he found many migrants had obligated themselves to pay 25 percent interest for the privilege of borrowing money.

Chuckling, Taylor recalled a telling sales pitch he gave the original group to convince them of the wisdom of the plan.

"My daughter drew a picture of some telephone wires filled with birds," he said. "Other birds were flying around looking for a place to land. I asked the group where they thought they were going to land if they didn't start saving."

The plan worked so well, Taylor said, that it was possible to incorporate for $20,000 after 2 years. New Citizens is incorporated for $75,000 and planning to enlarge that figure as soon as the housing project details have been ironed out.

The corporation has been paying 5 percent dividends.

Taylor's group, anxious for the welfare of the migrants, sponsors an educational program for them to show it is possible to get out of the stream if they so desire.

The corporation has found jobs for some migrants, Taylor said, but has found that many other migrants have accepted their life and show no desire to get out of it.

The funeral director is a native Floridian. He appears much younger than his 53 years. Active in scouting, he also is a deacon in the Baptist Church and teaches Sunday school.

With a desire to be a funeral director, he went to Palm Beach County and worked as a cane cutter to earn money for his education.

"It was while I was working in the fields that I learned I'd have to serve a 3-year apprenticeship with a funeral director before I could go to embalming school," he said.

Citizens contains 10 of the original 13 members.

"Only one dropped out," Taylor said. "Two others moved away."

Taylor himself hasn't taken any money for his work, he said, and his wife also worked years for the corporation. Now she is the secretary and draws $35 per month.

He now is business manager and director of the corporation.

Active assistance is provided by President Kerr, Treasurer Haywood Campbell, Secretary Willie M. White, Director Charles Butts, and F. Malcolm Cunningham, legal adviser.

St. Louis Globe-Democrat Calls for Return to Real Issue in Aid-to-Education Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in its issue of March 27, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat pointed out in an editorial, "Federal Aid—Back to the Issues," that the interest of the Congress and the people of this country has strayed from the truly basic questions involved in the controversy over Federal aid to education. As the editorial points out:

It would be tragic if the main issues were lost sight of in the smoke of battle over loans or grants to private schools.

I should like to enter this editorial into the RECORD at this point and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

FEDERAL AID—BACK TO THE ISSUES

Ever since Catholic spokesmen asked for Federal loans for private and parochial schools, the matter of Federal "aid" to education has been bogged down on a side issue. The crux of this matter is not whether private schools should get Federal "aid"—but whether any school districts need it, or should accept it.

To get the debate back on the tracks, the Globe-Democrat would like to point out that the main objections to so-called Federal aid are these:

First. Federal subsidies will lead to Federal control in education as in any other field.

Second. The States and local school districts have been meeting their educational needs with flying colors.

Third. Federal "aid" is a misnomer, since every dime kicked back to local taxpayers must be taken from them in the first place by Washington.

These are the important issues in the debate over Federal "aid." They are the reasons why the proposal will be defeated, we believe, just as it has been every other time it was proposed.

When Washington helps pay teachers' salaries, or helps build local schools, it will say who qualifies, and how. In fact, the bill already lays the groundwork for Federal regulation when it set forth the formula for distribution of funds.

When Washington dictates how the pie will be cut, it is already sticking its foot in the door of the public schools.

Let no citizen, or schoolteacher, be misled on this point. When the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare starts handing out funds, it won't be long until it lays down detailed rules on who gets the money, how it will be spent and why.

Ample facts and figures show that the American people, through their State governments and local school districts, are already meeting the challenge. In the last 10 years they have tripled the amounts spent on public grade schools and high schools.

This sum has gone up from about $5,800 million a year in 1949–50 to $15,500 million in 1959–60. This, of course, is almost seven times as much as the $2,300 million spent in 1930.

In the last 10 years, the number of public school classrooms has increased 60 percent.

Spending has increased far faster than the increase in school population. In the past 30 years, school enrollment climbed 42 percent, but spending on schools rose 571 percent.

Nor does this mean that a few States are meeting their school obligations but others can't.

Just a few years ago, the White House Conference on Education candidly conceded that no State was too poor to provide schools for its children. It conceded, however, that taxpayers in some States were not willing to make the effort.

Finally, it is important to point out that no one gets something for nothing from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Its Federal "aid" is simply Federal taxes, collected locally and returned minus Health, Education, and Welfare's handling charge.

It would be tragic if the main issues were lost sight of in the smoke of battle over loans or grants to private schools.

Federal "aid" to our local school districts is a snare and delusion. No one will really benefit, least of all the taxpayers.

Winchell Should Apologize and Retract Insult to Italian-Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in his column of April 3 Walter Winchell struck below the belt. He insulted millions of Americans of Italian descent by insinuating that President Kennedy has not appointed any Italians to high public office because Italians are controlled by or linked with "the Big M," presumably meaning the maffia.

I have this day sent a letter to Mr. Winchell demanding an apology and a retraction for his insult against a whole people. If he has any decency left in him and an appreciation of the feelings of other people, whom he has caused untold harm, he should publicly recant for his misdeeds in this instance.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD the text of my letter to Mr. Winchell so that my colleagues in both Houses of Congress may read it. In order that I may not be accused of quoting out of context, I want to quote here exactly what Mr. Winchell wrote in his column:

Insiders say the reason Kennedy hasn't made an Italian appointment is not his fault. More than 100 names, prominent Demos, were submitted. But always lurking in the background "is the Big M control or link." Characters right out of "The Untouchables."

I invite my colleagues to comment either on Mr Winchell's statement cited above or on my letter to him. They may do so on the floor of their respective Chamber, through the pages of the RECORD, or via direct mail to me. Incidentally, I am sending copies of my letter to President Kennedy and Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

The full text of my letter to Mr. Winchell is as follows:

Mr. WALTER WINCHELL,
Daily Mirror,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WINCHELL: I was shocked to read your column of April 3 in the New York Daily Mirror, in which you bluntly state that it has been impossible for President Kennedy to make "an Italian appointment" because "always lurking in the background is the Big M control or link. Characters right out of 'The Untouchables'."

I don't believe that you personally wrote this article, since I have always thought of you as being tolerant of all minorities. The article, however, is published as yours and you must take the responsibility. You refer to Italians in a slurring manner as though the name "Italian" is supposed to be something evil. By the use of the "Big M," you brand all Italians as members of the Mafia. And by saying that the hundred names submitted to President Kennedy were all "characters right out of 'The Untouchables'," you not only implied, but openly went on record as saying that there wasn't an Italo-American qualified to hold public office in this country.

I have never been one to appeal to racial and national prejudices. I have always spoken as an American and I have not hesitated to criticize members of my own national origin whenever they have appealed to Italian audiences on strictly national lines.

Although I was not born in the United States, I have always been proud of the opportunities which this country has afforded to me and to millions of others of Italian ancestry. I have been in the forefront of various movements to aid minority groups to better their lot in this country. Need I tell you that without minority groups there would be no America today? Need I also remind you of the tremendous contributions made by Italo-Americans in all walks of life? Our history books are replete with such contributions, from Columbus down to our own times, which are too numerous to mention here.

To be as blunt as you have been, I want to say that by your article you have insulted every American of Italian descent including prominent legislators, the Governors of four great States, many mayors, judges, and others, all of whom are upholding the dignity of America.

Furthermore, you have insulted the intelligence of our great Chief Executive, President Kennedy, who has many friends in Italian circles—and I pride myself in being one of these—and who has already appointed a number of them to high public office.

You have conceived the idea, which I know is only a minority view, that the power of the press is the power to destroy. Many of our great writers, editors, and publishers take pride in the contributions of all Americans. They do not feel as restricted as you do in writing, unless they can resort to slander or unless they can associate Italians with the Apalachin raid, the Mafia, and "The Untouchables."

On behalf of all the decent upright Italo-Americans, I demand not only an apology from you but a full retraction in your column. If you wish to treat this matter lightly, let me advise you that I will sponsor a congressional investigation of such un-American activities as these. It may interest you to know that I have already introduced a bill, H.R. 4502, to make it unlawful for radio and television stations to portray in their broadcasts any religious, racial, or nationality group in a degrading or criminal manner. This bill can easily be amended to cover the situation at hand to expose all of the destructive influences in our country.

At a time when this country should be more united than ever to combat the foreign evil of communism, it ill behooves a writer such as yourself, by means of a poisonous pen, to cause disunity, cofusion, and chaos.

I sincerely hope that I shall not have to resort to any of the things which I have mentioned in this letter in this moment of anger, for which you alone are the cause. It would be in the best interests of all concerned for you to print an appropriate retraction. I want to assure you that what I have said above expresses the views of every Italo-American in public office.

Copies of this letter are being sent to the President, and to the Attorney General of the United States.

Sincerely,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

Proposed New Rule for Congressional Investigating Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have been concerned for some time with the complex and time-consuming processes now required to test the lawfulness of challenged congressional inquiries. In my opinion, the present procedures are unfair both to the committees of Congress and to the witnesses involved. I have proposed legislation on this subject under active review at this time, and I intend to introduce my specific proposal in the very near future.

Recently, Mr. Ralph de Toledano, the well-known King Features Syndicate columnist, discussed my proposed bill in his "In Washington" column. His analysis of the subject is very incisive. It is apparent that Mr. Toledano has given this problem careful study.

Mr. President, because Mr. Toledano's article may be of interest to many Members of Congress who are concerned with this problem, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

IN WASHINGTON

(By Ralph de Toledano)

A NEW RULE FOR INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES?

"Cumbersome" is Senator KENNETH B. KEATING's word for the way in which House

and Senate committees must handle contempt-of-Congress cases. For some time, Mr. KEATING has been troubled by what he considers these outdated procedures. To protect witnesses and to expedite the work of congressional probers, he believes that legislation should be enacted to modernize the current practice. Two examples demonstrate what bothers Senator KEATING:

1. Recently, Chairman EMANUEL CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee mounted an investigation of the New York Port Authority. When he attempted to subpoena its records, however, he ran into the objections of Austin Tobin, head of the authority. Mr. Tobin and his attorneys argued that the port authority was a State agency, independent of Federal control or coercion. In this, the port authority was backed by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller. Cited for contempt of Congress, Mr. Tobin was arrested, mugged and fingerprinted, and subjected to litigation that will undoubtedly wend its weary way to the Supreme Court.

2. Dr. Linus Pauling, a Nobel Prize physicist who has participated actively in several scores of Communist-front groups, was subpenaed by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. He was ordered to produce the signatures of 11,000 scientists who signed a petition calling for an immediate ban on nuclear testing—and to supply the names of those who helped him collect those signatures. Dr. Pauling reluctantly submitted the signatures—earlier he had made them a matter of public record—but he flatly refused to give the subcommittee any information about those who had worked with him. He thereby paralyzed one phase of an important investigation into the widespread "Communist peace offensive." His reason: this information was "not pertinent."

In Dr. Pauling's case, the subcommittee was intimidated by the outcry he made, allowing its authority to be challenged with impunity. Had the subcommittee chosen to cite Dr. Pauling, he would now be spending his days with lawyers and in courts. In both the Pauling and the Tobin cases, however, congressional procedures were clumsy and unfair to the Congress and the witnesses.

"As the law now stands," Senator KEATING protests, "if a witness refuses to appear or to testify, the subcommittee must first report the matter to the full committee, the committee must then report to the Senate or House, which must then resolve to cite the witness for contempt, after which the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House must refer it to a U.S. attorney, who must in turn present the case to a Federal grand jury. If an indictment is returned, a full-scale trial must follow." By the time the courts have ruled, "the original investigation has long been closed without having obtained the desired testimony or evidence."

Senator KEATING recognizes that there are times when a witness is fully within his rights in refusing to answer particular questions or surrender his records. The Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled that pertinency is necessary before a witness can be compelled to answer questions or be penalized for failing to do so. KEATING is also aware that on occasion congressional committees go far afield of their mandate. Therefore, if a witness is right in questioning pertinency, he should not be put through the time-consuming and expensive process of defending himself. If he is wrong, there should be some way of making this known to him promptly. His refusal, then, becomes deliberate contempt.

The solution suggested by Senator KEATING meets both these tests. If a witness refuses to testify, KEATING proposes, he should be required to appear in Federal court that same day. A judge, who unlike a committee is not a party to the dispute, would then determine whether the witness' refusal was justified or not. If the judge decided that the committee's demands were pertinent, the witness could acquiesce or face immediate contempt-of-court action.

"The net effect of this procedure," says Senator KEATING, "would be both to restrain unauthorized inquiries and to facilitate compliance with proper demands for information." It would also satisfy the requirements of due process and speed up the work of investigating committees. Simultaneously, it would strengthen the Bill of Rights without crippling the congressional investigative process.

Oddly enough, there is one major block to enactment of the legislation Senator KEATING proposes. Is it constitutional? Does Congress have the right to surrender some of its powers to the Federal courts? Able lawyers in Washington are divided on this point, though they all agree that Senator KEATING has a first-class legal mind.

Nevertheless, the legal consensus in Washington is that the Keating proposal be put to the test. (The Supreme Court will be the final arbiter.) Particularly in the internal security field, congressional committees have been systematically hampered by efforts to halt their investigations. Students of government concur with Woodrow Wilson's contention that orderly congressional investigation is not only a vital part of the American system but also serves an educational function by giving the public a chance to know what is happening in the darker corners of the national life. Anything that streamlines this process is all to the good.

Comment on National Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks I have been receiving a tremendous response to the questionnaire I distributed throughout my district. In a number of instances, individuals have found they could not adequately express their views on the questionnaire and have chosen to write letters instead. Such was the case when Dr. R. C. Erdmann of Rapid City replied to my questionnaire. I felt his letter was so well written and reflected a deep understanding of the problems facing our Nation that it should be shared with other Members of Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, therefore, I wish to include Dr. Erdmann's letter as follows:

RAPID CITY, S. DAK.,
April 8, 1961.

Hon. E. Y. BERRY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BERRY: This is a singular privilege for me, and I want to express my gratitude for your questionnaire. Because of the complexity of the many problems facing our Nation today and the confusion that exists in my mind because of those problems, this reply to your questionnaire is belated. In opinion, I concur with you, in the realization that a yes or a no is not always adequate and it is for that reason my reply is in the form of this letter instead of your answer sheet.

Today, as never before we are faced with a heterogeneity of circumstances, not of our individual creation, but those that require the deference of our integrity. I would be remiss if I did not express my respect and appreciation for what you are trying to do. Both the patience portrayed and the fair-mindedness exhibited would command the respect of any honest-minded citizen.

My attitude is based principally on the dislike for the "hidden power" that seems to control our great country through our Government with questionable "pressures." Unhappily, my contentions inflict the accusations that we have been and are being controlled by a block of "internationalists" and "do-gooders" that originally sought growth and function in an environ incongruous in standards, cloistered in attitude and ambivalent in purpose. However, since War II, this group has undergone a noticeable change in intent, attitude and disposition of function; namely, a deliberate, unmitigated design to use a bureaucratic, big tax Government as the instrument for elimination of our Constitution and all for which it stands. The inroads in this situation are so deep and the diameter of coverage so expansive, that any attempt to outline in one letter, the ramification of the issues involved, or to attempt to prognosticate the eventual outcome would be ludicrous. Therefore, I seek simply to function as competently and honestly as I can with things as they are and may evolve with a sincere hope that I will be granted the privilege for continuation of occasional sincere criticism and reflection. It is in this spirit that I try to focus other persons attention on how I look at the issues.

All of the things I have in mind result in the American people being forced into either direct or indirect Government dependency with yours truly being no exception. This circumstance is and should be our concern but it does not and should not constitute a moral persuasion for the acceptance of the circumstances as they exist today. With this in mind I make the following comments and evaluations.

I am among those that would like to continue to evolve as a strong Nation, representing a society including a mosaic of occupations, degrees of education, ambitions, and wealth. On the other hand, we have those that want to establish a common denominator in technique of government and distribution of wealth, that they consider to be fair and equitable to all—for example, a welfare state and a welfare world. In all fairness, I carefully think this over and I must always ask the questions:

How can I with my sincere attitude, say yes to higher wages, higher taxes, increase in postal rates, more social welfare of great variety, and a high tariff as a necessity caused only by pricing ourselves out of the world markets? I cannot help but feel a moment of vindictiveness when I find our people expect to be asked about massive Government ownership and the continuation of pouring our money down foreign "rat holes". Because of the road block of poorly managed economics we must experience a serious threat from foreign competition and consequently suffer from unemployment and its complexity of associated problems.

Certainly, we should keep our Un-American Activities Committee and we should augment that committee and insist they do their very best to destroy the power that threatens our freedoms and even our country from within.

Believe me, it seems ambiguous and ridiculous to try to cure the malignancy of creeping socialism with the medicines of increased spending, big government, government in business, government control in business, government interference in business, forced higher wages, higher taxation, foreign aid, etc. Why not try the medication provided for in our Constitution, then destroy the

slums and disease of bureaucratic government and build anew.

It should be stated that you, of the U.S. Congress, are charged with a very difficult task; namely, to seek the right answers for the many important questions that you are confronted with daily. May God grant you the strength that will command extended wisdom, foresight, and tolerance. Progress in Government is also difficult to attain. It demands tremendous sacrifice of personal time and effort. The statesman, the individual who qualifies for statesmanship, is often the forgotten man in our society and the ideals and integrity that a statesman must have do not always pay off very handsomely, yet, you are compelled to persist and make improvements when they can be done. For men like you I am grateful. I only wish most of your colleagues looked at our important issues and problems the way you do.

Mr. BERRY, my comments have been too extended. I hope they have not been distasteful. Whatever has been intimated or suggested has been done, I assure you, with a feeling of deference. Our problems are not easy and I realize their solution cannot be immediate and complete. I sincerely request that you grant me the continuation of the privilege of your counsel. I know that you will constantly try to find new and good ways for Government improvement.

With kindest regards to you and yours, I am,

Sincerely,

R. C. ERDMANN, D.C.

Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the social security system has become so much a part of our lives that today most of us take it for granted. We take it for granted that we will pay social security taxes and that when we retire we will have an income to support us in our declining years. It is easy today for young people especially to fail to realize what a tremendous problem would face them if they had to undertake their own individual planning for their old age; how extremely difficult it would be for them to provide an adequate retirement income without the systematic operation of social security.

In a recent issue of Vogue, Sylvia Porter, in some excerpts from her forthcoming book, tells her readers, "You're Richer Than You Think." Her discussion of social security points up very dramatically the great benefits which our system of social insurance brings not only to the individual but to the economy as a whole.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

YOU'RE RICHER THAN YOU THINK

(By Sylvia Porter)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—A handsome woman with a flash of brown eyes that see clearly through figures and production indexes, Sylvia Porter writes a column with the fascinating name, "Your Dollar," and the biggest distribution 333 newspapers, in the business column business. When she was just out of her teens and out of several Wall Street brokerage firms, she started writing that column for the New York Post as S. F. Porter, because it seemed wiser to attribute her extraordinary perception in finanicial matters to a man. The wife of G. Sumner Collins, and the mother of an 11-year-old daughter, she runs two houses, one in New York, one in the country, produces, in addition to her column, a weekly newsletter on Government bonds, "Reporting on Governments," and an annual Income Tax Guide. Twenty years ago, in Vogue, she started her first magazine article, one of five financial primers Vogue published between 1941 and 1943, with these words: "You know, a fallacy that we've permitted to go unchallenged because of innocence or indifference is that men control the wealth and finances of America." Now, in this article from her book to be published in May by the World Publishing Co., she explores and dismantles some other fallacies.)

Most of us are worth a lot more than we may think. You would need a fortune of over $100,000—invested at 3-percent interest tax free—to produce interest to duplicate the $254 a month maximum benefit a family will be able to get under today's social security law.

You would have to have an estate of more than $76,000, also bringing you 3 percent a year tax free, to produce interest to duplicate the $190.50 maximum pension that a retired worker and his wife, both 65 or older, will be able to get under the social security law now in effect.

You would need a hefty nest egg of over $50,000, again invested at 3 percent tax free, to produce interest to match the $127 a month maximum you, as an individual worker covered by social security, will be able to get when you retire.

As these calculations surely dramatize, that social security card of yours really is becoming the equivalent of a fortune in retirement benefits. Few of us could even hope to accumulate the estates essential to give us the monthly incomes that payment of our social security taxes guarantees we will receive when we retire in the years ahead.

What's more, millions are also accumulating impressive retirement incomes under private pension plans; it is estimated that 34 percent of all workers in industry are covered by private pension programs now. Millions of others have insurance programs that will pad their retirement incomes, too; 8 in 10 families have life insurance coverage today and many have annuity and similar policies. And a growing percentage of us have reserves in cash, U.S. bonds, stocks, and other investments which will, in addition to our social security benefits, help us live on a decent scale in our senior years.

We are, in fact as well as in theory, creating an economy in which the person working today and contributing to public pension and private retirement programs can look forward to retirement with confidence that he will not need to depend on family charity for support. We are doing it by taxing ourselves on an increasing scale. Let's not kid ourselves—the social security tax is becoming a real pocketbook "bite." Consider the record just of the past 10 years.

In 1949, the social security tax was a minor 1 percent on a maximum of $3,000 of your pay, meaning it amounted to $30 a year at most. In 1950, the tax went up to 1.5 percent on a maximum of $3,000, meaning it amounted to $45 a year at most. In 1954, the tax went to 2 percent on a maximum of $3,600 of annual earnings, a top of $72 a year. In 1958, it was 2.25 percent on a maximum of $4,200, a top of $94.50 a year. In 1959, it was 2.5 percent on a maximum of $4,800, a top of $120. In 1960, it rose to 3 percent on a $4,800 maximum, a top of $144.

What are we getting for this? The answer is, "Plenty." For as the taxes on our pay have climbed so have the expected benefits they provide. In 1949, the peak benefits an individual worker could get were only $45.20 a month, and the peak social security benefits a family could receive were only $85 a month. Under the latest law, the peak an individual can get is $123 a month while the peak a family can get is $254 a month.

What do these tax and benefit changes mean to us?

They certainly mean that the millions of us who have been working for years and paying social security taxes, and who will continue working and paying the taxes for many more years, are now contributing major amounts of our pay to the support of our older citizens. Our taxes are providing the benefits to those already retired, maintaining the basic social security pension at a decent level. And, incidentally, a record 14,800,000 are now drawing social security benefits.

They also mean that these taxes are helping to protect our own jobs, for one of the great props under our economy today is the spending of social security checks by our senior citizens. The spending of these benefits has become a crucial jobmaking and antirecession weapon.

And, most important, they mean that we are building a system which some day will give us in turn an adequate, basic retirement pension.

Glance again at the jump in the benefits in one decade. Let yourself enjoy the feeling of confidence inspired by the knowledge that there will be a pension for you, too. Then you'll truly understand how rich our older folks are now and how rich you will be.

A YOUNG WIDOW'S FORTUNE

Social security is not just of value to older people. A young father of three infants was killed in a freak accident in our community the other day, leaving not only a heartbroken widow but also an empty bank account. While we were discussing with the neighbors how to east at least her financial tragedy, I volunteered, "One 'good' angle is the fortune she'll get from social security from now on. It'll run into tens of thousands of dollars in cash."

The astonishment at the size of the "inheritance" I mentioned pounded home again the fact that most Americans—and this probably includes you—don't realize that social security can be worth more to young people than to the older citizens of our land.

The cash stake of this young widow and her infants could be almost $70,000. And this inheritance is free of income and estate taxes. Social security is so very much more than retirement benefits, pensions for aged widows, aged parents, and retired people. It is, as the following details dramatize, also tremendous protection for young children and young widows. In our neighbor's case, the father had been fully insured at the top social security salary level of $4,800 a year. His infants are 1, 2, and 3 years old. Now:

On application, his widow will get a lump-sum death benefit. This amounts to $255.

His infants and their mother will get a pension of $254 a month until the oldest child is 18. Assuming she doesn't remarry during the 15-year period, this adds up to $45,738.

For the next 12 months, his widow and her two children still under 18 will still get a monthly pension of $254. This amounts to $3,048 over the year.

For the next 12 months, she and her one child still under 18 will get a monthly pension of $180. This amounts to $2,160 over the year.

Her widow's pension ceases when all three children are 18, but she gets widow's bene-

fits when she reaches her 62d birthday. At that date and for the rest of her life, assuming she hasn't remarried, she draws $90 a month, equal to three-quarters of her husband's monthly retirement pension. If she then lives for her normal life expectancy of about 17 years, she will receive an additional $18,360.

Add it up. It comes to $69,561. And all this income is, by law, free of all tax.

Of course, the totals will vary from family to family, depending on the number of children, their ages, the amount of credits in the social security account. But the key angle is not the precise total of benefits; rather it is the impressive value of social security to the young family as well as the old. How many young people can accumulate nest eggs and invest them at returns sufficient to guarantee over $250 a month for years?

The ironic tragedy is that it often is those most in need who forfeit their benefits because they don't know the elementary details of the social security program. If this tale of the young widow's fortune jolts you into learning more, her heartbreaking loss may be your gain.

The knowledge of your earning credits should give you a lift, and the knowledge will be vital to your intelligent planning for your financially independent older years. Of course, a social security pension is hardly adequate for comfortable retirement, but it is a darn good base on which to build a personal investment program. And the knowledge will give you new understanding of how your social security tax contributions are protecting not only your future but also your Nation's future. For you, as a citizen with a pension check to spend every month, will be a distinct prop under the economy's prosperity. So check your credit now. Whatever is in it is a plus for you, and I'll wager you'll find more in your account than you think.

Inheritance of a Kansan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the following poem "Inheritance of a Kansan," by Mrs. Hazel M. Hardtarfer, of Sedgwick, Kans.

Mrs. Hardtarfer's poem in free verse won two State prizes in the 1961 literature contest of the Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs. In this centennial year of Kansas statehood, this poem expresses so eloquently for all Kansans their awareness of the rich heritage we celebrate this year that I feel it deserves a wide audience.

The poem follows:

INHERITANCE OF A KANSAN

(By Mrs. Hazel M. Hardtarfer)

Why should I seek Cibolas in my land?
Riches lie at my feet;
Riches in traveled trails and pathless skies;
Mine is the heritage of pioneers
Who crossed the hills and plain
To build their homes of prairie sod—
Wealth of the prairie's openness,
And ocean-waves of wheat;
Ice-diamonds on nude trees at misty dawn—
Then heat, and sunset like a painter's dream!
Sunflower and tumbleweed; song of meadowlark;
Wide shallow streams, and on their banks
The Judas tree, red sumac, yellow cottonwood.
My legacy embraces the whole of Kansas' lore:
Tales of Apache raids, and John Brown's fiery work;
The bitter strife that came before the calm—
The growth of cities sprawling on the countryside;
Jet-birds that split the air with sound;
Chisholm and old Santa Fe—ribbons of concrete and of iron.
This opulence is mine.
But millions share my heritage:
The proffered gold
Of Kansas' destiny.

What's Wrong With Urban Renewal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the March 1961 issue of the Mortgage Banker contains an article on the Federal urban renewal program which should receive the careful attention of all those concerned with the continuing viability of our cities. This article, written by James Wm. Gaynor, housing commissioner of the State of New York, points out the inherent problems in the present restricted urban renewal program, which is able to deal only with scattered symptoms once they have become serious community problems, rather than being able to deal with the broad causes of urban blight and contributing to its future prevention.

Mr. Gaynor recommends that urban renewal programs be broadened, not only in their physical area, but also in their scope of planning, that rehabilitation and modernization be stressed equally with new construction, that there be adequate recognition of the importance of retaining the middle-income family in the urban area, and that more participation be encouraged by the private homebuilding industry.

I hope this article will receive the careful attention of all Members of the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

WHAT'S WRONG WITH URBAN RENEWAL

(By James Wm. Gaynor)

Urban renewal—the current "catchall phrase for expressing our efforts toward renewing and rebuilding our urban areas—was once considered the exclusive province of the esoteric planner—in the main, trained as architects, and emphasizing in our earlier urban renewal programs the single element of physical planning.

During the last few years there has been a growing awareness among the business community that urban renewal is more than just physical redevelopment; it is also good business. Economic and civic improvements, in addition to physical redevelopment, are basic considerations today; and a comprehensive urban renewal plan requires the teamwork of not only architects, but economists, engineers, public administrators, and builders.

Despite the broadened scope of our urban renewal planning, we can still be considered fumbling pioneers if we compare the scale of our efforts with the scope of the problems these efforts are intended to resolve. Consider New York City, the largest urban center, and where the State has invested most of its housing and community renewal resources. It has:

The largest public housing slum clearance program in the country.

The largest, and (despite criticism of several projects) by far the most successful title I urban renewal slum clearance program.

A pioneering State- and city-financed program to aid private builders with low-interest mortgage loans for middle-income housing.

A consolidated housing and title I urban renewal program under one agency.

A revitalized city planning commission which has embarked on total planning by area or neighborhood under the community renewal provisions of the National Housing Act.

A $52 million garage construction program in the business center of Manhattan.

These efforts represent a massive attack on the urban renewal problems of the country's largest urban center, expenditures of private and public funds in the billions, renewal of thousands of acres of city slums, generally improved business conditions, and increased tax revenues to the city.

Yet, the maximum potential of this massive program probably will not be realized because the program lacks an essential element: an effective transportation plan. 3,300,000 persons enter Manhattan daily, almost 2,500,000 of these by public transportation that is far from adequate. Sleet, snow, heat, and rain stay all but the postal workers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds, and newspapers carry regular boxes under the head "Why you were late today."

The 800,000-plus persons that arrive in Manhattan daily by private cars, taxis, and trucks represent only one-quarter of the daily travelers to the heart of the city, but they cause almost all the street congestion. The solution proposed at present is more parking in the center of the city. Experience elsewhere has shown that additional parking brings additional congestion and commercial stagnation.

The trip from Newark airport to the center of Manhattan, a distance of 13.5 miles, can be made by public transportation at the rush hour in 1 hour and 30 minutes, or about one-sixth of a mile a minute. A hundred years ago a horse and buggy could travel the same distance in 1 hour and 17 minutes, or just a little faster. So much for progress.

Victor Gruen, the country's outstanding planner of large urban and suburban shopping centers, has analyzed New York City's parking program and is convinced that the direct gain in retail sales in the center of Manhattan would be only a fraction of the $100 million a year that the garage planners anticipate. The intent to provide a place to park is laudable, but the economic objective is unrealistic. The answer is not more parking to attract more cars into the center of the city. The answer lies in more parking at the periphery and, most importantly, improved public transportation into the center core.

This particular situation represents only one aspect of urban renewal; but it should demonstrate in a concrete way the need for a comprehensive approach. It may show how

the lack of an adequate long-range view and proper coordination in planning public improvements not only will not restore an urban core, but, conversely, can ultimately destroy the economy of the entire urban area.

Another new concept in urban renewal requires not only comprehensive planning for redevelopment, but comprehensive planning for conservation as well. Rehabilitation of existing housing is an aspect of conservation that must be undertaken on a vast scale as part of our urban renewal efforts. An effective financing device exists under section 220 of the National Housing Act, provided a more imaginative and effective administration of the section can be brought about. David Walker, the outgoing Urban Renewal Commissioner, recommended income tax benefits, for homeowners as a means of creating customers for a new industry to develop competent, all-around conservation and rehabilitation contractors.

The third new concept in urban renewal is the general recognition that a basic need in our urban areas is an expanded housing inventory—an inventory that will emphasize housing for middle-income families. Too late have we witnessed the results of piecemeal planning that has produced a concentration of low-rent subsidized public housing and a spate of so-called luxury housing for high-income families. The effect now so readily apparent brought about the exit to the suburbs of middle-income families, the prime element of our urban society.

My recommendations are:

Urban renewal programs must be broadened, not only in the physical area covered, but in the scope of planning. Specifically, the Federal title I program should require a comprehensive area plan, in greater detail than at present, as a condition of assistance for even a small urban renewal project that lies within the greater area. This would assure that overall area needs had been considered, and that a given project is a part of a long-range program and not, as at present, a neighborhood renewal plan not necessarily related to the larger area's needs.

In broadening our urban renewal plans, rehabilitation and modernization of existing housing must be emphasized as well as the construction of new housing. We must prevent the economic waste that results when residential areas decay, real estate tax returns decrease, and capital improvements such as schools and utilities are underutilized while others must be built for new housing elsewhere.

We must recognize the prime importance of retaining our middle-income families in our urban areas. To continue to exclude them from our reuse programs will be fatal to our urban economy.

Finally, we must develop more participation of the entire homebuilding industry in urban renewal.

Fallacy in Revival of Buy American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following column by Joseph Ator from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Monday, March 27, 1961:

FALLACY IN REVIVAL OF BUY AMERICAN—CAN'T SELL EXPORTS UNLESS NATIONS ABROAD HAVE DOLLARS TO PAY

(By Joseph Ator)

The worst thing that has happened to efforts to increase American export trade is the recession-born revival of the Buy American fallacy. There are several reasons why it is poison.

First and foremost, we can't expect to sell things to foreigners if they don't have the dollars to pay us. The dollar shortage of the late 1940's has vanished, thanks to our antiquated Good Time Charlie foreign-aid policy. We can't pay our current foreign obligations without dipping into our slipping gold reserve.

It doesn't take a genius at political science to figure out that we are better off to give foreign purchasers the dollars to buy our exports by buying from them, instead of giving to them. And it should take no more than elementary arithmetic to figure out that we wouldn't have realized $19,600 million on our exports last year if we hadn't provided most of the dollars that were paid for them through $14,700 million in American imports.

START OF TROUBLE

That is just the beginning of the Buy American trouble, however. One of the principal obstacles to American exports is restrictions that other nations have placed on them, through tariffs and quotas. Our State Department can't argue very convincingly for the removal of these barriers if we start erecting some of our own for the benefit of American industries which complain that they can't meet foreign competition.

Such tactics are not only self-defeating in specific cases, they buck a world trend toward freer world trade. Trade between countries today is at a higher level than it ever has been in history, even accounting for the inflated prices in which its total is reckoned.

The old rationale of free trade is still sound. If every nation does what it can do best and most cheaply, the whole world benefits by free exchange of goods. There are thousands of exceptions to this rule in the form of tariffs and quotas, but bit by bit they are being relaxed. Any trend against this relaxation hurts us more than anyone else, because we are the biggest exporter.

The normal objective of placing a tariff umbrella over a weakling industry is to assure it of a monopoly in the country in which it is. If it can't compete at home, it pretty obviously can compete in the export field.

Such special favors do more than invite foreign reprisals. They make it harder for existing exporters to compete on a cost basis. Their employees' cost of living is increased by the added cost of protected articles. As wages go up, ability to compete in exporting goes down. Frequently tariff protection will destroy more jobs in export industries than it saves in the protected domestic industry.

Recognition that we have to buy if we are going to sell in foreign trade is the keystone of the campaign which the Chicago Association of Commerce is conducting to increase Chicagoland's trade. Its annual international trade fair, the largest in the Western Hemisphere, will be in McCormick Place July 25 through August 10.

PROMOTION AND DISPLAY

Foreign governments, manufacturers, and merchants will promote tourism and display their products at the fair, as they have at two preceding fairs, the first of which was in 1959 to celebrate the St. Lawrence Seaway opening. Alongside them will be the exhibits of American manufacturers of products which they offer abroad.

There have to be two parties to every sale. Getting those two persons together is the primary purpose of the fair. Present will be 500 to 1,000 foreign buyers and salesmen, and a far larger number of buyers of imports and salesmen of exports from the United States. All of these will exchange ideas at two conferences to be held in conjunction with the trade fair, the Chicago World Marketing Conference and the 1961 Inter-American Industries Conference, both of which will run from July 24 through 28.

Tribute to Ronald W. May

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of Ronald W. May, Washington correspondent for the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, shocked and saddened all who knew him either personally or as readers of his independent, searching coverage of Washington.

Ron May knew that our society's freedom and survival are dependent on integrity in every individual at every level of government and he knew that the essential responsibility of the press is to demand this integrity. The press, Ron May believed and proved, must make this demand by searching out failures no matter who the individual or organization involved.

Another respected Washington correspondent and author, Tris Coffin, wrote the following tribute to Ron May which I would like to share with my colleagues. The tribute appeared in the Capital Times of Monday, April 10, 1961:

RON MAY, A REPORTER WHO STIRRED SILT AT BOTTOM OF GLASS OF LIFE

(By Tristam Coffin)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Tristram Coffin is a Washington correspondent who knew Ron May, the Capital Times Washington correspondent who died of a heart attack last week. Coffin is the author of a new book about Washington which is causing widespread comment.)

A big, crumpled brown manila envelope with notes scribbled and clippings foaming out of the top was his hallmark. When this envelope was tipsily leaning against a typewriter in the Press Gallery, we knew Ron May was wandering around.

A tall, rugged fellow in a rumpled blue suit, a wild shock of hair and some of the keenest eyes in Washington, Ron could usually be found—a cigarette clamped in his lips—a stub of pencil in his hand, furiously writing notes on napkins.

He was the correspondent of the stubbornly independent and clear-thinking Capital Times of Madison. But even this stamp is too limiting. Ron was a breed of reporter almost entirely died out—the muckraker. These were the great reforming newsmen of the twenties, who stirred into the silt at the bottom of the glass of life, particularly of Government, and brought to light infamous abuses. Reform usually followed their revelations. Men lived better and freer because of their digging.

Ron was constantly on the trail; he could pick up a lead most of us would miss and track it down with an awesome thoroughness.

Nothing stopped him. He kept on asking blunt questions and demanding answers. He seemed driven by a furious reforming spirit most of us, his colleagues, lack. We are content to rewrite the mimeographed handout or take down the words of the press agent. This never satisfied Ron. He knew that behind the false front, there was many times corruption, stinking corruption.

Ron May was one of the first to tear the mask from Joe McCarthy. His stories and his book, with an almost ruthless tolerance and patience, described the petty hates and fears and jealousies of a politician who stunned other reporters to silence or nervous praise.

He helped drive from power a big west coast politician by showing his unseen alliance with the Maffia. His articles on millionaire oilmen who abused their friendship with President Eisenhower were devastating. His flie on the blunders of the Central Intelligence Agency is startling. He had been working, more recently, on lifting the lid on congressional conflicts of interest.

What bothered Ron the most was the indifference with which editors, investigating committees and the public received his research and prying. "Nuts," he would say in an occasional moment of bitterness, "no one seems to give a hoot whether a Cabinet member or a Presidential assistant or a Senator steals or cheats, so long as they've got their TV westerns to watch."

Then he would brighten quickly and follow a new stink with all the enthusiasm of a child hunting hidden Easter eggs. His untidy files in the Senate press gallery, in the Library of Congress, and at home were bulging with odd scraps of information which he patiently put together with the thoroughness of a great detective. Ron would notice a one-paragraph item in a newspaper—innocent enough to the rest of us—and let out a wild whoop.

"This is it," he would cry. "This is the missing piece of the puzzle."

Ron spent hours talking to people—Senators, crime investigators, elevator operators, reporters, clerks. He had an engaging charm; he was the country boy in town looking at the sights and asking questions. In the most unlikely casual contacts, Ron picked up clues leading to hidden guilt. The blurted word of a secretary, the boasting of a Congressman, the inference of a general.

His life must have seemed frightfully daring to the Government clerk who comes to work precisely at 8:30 and leaves at precisely 3:30, and has annual leave and a pension. Ron would get up around 10 or 11, stretch and yawn over hot coffee, and be off. On the bus jolting downtown, he did his reading—books, newspapers, investigations. He usually arrived at the Capitol shortly after noon, his big legs taking him impatiently across the plaza. Then in the halls or over the long table in the Senate restaurant, he talked and listened. He drank coffee. None of us ever recall seeing Ron eat a whole meal.

Scraps of his philosophy would drift out. He demanded much of the men and women of politics. He asked them to be dedicated to public services, to be scrupulously honest, to be fair and just and tolerant. He was surprised, hurt and angered when he discovered the opposite.

"What's the matter with that guy?" he would ask indignantly. The rest of us shrugged our shoulders. Ron went to work.

He spent afternoons and far into the evening digging, digging, digging. He rarely left the press gallery before 9 o'clock. You would see him, a big, engrossed man hunched over his typewriter. Then a lonely ride on the bus, thinking and reading and planning. He rarely went to bed before early morning. He could not shut off that great engine of thinking that consumed him. He did not let ideas go, even to eat or sleep.

Once he came to my house and met a friend who was talking of waste and corruption in foreign aid. Ron became so excited, he walked downtown with my friend and at 4 o'clock in the morning they were seated at a counter of a White Tower with coffee still talking.

Many times I wished I was the editor of a very large newspaper or magazine with a crusading spirit. For then I could hire Ron May to do this kind of work he was ideally suited for—lifting off the top soil and exposing rot. Our country would be stronger, more dedicated for Ron May's digging.

But the chance is gone. It was only a dream anyway. A few days ago, Ron May's heart stopped beating. He was only 38. For even a big, rugged fellow as he was, the strain was too much. Indifference, frustration, the choking mass of weeds in our national life took their toll. One gallant reformer.

Today, I wandered into the press room. Unconsciously I looked to the corner where the big, brown paper envelope used to rest. The corner was bare. I felt a pang of loneliness. The good guy was gone.

Salute to Local Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Thursday, March 30, 1961, which comments upon the tribute paid by the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce to John and Timothy Connolly whose actions saved the lives of five people in an explosion and a disastrous fire last March 13. I, too, wish to compliment and recognize the brave exploits of these two men in the face of a grave emergency and I certainly join the Luzerne Lions Club who have adopted a resolution nominating the Connolly brothers for an award by the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission. In my judgment there are none more deserving of this high honor.

The indicated editorial follows:

SALUTE TO LOCAL HEROES

Directors of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce voiced the sentiments of the community at a luncheon meeting of the board yesterday afternoon when they paid an impressive tribute to John and Timothy Connolly, of Luzerne, for saving the lives of five workers at the risk of their own in two explosions and a fire at the Schuyler Manufacturing Co. plant on March 13.

Spokesmen for the board lauded them for their valor and its members gave them a rising vote of thanks. Russell Gardner, president, presented each with a letter of commendation, signed by the officers, with plaques, now being made, to be presented later. The board adopted a resolution to join with Luzerne Lions Club in nominating the brothers for an award by the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission.

Their feat is a matter that concerns more than Luzerne. The chamber's interest stems from the fact that it has been spearheading industrial development in its own name and through its affiliates. Moreover, it speaks for the whole area which is proud of the heroism of the Connolly brothers on the home front.

It is a privilege to salute these young men, not only for their courageous actions in a grave emergency, greatly reducing the toll, but for their stimulating example of initiative, cooperation, and unselfishness, the solid foundation on which the future of the area must be built.

Newel Perry: Teacher of Youth and Leader of Men—Speech in Honor of Blind Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1961, Dr. Newel Perry died in Berkeley, Calif., at the age of 87. He was thus full of years, and his years were full of accomplishment.

During most of his long life Dr. Perry lived and carried on his work in Berkeley. His career was that of a pioneer in the fields of public welfare and education of the blind. He was founder and first president of the California Council for the Blind. He was for 35 years director of advanced studies at the California School for the Blind in Berkeley. It was through his inspiration and leadership that the blind people of my State came to be welded into an organized democratic movement to improve their status and condition.

On March 25, 1961, a memorial convocation was held at the School for the Blind in Berkeley in honor of Dr. Perry. The main address was delivered by another noted Berkeleyan and leader of the blind, Dr. Jacobus tenBroek, president of the National Federation of the Blind, chairman of the California Board of Social Welfare, and chairman of the Speech Department of the University of California. I believe that Dr. tenBroek's moving address deserves the attention of Members of Congress and of all citizens concerned with welfare and the public good.

The article follows:

NEWEL PERRY: TEACHER OF YOUTH AND LEADER OF MEN

(Address by Prof. Jacobus tenBroek at a Memorial Convocation for Dr. Newel Perry at the California School for the Blind, Berkeley, March 25, 1961)

I come before you today—indeed we are all gathered here—to discharge a public duty and to honor a private debt. Newel Perry was a public figure. To us, he was also a personal friend. We can appraise his public contribution. We can only acknowledge our private obligation and personal attachment. We can detail his public record, define his influential role, itemize his accomplishments, recount his deeds, enumerate his statutes, specify his doctrines, disentangle the elements of his social philosophy, identify the general and the institutional fruits of his life's work, analyze and psychoanalyze the personality traits that made him a leader. Upon the life we shared, we can

only dwell in memory, sifting through the loose meshes of the mind the hours, the days, the nights, the months, the years of our common experience; the fears, the travails, the aspirations, the laughter that were ours together.

We were his students, his family, his intimates, his comrades on a thousand battlefronts of a social movement. We slept in his house, ate at his table, learned geometry at his desk, walked the streets interminably by his side, moved forward on the strength of his optimism and confidence.

The boundless devotion to him of his wife Lillie (to whom he was married from 1912 until her death in 1935) spilled over onto us to balm our institution-starved spirits, to lighten with gentle affection the bewilderment of our eccentricity and the unnatural confinement of our segregation. Upon a later generation of us, after the death of Lillie the same bounty was conferred in her turn by his sister Emma Burnham, who lived with Doctor during the last 21 years of his life.

As a forward youngster of 12, who made so bold as to address him as "Doc," I was once thrown out of a class by Doctor with such a lecture as still rings in my ears. As a somewhat older youngster, still forward but now also bored by the slow pace and the unimaginative techniques of high school, I was expelled by him altogether for incorrigible recalcitrance. Eventually, despite these unpromising beginnings, I did graduate from high school. With plenty of ambition but no money, I prepared to enter the university. At that point I was denied State aid to the blind, a program then newly instituted as a result of Doctor's efforts in sponsoring a constitutional amendment and a comprehensive statute. The reason was not that my need was not great. It was that I intended to pursue a higher education while I was being supported by the State. That was too much for the administrative officials. Almost without discussion, Doctor immediately filled the gap. Just as Warring Wilkinson had earlier done for him, he supplied me with tuition and living expenses out of his own pocket for a semester while we all fought to reverse the decision of the State aid officials.

It was ever thus with Doctor. The key to his great influence with blind students was, first of all, the fact that he was blind and therefore understood their problems; and second, that he believed in them and made his faith manifest. He provided the only sure foundation of true rapport: knowledge on our part that he was genuinely interested in our welfare.

Aside from these immediate personal benefactions, there were three habits of life—one might almost say three elements of personality—which I formed out of his teaching and example when I was an adolescent in his charge. First, an attitude toward my blindness, a conception that it is basically unimportant in the important affairs of life. A physical nuisance, yes. A topic of unembarrassed conversation, a subject of loud questions by small children in the street as you pass, certainly. But not something which shapes one's nature, which determines his career, which affects his usefulness or happiness. Second, a basic assumption that sighted people generally have boundless good will toward the blind and an utterly false conception of the consequences of blindness. It is their misconception about its nature which creates the social and economic handicap of blindness. Third: public activity as a rule of life, a sense of responsibility to exert personal effort to improve the lot of others. While I was still a lad in my teens, I was attending meetings and doing work that Doctor assigned me in the blind movement. He was a social reformer. He made me one, too. Through participation with him, these attitudes and practices became habits of my life. So deeply instilled were they that they have remained ever after an almost automatic behavioral pattern—potent and often governing factors in my outlook and activity. Mature reflection in later years could only confirm through reason what his influence had so surely wrought in my youth.

It is altogether fitting that we should hold this memorial convocation at the California School for the Blind. It was here that Newel Perry came in 1883 as a 10-year-old boy—penniless, blind, his father dead, his home dissolved. Two years earlier, he had lost his sight and nearly his life as the result of a case of poison oak which caused his eyeballs to swell until they burst and which held him in a coma for a month. It was here at the school that Warring Wilkinson first met and took an interest in him, laying the basis for future years of intimate relationship and mutual endeavor. Warring Wilkinson was the first principal of the California State School for the Deaf and the Blind. He served in that capacity for 44 years, from 1865 to 1909. With his characteristic interest in his charges, he soon saw young Newel's full potentiality. He sent him from here to Berkeley High School to complete his secondary education. It was he who overcame the numerous obstacles to this arrangement, so fruitful in its understanding of education and of the needs of the blind. Newel continued to live here at the school while he attended the University of California from 1892 to 1896. Again admission had to be secured over strong resistance. Again Wilkinson was the pathfinder; Newel his willing and anxious instrument. Wilkinson's role in Newel's life as a youth can hardly be overestimated: father, teacher, guide, supporter—in Newel's own words, "dear Governor."

As this institution was not only the school but the home of his boyhood and the foundation of his manhood, so 16 years later, in 1912, at the age of 39, Newel Perry returned here to take up his permanent career as a teacher. He remained in that post until 1947—a third of a century. It was here that his life's work was accomplished. It was from this place as a base that he organized and conducted a movement for social reform. It was here that many of us first met him as his students. It was here that his impact upon us first made itself felt. It was here that our lifelong association with him began. How often in these halls have we heard his footsteps? How often in this chamber, his voice? The sound of those footsteps and that voice have now gone from the world as a physical reality. How often hereafter will they continue to sound in the halls and chambers of our lives?

In the years between departure from the school in 1896 and return to it in 1912, Newel Perry devoted himself to further education and to the search for an academic job. He took graduate work at the University of California, meanwhile serving successively as an unpaid teaching fellow, a paid assistant and finally as an instructor in the department of mathematics. In 1900, following a general custom of that day, he went to Europe to continue his studies. He did this for a time at the University of Zurich in Switzerland and then at the University of Munich in Germany. From the latter he secured the degree of doctor of philosophy in mathematics with highest honors in 1901. He lingered in Europe for a time traveling and writing an article on a mathematical topic which was published in a learned journal. He then returned to the United States in 1902, landing in New York where he was to remain until 1912. He had about $80 in capital, a first-class and highly specialized education, and all the physical, mental, and personal prerequisites for a productive career, save one, visual acuity.

During this period, he supported himself precariously as a private coach of university mathematics students. He applied himself, also, to the search for a university position. He had begun the process by mail from Europe even before he secured his Ph. D. He now continued the process on the ground in New York. He displayed the most relentless energy. He employed every imaginable technique. He wrote letters in profusion. In 1905, he wrote to 500 institutions of every size and character. He distributed his dissertation and published article. He haunted meetings of mathematicians. He visited his friends in the profession. He enlisted the aid of his teachers. He called on everybody and anybody having the remotest connection with his goal.

Everywhere, the outcome was the same. Only the form varied. Some expressed astonishment at what he had accomplished. Some expressed interest. One of these seemed genuine—he had a blind brother-in-law who, he said, was a whiz at math. Some showed indifference, now and then masked behind polite phrases. Some said there were no vacancies. Some said his application would be filed for future reference. One said for what—ironically, "as an encouragement to men who labor under disadvantages and who may learn from it how much may be accomplished through resolution and industry." Some averred that he probably could succeed in teaching at somebody else's college. Many said outright that they believed a blind man could not teach mathematics.

Many of these rejections were, of course, perfectly proper. Many were not. Their authors candidly gave the reason as blindness.

We know about this period of Newel Perry's life from reports of contemporaries or near contemporaries such as Hugh Buckingham, a student at the school from 1896 to 1900 during Doctor's absence, who has prepared a manuscript about Doctor's boyhood and youth. We know about it from what Doctor told many of us in later years. But we know about it in all its poignancy, desolation and bleakness, from Newel Perry's own intimate accounts written at the time to his old mentor and true friend, Warring Wilkinson. These accounts, with copies of many of the letters of rejection, have been preserved by the Wilkinson family through the intervening years. In the last 2 weeks, they have been opened to my inspection by Wilkinson's granddaughter, Florence Richardson Wyckoff, who is here with us today.

I have dwelt on this period and these experiences for several reasons. They reflect, they accurately portray, a phase of all of our lives as blind people. In fact, 35 years later, I personally received identical letters from many of these same institutions. It was almost as if a secretary had been set to copying Doctor's file, only changing the signatures and the name of the addressee. Yet great progress has been made. Many of us are now teaching at colleges and universities around the country and filling many other jobs hitherto closed to us.

Doctor Perry's reaction to this decade of defeat and privation was remarkable. He did not break. He did not resign. He did not even become embittered. Discouragement, frustration, a sense of wrong and injustice, certainly these; but never collapse. He was not licked. We see in these bitter years of hunger and rejection the source of true knowledge about the real problems of the blind and an ineradicable determination to do something about them. Here was a mainspring of social reform, an ever-flowing motivation to redirect public attitudes and actions toward the blind. To this was added the thrust of an active and restless disposition and the wit to perceive remedies and adapt them to the need.

Out of these elements of mind, personality, and experience were compounded the public career of Newel Perry; and out of these elements also were constructed the programs the initiation of which made that career publicly signficant.

First of all, the distress of poverty must be relieved. The necessities of life must be available. The minimum essentials must be assured. So much in some way had been provided in the Anglo-American system for three centuries before Newel Perry faced near starvation and economic exclusion in New York City. The Elizabethan poor laws did it in one way. County direct relief, instituted in California in 1901, did it in another. The almshouse and the county hospital and poorfarm did it in still other ways. At the very minimum, it had to be done better. It should be done by a system of cash grants, adequate in amount to maintain standards of decency and health, receivable upon fixed and uniform standards of eligibility, made generally applicable by State participation and control, and expendable by the recipient through a free exercise of self-management and consumption choice. To bring this about, however, prohibitions in the State constitution would have to be removed by the arduous process of a people's amendment, an organic statute would have to be lobbied through the State legislature, faithful administration would somehow have to be secured. Year by year and session by session into the indefinite future, the myriad minor corrections and major improvements made necessary by time and disclosed by experience would have to be worked through the legislature and the administration. And so indeed it came to pass in California.

Secondly, much more had to be done than merely relieve the distress of poverty. Security is a necessity. As an unmixed blessing, however, it is a stultifying concept. An indispensable ingredient of any welfare system is opportunity. One of the objects of public aid must be to stimulate and enable people to become independent of it. Accordingly, their initiative must not be hemmed in. The means of productive activity must not be withdrawn or denied. Independence of action and self-reliance must be encouraged. Legal liability of relatives must be relaxed so as not to spread poverty, increase dependence and disrupt family life. Economic resources, reasonable amounts of real and personal property must be devotable to plans for self-support instead of being required to be consumed in meeting daily needs. Incentive to earn must be constructed out of retention of the benefits of earning. And this too presently came to pass in California. The new system took cognizance of the need of the blind for adjustments on the social and psychological as well as the physical level. It permitted and encouraged them to strive to render themselves self-supporting. It applied the democratic principle of individual dignity to an underprivileged class of American citizens. It guaranteed them a fair measure of independence and self-respect in the conduct of their lives. The California system, the Newel Perry system, was thus far in advance of its time. It is still envied and emulated throughout the Nation.

Thirdly, the reintegration of the blind into society on a basis of full and equal membership could only be achieved if they had a chance to earn their daily bread as others do in the community. Accordingly, action must be taken to eliminate restrictive barriers and legal discriminations. The main channels of opportunity must be swept clear of artificial and irrational obstructions. The public service, private employment, the common callings, the ordinary trades and occupations, the professions must be rescued from arbitrary exclusions based on blindness when blindness is not a factor bearing on competence and performance. Doctor was a prime mover in securing legal, constitutional and other provisions which; protect the right of the blind to enter a number of professions; forbid arbitrary discriminations against us in the State civil service and in secondary teaching; enable blind college students to pursue their studies with the aid of sighted readers hired by the State; bring the blind in an ever-increasing stream into the colleges and universities of the State and thence into the higher callings.

These achievements—legal, social, economic and political—have been the fruits at once of Dr. Perry's leadership and of the collective self-organization of the blind which that leadership engendered. More than any other person, it was Doctor who implanted and nurtured among the blind of California the sense of common cause, the spirit of collaborative effort in seeking solutions to our problems. More than any other person, it was he who taught us that the blind can and must lead the blind and the sighted, too, when dealing with the problems of the blind. More than any other person, it was he who made us aware that to go on unorganized was to remain disorganized, that only through concerted action can the blind hope to convert and enlist the power of government and to defeat the thoughtless tyranny of public prejudice and opportune ignorance.

Newel Perry was a teacher: a teacher of subject matter and a teacher of men. He taught his specialty of mathematics and taught it very well indeed; but he taught his pupils even better. To be sure, not all the students who came his way during his 35 years on this campus were wholly inspired by him. His personality was vigorous and his standards rigorous. But for many of us who attended the school during those three and one-half decades it was Dr. Perry who furnished the impetus and incentive, the goad and the goal, that would light our later lives and nourish our careers. Our bond with him was not broken when our schooldays ended. We went on to become his comrades and colleagues in the cause which was always his true vocation.

Newel Perry was, in short, both a teacher of youth and a leader of men. These two roles were not, however, quite separate. For the secret of his success in both of them lay in this: that his teaching was a kind of leadership, and his leadership a kind of teaching. In his pedagogical method as well as his social purpose Doctor was thoroughly Socratic. His classroom manner was essentially that of the platonic dialogue: dialectical, inquiring, insistently logical, and incessantly prodding.

In this Socratic combination also lies, I think, the secret of Doctor's success as the leader of a social movement. Just as in the classroom he taught his students by leading them, so as the pioneer of the organized blind movement he led his followers by teaching them. His power, like that of all leaders, rested in the last analysis upon persuasion. His triumphs, however, were not the product of oratorical or literary skill, although he had a notable gift for trenchant and incisive phrasing, the epigrammatic thrust which distills the essence of a complex issue. His persuasive power was not that of the demagog but of the pedagog. And it was not only his followers who learned from him. He educated the blind people of the State to an awareness of their capabilities as individuals and of their powers as a group. He educated the legislators in the State capitol by dint of dogged, relentless, well-nigh incorrigible campaigns of persuasion carried on year after year and decade after decade. He educated the general public by his preachment and his example to regard the blind not in the traditional terms of charity and custody but in the realistic terms of normality and equality.

And most of all, in his role as leader, Newel Perry educated, indoctrinated, and persuaded a distinguished group of cohorts to join him in carrying on the struggle and carrying out its goals. Those whom Doctor gathered around him were other blind men and women, mostly former students, whose special talents and professional positions uniquely supplemented his.

Raymond Henderson: By profession an attorney, self-taught, by preoccupation a reformer, with poetry in his soul and literature in his stylus. Born in 1881, he attended this school from 1889 through high school and continued to live here until his graduation from the University of California in 1904. He practiced his profession in Bakersfield, Calif., from his admission to the bar until his death in 1945. Raymond came to the organized blind movement in his maturity from a long background of experience in other causes. He brought to it a notable array of personal abilities, a high degree of professional skill, a fine spirit of humanity, and the enrichment of wide and intensive activity.

Leslie Schlingheyde: also by profession an attorney, gentle and religious by disposition, practical rather than reflective in frame of mind, with a brilliant academic record and a liberal outlook. He was born in 1893, attended this school from 1906 to 1913, and thus came under Doctor's influence in the year of his graduation. He received a J.D. from the law school of the University of California in 1920 and from that time until his death in 1957 practiced his profession in Modesto, Calif., and served the blind movement all over the State.

It was Raymond Henderson and Leslie Schlingheyde who were primarily responsible for handling cases in court, for preparing innumerable legal briefs and arguments, for drafting projected bills and constitutional amendments, for continuous legal counsel during the insurgent and formative years. They were in a real sense the legal arm of the organized blind movement.

Ernest Crowley: again by profession an attorney but distinguished for his service in another arena. He kept a law office open in Fairfield-Suisun from the time of his graduation from the University of California Law School in 1923 unti lhis death in 1952. To him, however, the law was only a necessary and not a particularly attractive means of earning a living. His law office was a cover for his real love and active life—the practice of politics. He was born in 1896 and attended this school from 1910 to 1916. He was thus under Doctor's tutelage as a student for 4 years. His significant contribution was made as a member of the State legislature from 1928 to 1952. It was he who introduced and skillfully maneuvered through to passage the memorable bills which are now the statutory landmarks of our movement. In a very real sense, he was the legislative spokesman and arm of the movement.

Perry-Sundquist: social worker and public administrator by profession, bringing to his work a sympathetic personality, an unshakable faith in blind people and skillful management of administrative techniques and devices. He was born in 1904 and attended this school from 1918 to 1922. For exactly 20 years now he has been chief of the division for the blind in the State department of social welfare. During those two decades he has translated the principles of the organized blind movement into concrete administrative action, from legislative parchment into practical reality. Under his direction programs for the blind have multiplied and prospered, services have been expanded and their benefits spread. Most important of all, the working philosophy of the movement has been transformed into a working practice. In a very real

sense, he has been the effective administrative arm of the movement.

Through the years this little band grew in numbers and evolved in formal structure. It formed the nucleus of the California Council for the Blind, which came into being in 1934 with Doctor Perry as its first president. For 19 productive years, until his retirement in 1953 at the age of 80, Doctor forged and shaped the council on the anvil of his own will into an instrument larger and more formidable but essentially similar to the informal group from which it originated.

Doctor's social vision in the field of blind welfare outdistanced his time and placed him in the advance guard of thought and planning. His liberality on these matters gains, rather than loses, in significance when it is placed alongside his broader attitudes toward politics and human affairs; for in matters unrelated to the blind, Doctor was fully an heir of the 19th century, conservative, even reactionary, by nature, often inflexible and not without a touch of old-fashioned nationalist-imperialism. When it came to the cause to which he was most committed, he was far less a victorian than a utopian—less a standpatter than a restless progressive in search of new horizons.

How shall we sum up a man's life? How capture the essential quality of a human career? How convey the inward meaning, the imponderable and intangible qualities of will and heart and spirit? There are the vital statistics. But they are more statistical than vital. All that they can tell us of a man is that he was born, he lived, he loved, he died. For Newel Perry we must amend the litany at least this much: he lived, and he brought new life to many; he loved, and he was beloved; he died, and he will not be forgotten.

On the day following the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Walter Lippmann wrote some words about him which might also stand as an epitaph to the leader and comrade whom we honor today: "The man must die in his appointed time. He must carry away with him the magic of his presence and that personal mastery of affairs which no man, however gifted by nature, can acquire except in the relentless struggle with evil and blind chance. Then comes the proof of whether his work will endure, and the test of how well he led his people. * * * The final test of a leader is that he leaves behind him in other men the conviction and the will to carry on."

College Loans Help Students in New Orleans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 days the RECORD has included two articles in a newspaper series on the current federally financed student loans available at New Orleans universities and colleges. Today, I am pleased to include the third and last of these fine articles by Mr. Robert N. Kelso, a reporter for the New Orleans States-Item. Mr. Kelso relates in detail what New Orleans institutions of higher learning are doing through the National Defense Education Act to help young students to pursue a college education.

The third article follows:

LOANS HELP 1 STUDENT IN 10 THROUGH COLLEGES IN ORLEANS

(By Robert N. Kelso)

Federally financed loans are helping put about 1 student in 10 through college in New Orleans.

This program is authorized by the National Defense Education Act, which expires June 30, 1962. But indications are similar aid to needy and capable students will be continued.

President Kennedy has called for passage of a $5.7 billion aid to schools program, of which more than $500 million would be earmarked over a 5-year period for college scholarships.

The fate of this proposal will have a strong bearing on possible renewal of national defense student loans.

Aid to students in a Nation which has been jolted into putting a premium on brainpower seems certain to persist.

Spiraling costs of getting a college education will shut out thousands of capable youngsters unless they get financial help to continue their training.

Tuition costs are being boosted next fall at New Orleans' two largest universities. The flat fee at Tulane will jump from $990 to $1,200, and at Loyola from $600 to $700.

These amounts are only a starter, particularly for students who either reside on the campus or maintain residences of their own while attending school.

A male undergraduate at Tulane living on campus will have to spend some $2,275 for his tuition, university activiities fee, room, meals and books.

Living off campus, his tuition, university fee, and books alone will cost more than $1,400.

At Loyola, the average student living on campus will need $1,625 a year to meet fixed expenses. The off-campus student will need $825 for tuition, basic fees and books.

Additional expenses like clothes, laundry, spending money and incidentals add an undetermined, but substantial, amount to the student's education bill.

Six institutions in New Orleans have dispensed approximately $450,000 in national defense student loans this year to more than 900 of their students.

This roughs out to an average of $500 per student.

Tulane and Loyola may, and sometimes do, lend the full $1,000 a year authorized under the Federal loan program.

But other schools here set a general limit on the loan at either $500 or the cost of tuition.

The amount of money a student can expect to get from the national defense loan program is geared precisely to the amount he and his parents can afford to contribute.

This is calculated with some nicety by the institution from which he seeks a loan.

The school requires the prospective borrower to submit a detailed statement on his own and his parents' financial resources.

The question of how much a family should contribute toward college expenses has been worked out by the College Scholarship Service.

College Scholarship Service is an organization of more than 300 colleges and universities (Tulane is one of them) that distribute scholarships, jobs and loans to able students with financial need.

It has a number of other functions in the educational picture, but its main purpose is to act as a clearinghouse for the family financial information all participating institutions require of students seeking financial assistance.

Here are a couple of examples from a College Scholarship Service chart on what is considered a minimum of annual family support, from income, toward college expenses:

A family with two children with an income before taxes of $6,000 would contribute $680; a $6,000-income family with three children, $620, and with four children, $540.

A family with two children and a "before taxes" income of $9,000 would contribute $1140; with three children, $980, and with four children, $890.

The amounts expected are reduced if the family faces unusual financial difficulties or responsibilities, and when the student is commuting from college to his or her home.

In addition to its income, a family's liquid assets are also tapped for college expenses under College Scholarship Service procedure.

Assets are considered to include the family's cash savings, stocks, bonds, and other investments, one-half of its equity in a home or other real estate, one-half the loan value of its life insurance, and varying portions of holdings it may have in a small business or a farm.

In a manner weighed to give the family a fair shake, the College Scholarship Service would expect a family with one child and $6,000 in liquid assets to contribute $25 from its assets toward a year's college expenses.

With only $6,000 in assets and more than one child, the bite on assets would be zero.

In ascending scale geared to its assets, an average family with three dependent children would be expected to contribute annually:

With $8,000 assets, $55; $10,000, $125; $12,000, $200; $15,000, $305; $20,000, $615; $30,000, $1,310.

Most or all of a student's own savings, if he has no sizable assets, are expected to be applied to college expenses.

A student planning on a 4-year program with $1,000 of his own in savings would be expected to draw about $200 annually from his savings.

When all of these sources of income are tallied, the college computes the difference between this total and the cost of a year's attendance. That difference determines what is considered the student's financial need.

At many schools, Tulane among them, a thoroughgoing effort is made to provide the balance needed through scholarships, loans and part-time jobs .

Dr. Joseph E. Gordon, associate dean of admissions and loan administrator at Tulane, says a third of Tulane's 4,500 full-time students are getting financial help from one or more of these sources.

The Reverend Father Robert L. Boggs, dean of admissions and loan administrator, says about 100 Loyola students have gotten loans ranging from $319 to $1,000 this year.

"The majority of them are in the dental school," Father Boggs said, "but we have borrowers in every department."

Xavier University limits its loans under the program to $500 because of the number of applicants. It has lent out $40,000 to 101 students.

A Dillard University spokesman said more than 100 students there were getting varying amounts under the loan program, but declined to state the total lent or the spread between individual amounts borrowed.

At St. Mary's Dominican College, 21 students have borrowed $29,707 in Federal money this year. All but three of them, who sought bigger loans to help pay for their room and board, were limited to the $600 tuition charge.

College officials handling the loans here think they could use more Federal money than they're getting.

But $450,000 in 1 year isn't a meager contribution from Uncle Sam.

Tulane's Dr. Gordon, who is overseeing disbursement of the top amount allowed any one institution says there is some talk of raising the $250,000 Federal loan limit per school.

"At Tulane," Dr. Gordon said, "we haven't gotten a great many more applications than we've had money to loan.

"But tuition is going up next year, and every time that happens we find more students who have legitimate financial need.

"So far, I would say that any student denied a loan didn't get one because of academic qualifications rather than a lack of funds."

Father Boggs agreed that Loyola, thus far, has gotten enough loan money to take care of students with sufficient brain power but a shortage of money.

Whether the situation will work out as well next year with more students knocking on the loan-man's door, nobody is prepared to hazard a guess.

Railroad Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished Member from Washington, and chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Senator BURDICK, have recently directed attention to the need for proceeding with caution, in connection with proposed mergers of railroads.

With the ever-declining share of intercity ton-miles of freight traffic, which the railroads are transporting, and with the great decline in railroad passenger traffic, it may well be true that there is a surplus of railroad facilities, and in the light of the present financial plight of the industry, mergers are no doubt necessary. Authorities on the subject are generally agreed on that. There is serious disagreement, however, as to how mergers should be accomplished. The great railroad industry is too important to this Nation in time of peace as well as in wartime to approach railroad mergers on a piecemeal basis. They should be carefully planned to protect the public.

Mergers in the railroad industry are not an innovation; the great railroad systems of America today are the result of thousands of mergers of smaller railroads. I have no doubt that the public interest will be given full consideration by the Interstate Commerce Commission as proposed mergers are considered by that body. It is of great importance that the Commission do just that.

One of the country's great railroad executives, commenting upon the merger situation, in the annual report of his company, just a few days ago, had something to say about the public interest in these railroad mergers which I believe should be considered by everyone.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the statement of Mr. A. E. Perlman, president of the New York Central System, in his annual report, entitled "A Special Report on Railroad Mergers."

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

A SPECIAL REPORT ON RAILROAD MERGERS

In recent months, there has been a flurry of merger activity ranging from proposals to actual accomplishment, within the railroad industry in the East, West, and South.

Historically, mergers are an old subject within the railroad industry, for nearly all of our present rail systems are but the end results of many mergers of smaller companies. This new interest in consolidation is a result of railroads moving to meet the challenges of adapting modern technology to our modern-day economy. Through sound mergers, the Nation's railroads can build stronger, healthier and more competitive rail networks.

The Central, itself a product of some 500 mergers, has a long history of favoring the merger philosophy. We still do. Our only qualification is that such mergers be in the public interest—for healthy, competitive real service is still the keystone to our transportation system and our economy.

For these reasons, the Central has engaged during the past few years in numerous merger discussions. In 1958, we studied such a consolidation with the Pennsylvania Railroad. This study was suspended because of our belief that merging the two largest lines in the East would so overbalance the remaining rail carriers that effective competition would be impossible.

Instead, the Central initiated three-way studies with the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway. It was, and is, our belief that a consolidation of these three roads, in addition to being to the best interest of each, is the only effective rail system that can be assembled in the East to meet the competition from the Pennsylvania Railroad's ever-growing rail empire.

However, the Chesapeake & Ohio chose to unilaterally seek control—not merger—of the Baltimore & Ohio through an exchange of stock. The Central, still hopeful of a three-way merger, also made an exchange of stock offer to B. & O., which our shareowners approved last October.

At the present time, the Central has become a substantial shareowner of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. Through purchases, the Central and its affiliated interests now own in excess of 20 percent of the total outstanding B. & O. shares.

Within a few months, the Interstate Commerce Commission will be asked to rule upon the C. & O.'s plan to control the B. & O.

Our philosophy is to encourage carefully formulated, well-planned mergers designed in the interest of promoting and building an ever-improving rail system to the benefit of the public, the investors and owners, and the industry itself.

A piecemeal approach to mergers, haphazardly thrown together without regard to other than self-interest, or the aggrandizement of the stronger railroads, can do irreparable damage to our already weakened transportation system and, consequently, to the public and economy.

While we of the Central stand ready to work toward the three-way merger we have so often proposed, we stand equally ready to resist with every resource at our command, the C. & O.'s attempt at unilateral control of B. & O. and its detrimental consequences to the economy and the industry.

The choice is not ours to make. But we shall accept either course in full confidence of our ultimate success.

Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, education is important. The tax burden is almost unbearable. The following article is plain horsesense:

SUGGESTIONS GIVEN FOR MORE SCHOOLING

(By George W. Crane)

(College heads are notoriously poor businessmen, so you State legislators and members of the board of trustees must stop the needless demand for more taxes. Make the colleges use horsesense, and they can handle twice their present enrollment without a penny for new classrooms or additional faculty. Let's also stop panhandling from Uncle Sam for education.)

Case H–450: George G., aged 45, is a member of the Nebraska State Legislature.

"Dr. Crane," he asked me recently, "we are constantly being urged to appropriate more money for new buildings at our various State universities and teacher's colleges.

"I am very much in favor of education, and as much free schooling as we can offer, but we can't go on forever increasing our tax rates, even for schools and public welfare.

"So what is the solution?"

HORSESENSE IN COLLEGE

More horsesense on the part of our colleges.

Despite the widespread clamor that we shall have twice as many college students in 1975 as today, and many educators are sending up trial balloons to get legislatures favorably inclined toward bigger appropriations, let's face facts.

You legislators (and college boards of trustees) should just demand more American business efficiency on the part of the colleges before you grant them any more funds.

Our colleges can handle double their present enrollments and without an extra cent of appropriations, either for new classrooms or for any new teachers.

Read that sentence again for it is gospel truth.

All we need to do is schedule a second educational "shift," just as efficient factories run double (and often triple) shifts of workers.

Our present classrooms, microscopes and other lab equipment would handle not only double our present school enrollment, but if need be, we could run a third shift and handle triple the number.

College students are adults in physical and mental age, so they don't need be limited to grade school hours of 8 a.m. to 3 p.m.

Let the second shift start at 3 or 4 p.m., and run through 9 or 10 p.m.

"Yes, Dr. Crane," you may protest, "but what about the extra faculty members needed to handle that double enrollment?"

Again, use horsesense which has been ominously lacking on our college campuses for 300 years in America.

The typical college professor today handles an average of only 12 students, whereas each high school teacher handles 24.

Why shouldn't college profs work as hard as high school profs and thus raise that student-teacher ratio from 12:1 up to 24:1, where it easily could be?

Then the present college professors would be handling twice the present college enrollment, without adding to their number at all.

And that added number of tuitions per prof would permit a 50 percent jump all the way along the line in salaries and without 1 cent of new appropriations from our State legislatures.

The only new buildings needed to accomodate double our present college enrollments would be dormitories. And thousands of townsfolk still have vacant rooms available, which could easily be used for that purpose.

Fancy million-dollar-college dormitories don't raise the students' grades. You can rate just as high on exams by living in a rented room in a private home of the townfolk.

So let's stop this mad stampede toward ever-increasing taxes. You can do it easily by simply using American horsesense.

"The Sod-Busting Senator"—Milton Young, of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, the farmers of our Nation, and particularly in the Midwestern and Northwestern sections of the United States, are fortunate to have as a Member of the U.S. Senate, Senator MILTON YOUNG, of North Dakota.

MILTON YOUNG knows agriculture, not only from experience as a farm operator, but also as a student of the problems of agriculture for many years. He is a recognized authority in the U.S. Senate in this field.

As a member of the U.S. Senate from the State of Kansas, it has been my privilege to have been associated with him in proposing and in having enacted legislation affecting all agriculture, and particularly wheat.

Kansas and North Dakota are the two leading wheat producing States in the Nation, and therefore, we have many mutual interests in the solving of the wheat problem.

The ever-increasing surplus of wheat is a problem that must have consideration by the Congress and Senator YOUNG will, I am sure, have great influence in writing this legislation.

The 1961 spring issue of the Co-op Grain Quarterly of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, St. Paul, Minn., contains an article written by Lew Muenz, entitled "The Sod-Busting Senator," and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

OUT OF NORTH DAKOTA—THE SODBUSTING SENATOR

Nowhere in all the land are the furrows as long and as straight as they are in the wheat country of North Dakota. Mile after mile they flow each spring, in a dusky pattern that reaches across the earth to the horizon and beyond.

It has been thus ever since the sodbusting days of the homesteader and the bonanza farms that followed the opening of the upper Great Plains. And the furrows seemed even longer in the olden days. Often they were a mile in length and that meant a half hour of plodding for a team of four horses pulling a two-bottom plow. It was a lonely walk for the farmer or the farmer's son who held the reins. But it gave a fellow a chance to think and a time to dream, and a dream has carried many a farm boy from a furrow to lofty places—perhaps even to the Congress of the United States.

That's what happened to the Honorable MILTON R. YOUNG, the sodbusting Senator from North Dakota whose highly respected voice in the farm affairs of the Nation is a voice of experience.

Senator YOUNG, who has served in the Congress of the United States since 1945, is known throughout that body as "Mr. Wheat." The title is not unwarranted or lightly bestowed, for when it comes to a long and devoted record of service to agriculture, with particular emphasis on the welfare of the wheat producer, the Senator's record is second to none.

Not even in his own North Dakota, where this lanky, soft-voiced, immensely popular servant of the people has held some kind of a public position since the mid-1920's, do men always agree with Republican Senator MILTON REUBEN YOUNG. But they respect him, an applied virtue that in the affairs of men often transcends conformity. Politics in the land of the long furrow are spirited, and at times raucous. But opponents in his home State, as well as in Washington, have learned that you don't scare Senator YOUNG by hollering at him.

As a matter of record, the Senator got some of his most valuable background experience in public affairs back in the days of the great depression by out-hollering traveling men in the little town of Berlin in southeastern North Dakota near the farm where YOUNG was born on December 6, 1897.

"I became interested in politics about the mid-1920's but didn't become active until the late 1920's or early 1930's," he recalls. "I got my start in politics arguing with traveling men and other visitors with whom I came in contact on the streets of Berlin during the depression. Invariably their argument was that farmers would do all right if they would only diversify their operations. Actually, there were surpluses and low prices for every farm commodity in those days. There was no opportunity to switch to some other production to improve your economic situation, yet this was the propaganda with which many outside interests tried to pacify North Dakota in the depression days."

Transient debaters found it difficult to win a point against the young man whose logic came out of the very soil. YOUNG's formal education was not extensive. It began in a one-room schoolhouse near his father's farm, about 3 miles from the Berlin townsite. Soon afterwards the one-room school was moved into the town of Berlin.

Berlin was the typical North Dakota country town, born of the farmers' need for a center of activities and a source of services which the farmers themselves could not supply.

Settled by sturdy folk, many from far-off lands, the very name of MILTON YOUNG's birthplace is the out growth of an immigrant's memory of his Teutonic homeland.

Once started, the community gradually grew to fill, quite adequately, the expanding needs of the countryside's citizenry. One man built a two-story frame building and opened a grocery store in it. The next spring another store appeared. A blacksmith came and opened for business. Soon there was a hotel and restaurant; and even a drug dispenser set up a little shop. The bank was a brick building, strong and imposing.

The community was not what you would call rich. But some of the leading citizens were "well-fixed" and there was a comfortable feeling of solidity within the town.

MILTON finished grade school there, and in 1915 was graduated from high school in the larger town of LaMoure, about 11 miles away. After that came a brief stint at North Dakota Agricultural College at Fargo and a period at Graceland, a small college in the southern Iowa town of Lamoni.

He would have liked to continue his schooling. But the pull of the land was strong and, besides, young MILTON was in love.

In 1919 he married petite, blond Malinda Benson, a neighbor girl who looked almost diminutive as she stood beside her lanky bridegroom.

Malinda's parents were a sturdy Norwegian couple who had moved to North Dakota from Spring Grove, Minn., and started farming in 1888. Their farm was near Benson Corners, about 8 miles northwest of the village of Verona. This was near the farm of MILTON's father, John, one of the best-known and most highly regarded farmers in that part of the State.

The elder Young was a good farmer, kindly, ambitious and wise. He was born at Reed's Landing, Minn., of German parents. With his wife, Rachel, a Swiss girl from Anoka, Minn., he went to North Dakota in 1881 and started farming that same year. MILTON often heard his father recall that to help finance his farming operations he hauled groceries by ox team from Jamestown to the inland community of Grand Rapids, near his farm and about 35 miles from the railroad. It was pleasant, in the warmth of a prairie summer, to loll in the wagon seat behind the plodding oxen, their cloven hoofs scuffing out a percussive rhythm for the meadowlark's flute. "You know I want your wheat to grow," is what the old folks said the meadowlark sang in his lilting eight-note call.

But in the winter, it was another story. Strong winds, icy and cruel, often whipped the snow into belly-deep drifts. Trails vanished under the dangerous white, and it took all the red-eyed cunning the oxen possessed to reach home.

John Young prospered in his business. He had started farming on section 1 in LaMoure County's Henrietta Township, about 3 miles from the town of Grand Rapids. Six years later he bought the south half-section 3 in the same township, and these acres today are called by the Young clan the old home farm. Soon the elder Young owned the entire section, and when the Northern Pacific Railroad established a branch line from Fargo to Edgeley in the early 1890's he opened a small land office. The site of this little office later became the town of Berlin.

Early in his farming operations, Mr. Young became active in inducing immigrants to come to North Dakota. This gave him further opportunity to expand his business of buying and selling land, and he finally quit active farming in 1909. But he continued in the land business, was an active partner in a farm machinery sales company, and joined with his oldest son (not the Senator) in an automobile sales agency. But always his major interest was in the land.

It wasn't always fair weather for John Young, however. He had made considerable money from the land he had purchased over the years, not a fortune but enough to be regardless as "well fixed." All of this went down the drain in the great depression, part of it when a local bank went to the wall at Forman, N. Dak. Those were the Dust Bowl

days, when for weks at a time a great ceiling of soil particles, cast into the air by the relentless winds, hung over all the plains. Men cursed as the earth died.

Out of that time comes a story about the elder Young—an anecdote which perhaps has had an effect on the way Senator MILTON YOUNG thinks. Certainly it is evidence of why neighbors held John Young in such esteem.

During the Dust Bowl time, landowners, particularly absentee owners and the large corporate firms which had vast holdings in the State, were making every possible effort to collect cash rentals from their tenants. Only a few could pay, however. Most of the cattle in the area had been sold to the Government, as had the hogs and most of the sheep. The few remaining head were being kept alive on high-priced hay, straw, and grain shipped in from other States where nature was being more benevolent. From these scanty sources, farmers were trying to scratch out a living—and an occasional dollar with which to pacify the landowners. The story about the elder Young is perhaps best told by the man who played an important part in it, a man named Thorfinnson who at the time was the Government extension agent in Sargent County.

"Mr. Young came into my office one day, in the depths of the drought, and asked if I knew any of his tenants," Thorfinnson recalls.

"You have three in Sargent County," the county agent replied, and Thorfinnson bristled as he envisiond another case of trying to extract the last penny from men already on relief.

"Probably you can help me then," said Young. "I'm remitting all my cash rent so that I can help these farmers get through the winter. And I've got one old codger who's too proud and ornery to take any help. So I want you to watch him, and if the going gets too rough you can let me know and maybe between us we can get him to take some help."

"I wept," says Thorfinnson.

That is some of the background out of which came North Dakota's sodbusting Senator. The Senator farmed through the depression, on "the old home place" which had been rented out from 1909 until 1919 when the newlyweds, Milton and Malinda, moved onto it to start farming on their own.

Like his father, the future Senator confined his operations mostly to small grain although most of the time he kept from 15 to 25 milk cows. And with the same restless urge to always be doing something that characterized his father, he specialized in doing custom threshing for his neighbors and for other farmers for miles around.

Milton's threshing rig was gas-powered. But his Dad had a steam-powered rig, headed by a big fire-eating boiler and engine on great wide wheels, as huge and as awesome as the blood-sweating behemoth of Holy Writ.

It was not strange that the young man who dreamed at the plow handle and enjoyed a verbal set-to about politics with a traveling man should also be fascinated by the big machines that were so colorful a part of farm life in those days. The annual threshing season was looked forward to eagerly by most farm boys, and their elders as well.

Childhood excitement began when the distant whistle heralded the approach of the threshing rig and its crew.

On that exciting day, a boy would watch agape as the overalled crew set up the rig in the farmyard or in the field and began the threshing from stacks or from bundle wagons. The red bandana around the neck of each itinerant crewman was the badge of adventure; and, oh, the status symbol that was the blue-and-white-striped peaked cap of the engineer.

To the boy, it was worth getting up early in the morning and staying up until he was dog tired. The noise was like music as the clattering separator sent a golden cascade of grain into wagons while straw flew high from the blower.

Spirits were high, too, as workers vied to outdo each other in feeding bundles into the great maw of the machine, or in carrying away the product of the harvest.

Most of all, though, a boy liked to watch the smooth powerful piston on the puffing engine—or the spinning governor that lifted its iron weights as the engine gained speed.

It was wonderful to be alive.

As late as 1945, MILTON YOUNG did some custom threshing back home during the fall congressional recess after he had been appointed to the Senate in March of that year. It was to help out some of his neighbors, for whom he had been threshing for years, when they were unable to buy or rent combines or otherwise get their crops threshed.

Today, all three of the Senator's sons—Duane, Wendell, and John—are active farmers, and they still help the neighbors at threshing time. Duane and Wendell are on "the old home place"; John, the youngest, has a farm about a mile west of Berlin.

Senator YOUNG's service as a public official started as a school board and township board member in the mid-1920's. In 1932 he was elected to the North Dakota House of Representatives, and in 1934 to the North Dakota Senate. His senate colleagues named him president pro tempore in 1941, and he became floor leader in 1943.

During the 1930's, the Berlin farmer-politician was chairman of various agricultural action groups established under the New Deal farm program and later was a member of what was known as the Wheat Allotment Board. Service in these groups proved to be mighty valuable experience for him as a member of the State legislature and in the U.S. Senate.

Senator YOUNG's appointment to the Senate perhaps was due in large measure to an early friendship with Fred G. Aandahl of North Dakota.

When MILTON YOUNG was president of the LaMoure County Corn-Hog Committee back in the 1930's, Aandahl was president of the same unit in neighboring Barnes County. The two also served together in the North Dakota Senate, and in the fall of 1944 YOUNG managed the political campaign which resulted in Aandahl's election as Governor of North Dakota.

In that same election, John Moses, the tall, white-maned former Governor of the State—one of the most popular men ever to win North Dakota's highest administrative office—defeated Senator Gerald P. Nye in a knockdown, dragout Senate race.

But Moses died shortly after taking office; and Governor Aandahl named YOUNG to fill the senatorial vacancy. North Dakotans reaffirmed Aandahl's choice at a special election on June 25, 1946, for the Senate term ending January 3, 1951. Then, Senator YOUNG, in a general election on November 7, 1950, was reelected to a full 6-year term. He repeated on November 6, 1956. As a measure of his popularity with North Dakota voters, the records show that in all these statewide elections, both primary and general, MILTON YOUNG lost only 1 country (1950) of the entire list of North Dakota's 53 counties. He was the only Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate in the 1956 general election who received a larger majority than did reelection candidate Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Senator YOUNG has been secretary of the Senate Republican conference since 1948. He is a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, where he is the second ranking Republican, and a member of the powerful Senate Committee on Appropriations, on which he sits as the third ranking Republican. He has been on the Agriculture Committee since 1945 and on the Appropriations Committee since 1947; and he has been serving as a member of the Select Committee on National Water Resources.

A visit to Senator YOUNG's Washington office is a flashback to the Plains. Photos of his beloved North Dakota adorn the walls, with pictures of old-fashioned smoke-belching steam threshing engines among the favored memorabilia.

That's something of the story of MILTON RUBEN YOUNG, the "Mr. Wheat" to whom Senators on both sides of the aisle listen with respect—important member of the most powerful lawmaking body in the world, a son of the soil, the sod busting Senator from North Dakota.

Why Probe Scurrilous Drivel?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Monday, April 10, 1961:

WHY PROBE SCURRILOUS DRIVEL?

The Times-Dispatch was, we believe, the first newspaper in this area, and one of the first in the United States, to comment on the preposterous pronouncements of the founder of something called the John Birch Society, concerning President Eisenhower, and other public figures.

We raised an editorial eyebrow practically to the ceiling on August 9, 1960, over the incredible nonsense uttered by this man—Robert H. W. Welch Jr., a native North Carolinian and Harvard graduate who had led in establishing the society some 2 years previously.

Recently the John Birch Society has been much in the news, and there has been a great deal of comment in the press. Some of our liberal friends rushed to demand a congressional inquiry.

These demands grew out of such irrational declarations as that of Founder Welch that Mr. Eisenhower is a "dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy," and that "treason" was the only word for some of his actions. Mr. Welch prides himself on being violently anti-Communist, and the society fights what it terms "pro-Communist" activities.

After a considerable amount of secrecy concerning the makeup of the society, and mysterious references to "cells," Mr. Welch himself has now asked for a congressional investigation. Furthermore, he has promised that neither he nor any other member of the organization will take the fifth amendment in such an inquiry—an impressive pronouncement.

But there is no occasion for any congressional inquiry at this time into the John Birch Society. Such horrendous drivel as its founder has been guilty of isn't worth an investigation.

Furthermore some of the liberals now say they see no occasion for an inquiry. Among these is Americans for Democratic Action.

However, it should not pass unnoticed that some of the very liberals who wanted to investigate the John Birch Society have been shuddering dolefully over the House Un-American Activities Committee, on the theory that it has been harassing honest patriots. These liberals blow their tops

when efforts are made by that committee to expose the Reds who have been boring into our Government as agents of the Communist conspiracy, but they wanted to mount an investigation of the John Birch Society on the basis of a few screwball pronouncements by its founder. (Since the House of Representatives voted recently, 412 to 6, in favor of increasing the appropriation of the Un-American Activities Committee, instead of abolishing it, the attitude of Congress seems obvious.)

As we say, there has been no showing that an investigation of the John Birch Society is called for. If the organization should ever do anything overtly dangerous, there will be plenty of time for a congressional probe.

Proposals to Transfer Silver Bullion From the U.S. Treasury to Private Users

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, some time ago the Bunker Hill Co. circulated a letter which contains impressive arguments against the Treasury's present policies with respect to silver. Since Idaho ranks No. 1 in the Nation in silver production, and since the Treasury policies to which this letter refers seem to favor commercial users of silver at the expense of those who produce it, I have asked the Treasury to give me its comments on the criticisms of its policies which the letter contains. Meanwhile, I believe the letter is of special interest to all those who are concerned with the problems of the silver-mining industry, and I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

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

THE BUNKER HILL CO.,
San Francisco, Calif, March 15, 1961.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: There have been indications that proposals will be made to the 87th Congress that may have, as their ultimate purpose, the transfer to private hands of a substantial portion of the wealth now held by the U.S. Treasury in the form of silver bullion, the effect of which would be much the same as the present serious drain upon our gold reserves.

As you may know, by reason of coinage requirements and sales to private industries, the Treasury's formerly ample stock of so-called free silver (meaning the seigniourage on that acquired at prices below the monetary value of $1.29 per ounce) has dwindled from well over a billion ounces to about 125 million ounces, or approximately a 2-years' supply at the present rate of decrease. Whereas in 1958 practically the entire U.S. production of 35.7 million ounces was purchased by the Treasury under the Silver Purchase Act, at the present time almost no domestic silver whatsoever is being tendered to it—in fact the reverse is true—the Treasury is now a substantial seller of silver on balance.

What has brought about this abrupt reversal in the movement of silver? In 1 year's time the trend has changed from "into the Treasury" to "out of the Treasury." The reason is simple—the Treasury is selling silver at bargain prices. In the bullion market in London, the spot price of silver today is the equivalent of 92.9 cents an ounce and the futures price 93.6 cents an ounce, whereas the Treasury's inflexible selling price is 91 cents an ounce. In other words, the U.S. Treasury is deliberately selling off the wealth of this country for less than others are willing to pay for it elsewhere.

At the same time we are selling silver at bargain prices, our requirements for coinage purposes are mounting steadily due to the tremendous growth in machine vending and in the population. When used for coinage purposes, the free silver on hand at the Treasury becomes worth around $1.60 per ounce to it because of being combined with alloys. Thus the difference between coining the free silver stocks into money and selling it to consumers at 91 cents an ounce amounts to about 70 cents an ounce loss in value, or to put it another way, a giveaway of about 75 percent of the value of the silver sold.

Those who would plunder the Treasury raise specious argument that silver is no longer the standard of value anywhere in the world. The fact of the matter is that the consumption of silver, for coinage as well as industrial purposes is constantly rising worldwide in the face of a static supply situation, and were it not for the intervention of the U.S. Treasury in obligingly making up the deficiency, there would be a critical shortage in silver supplies today. It is this interference with the free play of supply vs. demand that prevents the increase in price which is so necessary to bring forth the additional production so sorely needed. Because silver is essentially a New World mineral, this unorthodox and costly interference with fundamental economic forces prevents the stimulation of mining in the severely depressed areas of this country and the new jobs this would create, and likewise works a hardship on our Latin American neighbors, where so much of the world's silver is normally mined. All this merely to maintain artificially low costs for the silver manufacturers and fabricators who are hardly in a depressed condition.

There is no possible justification for the policy which the U.S. Treasury has been following. The gratuity which is being handed those who do not need it is at the expense of those, here and abroad, who cannot afford the injury which is being done them. Furthermore, it is not, we believe, within the province of any democratic government to discriminate against any particular segment of industry, as in this case.

We therefore respectfully urge your mature consideration of any proposals which may have, as their ultimate objective, a subsidization of a type of business where relatively little risk is involved (the silver consumers) at the expense of the risk-takers (the mining industry), at the same time further sacrificing our dwindling reserves of precious metals badly needed to support our currency.

Sincerely yours,
D. L. FEATHERS,
Vice President-Secretary.

Condemnation Not Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, there is much talk about increasing tendencies toward the so-called welfare state. An editorial in the Daily Sentinel of Grand Junction, Colo., vividly expresses the need for community cooperation and individual responsibility in creating opportunities. The editorial follows:

CONDEMNATION NOT ENOUGH

It is easy to applaud condemnation of Federal aid; easy to take a stand against the welfare state. Millions do it daily. What most of them do not do is to accept the National, State, and civic responsibilities in the fields of economics, culture, and community life which will prevent the welfare state.

The welfare state is not imposed upon us from the top. It is instigated, advocated, and supported from the bottom. This is a democracy, and we will not have a welfare state unless we want it.

A free and vigorous nation depends upon a vigorous economy in which all individuals face emergencies imaginatively and with a willingness to plan and to sacrifice the profit of the moment for the growth of the future. This is true whether the field is finance, education, religion, or health.

It is not a matter of charity. It is a matter of preserving or creating a climate in which opportunities are continually expanding. It is not enough to "be against" government dole. It is necessary also be vitally and emphatically for any community expansion, any new industry, any project which will improve and expand the area.

When this rich Nation slides into a welfare state the blame must fall upon the refusal of the total community to accept its total responsibilities. It must be considered to have grown up out of a home, community, and national atmosphere which promoted it by neglecting the hard work and sense of obligation which keep a nation alive.

Pressures against Federal assistance, whether in the field of medical care, unemployment subsidies, or educational help, are not enough. Community cooperation to prevent the need of Federal aid and individual responsibility in preserving a healthy economy are far more important and in the long run the only effective weapons.

Unfair Tax Burdens on the Clay Tile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the City Council of East Liverpool, Ohio:

RESOLUTION 9

Resolution requesting the U.S. Congress for legislation eliminating unfair tax burdens on the clay tile industry

Whereas the manufacture of clay sewer pipe is one of this city's most important industries; and

Whereas it is in competition with the cement pipe industry which has been given depletion allowances under code, see 613 and the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960 and rulings thereunder over and above those given to the manufacture of clay sewer pipe; and

Whereas this has added to the financial burden of the clay sewer pipe industry to meet the competition aforesaid resulting in possible industrial failure: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of East Liverpool, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby petitioned to change the income tax laws pertaining to the above-described inequity in order that competition between the two industries be restored on a just and equitable basis.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to Representative WAYNE L. HAYS for presentation to the Congress of the United States and additional copies be forwarded to Senators LAUSCHE and YOUNG and to Hon. Arthur J. Goldberg, Secretary of Labor.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Passed this 3d day of April 1961.

CHARLES N. EDWARDS,
President of Council.

Attest:

OWEN D. KOUNTZ,
Clerk of Council.

Approved by the mayor this 5th day of April 1961.

BERT H. GOODBALLET,
Mayor.

The Greek Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Norman Meese, editor of the New Age and assistant to the Grand Commander of the Supreme Council, 33d degree of Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry Southern Jurisdiction, United States of America, in the April issue writes a timely article entitled "The Greek Way." I am sure that these wisely spoken words will interest all who are members of fraternities and sororities and many others who are interested in our colleges:

THE GREEK WAY

The precise nature of the spontaneous protest, staged by rioting students in San Francisco during the hearings by the House Un-American Activities Committee in May 1960 was made clear by the motion pictures taken there during the demonstration. That it was part of a worldwide Communist conspiracy operating on American soil by an enemy dedicated to the destruction of this Republic can hardly be questioned. This was substantiated in a report on the occurrence issued by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in his "Communist Target—Youth."

Many of our young people are being continually victimized and exploited by Communists, and Mr. Hoover points to the San Francisco riots as an example. In connection with this defiance of authority, however, it is worth noting that nowhere has the name of any fraternity or its members been mentioned as having taken part in this or any other antisocial student demonstration elsewhere.

Here is a trenchant lesson for those who have for years advocated the abolition of our college fraternities or the making of changes in their structure or composition that would be the equivalent of their destruction.

The Greek letter college fraternity has flourished because it meets certain well-defined needs of the students. They are an important influential part of the collegiate picture today. Because of their structure and setting they provide a substantial segment of the social control made necessary by a rapidly growing student body and the increasing complexity of the American cultural pattern. They serve in their own way, but within a more restricted framework, the same disciplinary purposes that the civic and service organizations serve in their own fields. They also share with these many of the same problems.

The exemplary aloofness of these Greek letter fraternities from the recurrent student disorders reported in our news media should constitute reasonable proof that they have a common interest in promoting those values upon which the life of this Republic depends. In addition to fostering fellowship and scholastic excellence, they look to the cultivation of self-discipline, honorable conduct, leadership, and self-reliance in a world in which these sterling virtues seem to be in eclipse. The fraternities serve a most useful and worthwhile purpose and should be supported and encouraged because of their obvious contribution to their social milieu.

World Economic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following pamphlet written by Julius Stulman. The program outlined by Mr. Stulman touches upon a problem which I am sure we will all agree is of the utmost importance to our Nation:

WORLD ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT—A PROGRAM FOR UTILIZATION OF FULL CAPACITY PRODUCTION

FOREWORD

In every period of crisis, the expectancy runs high throughout the world that the idea and its time will meet. In our time, the urgency is great for ideas that will shed light on the way to solution of those crucial problems, which if they remain unsolved can precipitate mankind into catastrophe.

The new ideas which may generate bold, new policies and programs to ameliorate the human condition will not necessarily emerge from public offices, no matter how high these may be. This is not to say that our leading officials and their aids are without the knowledge, wisdom and creative intelligence to face problems of magnitude and advance their solutions. The point is, if there are others with creative insights who have something to say that might be important and useful, their thinking should be heard and appraised.

An example of this kind of thinking may be found in this monograph by Julius Stulman, "World Economic Development." It proposes an approach to hasten the economic development of needy areas through a program utilizing the full productive capacity of the United States and other producing nations. It is a program that has not yet been tried by us in the various undertakings we have underwritten to help new nations develop within a system of growth and freedom; but because it is fresh, compassionate and practical it deserves the attention of policymakers and is entitled to the benefit of public discussion. Only through such aeration can the idea be helped to meet its time.

Julius Stulman is a successful businessman with a greatly respected reputation in the lumber industry. He is founder of the World Institute Council, one of the founders of the Foundation for Integrative Education and publisher of Main Currents in Modern Thought, a magazine prized by scholars. The magazine's great virtue is that it provides a forum for the ideas of men who have something unconventional to say.

HENRY MARGENAU,
YALE UNIVERSITY, *New Haven, Conn.*

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Julius Stulman is a successful New York businessman who for over 25 years has been one of the major wholesale distributors of forest products in the United States. He heads the Stulman-Emrick Lumber Co. and its many affiliates throughout the country and the Lumber Exchange Terminal, the largest facility of its kind on the east coast.

In 1949 Mr. Stulman laid the basis for the establishment of the World Institute in a statement submitted to the members of the Foundation for Integrative Education. In this statement he proposed a bold, new approach to the solution of the onrushing, explosive problems of mankind in terms of ideas he first formulated in 1941. The integrative and synthesizing methodology of the World Institute has attracted the interest of policymakers, educators and social planners.

Mr. Stulman's thinking on public affairs has influenced many who help formulate public policy and action. Dr. Donald Faulkner of Western Reserve University in 1958 wrote to him, saying, "I have noticed so often analyses and recommendations which you propound becoming common discussion months later." In his book "Integration of Human Knowledge," Dr. Oliver L. Reiser, professor of philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh, pointed out that Mr. Stulman's "thinking about social problems has influenced my own at a number of points."

In 1951, at the request of Prime Minister Nehru, Mr. Stulman worked with the Indian Planning Commission on India's first 5-year program. His approach to the socio-economic problems of India was widely reported and discussed in the press of that country.

It is the author's thesis that only by integrating human knowledge and pooling the best talents available can a whole effort be made to solve our problems. Central to his thinking is the idea that the problems of every nation are inseparable from the total problem of mankind. This view is at the core of this monograph.

(By Julius Stulman)

Since 1945 the United States has spent approximately $75 billion on various foreign aid programs. This massive outpouring of capital helped revive the economics of Western Europe where, to begin with, the technological base was sturdy and contemporary. But it has not succeeded in catalyzing the dormant energies of the greater part of the world. In total balance, per capita standard of living, on a global basis, has hardly budged upward at all. Nor has the vast grants program fed back to the United States the kind of economic return that has lessened the toll of cyclical recessions or minimized the level of unemployment here. As a direct effect, it has contributed substantially to our gold imbalance. Moreover, the enormous expenditure has not succeeded in decreasing the effects of the Communist appeal in impoverished and uncommitted areas.

It is clear that the traditional foreign aid programs, even abetted by our own prospering allies, are inadequate to the larger purpose to which the American people and the free world must be attached. This purpose is no less than upgrading the impoverished peoples of the world to a level of decent living and to formulate the methods and means to make possible a progressive increase in well-being and freedom for everyone.

Large-scale handouts will not accomplish this purpose. The solution lies in the full utilization of natural and human resources, in the full employment of productive capacity, and in the stimulation of constant growth to ever higher levels of capacity and output.

Essential to any program conceived in such large terms is a view of mankind as a whole integrated economic unit, interdependent, growing in a process of taking and feeding back. A program based on such a view excludes the piecemeal palliative and calls instead for solutions that produce growth not only for recipient nations but donor nations as well.

In terms of the United States, such a program, to be creative, must also stimulate our own growth while it contributes to the development of deprived nations.

THE GAP BETWEEN FERTILITY AND PRODUCTION

Time worn methods, even though they flow from generous impulses, cannot meet the world's needs. The solemn fact is that the growth of population is faster than the rate of industrialization, posing a crisis that threatens equally the Western, the noncommitted and the Communist-dominated nations. Procreativity and longevity, already the causes of the gravest contemporary problems, can in the short term future reduce the major segment of mankind to a permanent condition of poverty.

At a 3 percent rate of annual increase from births and growing longevity, it takes only 23 years to double a population. The Ivory Coast has an annual increase of 5.3 percent, a rate that will double its population in under 20 years. The population of South America grew from 60.3 million in 1920 to 110.4 million or 83 percent in 1950. Mexico's population rose in 30 years from 19.2 million to 34.6 million.

The logic and logistics of the warfare between fertility and production are such that not even the richest nation can afford to ignore the impending danger of poverty. Between 1950 and 1959, the population of the United States rose from 151 million to 175 million, an increase of one-sixth in 9 years. Only increasing our production by more than the annual percentage of population increase can we secure jobs and livelihoods for our people. In view of technological improvements, permitting the creation of more goods by fewer people, our production increase must substantially exceed our population increase to supply ample levels of employment.

Clearly the only solution to the problem of population growth is an effort to outrun human fertility by human productivity. Produce or perish has become the imperative of nations.

For the American people, the imperative is to lead the way through a new effusion of idealism and new ideas. The mission falls to our lot because of our capacities and our unique know-how in the mastery and use of technological and managerial power. No other nation has the excess productive capacity and the wealth of skills that we have. Moreover, there are other untapped resources throughout the world that could be put to work if an adequate method of utilization were devised.

In accepting the commitment of leadership in the mission to transform a world half free and half slave into one of freedom for all, the American people will finally have a clear vision of a national goal in the latter part of the 20th century. To fulfill this commitment and regain thereby an unassailable stature of world leadership, we must begin now to mobilize our brainpower, resources, will, and ingenuity in what might be the last struggle of the human race for a full, safe, and free life.

International politics can no longer be viewed in the form of power relationships, but must now be concerned with profound socio-economic impulses driving all mankind.

The program proposed in these pages offers a breakthrough to a new method of rapidly increasing the world's rate of productivity under a growing system of freedom and without coercion. It outlines a process by which social, economic, and psychological needs of emerging nations can be creatively served.

The program outlines a method by which the United States can:

1. Achieve full maximum capacity production at declining costs.
2. Progressively increase its capacity.
3. Distribute to needy nations the difference between what we require for home consumption and trade and the full output of a rising capacity.
4. Provide the opportunity for other nations voluntarily to join by the same means this global economic mission to raise the standard of living of all people.
5. Increase the consumption and rapidly expand the technological development of emerging nations and help them to acquire the ability to pay for their own economic growth.
6. Progressively diminish the power of the Communist economic offensive, the allure of Communist slogans, and the effects of other doctrinaire propaganda.
7. Broaden and firm up the base of freedom by which men can find their true stature throughout the world.

FULL MAXIMUM CAPACITY PRODUCTION

In the light of the apparent needs of the world, including those of the United States, it is unimaginative and paradoxical that either industrial or agricultural production should continue to be restrained. Our schizophrenic farm program is torn between the alternatives of reducing productive acreage and of supporting farm prices, while at the same time accumulating stockpiles of many billions of dollars. To its credit, where the program has implemented oversea disposal, some results have been economically creative. As a result of barter arrangements, the U.S. Government has received, in exchange for food, minerals, fibers, and other raw materials with a heavy labor content from recipient countries. In other instances, where payment for American farm products has been made in local currencies, reserves of working capital have been set up for economic development. While national policy has cut back our agricultural capacity, surplusage nevertheless occurs and is used with wisdom by our Government in its program for impoverished areas.

Fundamentally, however, with half the world still starving the immorality of restraining food production should by now have created a strong sense of national guilt. The frustrations of a bad policy are felt by all of us. The American people basically want a better way to handle this problem, but as of now they have not been able to devise one. The promised food-for-peace crusade may alter this condition and liberate our farm policy from its inhibiting attachment to parity prices.

Our industrial output, which is consistently much lower than actual capacity will not have the benefit of a products-for-peace crusade and has no program supporting utilization of excess output. Production is maintained at levels determined by classical market conditions both here and abroad. There is certainly no extra stimulation to produce at maximum capacity.

Yet maximum capacity production offers the way out of a vast number of problems, not only in our commitment to needy nations but domestically as well.

Production at full capacity is feasible of attainment, but it requires an ability to override historic blockages which now tie production planning to traditional standards.

The method proposed in this program for full capacity output is a dual system of production, one cycle of which will be used to meet normal market requirements, the other cycle to be used for the requirements of needy nations.

In the first cycle, an enterprise participating in this program will maintain the necessary levels of production, within existing formal patterns of costing, to serve its traditional domestic and foreign markets. Standard accounting procedures will continue to be applied in this production cycle, in which overhead and other standard costs will be charged to the cost of production.

In the second cycle, the participating enterprise will assign its total excess capacity to produce products, stripped of the frills and trappings required for competition in normal markets, for distribution to underdeveloped areas. Such products are to be made to meet the psychological requirements of emerging nations, at a price they can meet, and at a profit to the company supplying them. Prices of products so destined for underdeveloped countries can be rolled back to include principally costs of direct labor and materials, and to exclude charges for general overhead, design, warehousing, selling, advertising, promotion, fancy packaging and like items. These charges can continue to be absorbed by the percentage of production earmarked to meet the demands of normal markets.

In addition to making products available at low cost to underdeveloped nations—in some instances as low as one-fifth of normal cost—this system will increase the profitability of any enterprise adopting it. A company, for example, producing at a given time 70 percent of rated capacity and which assigns the 30 percent unused capacity to production for needy nations will manage this share of its output at "bargain" costs enabling it to sell it at "bargain" prices with a true profit. Full capacity production, moreover, will make possible benefits in purchasing, labor utilization, plant efficiency and other elements which will beneficially affect the total cost of production.

Companies participating in this program should have agreements between management and labor which establish the conditions to insure the success of the program.

Appropriate safeguards can easily be erected against the dangers of a dual pricing system and the possiblities of black market operations. Products made for underdeveloped countries will be uniquely marked. A clear definition of eligibility should be made for the procurement of goods under this program. Proper policing can prevent the lower priced products from affecting normal market structures. India, for example, has a double pricing system for foods. Eligible families below a certain annual income level receive as proof of eligibility food cards entitling them to purchase food far below the free market prices. Those not eligible have to pay free market prices.

INCREASING OUR PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY

In addition to the need for producing at full capacity, the world's requirements are so enormous that a continuous increase in capacity is one of the imperative targets. To increase capacity requires a constant replacement of production equipment by the most technologically advanced substitutes.

Since the proposed program excludes enforced participation or any other form of coercion, attractive inducements must be set up to encourage enterprises to underwrite capital expenditures for new, advanced equipment. The tax structure should be revised permitting very rapid depreciation write-off of equipment used in production for underdeveloped countries. A governmental, or as will be seen later, an international pool of depreciated equipment should be established for delivery to under-

developed countries, as second-hand tools and equipment. Contributions to this pool by individual enterprises should be paid for under a schedule which will encourage replacements by the most advanced types of production machinery, so that our ability to produce quality goods in increasing capacity and at declining costs will be constantly enhanced. Such strong encouragement to technological progress can be an important contribution to freedom.

This process can result in other major benefits both to underdeveloped countries and to the people of the producing nations of the world. With respect to underdeveloped countries, tools and equipment for the erection of factory systems can become available in abundance. Production set up around such equipment will almost certainly be for home consumption exclusively, and because the equipment will not have the same productivity rate as the new, advanced types replacing it, it will not pose a competitive threat to the world's markets. Nevertheless, it will be the best available at the time of disposal and a challenge to the machine adaptability of the emerging peoples.

As for the economy of the United States and that of any other industrialized nation participating in this program, the large-scale replacement of existing equipment with new types will open the door wide to the latest in automation. It will increase productivity per man-hour; reduce unit costs; increase real wages, purchasing power and consumption at lower prices; and provide a strong underpinning for full employment. As the level of technology rises in underdeveloped countries, the process of machinery disposal through the equipment pool will include automated equipment, stimulating a constant turnover of capital equipment, toward ever advanced types. Eventually, as the machine-orientation of the emerging peoples increases, their own equipment will be replaced through this pool by automated equipment from level to level.

DISTRIBUTION AND PAYMENTS

As we conceive of this program as a "products and machinery for peace" crusade and as a method for our own continued growth, and, concerned as it is with the solution of mankind's gravest problem, it would be futile to bind it to traditional forms of international payments. The distribution of products and machinery to underdeveloped nations is not part of a grant-in-aid program proposing stop-gap solutions at random sore spots. It is a total, integrated program promising solutions in which the recipient underdeveloped nations, in the very act of receiving, will be catalyzing the advance of the industrialized nations to higher levels of technology.

In spite of its force for growth, the program, nevertheless, requires a practical approach to the question of payment. Neither the psychic reward of moral satisfaction nor the overriding benefit of minimizing a major cause of world strife is sufficient compensation if we are to insure human freedom and human dignity. The emerging peoples, however, cannot now pay for what they may receive and rightfully should have. Currently the underdeveloped nations are rich in manpower, potentially the most productive resource of all. Conversion of this resource into an increasingly productive force will provide the ultimate means of payment for products and equipment. The capability of paying from future earnings will increase as the industrialization impetus drives on. Even in the short term, increased productivity in farming, mining, and some industrial operations can produce net earnings out of which debts for the purchase of tools can be paid.

For the long term, there must be inherent in this program a persuasive faith in the desire and ultimate ability of the underdeveloped peoples to make good their debts. Supported by such a faith, a system of credits should be established that will enable needy nations to postpone payments for products and machinery in the form of labor and goods. To convert the promise of payment into current receipts it will be necessary to equip existing international banking institutions with an adequate revolving fund. For this fund, the present capital of the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the U.S. Export-Import Bank and the banking systems of Western Europe may well supply the means. Some of these institutions are not now using substantial parts of their resources. Added funds can be mobilized in the capital markets of the world if the institutions implementing the program continue to enjoy the confidence of financial communities. Moreover, funds earmarked for giveaway grants should be used to support this program.

It should be recalled that the wealth of the United States could never have been developed without massive investments in its future by the European financial community during the 19th century. These investments were based on confidence in the debtor's ability and readiness to honor obligations. They were made in the light of our natural resources and in the desire to make this Nation a trading partner, buying goods from Europe and selling its products in payment to the markets of the world. The relationship between the underdeveloped nations and the industrialized countries today cannot be very much different from the earlier relationship between the United States and its more advanced European partners. History will also record that the emerging nations helped the producing nations as the United States helped its European sponsors. Actually, the manpower and natural resources of the emerging nations offer the largest pool of production ingredients in the world, and they should be viewed as strong collateral for long-term credits.

The total program of industrial surplus sales to underdeveloped countries and consumers within them should be transacted by private sellers and buyers. The interference of government bureaucracies should be reduced to a minimum at the source of procurement as well as the place of destination. This does not mean an exclusion of government supervision. As in the disposal of U.S. farm surplus commodities, the problem of protecting growing normal sales against price destruction by surplus disposal must be solved.

The needy countries at the receiving end of this program can set up an exchange system in which consumer goods are traded with their own nationals for hours of labor contributed to natural resources exploitation, public works, educational institutions, and other construction projects. An underdeveloped country, for example, can purchase commodities under long-term credit made possible by this program. It can then sell these commodities to its people for their surplus hours of labor rated at prevailing wage scales.

By way of illustration, an item for which the country is charged $3, and in the normal markets sells for $12, may be exchanged for $6 worth of work assigned to a roadbuilding project, an assembly plant construction or comparable capital developments. In this manner, basic wealth accumulations can be built up. Let us say, a volume of goods for which the country is charged $1 million may be exchanged for $2 million worth of labor poured into a capital project. The gain in terms of national wealth is $3 million, together with a new capacity to produce goods or other values, and at the same time provide a capital base for continuing credit. On a large scale, this process can bring about rising levels of consumption and larger accumulations of capital. In the long term, the compounding of national wealth by this means will make possible repayment of the country's debt to the international credit agency.

While surplus labor hours can be used for public works, housing, and similar developments, they will also be available in volume for assignment to the erection of processing, assembly, and manufacturing plants built around the equipment sold from the machinery disposal pool. The formations set up around such equipment can be organized under credit systems devised in the recipient country. In all cases the principle is to transform the country's manpower resources into productive wealth.

A MULTILATERAL PROGRAM

While the United States has the potential in resources, know-how, and capital to carry a substantial burden of the program alone, rapid fulfillment of its material and moral aims can best be attained if all the industrialized nations participate. The program, therefore, proposes the organization of a central international body, within or outside the United Nations, to supervise its operations, set up the required structure of payments and credits, act as a central management counseling body and establish thorough research facilities.

Whether the program is wholly American or ideally international in sponsorship, its research adjuncts must be given high priority. Among their functions will be to research and design products that can be manufactured in excess capacities and that are acceptable to recipients in needy nations; to research the potentials in developing areas that can be encouraged by selected types of industrial equipment; to research local market needs, labor skills, natural resources, and other areas of potential wealth.

The central organization will also have to face up to the widespread lack of machine orientation in the emerging nations and establish training programs around works in progress or for installation in the planning stage. The rapid development of even marginal skills will make possible final assembly of many products produced in preliminary stages in the excess capacity of plants in the United States and elsewhere. Management know-how and the men who can teach it are exportable items and should be made available for assignment to needy nations as a basic phase of this program.

To preserve the free enterprise character of the program, the central organization should eventually be self-supporting, and although nonprofitmaking, it should earn its keep from income out of royalties on patents and developments, nominal commissions on the sales it engineers, and nominal fees for management services.

INCREASING CONSUMPTION AND INDUSTRIALIZATION OF NEEDY PEOPLES

Industrialized United States and Western Europe, in command now of extraordinary scientific resources and imminently capable of fully automated production, will in greater degree have to find expanding markets for their output. All producers, including the Soviet Union, are contending for all available markets in which to trade. The hope everywhere is that the vast underdeveloped populations will be converted rapidly into full consumers and therefore rich markets.

Currently per capita income in scores of underdeveloped nations is below $100 per annum. The explosive rate of population increases prevents current industrialization efforts to upgrade per capita income. Only rapidly increased productivity can raise the level of income and expand these nations into richer markets.

The proposed program essentially will achieve this end. Capital equipment, in the

quantities it envisions, put to use in extractive industries, public works, fabrication, and assembly, will hasten the process of technology, raise productivity and with it purchasing power. By exchanging labor hours contributed to the industrial buildup for commodities, people in underdeveloped countries will have the means to purchase products imported within this program from the surplus production of participating enterprises. These products, stripped to the core and redesigned if necessary to serve these people, will contribute to a rising standard of living. This is the beginning of the process of transforming underconsumers into full consumers, and the beginning of consumer education, an essential factor of market strength and healthy people.

As the process continues under this program, production tools, in increasing diversity, will be supplied by industrial nations by which emerging nations will manufacture the basic needs of their people. These tools will come out of the pool of depreciated equipment, adapted where necessary to local conditions. Again, in the normal process of development, this is the beginning of a large, advancing, maturing capital goods market.

NULLIFYING THE COMMUNIST OFFENSIVE

The principal strength of the Communist economic offensive and the allure of Marxist slogans derive largely from the grave deficits of capital throughout the underdeveloped world. Goaded by the historic imperative to industrialize, caught in the gap between productivity and procreation, and driven by nationalistic pride to be contemporary among nations, underdeveloped countries are the natural prey of the Communist offensive. Unless a nation is helped quickly to industrialize in freedom and in freedom to develop the capital wherewithal for growth, it can succumb easily to the promise of Communist slogans. The next step is a consolidation of economic power in a central government and the establishment of a system of duress in which power manipulates men, money and machines for its own aggrandizement and perpetuation.

In the long run, the imperative of history is produce or perish. In this generation, the imperative is to lead the underdeveloped nations in freedom to industrialization or watch them, one by one, fall into the Communist trap. The U.S.S.R. claims to have spent 9 billion rubles or $2,250 million on aid to Asian and African countries. William O. Douglas has characterized Soviet aid as having "no charity in it." He pointed out that every economic favor rendered in the form of loans at 2½ percent interest per annum had its political price. Russia, however, is also a have-not nation; it does not have the productive capacity and technological abundance to remake the world in the Soviet image. It cannot now, nor will it for a long time, have the ability to satisfy the needs of its own people.

There unquestionably obtains in Russia a great capacity of scientific and technical talents, but there is also a great incapacity in management. Russia—and this is evident as the momentum of its growth picks up—does not posses the managerial know-how, communication skills and technological orientation rapidly to change-over itself from a basic have-not nation to one of opulence. The U.S.S.R. tends to resist change and improvement and intellectually cannot adopt a method involving a process of change. No matter what it promises to the needy nations, without the power to produce and manage, it can only succeed in socializing poverty. If the resources of the United States and the free world are mobilized in a program as outlined, involving the full utilization of productive capacity, products and machinery could be sold to needy nations at a profit to us, not only at a price below the cost of production in the Soviet Union, but in quality and quantity the U.S.S.R. cannot equal. In the face of such strength, the Soviet boast to swamp us would be reduced to a whimper.

THE BASE OF FREEDOM

No program sponsored by the American people can ever enhance our stature or give us moral satisfaction unless it flourishes in freedom and extends the base of freedom to all people. The commitment to make the half-slave part of the world free, to extend the frontier of freedom to a new and distant horizon, is the American mission. The program based on full and growing capacity production has the means within it to begin the achievement of freedom and economic independence for deprived nations, and through its methods give the people of these nations the opportunity to raise their standards of living through productive labor, and through their own will and toil capitalize their growth and development. The feedback to us and other producing nations will be the way to our own new growth dimensions.

With inducements of self-interest, without coercion, and with methods that are humanly manageable, no people will choose to surrender their right to freedom if given the opportunity for a proud, dignified, and creative way of productive growth.

Hospital Care for Gold Star Mothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my statement before the Veterans' Affairs Committee in support of my bill, H.R. 699, to authorize the furnishing of hospital care at Veterans' Administration hospitals for Gold Star Mothers:

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS J. LANE, OF MASSACHUSETTS, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 699, A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE FURNISHING OF HOSPITAL CARE AT VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS FOR GOLD STAR MOTHERS, APRIL 10, 1961

Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States has been most thoughtful and generous, in legislating a wide range of benefits for veterans, and extending in part to their dependents.

The GI bill of rights that was enacted in 1944 was the most comprehensive program of its kind in human history. It recognized the special obligation of the Government "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow, and his orphan."

In order to help the 16 million veterans who returned from World War II, in their adjustment to civilian life, we overlooked a need that would come for the mothers of those who gave their lives in defense of our country. Some of them were the beneficiaries of Government insurance. A few of them are on the pension rolls. But not one of them is entitled to hospital care at Veterans' Administration hospitals.

There are not many Gold Star Mothers of World War I living today. And the Gold Star Mothers of World War II are in their fifties. Their great need is for hospital care which is not provided for them under veterans' legislation in effect today.

To many Americans this is an unintentional but serious neglect of those to whom we owe so much. By example and instruction, these brave mothers raised their sons and daughters to be good citizens and to give their lives, if need be, in defense of our country and its freedoms.

I know the admirable character of these women. I saw some of them soon after they had received official notice that a son had been killed in action. In their grief they did not complain of the most difficult loss of all to bear.

The least we can do for them, in return for the sacrifice that they made, is to provide hospital and medical care in their time of need. It is not enough to honor them with words, on Memorial Day and Veterans' Day.

As a mark of our sincere gratitude and enduring respect, we should care for them when they need our assistance, in veterans' hospitals, where they would be treated and comforted and restored to health. Not because they claim it as a right, but because we want to help them who gave of their own flesh and blood to save us. In a Veterans' Administration hospital they would be cheered by visible evidence of our Government's consideration for them.

Last year, a mother in my district who had lost two sons on the battlefield in World War II, became gravely ill. She did not have any health insurance, or enough money to pay for private hospital care. Through the veterans' aid department of her community, we made arrangements to finance her hospital expenses until she passed away. But as this was a form of welfare, it was embarrassing to the pride of this poor woman and to those of us who tried to assist her.

For her service to the Nation, she deserved more than this.

In order to protect her during the emergency of sickness, I have introduced H.R. 699. To the extent that the furnishing of such care will not jeopardize the availability of facilities for the furnishing of hospital care to veterans it will authorize hospital care at Veterans' Administration facilities for Gold Star Mothers.

Textile Industry Must Have Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Fall River (Mass.) Herald-News of Monday, April 10, urging the necessity of curbing a rising tide of textile imports into the United States, to the detriment of American industry and labor:

NEED PROTECTION

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America has announced its intention to stop cutting Japanese fabrics on May 1. The boycott on Japanese goods is intended to put pressure on Japan to impose voluntary quotas on its exports of finished men's and boys' suits to this country. Whether it will be successful is questionable, but it certainly makes plain just how determined many Americans are to reverse the tide of imports flowing into this country.

Evidently the clothing workers are tired of Washington's dilatory and half-hearted

attitude toward what is one of the most pressing economical problems in the country today. By now the administration has heard management and labor, to say nothing of deputations from Congress, all expressing the same fear of the damaging effect these imports from abroad are having on our own industry. There is nothing new about the situation. It has been basically the same for the past 15 years. But it is getting rapidly worse, and its repercussions are being felt everywhere.

The problem it presents to the Government is complex. Washington does not wish to weaken its allies economically and thereby make them more susceptible to Communist blandishments. At the same time, it is keeping them strong at the expense of American taxpayers. The conflict of interests here is sharp, and in the end domestic industry will have to be preserved, or this Nation's own strength will be sapped.

The time is not far off when the administration will have to reappraise the situation, however agonizing that reappraisal may be. The action of the clothing workers should hasten that day.

A Program for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to bring to the attention of the House the activity of a Michigan company that wants to aid the economy by a direct program of action by all business management. Mr. Clyde H. Reeme, president of the Udylite Corp. of Detroit, is to be commended for the following address he gave to members of Udylite management on April 10, 1961:

For practically a full year now, the headlines of the morning papers have made a poor side dish for your toast and coffee. You have read about the increasing rate of unemployment, the falling rate of national growth, about higher prices and lower profits, about regression and recession and other types of crises in our national economy. And if you are like any other member of business management, this talk disturbs you and makes you wonder a little bit as you make your way to work.

As men of management we have willingly accepted the leadership. We have willingly joined the ranks of men who, like ourselves, determine how business can best serve the needs of the people of this country. Now we are faced squarely with the question: What are we going to do about this deadly state of mind faced by our Nation and our business community?

One answer—and I believe a valid one—has come from a man on our own management team. Just a few days ago Chet Clark suggested to me a simple, yet purposeful program that will place the economic situation of ourselves, our company, and our country back in its proper perspective.

You may be apprehensive about spending your money on the new car you had planned to buy—on signing the mortgage for the new homestead you've been looking forward to having for years—on taking that trip that you'd really like for this year's vacation. You may comprehend all these apprehensions as evidence of some unspoken kind of insecurity about your own job.

Without realizing it, we have let ourselves—not only here at Udylite, but all throughout the country—be drawn into a situation from which it becomes harder and harder to extricate ourselves.

But let's look at it in another light. Because the purchases we postpone today mean fewer jobs in the industries we supply, fewer orders on our own order books, fewer jobs in our own plant, we are working ourselves deeper and deeper into more of the same kind of apprehension that started this cycle in the first place. It promises to rob us—our personal selves, our industry and our Nation—of vitality and confidence.

Obviously we don't want this kind of thing to happen. Nobody does. As men of management, it is our responsibility to shape the course of events. We exert the power we have earned to make things happen, not to permit things to happen to us. And the program resulting from Chet's suggestion offers a guide to solving today's particular problem.

What, then, am I asking of you business leaders here at Udylite, and all business leaders throughout the whole U.S. economy? Simply this: I am proposing that we start now the recovery program for the economy by our own action.

I am going to ask you to show your vitality and confidence by proceeding with those purchases you were planning on making * * * by buying the new car and appliance * * * by signing the mortgage * * * by taking the vacation. Pour the fruit of your labors back into the wealth of the Nation. Enjoy the benfits you deserve unhampered by an unholy specter of fear for the future.

This is the surest way of guaranteeing the security of your own job—which really may be what is haunting us all. By making jobs for others we make job security for ourselves. It is as simple as that, and it works as quickly as that.

We would like to see this program spread to your friends, to our suppliers, to the other industries here in Detroit and, in fact, throughout the entire Nation.

Take for our example, the contributions already made by other groups, and the sacrifices suffered by them during our national economic decline. Our own organized labor has already paid more than its share through lost jobs and lost wages, through reductions, even in jobless benefits in critical unemployment areas. Can we who do not feel the job pinch so quickly stand by while fellow employees return to their homes without work today?

We have seen time after time that we can plan for progress and achieve it. Sometimes it takes daring. Sometimes it takes no more than doing the job to be done today, with confident hope that we will achieve the awards of tomorrow.

I mentioned a second part to the program being proposed initially to you today. That is, to spread this gospel as far and as wide as you can. You will be interested to know that I am sending a copy of this talk with the Udylite plan for progress to the presidents of leading corporations in the country. In a covering letter there is a request that they encourage their own management teams to take the same action I am asking you.

Will you, then, convert others to it, and ask them to serve as missionaries as well? This includes your friends and neighbors, your grocer and milkman—anyone who has ears to listen to your voice. It is through concerted efforts on the part of all confident men in the country that this program can really succeed. And it is through the enthusiastic beginnings made by this group at Udylite here today that such a worthy program can get started.

Consider this program thoughtfully—seriously. Discuss it at home and with your fellow employees. Then act. Don't hesitate any longer. Get out and show your confidence with your purchasing power and revitalized objectives, letting your confidence rub off on every friend and acquaintance you know.

A Dormitory for Congressional Pages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to testify on April 11, 1961, before the Accounts Subcommittee of the House Administration Committee, in behalf of H.R. 1221, a bill to provide a residence for the pages of the Senate and the House of Representatives. I introduced this bill on January 3, 1961, and I commend to the attention of our colleagues my remarks before the subcommittee:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to thank you for this opportunity to give you my views on H.R. 1221, a bill to provide a residence for the pages of the Senate and House of Representatives under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board.

The absence of a properly supervised dormitory or other suitable living quarters for the Capitol pages continues to be a serious problem which should have our prompt and careful attention. I have proposed that three Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker, form a Capitol Pages' Residence Board. This board is to be responsible for the maintenance and operation of a dormitory-type residence for the Capitol pages. Fees to be deducted from the salary of the pages at rates that would make the operation of the residence self-sustaining, so far as practicable, would be set by the board. In most cases, it is expected that these rates would be less than the rents now being paid for private housing. Construction is not contemplated at the present time and none of the appropriated funds will be used to purchase real property unless specifically authorized in the appropriation act. The board is authorized to accept voluntary donations for the purchase or construction of a residence.

Each page employed by the Senate or the House of Representatives would be required to reside at the pages' residence while Congress is in session and during all periods when he is entitled to receive compensation as a page, unless the board had approved alternative living arrangements. One or more persons with the necessary maturity and experience to provide the care and supervision these boys need would be appointed by the board.

This lack of any adequate housing for the Capitol pages is deplorable. It is almost unbelievable that these boys of high school age must seek living accommodations wherever they can in a city as big as Washington. Many of the pages must rent rooms or share apartments in various parts of the city, sometimes at exhorbitant rents. Only a fortunate few have relatives with whom they can live. The rest must do the best they can and often live under conditions where they run the risk of associating with persons of less than the most desirable character.

The page boys are still in their formative years. They must be between the ages of 14

and 17 in order to be eligible for appointment. Since they are appointed on a patronage basis by a Congressman or a U.S. Senator from their home State, many come from across the country.

Under the present conditions, they are, in effect, thrown out into the city without any protection or guidance after they arrive. They are allowed to come and go as they please without sustained supervision over and above that given by some of their landlords.

These boys are not mature enough to cope with city life under these conditions. The possible consequences have been amply demonstrated on two occasions in the past years. Only a year ago a street gang attacked four 16-year-old pages at Fifth and East Capitol Streets and stabbed one of the boys. Another page boy was attacked and brutally beaten near the Capitol the year before that. A similar tragedy or worse is liable to happen again unless proper housing and supervision is provided for these boys. The pages will continue to be vulnerable to such attacks until the situation is rectified.

Congress has furnished the Capitol pages a school in the Library of Congress which has an unusually good teaching staff that does an admirable job under difficult conditions. The physical plant of the Capitol Page School is limited. The necessarily irregular hours constitute another hardship. There is no way to provide organized or supervised study periods under present conditions.

It is equally essential that we in the Congress provide the Capitol pages with suitable living conditions, an inspiring rather than a degrading environment, and proper supervision. These things are as important to the healthy development of these young men as a good education. We have a special responsibility to give the Capitol pages the kind of academic and spiritual atmosphere we would like our own children to have away from home.

These boys have a rare opportunity to observe the workings of our Government. Their job here in the Capitol gives them an insight into governmental processes which they can get no other way. The Capitol pages can form a valuable nucleus for education and training in politics in the best sense of the word. If we give them a decent chance, they have an opportunity to become outstanding citizens and leaders of the future. But adequate housing facilities where they can eat, sleep, play, and study under proper supervision are essential to the achievement of this goal.

Congress has appropriated large amounts of money for our office and service needs in recent years. The least we can do for these fine boys, who provide a valuable service for our work, is to give them better living conditions. Their schedule is a demanding one which involves early hours for schoolwork and late hours when Congress works late.

We all share a common responsibility for the welfare of the Capitol pages whom we have brought here to serve us. Many bills have been introduced to provide the pages with a suitable residence in the last 10 years. The matter is already long overdue.

I first introduced a similar bill in the 85th Congress. It aroused considerable favorable comment. In the 86th Congress many Members joined me in urging enactment of the bill I then introduced.

I am happy that this committee has seen fit to order this hearing. I sincerely hope that this bill will receive your early and favorable consideration. Thank you for hearing me.

Legislation To Help Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Small Business Committee, today addressed the convention of the National Independent Dairies Association which is meeting here. As a member of that committee and chairman of its Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry, I think his remarks on "Legislative Proposals To Help Small Business" will be of interest to all of our colleagues. While Mr. PATMAN's remarks are particularly pertinent to the dairy industry, they also offer avenues of approach to help remedy the ills of other small independent business firms who need legislative aid to ease their burdens.

Under unanimous consent, I include his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO HELP SMALL BUSINESS

(Address by WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, National Independent Dairies Association, Washington, D.C., April 11, 1961)

It is pleasing to see and visit so many independent and small processors and distributors of dairy products. Indeed, it is surprising that so many of you have survived the rigors of trade practices and conditions to which you have been subjected.

Those of us who have served with the House Small Business Committee have learned much about your problems. Well do I remember the first hearings our Small Business Committee held regarding the problems in the dairy industry. We opened those hearings in Dallas on December 30, 1957. They produced some shocking evidence about how some large processors and distributors were selling milk at prices below cost with devastating effects on small business.

Since then our colleague and good friend, TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, has held hearings and made investigations in various parts of the country about the practice of selling dairy products at prices below cost. The work he has done has added substantially to the evidence we collected in our hearings at Dallas.

DISCRIMINATORY PRICING BY THE FIRMS HURT SMALL FIRMS

"You know better than I how the below-cost selling practices have increased your difficulties in your efforts to survive," he said: "Some of the larger firms do not experience the same difficulties.

This is true even though they engage in the practice of selling milk at prices below cost in some areas. They are able to do this by recouping their losses through the sale of milk at higher prices in other areas.

"Some of them are such large, conglomerate corporations that they are enabled to survive for some time even if they should make all of their sales of milk at prices below cost."

National Dairy Products Corp., (Sealtest) is not only the largest processor and distributor of dairy products, but its operations are widely diversified. Its total gross sales now approximate $1,600 million annually.

This large conglomerate corporation is engaged in the sale and distribution of many products. In one of its annual reports a few years ago to its stockholders it stated:

"We move ahead on our program to expand manufacturing and distributing facilities for our lines of cheese, salad dressings, cooking oils, margarine, confections, and other grocery products. A new cheese plant was started at Stockton, Ill. Construction also moved along on our new vegetable oil refinery at Champaign, Ill.

"We entered the glass container industry in the late summer of 1956, acquiring the Metro Glass Co. with plants in Jersey City, N.J., Washington, Pa., and Dolton, Ill. Metro is a supplier of containers to National Dairy, as well as to many other companies in the food, beverage, household products and cosmetics industries.

"In Mexico, we began to make and distribute cheese and salad products at a new plant in Monterrey.

"Products introduced during the year were orange juice, fresh fruit salad, jellies and preserves, a new line of flavored cheese spreads and a new whipped cream cheese.

"Our newly developed orange juice, packaged ready for use in quart paper containers, began to appear in grocery dairy cases under the Kraft brand. Derived from selected sweet ripe oranges, this is a reconstituted juice maintaining a constant, peak-of-season flavor. We also introduced Kraft fruit salad. The orange, grapefruit, pineapple and maraschino cherry sections going into these salads are processed and packed at our plant in Lakeland, Fla., where special care is taken to conserve all the natural fruit juices.

"We also expanded the company's business with a new Kraft line of jellies and preserves in a wide variety of flavors."

Its more recent reports to its stockholders have described in detail how this expansion into new product lines and into new markets has continued. Many of the plants this large nationwide corporation has acquired by buying out small and individual firms who had built goodwill in their respective sections of the country and on the products they had developed. Thus, some of these large firms have not only bought the facilities, but also, the businesses of many competitors.

According to testimony which has been presented to a subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee, the viewpoint has been expressed by representatives of at least one of these large processors and distributors that through the practice of making sales in particular areas at prices below cost, they can destroy competing small business firms and take over their business more cheaply than by going through the process of buying them out.

On May 14, 1960, a representative of small business complained to members of the House that the National Dairy Products Corp. (Sealtest) was selling dairy products in Kentucky at unreasonably low prices, and in that connection stated:

"The unreasonably low price at which these products are being sold would seem to be for the sole purpose of destroying competition, especially independent dairies such as ourselves. This can be very easily done by a large national concern such as Sealtest who operates in many different geographical localities and are able to finance and subsidize a price war against small dairies who sell in competition.

"By using these unfair competitive practices they would in effect force us out of business within 30 to 60 days. Therefore,

the urgency for action is of the utmost importance. We ask that you help us eliminate these unfair practices as quickly as possible."

This method of expanding business by making sales at prices below cost has been referred to as "advertising."

Not long ago the Committee on the Judiciary, in the course of hearings regarding monopoly power, heard a witness who had engaged in loss-leader selling. In the course of the testimony and with reference to that practice, he stated:

"What cheaper method of advertising is there if I advertise a commodity that cost me a dime for 5 cents and that customer comes into my store. And my only hope is he will buy something else from me."

The advertising characteristics and any misleading and deceptive effects incident thereto are not necessarily the worst aspects of making sales at prices below cost. Its deadly effect upon small and independent competitors of the loss-leader selling is one of its most dangerous characteristics.

EXISTING LAW IS INADEQUATE TO MEET THIS PROBLEM

Existing law has been interpreted as unusable by small businessmen in their effort to deal with the problem of selling at prices below cost. The Supreme Court of the United States on January 20, 1958, by a 5-to-4 decision held that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act is not a part of the Federal "antitrust" laws, and therefore is not available for proceedings by persons injured as a result of things forbidden by the antitrust laws. The Court so held in the cases of *Nashville Milk Company* v. *Carnation Company* and *Safeway Stores, Inc.* v. *Vance*. The ruling by the Court in these cases means that under existing law, small and independent business concerns are not permitted to use section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act in proceedings against unlawful selling at unreasonably low prices—even at prices below cost—and even though those practices result in the creation of monopoly.

Section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, as approved June 19, 1936, was authored by Senators Borah and Van Nuys. It became an amendment to the bills introduced by me and Senator Robinson. I did not discuss with Senators Borah and Van Nuys whether it was their intention to have their amendment apply as an amendment to the Federal antitrust laws.

However, I have made it clear on more than one occasion that the definition of antitrust laws as set forth in section 1 of the Clayton Act, should be amended so that there would be no question about section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act being embraced as a part of the antitrust laws. Indeed, on January 23, 1958, 3 days following the 5 to 4 decision by the Supreme Court in the cases to which I have referred, I introduced H.R. 10243 (85th Cong.) to accomplish that objective. On the same day, Senator SPARKMAN, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, introduced a companion bill. Those bills were referred to the Committees on the Judiciary, as are all proposed amendments to the antitrust laws. However, no action was taken. Therefore, at the opening of the 86th Congress, we reintroduced bills for the same purpose. In the House, my bill was H.R. 212. The Judiciary Committee did not consider it. On January 3, 1961, I presented to the present 87th Congress an identical bill; it is H.R. 125. The Judiciary Committee has been asked to schedule hearings on it.

In the meantime, practices of selling at prices below cost, as I have explained, are continuing unabated.

SOMETHING MUST BE DONE TO HELP SMALL BUSINESS

Our investigations and hearings, and the reports made by other agencies and organizations, have made clear that action must be taken if we are to help small business survive and prosper.

Our report on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry concluded with a statement to that effect. Our committee recommended that new legislation be considered and enacted which would strengthen our laws against price discriminations, and provide for more expeditious processes under the law, and, thereby, provide small business firms with speedy and needed relief.

STATES HAVE TRIED TO HELP

Many of the States have enacted legislation to combat this practice of selling at prices below cost. The courts have upheld the State laws, but due to the fact that the law of any State does not reach beyond the State line, it can have no application to transactions in interstate commerce. The need for Federal legislation on the subject to fill this void is apparent.

BILLS HAVE BEEN INTRODUCED IN CONGRESS

The recommendations made in the House Small Business Committee report on small business problems in the dairy industry for new Federal legislation have been followed up. I, the Honorable TOM STEED, and the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, have introduced a number of bills to help carry out those recommendations.

I introduced H.R. 11 and H.R. 124—bills to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act against discriminatory pricing practices, and H.R. 127 to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to make it unlawful to discriminate in price when the discriminatory prices include prices at unreasonably low levels and at levels below cost.

H.R. 127 has been referred to the Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives. I have requested the chairman of that committee to schedule hearings on it. There is hope for favorable consideration during this term of the Congress. Members of your association and representatives of small business organizations all over the country are expressing support for this legislation. We have just been informed that one such organization polled its members of more than 160,000, and that more than 70 percent of those who responded expressed their support for H.R. 127.

Also, I may say that there is strong support for H.R. 11 and H.R. 124, to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act. Those bills have been referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary. I have requested that hearings be held on them at an early date.

Our colleague and friend, Hon. TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, introduced H.R. 1233. That bill would empower the Federal Trade Commission to enter temporary cease and desist orders in cases where during the pendency of prolonged litigation, the Commission would be enabled to stop destructive practices pending the completion of long, drawn out cases. We know that it is of little value to small business firms for the Federal Trade Commission to issue cease and desist orders years after the challenged practices have destroyed the complaining small business firms. That bill has been referred to the House Committee on Commerce, and the chairman, Hon. OREN HARRIS, has been asked to schedule hearings on it at an early date. We have much hope for this legislation because the 1960 Democratic platform contained a plank providing for it. Also, the recent report by Dean James M. Landis suggested legislation along this line.

On February 2, 1961, our colleague, Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, introduced H.R. 3798. That bill would amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, to strengthen independent competition by providing for a separation of some of the distributive functions from some of the processing functions. This would be a reversal of the trend to vertical integration of processing and distribution. The bill would make it unlawful for any meatpacker whose gross sales were more than $30 million during the preceding calendar year, or for any person engaged in the business of manufacturing or preparing livestock products for sale or shipment in commerce, or in wholesale marketing in commerce of meats, meat food products, livestock products, dairy products, poultry, poultry products, or eggs, whose gross sales were more than $30 million during the preceding calendar year, to engage in the business of selling at retail meats, meat food products, livestock products, dairy products, poultry, poultry products, or eggs.

This, naturally, brings up the question as to whether a large dairy processor, national in size, with gross sales of more than $30 million would be prohibited by the terms of this bill from distributing milk at retail to various homes throughout the cities where it operates. If unqualified, this question should be answered in the negative. In other words, this bill would not apply to large dairy processors as it would be large meatpackers.

The large dairy processors would be prohibited by the terms of the bill from selling dairy products at retail only in those situations where they were also engaged in the wholesale marketing of dairy products in commerce. Thus, you can readily see that the bill would apply to a large dairy processor only in those situations where it sought to compete with its customers by engaging in dual methods or systems of distribution.

Despite the provisions in this bill which would limit its application to large dairy processors and distributors, nevertheless, it would be expected to have a healthy effect in helping restore fair trade practices and conditions to the dairy industry. It would compel the large dairy processor and distributor to choose whether it would distribute at wholesale or distribute at retail. This choice would provide small business firms which distribute dairy products only at retail a better opportunity to compete with its larger competitors.

Representative ROOSEVELT'S bill has been referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. Representatives of many small business firms are asking that hearings be held on it, but none have been scheduled as yet.

It is hoped that this discussion about small business problems in the dairy industry and the measures which are being taken to solve those problems have been of interest and value to you. I repeat that it has been a pleasure to participate in this meeting of yours and to visit with you on this occasion. Thank you.

Bataan and Corregidor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 9, we witnessed in this Capital City a ceremony that was both inspiring and uplifting. The District of Columbia named two streets, located near the Philippine Chancery, Bataan and Corregidor. Three remarkable speeches were made by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo, and Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner, which should be called to the attention of the American people. The speech of Secretary Rusk is a tribute to the gal-

lantry of the Filipinos which we Americans should always remember. The speech of General Romulo describes eloquently the difficult position of the Philippines as a committed country under unrelenting attack by communism on the one hand and surrounded by neutralist countries on the other. I would like to quote the paragraph that has reference to this question because we Americans should realize the difficulties with which our Filipino friends have to contend:

And yet, I must say, that the new house of the Philippines is not yet as welded a structure as is your house of America. It is still a mosaic held together by new rivets of remarkable design, and all depends upon how seriously and how soon they can loosen. For we are under the shadow of a Communist nation of more than 600 million people and we are under unrelenting attack by the dangerous Communist subversive pattern of infiltration and subversion. We are at the same time surrounded by another 600 million fellow Asians who are uncommitted and our people see how they are wooed and courted by the two power blocs.

The American people must bear in mind the loyalty that our Filipino friends and allies have always shown to democracy. It is for this reason that the ceremony commemorating the fall of Bataan is really an American national day.

The last broadcast of the Voice of Freedom before Bataan surrendered was quoted by Minister Mauro Calingo of the Embassy, who was master of ceremonies.

In view of the importance of the three speeches delivered at Sunday's ceremonies, I, under unanimous consent, include them in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY RUSK COMMEMORATING BATAAN DAY, APRIL 9, 1961, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Commissioner, Mr. Ambassador, Members of Congress, ladies, and gentlemen, it is not for me, an American, to match the golden voice of the Philippines we have just heard. Indeed, it would be fitting for us to spend our time in deep and silent contemplation about what it is we here commemorate.

Some 20 years and 4 months ago the waves of aggression swept through the peaceful Pacific—in the Philippines, in Hawaii, in southeast Asia. It was a war unwanted, unprovoked, and for which we were not prepared. Once again we learned that peace-loving peoples who neglect their arms can tempt the ambitious who make the mistake of confusing democracy's desire for peace with a willingness to submit. Our friends in the Philippines were moving rapidly toward the complete freedom which a free people in America had pledged to them in full measure. The land was bright with the promise of dreams about to be fulfilled.

But in those months of early 1942, freedom was hanging by the sheerest threads in Europe, the Middle East, and Asia. The human spirit was called upon to provide, in gallantry and courage, what slender arms could not accomplish. The final victory of freemen was assured by what was revealed on Bataan and Corregidor, by the Philippine and American men and women who fought with General MacArthur and General Wainwright. It was their splendor which gave the ring of true prophecy to the words, "I shall return." The enemy flag was finally hoisted on Corregidor but it was only occupied and not conquered. The courage of the regiments which were overcome there became the courage of individuals who continued the fight, singly, and in small groups. The war continued within the Philippines until MacArthur and his forces came ashore to link up with those who had been carrying the struggle to bring it to a prompt and victorious end. The march to Philippine freedom was then resumed and a great democracy arose from the consuming fires of those bitter years.

Today, Mr. Ambassador, the Filipino and American peoples are joined with us here in Washington. In every State of our Union are homes which shared with yours the glory and the suffering of Bataan and Corregidor. Both in your land and in ours the wounds of war will heal, for reconciliation is a great source of hope in the tragic story of man. But we shall not forget our comrades, and the personal friends, who reminded us that freedom is not cheap, but is for the strong in spirit.

Bataan and Corregidor make up another inspiring chapter in the history of freedom. It is a history not fully told, filled with great deeds by individuals and nations, who staked all they had on the hard choices which had to be made. Here was an entire people denying to mere power a privileged intrusion upon the dignity of man. Here might have been a judge, throwing his arm around a prisoner at the bar, saying to a despotic king that the king must do no wrong. In another place it was a writer or an orator who proclaimed at great hazard the simple truth that man was born to be free. Bataan and Corregidor are a part of the greatest story written by man, a story not yet finished, but a story which can have only one end because the nature of man will have it so.

It is a great privilege for me to be here today to speak for the President and for the people of the United States in sending our greetings to President Garcia and the people of the Philippines and to pay tribute to those we remember as we establish here in Washington a perpetual reminder of their gallantry in the naming of Bataan and Corregidor Streets.

ADDRESS BY GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO, PHILIPPINE AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES, AT THE CEREMONIES MARKING THE NAMING OF BATAAN AND CORREGIDOR STREETS NW., WASHINGTON, D.C., SUNDAY, APRIL 9, 1961

Your Excellencies, Mr. Secretary, Commissioner Tobriner, ladies and gentlemen, to name these two streets in this Capital City of the United States—Bataan and Corregidor—is to bring back to American conciousness the story of an epic that is part of the timeless pattern of history.

Nineteen years ago, Filipino and American soldiers fought side by side against a common enemy. The names Bataan and Corregidor conjured up the picture that those of us who were there and were fortunate to survive can never forget: of handsome, blond American lads—dead, in the foxholes or in the tunnel, and alongside them, also dead, handsome, black-haired Filipino lads, killed by the same enemy bomb, their blood freely intermingled in the sacred cause of freedom. Their bones now lie in Philippine soil, dust, and ashes, sacred earth—and who will dare sift that dust and those ashes, by race, for separate honor?

That is the meaning of Bataan and Corregidor. East and West met and fought together for the same ideal. It was a portent of things to come. For the first time, of their own free and positive choice, an Asian people rose, almost unanimously, to the defense of an Occidental power, not because America was white and Western, but because the United States never carried the mantle of imperialism with ease and despite initial errors, when your leaders saw our firm determination not to settle for less than our freedom, every step that you took was to implement the policy announced by William H. Taft: "The Philippines for the Filipinos."

In your one great adventure into colonialism, you retreated almost before you began. You came to the Philippines, you saw, but you did not conquer. Instead, you worked with us, and learned with us, and out of the relationship emerged your promise to help us achieve and assure our independence. That promise went through the purfication of fire 19 years ago. And in 1946 the promise was fulfilled.

What have we done in the Philippines since 1946 to be worthy of the sacrifices in Bataan and Corregidor? Something new has arisen in our country, something strong and fresh, something identifiably Filipino, and upon this we have built. Because we have a history of which we are proud, we opposed communism successfully. We fought for democracy and we had no hesitancy, despite its dangers, to choose the hard sinews of dignity, integrity and freedom—your side—against a gutless peace and the degradation of slavery implicity in a ruthless monolithic ideology that reduces everything to materialistic dialectics which is communism.

We now see a Philippine economic renaissance, where under the leadership of President Carlos P. Garcia, we won our fight against inflation; our international reserves have gone up to a new high level; we have refused to devalue our peso; we have partially decontrolled and will soon eliminate all exchange controls: we have achieved a favorable balance of trade; we have established more than 800 new industries; we produce more rice than we consume; we have improved the living standards of our masses; we have an uninhibited press, one of the freest in the world. All these we have accomplished under a system of free enterprise and we have not deviated from the truly democratic pattern. We are proud of our progress because it is a progress that shows the vitality of our devotion to constitutional government, the maturity of our political philosophy, and the stability of our political understanding.

And yet, I must say, that the new house of the Philippines is not yet as welded a structure as is your house of America. It is still a mosaic held together by new rivets of remarkable design, and all depends upon how seriously and how soon they can loosen. For we are under the shadow of a Communist nation of more than 600 million people and we are under unrelenting attack by the dangerous Communist subversive pattern of infiltration and subversion. We are at the same time surrounded by another 600 million fellow Asians who are uncommitted and our people see how they are wooed and courted by the two power blocs.

By our record these last 15 years since our independence we have shown we can achieve progress. But history tells us that societies change and achieve cohesion by fits and starts and in the process there may be ruptures or dislocations. Under the pressure of communism on one side and neutralism on the other, if the binding rivets of our house begin to loosen, to sustain it and keep it whole and unimpaired we must depend on the unity of our friendship, the comradeship of our alliance, and the victory to America that is Bataan and Corregidor, in the words of one of your great writers "the spirit of unswerving Filipino loyalty which is our creditor often enough in the past."

The men who died on Bataan and Corregidor offered that which was most precious to them—their own lives—on the altar of human freedom and human friendship. We who survive have an obligation to them that cries out to be repaid. We owe them the continuation of the battle. We owe them the never-ending pledge to carry on, that the Filipino-American friendship they sealed

in war with their blood we will not allow narrow self-interest or greed to weaken or undermine in peace.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WALTER N. TOBRINER, PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ON THE OCCASION OF THE CEREMONY COMMEMORATING THE NAMING OF TWO STREETS, CORREGIDOR AND BATAAN, ON APRIL 9, 1961

Mr. Ambassador, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to participate today in this special occasion dedicated to the memory of the heroic Philippine and American dead who gave their lives at Corregidor and Bataan.

Since the beginning of this century, when through the war with Spain our peoples first became acquainted, the people of the Philippines and the people of the United States have become steadfast friends. Our Governments have worked together to establish and to extend the blessings of democracy.

The war in the Pacific brought us closer. From the depths of despair at the fall of Corregidor and the death march on Bataan came a stronger common devotion to the cause of freedom, democracy and peace.

The sharing of struggle and sacrifice in the liberation of the Philippines bound in blood our peoples forever. The associations of the war years developed a deep, mutual understanding and appreciation which tends to grow progressively stronger with time.

The Philippines have become an example for people of other areas seeking their freedom. Bataan and Corregidor represent the ultimate victory of man's quest to determine his own destiny. At one time exemplars of humiliating defeat, they shine now in history as glorious victories of the spirit to be free.

Therefore, it is most fitting that in this Capital we should preserve those names perpetually as the names of streets, so that all who come here may be reminded that when, as at Corregidor and Bataan, valor and justice shall meet, freedom remains imperishable.

Nonprofit Firms Under Scrutiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science and Astronautics is conducting an investigation of numerous so-called private nonprofit organizations which operate as virtual adjuncts of Federal agencies.

Recently the New York Herald Tribune news service distributed to its syndicated news clientele throughout the country an article dealing with the committee's study of these comparatively little known, but tremendously important, private groups.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NONPROFIT FIRMS UNDER SCRUTINY—CONGRESS EYEING COSTLY R. & D. OPERATIONS

(By Joseph R. Slevin, Herald Tribune News Service)

A congressional committee is taking a long, hard look at the "nonprofit" organizations that do research jobs for the military and space agencies.

The nonprofit firms have been multiplying in recent years. Their rise has gone hand in hand with the missile and space boom.

The investigation is being run by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. The congressional group is worrying about everything from outsized salaries to possible conflicts of interest.

All of the organizations under investigation work chiefly for the Federal Government, and most of them work exclusively for the Government.

"There are dozens of these companies," a committee source says. "Their contracts range from a few million dollars to many tens of millions of dollars."

FUNCTIONS OVERLAP

The nonprofit concerns ostensibly are research and development organizations, but they often provide technical direction and systems management for production operations that are carried on by profit-making corporations.

The committee still is asking questions instead of making charges. It is concentrating its initial investigation on about 12 nonprofit firms, giving them detailed questionnaires to answer.

The group plans to disclose its findings at public hearings in Washington during the late spring or early summer.

"There's no statutory control over these outfits and some of us think there ought to be," one source declares.

The nonprofit groups commonly operate under contracts that pay them their costs plus 15 percent.

"That hardly provides an incentive for efficient, low-cost operations," the same committee source said.

FORMER U.S. OFFICIALS

The congressional group is disturbed by evidence that some particularly juicy contracts have gone to firms that employ—or are run by—executives who have held high Government jobs in the agencies that awarded the contracts.

It's checking, too, into reports that the well-paid officials of nonprofit firms often hold even higher-paying jobs with profit-making corporations that have been given large subcontracts by the nonprofit company.

Many of the nonprofit companies are used as a device for paying scientists and technicians more than the Government can pay them.

Federal salaries are controlled by the Civil Service, and the Government frequently cannot get top experts to work for it at the Civil Service salary scale. But it can get the services of a reluctant expert by giving a research contract to an existing nonprofit firm that is set up just for the purpose.

SALARY DISCREPANCIES

Eight Government agencies are allowed to pay as much as $19,000 a year to key research people, and the National Aeronautics and Space Agency can pay $21,000 to 13 specialists, but most Government scientists can receive no more than $15,000, Committee Chairman Overton Brooks reported recently.

The Louisiana Democrat said a $15,000 Government scientist and a $40,000 scientist employed by a nonprofit organization both are paid by the Federal Government—one directly and the other indirectly.

"This practice is obviously a means of getting around the Civil Service pay scales," Brooks said. "I am not passing judgment upon the practice, but I question whether this is the solution to the problem of obtaining skilled personnel for the Government."

The Continued Need for REA Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech made by Walter H. Johnston, vice president, Association of Illinois Electric Cooperatives, Springfield, Ill., at a breakfast meeting with Illinois Members of Congress this morning. Mr. Johnston's remarks follow:

Today in rural America, over 97 percent of the farms and rural residences have the blessings of central station electricity. In Illinois, the figure is close to 99 percent.

From these facts some people might conclude that the job of rural electrification has been completed, and that there is no longer any need for REA loans. But these conclusions are erroneous. They would be comparable to assuming that since every child in America has a school available to him, that the job of education is over. Actually the opposite is true. The biggest problems of education lie ahead. And the same can be said of rural electrification.

In all of our estimates of the use of kilowatt-hours by rural electrics, we in the rural electric co-op business must readily admit that our guesses have most often been too conservative.

The rapid growth of the rural electric cooperatives has astonished us as much as it has any of the so-called experts. The experience of most cooperatives has shown in the past a doubling of the load every 5 to 7 years. So if we were to predicate the future growth solely on normal past experience, we could expect that the thousand rural electric cooperatives in the United States will be selling about 250 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity by the time the REA program is 50 years old, or in 1985.

Experts tell us that modern farms will then be averaging 40,000 to 50,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity per year. Presently, the rural electric systems in America have an input of about 29 billion kilowatt-hours. Thus you can understand that to meet the future power needs of rural America, the investment of considerable sums will be required. However, gross revenue from the sale of power by co-ops in 1985 is estimated to be around $3⅓ billion, thus insuring the funds to repay REA loans.

Now that is what future outlook was like until a few months ago. But, if the rural redevelopment program becomes a reality (and I wish here to credit our great Senator DOUGLAS as being one of its prime movers) and we believe it will, then the growth of rural electric cooperatives will be accelerated beyond our present most visionary estimates.

While rural electric cooperatives alone would not anticipate being able to meet all of the zooming demands for power that a rural redevelopment program would create, it should be obvious that by the nature of the location of rural electric systems in the heart of areas directly affected by redevelopment, that they will be called upon to play a primary role in this exciting new stage of restoring economic health to the rural sections of our Nation.

With the stimulus of a government program designed to attract industry to the rural areas that we have been serving for so many years, the demand on our co-op systems for electricity would be tremendous. Besides the power requirements of new

industries, cooperatives would be expected to supply the needs of the countless thousands of homeowners who would be attracted to the rural areas by the new economic opportunities.

Yet even without the stimulus of such a program as Senator DOUGLAS is sponsoring and which President Kennedy has endorsed so enthusiastically, it can be expected that more and more industries and more and more people will seek to locate in the uncluttered areas of the Nation which our rural electric systems serve.

To meet this challenge of restoring economic vigor to rural America, rural electric systems will need a source of low-cost loan funds and in greater quantities than ever before. And we believe the only practical source for this financing will be REA. But as always we shall accept the funds on a self-liquidating basis and we shall point to our enviable record of repayment as the guarantee of security for these loans.

It is quite logical to assume, I believe, that since we have been able to maintain a near-perfect loan repayment record during the formative years of our cooperatives when the pickings were slim and when much of the cream had already been skimmed, we should be even better financial risks in the years ahead.

The promising prospects for a rejuvenated rural America should add new loads to our lines and should increase the density of our areas substantially, thus strengthening our financial feasibility greatly beyond what it has been in the past.

I might mention here that so far REA has loaned $4.2 billion to 1,087 borrowers. Ninety-three percent of these loans went to cooperatives. So far our rural electrics have repaid a total of $1,372 million and this included $759 million in principal, $448 million in interest, and $165 million paid ahead of time on principal. Only two borrowers were overdue in payments as of February and the amount involved was $102,000.

One of the principal uses of REA loans in the future, we believe, will be for building co-op generating and transmission systems. As you know, the cost of these systems is sizable and that it is REA's policy to make them only when feasible.

A year ago three of our southern Illinois rural electric systems received a loan in the amount $25,800,000 to build their own power-plant and transmission grid.

We realize from our many years of negotiating with our power company suppliers that we have little control over our wholesale rates or over the conditions of service. We also realize that if we are to continue to be successful that we must utilize the same cost-saving techniques that the private power companies have employed so successfully for many years. Here I refer to interconnections.

Our cooperatives in Illinois are now aware that their lack of interconnections isolates them from the benefits of power exchange with Federal, municipal, and other sources.

In addition to the billions in loan funds that will be needed to accomplish some of the objectives that I have referred to, a considerable amount of additional financing will be necessary to bring telephones to rural America. At the present time only 70 percent of the farms in the United States have telephones and a large portion of these are not modern, automatic dial phones. Much remains to be done in the REA telephone program. And its future depends on a continuation of REA loans.

While the success of the rural electrification program is one of the brightest pages in the history of American agriculture, and while this success has been accomplished on a sound financial basis, it still cannot be overlooked that cooperatives are generally earning net margins that cannot be compared to those of private power companies.

It is, of course, a great credit to rural electric cooperatives that they have been able to do as well as they have financially in the thinly populated areas which they serve. The steady influx over the years of new industries and homeowners in rural areas, have benefited cooperatives financially and have increased their feasibility considerably.

However, rural electric systems in America are a long way from being able to borrow the huge sums of money they will need in the private money markets.

When you consider that the rural electric cooperatives of America have less than 20 percent member equity; that they are prohibited by law from serving towns of over 1,500 population, and that they must repay their REA loans with interest in contrast with the practice of the power companies which never liquidate their indebtedness but continue to float it in perpetuity, you realize that the only practical source of financing in the foreseeable future for rural electric cooperatives is the Rural Electrification Administration.

Moreover, it is doubtful that private sources of investment could be induced to risk their money in rural electric cooperatives when these cooperatives in most States have no guarantee of territory and have no status as regulated monopolies with a guaranteed rate of return.

It is unrealistic to believe that investors would prefer rural electric cooperatives to private power companies which enjoy the protection of territory and assured returns on investment. Moreover, the cost of borrowing money in the private market, even if we were unrealistic enough to assume all of the State objections did not exist, would be so high that many cooperatives and generation and transmission systems could no longer operate feasibly.

So just as in 1935, when 90 percent of the farm and rural residences were waiting for electricity and the administration and the Congress launched the REA program in recognition of the fact that rural America could be lighted only through low-cost government loans, the rural electrification program of today still faces great challenges. And if these future challenges are to be met successfully by our rural electric systems, then our co-ops must be able to rely on low-cost REA loans which have proved to be among the soundest investments in the welfare of the Nation that the Government has ever made.

Many-Sided Educator, Dr. Samuel Belkin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial as it appeared in the New York Times of March 27, 1961, concerning the president of Yeshiva University, Dr. Samuel Belkin:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 27, 1961]

MANY-SIDED EDUCATOR—SAMUEL BELKIN

The president of Yeshiva University likes to describe himself as "a rabbi who doesn't preach, a doctor who doesn't cure, and a professor who doesn't teach."

Dr. Samuel Belkin is also, more positively defined, a scholar, an amazing fundraiser and a dynamic administrator who usually lunches at his desk on nothing but many cups of black coffee, while smoking plenty of cigarettes. He praises the "blessing of the night" when he at last has the leisure for research in his special field, Hellenistic philosophy.

"His books have been written between 11 p.m. and 3 a.m.," an associate said. "They are the safety valve of an enormously busy man."

After an academic ceremony yesterday in which he conferred an honorary degree on Chief Justice Earl Warren, Dr. Belkin found time to discuss the Hellenistic period, when classical Greek and Jewish civilization blended while the barbaric threats that were to destroy the ancient world were already visible. "There are dangerous menaces also today, and they can destroy more than ever before," he remarked.

Dr. Belkin was speaking in his unadorned office where a personal reference library attests to the variety of his interests and preoccupations. A "Survey of Dentistry" is wedged between rabbinic literature and Aristotle.

INVITED TO ISRAEL

A little more than a year ago Dr. Belkin had his first meeting with another Jewish lover of Greek leters, Premier David Ben-Gurion of Israel. Witnesses of the encounter recall that the Premier was deeply impressed by his visit to Yeshiva University. He invited its president to Israel.

However, Dr. Belkin says, he has no immediate travel plans, because "all my work belongs to Yeshiva." Rather than further expansion of the university, he envisages its "strengthening, academically and in terms of physical facilities."

Running America's oldest and largest university under Jewish auspices is a complex and demanding job. From his apartment at 65 East 96th Street, Dr. Belkin rides at 9 a.m. every morning to the institution's main building at Amsterdam Avenue and West 86th Street. Almost every day he visits at least one outlying unit of the university, which is scattered over six sites.

The administrative work and the necessity of attending many formal functions prevent him from teaching, and this is his great regret.

BORN IN POLAND

Samuel Belkin (he has no middle name) was born in Swislicz, Poland, on December 12, 1911. As a boy 6 years old he watched with terror as the police, searching for "Communists," took away his father, a dreamy teacher of Hebrew. The father never returned, and all of Dr. Belkin's 11 brothers and sisters disappeared tragically before and during World War II.

Dr. Belkin was ordained a Rabbi at Radin when he was only 17. Soon afterward, in 1928, he came to America, an immigrant who spoke Polish, Yiddish and Hebrew, but no English.

With distant relatives scraping together the money for tuition, he was able to continue studying, and in 1924 won a Ph. D. from Brown University.

In 1935, Dr. Belkin joined the staff of Yeshiva, then a small institution, as an instructor in Greek. He became a full professor in 1940, and in 1943, when he was not yet 32 years old, was elected university president.

Since then, the enrollment of Yeshiva has increased from 850 to 5,000, its faculty from 94 to 1,200 and its annual budget from $444,000 to $4 million.

Dr. Belkin's wife is the former Selma Ehrlich, a granddaughter of the late Rabbi Bernard L. Lewenthal, who for many years was the dean of the rabbinate of Philadelphia. Their daughter, Linda, married Rabbi Ralph Schuchalter, and Dr. Belkin is twice a grandfather. A son, Salo Maurice, goes to private school.

On Saturdays Dr. Belkin attends congregation Kehilath Jeshurun, at 125 East 85th Street, to pray but not to preach. Despite his disclaimer, he does "teach," though—in his books. The latest of them, "In His Image" (Abelard-Schulman, 1959), is a compendium of Jewish philosophy. An inscribed copy was presented to Chief Justice Warren yesterday.

Assistant Secretary Kelly Reviews Interior Department Mineral Resources Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, we all received with great enthusiasm President Kennedy's message of February 23 on natural resources and have looked forward to its implementation. Among the first steps in this direction was an address by the new Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Mineral Resources, John M. Kelly, at a meeting of the Western Petroleum Refiners Association at San Antonio, Tex., on April 11, 1961.

Even though there are some individual statements which may require further examination, I commend this address to all Members and, under leave to extend my remarks, submit the full text for inclusion in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR JOHN M. KELLY AT MEETING OF WESTERN PETROLEUM REFINERS ASSOCIATION, SAN ANTONIO, TEX., APRIL 11, 1961

Several years ago, in addressing another oil industry group in Texas, a leading representative of the steel industry chose a term common to airline pilots—the phrase "a point of no return"—as the starting text of his remarks.

He related the disquieting feeling which came over him on a trip across the ocean when someone mentioned that the plane had passed the point of no return. It meant, he said, the plane was committed to continue onward, for good or ill. To turn back had become impractical, if not impossible.

He philosophized that individuals and nations also have their point of no return—a point where certain decisions and actions had irrevocably dictated the future.

To a large degree, this has happened in the United States and in the world. We live in a period of tremendous transformation in our national attitudes and our national institutions, as well as in a world in which two powerful ideologies stand opposed to one another.

In my lifetime and yours, there have been profound changes in the political, economic, and social institutions and attitudes of our Nation. The past is dead. And, it is an idle pastime to shed nostalgic tears for the good old days when the present forces upon us, in President Kennedy's words, "the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger."

Today, the leaders of industry and the leaders of government are bound together by mutual responsibility for the social, economic, and political impact of our individual actions on the affairs of our country and of our world. We in Government, and you in industry, must accept this responsibility—a responsibility which we must meet on common ground, side by side.

In his inaugural address, President Kennedy also uttered these now historic words, "Ask not what your country will do for you—ask what you can do for your country." A few days later, in his first message to the Congress, the President pledged his administration "* * * to a continuous encouragement of initiative, responsibility, and energy in serving the national interest."

These are times which demand far more than mere cooperation between Government and industry. In this troubled world, a world restless, changing, a world challenging old ideas and moving toward new horizons—in a world of this fabric, the United States must demonstrate that its economic system is efficient, that it is flexible, and that it is the servant not the master of a free people. Such demonstration demands, on the part of us all, an identity of purpose and a dedication to the common interest.

The petroleum industry is one of the key building blocks in the foundation of American economic strength. The industry is essential to the welfare and social progress of our Nation and the free world. We in the Kennedy administration know its importance, we recognize its complexities, and we respect the intelligence and ingenuity of those who direct it.

In looking realistically at the future, the petroleum industry itself must bury the shibboleths and totems of the past—the outworn creed that looks at cooperation with Government as a mutually antagonistic partnership, temporarily formed by expediency—at Government as an evil to be tolerated.

Government is inescapably involved in this industry, and this involvement—particularly in the Department in which I serve—will grow rather than diminish in the years ahead. The petroleum industry itself, on many counts, has actively sought this involvement as being in its own best interests. Conversely, it must willingly accept Government as a referee of the industry, as its shield in foreign affairs, and as the protector of the public interest.

We have a new administration in Washington, a new attitude toward national affairs, and a new dedication to the principle of mutual action in the best interests of the people. We have a Secretary of the Interior who personally maintains an open door and an open mind on the pressing subjects of natural resource development.

And his policy is also my policy in the field of mineral and fuel resource matters falling under my jurisdiction.

The door of my office—and the doors of those who work in the mineral and fuel bureaus of the Department—will always be open to your industry, to the coal industry, to the extractive industries, and last but foremost of all, to the public.

We want your ideas, we seek your counsel, and we value your suggestions. There will be times when we will not see eye to eye—when our views will not coincide. Responsible Government cannot let others make its decision by default, and this administration intends to renew and revitalize responsibility in Government.

There will be times when our views will be identical—and I hope this will be the rule—because that which is in the best interest of the American people is also in the best interest of American industry, whether it be oil or oysters.

In recent years, fuels programs have been hammered out behind locked doors. We in the Department of the Interior intend to reverse that trend. We actively seek greater public participation in Government, greater public awareness of the programs of Government and their impact on all aspects of American life.

We seek an active, participating citizenry from all walks of social and economic life which will work together without regard to personal interest but dedicated rather to the utilitarian principle of the greatest good for the greatest number.

In the area of our Nation's mineral resources, we face many problems—complex problems which were not made in a day and which will not be solved by a stroke of a pen or in a constant reassurance that we live in the best of all possible worlds.

In the metals and the nonmetallic mineral industries, we have—as in the petroleum industry—a mixed picture. A number of commodities have shown steady growth and radical progress has been made with respect to some of the newer metals.

It is, however, in the group of metals which in their own right are as essential to our economic well being as oil that serious difficulties have been encountered in recent years. I speak primarily of lead, zinc, and copper.

Lead and zinc have been subject to declining domestic production and increasing pressures from imports. The copper industry has been affected materially by events in distant parts of the world with resulting instability, although production has expanded. Speaking parenthetically, these generalizations should have a familiar ring to this audience.

These are pressing problems which require—and which will get—a substantial portion of my energies and the energies of my staff.

In coal, we have the problem of an underdeveloped, underused natural resource. Let me say, at this point, that underdevelopment of a vital natural resource is as abhorrent to true conservation as wasteful use.

The coal industry today has fewer employed miners than in the year 1890—the first year for which reliable statistics are available. Coal production declined drastically from 1947 to 1958, and, while minor gains were achieved in 1959 and 1960, the rate of activity is falling again in 1961.

We have a coal industry which cannot be allowed to decline, if it is expected to meet the greatly increased demands which would be placed upon it in time of national emergency. This is a disturbing situation—a situation to which the Department of the Interior will direct its efforts to alleviate.

In oil, we have almost a parallel situation. Current refinery capacity and current crude oil productive capacity in the United States, even after allowance for a "defense reserve," exceeds the consumptive capacity of the American people.

However, this is more closely defined as a current economic problem, as distinct from some of the more technological problems which stand in the way of a marked increase in coal consumption. No matter which economic crystal ball you look into, the picture is always the same: Progressively mounting petroleum requirements in the years ahead.

Here is the crux of the petroleum problem. Reserves of crude oil available to the people of the United States must be abundant, must be secure, and must be available on a reasonable economic basis.

In this regard, we are distressed by the 1960 showing in exploration and development. In 1960, the volume of new crude oil discovered in the United States was only slightly higher than in 1946. Furthermore, the addition to proven reserves by extension of known fields was the lowest in 10 years. It was only through an increase in natural gas liquids that total liquid hydrocarbon reserves made any advance over 1959 levels. Here also, the picture is not completely bright

because the discovery rate of natural gas liquids was also declining.

Although we have skirted them briefly, I think we can see a similarity in the various minerals problems of the Nation, a basic pattern of immediate abundance of resources, underdeveloped demand, and overdeveloped productive capacity.

These problems present a unique, tremendous challenge to American ingenuity, for we must show the world we have the maturity and vision to make our basic abundance a blessing, rather than a millstone around our economic necks.

Turning now to the more immediate matters of interest, Secretary Udall has pledged the Department of the Interior to a "new look" at the oil import program—the philosophy which underlies it, the machinery by which it operates, and the effectiveness of this machinery in meeting the objectives of the program.

This searching reappraisal for residual fuel oil has been completed. We feel that some of the earlier ineqities have been eliminated and that the residual portion of the program is more firmly based, more responsive to public policy, and more soundly geared to efficient supply and distribution.

We intend to give the crude oil portion of the program equal scrutiny in the weeks ahead. I can announce today that two public hearings have been scheduled—one in Washington on May 10 and 11, the other in Los Angeles on May 4.

We come now to the subject of another review—that of a congressional fuels study, a study of no little controversy in the petroleum industry.

President Kennedy and Secretary Udall have firmly endorsed a balanced, long-range fuels study which uses the test of the public good as its cardinal principle. In Secretary Udall's words, "We cannot in something as important as fuels and energy let policy be set by drift and default." For this reason, the administration is supporting legislation which provides for a thorough study in the national interest.

Let me say this: No one can dispute the right of the Congress of the United States to initiate such a study.

Let me also add this: Unthinking, blind opposition within the petroleum industry to an impartial, long-range study can easily leave the mistaken impression that the interests of the industry are somehow different than the interest of the Nation as a whole.

For these reasons, I am personally gratified that in recent weeks many responsible leaders within the petroleum industry have endorsed a national fuels study.

We have much to gain from a thorough look at where we have been, where we are, and where we are going. I, for one, would like to know the answers to some of the more searching questions, questions such as:

What public policies are necessary to insure an adequate, dependable fuel supply for the Nation in order to achieve a healthy, balanced development of the national economy?

Can our present Federal, State, and local laws and programs promote the public interest in the wise development of our fuel resources?

Finally, how can we define in specific terms what the public interest really is, when confronted with the technical, economic, and international problems entailed in fuel resources development and use?

President Kennedy, in his state of the Union message, cautioned our Nation that we "cannot escape our dangers—neither must we let them drive us into panic or narrow isolation."

He meant not only panic and narrow isolation in the more conventionally understood area of foreign affairs, but also panic and narrow isolation from ourselves and our society.

We are back on the frontier—but this frontier extends into space and time, inward into the scientific core of matter itself, and outward to the friendship and loyalty of all free men. We each have a part to play, a contribution to make to others, and to ourselves in the process. Time will not let us wait, nor can we shirk or avoid our mutual responsibility to a common goal and a common ideal.

This is not the decade—nor the century—for the soft look, or the soft compromise, or the soft way to a shaky security. It is instead a time for determination, for devotion, for daring.

This is the way America is going, and the oil industry will go with it—or be left behind. This industry has always accepted its challenges and performed with honor and credit in national emergency. This vigor, this vitality, must now become the daily watchword of an industry moving forward in the mainstream of American life and American purpose.

I thank you very much.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Senator Clark Presents Significant Message on Equal Job Opportunity to Second Annual Dinner of Charleston, W. Va., Mayor's Commission on Human Relations—1,000 Citizens in Attendance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the second annual dinner of the mayor's Commission on Human Relations of Charleston, W. Va., was held last night in the civil center of that city. It was my privilege to have been a participant in the program over which the Honorable John A. Shanklin, mayor of Charleston, presided as master of ceremonies, very abley assisted by the Honorable L. Leo Kohlbecker, chairman of the commission.

Mayor Shanklin is to be commended for his support of the commission, its dedicated chairman and fellow officers and members. I pay deserved tribute to them and to the churches, civic groups, lodges, labor unions, and organizations, as well as dozens of industrial and commercial firms which are subscribing cosponsors of the commission, the objective of which is "to strive for the elemination of discriminatory practices and policies in our community based solely upon race, creed, or national origin."

Appropriately representing the State of West Virginia at the significant event attended by approximately 1,000 citizens of Charleston interested in the promotion and development of better human relations was the distinguished Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable William Wallace Barron. In his effectively presented remarks, the Governor expressed the appreciation of his administration and West Virginians generally for the vital contribution the commission is making to improve human relations, not only in the State's capital city but over West Virginia as a whole as a consequence of its program, effort, and example.

Although our able colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK, was prevented from being present because of air traffic problems which stemmed from the inclement weather conditions which prevailed, he fulfilled his mission as guest speaker by delivering his address from Washington to his Charleston audience over a closed circuit telephonic connection with the Civic Center amplification system.

Mr. President, I am privileged to report that an understanding and attentive audience received Senator CLARK's forthright message with enthusiasm.

In introductory remarks, I spoke of our esteemed colleague as follows:

Senator CLARK is not one who reserves his concern for human relations for formal commissions and conferences, important as they are. After more than 2 years of serving in close association with him on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have come to know JOE CLARK as one whose every action is informed with respect for the individual and the desire and determination to eliminate the barriers which separate and divide men. It is this emphasis, as well as the high quality of intellectual discipline which he brings to the task, that earned Senator CLARK—within a single term in the Senate—national renown as a leader in the fields of human relations, civil liberties, and civil rights.

Prior to his service in the Senate, however, JOE CLARK had already made his commitment to human relations problems as mayor of Philadelphia from 1951 to 1956. The leadership and direction which he gave during those years to the mayor's Commission on Human Relations brought new meaning to Philadelphia's honorific title as "The City of Brotherly Love." Despite the complexities of having large and growing ethnic and racial minorities, Philadelphia, under the influence of the then Mayor CLARK, became a model for those cities which were seeking to relieve group tensions and improve the quality of human understanding.

Thus, we are signally honored indeed in having as our speaker one with such wide experience at the municipal as well as the national level. We are fortunate also in having one who represents that rare combination of the thoughtfulness of the scholar and the effectiveness of the practicing politician.

It gives me great pleasure, therefore, to introduce my good friend and our neighbor, a sincere liberal and true exponent of practical idealism and meaningful religion, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK.

And, now, Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address entitled "Equal Job Opportunity," prepared by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania for the occasion.

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

EQUAL JOB OPPORTUNITY

(Remarks of Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, at the second annual banquet of the mayor's commission on human relations, Charleston, W. Va., April 12, 1961)

With my first 6-year term in the U.S. Senate over next year, I resolved at the beginning of this session of Congress not to speak outside Pennsylvania again until after my reelection campaign.

It took the combination of an invitation by my close and irresistible friend, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, to whom I am deeply indebted for many courtesies, and the occasion of the annual dinner of Charleston's Commission on Human Relations to make me break my resolution tonight. I do so with pleasure, honored by your invitation.

I have some familiarity with the essential, but largely thankless, work performed by your commission from my own experience as mayor of Philadelphia with our Commission on Human Relations.

The Philadelphia commission was created by the provisions of the city home rule charter in 1951.

The opening sentence of the charter preamble shows the high obligation felt by the framers to cleanse the city of discriminatory practices: "Grateful to God for the freedoms we enjoy," the preamble reads, "and desirous of establishing a form of improved municipal self-government in which all qualified citizens may participate equally without any distinction base based on race, we, the electors of Philadelphia, hereby adopt this 'Philadelphia home rule charter.' "

The charter provided for appointment of the human relations commission members by the mayor without the necessity for confirmation by city council. I chose the nine commission members, who serve without pay, to reflect as accurately as possible the various racial groups in the city.

On January 7, 1952, the commission assumed the powers and duties of the fair employment practice commission, established 3 years earlier, to administer the fair employment practice ordinance. Subsequently it was empowered to enforce a variety of State and local laws and ordinances concerning discrimination.

Early in 1952 we were extremely fortunate in being able to entice Mr. George Schermer from the Detroit area, who had had valuable experience in human relations work there, to be executive director. He is still serving as director of the commisison today.

The Philadelphia commission performs, as I am sure yours does, a wide variety of assignments. It is the commission's job to promote better racial relations in employment practices, public education and public housing, to organize community human relation councils throughout the city to foster better racial relations, to provide a 24-hour day "tension alert" to guard against and resolve intergroup incidents, to conduct leadership training in human relations, to coach Spanish-speaking minorities in citizenship rights and duties, and to provide public information about the problems of discrimination, segregation, and human relations in the area.

It is the first mentioned of these assignments—the promotion of equal job opportunity—that I will speak tonight: Developments in three different areas—the Philadelphia city government, the Federal executive and legislative branches—may be of interest to you.

Much of the work of the Philadelphia Human Relations Commission, which has a full time staff of 32 employees and a current operating budget of $230,000, has concentrated on fostering equal job opportunity in the firm belief that racial barriers in employment must be broken if the large Negro community in the city (now numbering more than half a million) is to enjoy the most basic rights and advantages of citizenship.

In the last 10 years the commission has investigated more than 2,000 complains of discrimination in employment, substantiated findings of discrimination in more than 500 cases and effected satisfactory adjustments without court action in almost all of the latter cases. Informal hearing procedures to resolve complaints of discrimination in employment have been highly successful.

Eeach year the commission formulates and adopts a specific list of annual program objectives to focus the group's limited resources on a selected number of problems and areas of concern. In a field as complex and indeterminate as intergroup relations, program objectives clearly must be as concrete, feasible and attainable as experience, judgment, money, and manpower will allow. Each year the commission tries to be a little more precise and realistic about what it attempts to accomplish. So far as I know it is the only intergroup agency in the Nation which makes this type of effort to design and specify its annual work plan in advance. If you haven't seen copies of the Philadelphia commission's yearly statement of goals, I hope you will contact Mr. Schermer, the commission's director, to see whether this plan could be usefully employed here.

Perhaps you would be interested in hearing the eight goals stated in the commission's 1961 program relating to fair employment practices:

1. Receive, investigate, and adjust all complaints of discrimination in employment under the Philadelphia city code; such adjustment to include affirmative measure to correct patterns of exclusion whether or not unlawful discrimination has been found.

2. Conduct periodic inspection of "help wanted" advertisements to assure compliance with laws and regulations thereto.

3. Conduct regular inspections of city work contracts to assure compliance under the standard antidiscrimination clause in such contracts.

4. Conduct regular inspections of those firms that are subject to either adjudicative or advisory orders from the commission.

5. Initiate inspections, conduct, and issue advisory findings and recommendations upon not less than 50 employer firms in addition to other investigations.

6. Continue negotiations and such other measures as are necessary to attain affirmative implementation of merit employment in the hotel and restaurant industry.

7. Continue investigations and negotiations of waterfront employment to remedy the alleged patterns of discrimination and segregated job assignments.

8. Initiate negotiations with, or investigation of the banking industry to promote and implement affirmative employment practices.

In these difficult assignments the commission has had the unqualified support of Mayor Richardson Dilworth. Last fall Mayor Dilworth called a meeting of the 80 top industrial leaders of the Philadelphia area and the hierarchy of the local chamber of commerce to urge them to expedite adoption of fair employment practices before commission findings and court adjudications were required. And, indeed, the progress made has been encouraging. Negro salesgirls and managers, seldom seen in the large commercial establishments a few years ago, are now a common and accepted sight in the downtown area.

But it is the city itself that has led the way. The city payroll, pitifully short of Negro employees just 10 years ago although the colored population of the city numbered almost 25 percent, now includes Negroes as department and division heads, assistant office chiefs, and, thanks to an open recruitment drive, personnel at all levels of employment.

Truely Philadelphia has seen a big change for the better in race relations in the last decade, but I am the first to acknowledge the long, long road ahead to attain the goal of equal employment opportunities for all based solely on merit, not on race.

You may have noticed in this morning's papers the story emanating from Philadelphia concerning the commission's report filed yesterday about the city's hotel and restaurant industry discriminating in the hiring and assigning of employees.

Nathan L. Edelstein, chairman of the commission, called the findings of the commission's investigations, which had extended over the last 13 months, "an indictment of an entire industry." "The report," he said, "is the most forceful and vital step we have ever taken."

Accused of discrimination in the report were 19 major hotels, 2 restaurant chains, 3 union locals and an association representing more than 50 restaurants.

It is entirely safe to assume that the Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations and the city government will bring every possible means of pressure on the industry to bring an end to the discriminatory practices found by the commission. In this work I know that the commission will have, as it has had in similar efforts in the past the invaluable assistance of voluntary civic agencies in the city, and particularly the fellowship commission groups who have worked long and hard and without compensation to foster the goal of equal job opportunity in the city of brotherly love.

II

Turning now to the Federal Government, the Nation's biggest employer, I am sure that all of you are aware of the courageous and far-reaching Executive actions to promote fair employment practices taken by the President to date.

By Executive order the President established a Committee on Equal Opportunity to fight racial discrimination in employment practices by the Federal Government and by private employers doing contract work for the Government. As he stated yesterday when he met with the Committee for the first time, the group's assignment is nothing less than "the permanent removal from government employment and work performed for the Government of every trace of discrimination because of race, creed, color or place of national origin. This is not only just in itself, it is one of the purposes for which we stand before the world."

In the sweeping Executive order the President armed the Committee, which started operations on April 5, under the chairmanship of Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, with a broad range of powers to enforce antidiscrimination policies, and designated the Labor Department with all of its widespread branch offices and factfinding facilities, to be the chief investigatory arm of the Committee. The keen interest of the Vice President is evidenced by a story out of Nashville in today's New York Times. Apparently Mr. JOHNSON met last weekend with a group of Negro leaders in Nashville, Tenn., in the presence of the State Governor, a known segregationist, to discuss job discrimination problems in the area. The group which came to the meeting, skeptical of the Vice President's views left with high praise for him.

The President's action will have a direct impact on the lives of thousands and perhaps millions of persons in this country in the days to come.

Every business doing work for the Federal Government either as a prime or a subcontractor will have to submit a statement when bidding for the work certifying that "all qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin."

Labor unions are also affected by the Executive order. Although the Government does no contract business directly with unions and thus there are no direct sanctions applicable to unions provided in the order, the Committee is authorized to publicize union discriminatory practices at hearings and to take other steps to obtain union compliance with fair employment practices.

President Kennedy's directive, unlike the orders under which two antidiscrimination committees operating under the past administration which merely authorized the committees to receive complaints, contains a variety of sanctions. Conciliation discussions are mandatory at the start of each case, but if the employer fails to end an established discriminatory practice, any one of the following steps, among others, can be taken:

(1) Publication of the names of contractors or unions found to be in violation of the rules;

(2) Recommendation of suits by the Justice Department to enforce the nondiscrimination clauses in contracts. (Parenthetically, I might note that the Department has been empowered to bring such suits for the last several years, but has never done so.)

(3) Contracting agencies of the Government are forbidden to give any new business to companies that discriminate unless and until the companies demonstrate that their policies have changed;

(4) And, finally, termination of any contract because of job discrimination either by the Committee's own action or through contracting agencies of the Government.

The commission has already received 110 complaints of job discrimination, which are being processed. One investigation, of Lockheed Aircraft's Marietta, Ga., plant which does a great deal of contract work for the Government, has already been announced. In addition the Committee has asked each Government agency to name a civil rights officer to enforce nondiscriminatory employment practices within the agency. New contract forms are being distributed to the procurement agencies for immediate use.

West Virginia, like Pennsylvania, is not blessed with the abundance of Government contract work that California and Georgia boast. Still, there are contractors who do substantial Federal contract work and some Government agencies in the Charleston area.

I would think that your commission could perform an invaluable service in making President Kennedy's equal job opportunity order known to employers, employees and persons seeking employment in this area, so that the goals which the committee has been set up to serve can be expedited in every way possible. I am sure that the Committee office in Washington can provide the commission with all of the information needed to do this job, or that your congressional delegation can obtain this information for you.

III

But additional legislation is also needed, and the 1960 Democratic platform recognized this fact. It pledged that "the new Democratic administration will support Federal legislation establishing a Fair Employment Practices Commission to secure effectively for everyone the right to equal opportunity for employment."

Last September President Kennedy asked Congressman Celler of New York and me to prepare civil rights legislation, embodying the civil rights commitments of our party's platform for introduction in this session of Congress. We have carried out this assignment and drafted a series of civil rights bills, including an FEPC proposal, with the assistance and advice of the Department of Justice.

The need for Federal FEPC legislation is painfully evident. The 17 States which have such legislation on their books (and Pennsylvania since 1955 is one) are hopelessly hamstrung in obtaining adequate enforcement where interstate commerce is involved, as it is in such a large percentage of commercial employment situations. Thirty-three States with almost 80 million people are outside the coverage of any FEPC legislation today.

With unemployment in the United States at about 7 percent of the total labor force in February, nonwhite unemployment stood at a staggering 15 percent, a rate that would never be tolerated if it applied across the board. But this discrepancy is not limited to recessions. Unemployment among nonwhites runs just about double the rate for whites at all times according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Among the employed, the pattern of discrimination is less apparent, but no less real. In the occupational structure of our society, positions as managers, officials, executives and proprietors are held at 14 percent of all white male workers, but only 2 percent of all Negro male workers. Over 10 percent of all white male workers are in professional and technical occupations; less than 3 percent of all Negro male workers. Over 33 percent of all white female workers are in clerical occupations. Only 8 percent of all Negro female workers have gained access to clerical work.

The difference in wage rates is no less startling. The Department of Commerce reports that in 1957 the average wage or salary of a white person was $3,775; of a nonwhite $1,845. This deficiency in earnings for Negroes as a class is said to total a staggering $12 billion per year. Granting existing differences in educational opportunities and trained skills these statistics still establish a substantial differential based on racial prejudice.

The bill which Congressman Celler and I have drafted would make racial discrimination in hiring, promotion, and firing, an unfair labor practice for which administrative and ultimately judicial sanctions would be available. The proposed law, which would be administered by a 5-man Fair Employment Practices Commission, would apply to all employers, business or labor organizations, who are engaged in interstate commerce or operations affecting such commerce and employ more than 50 persons.

While the roadblocks to such legislation in the Congress under our archaic and undemocratic rules of procedure are substantial, we are hopeful that this bill will pass the 87th Congress before it finally adjourns in 1962. I am confident that these measures will ultimately have the all-out support of the administration. The only question is one of timing.

It was President Kennedy who stated last fall that "Freedom is indivisible, in all its aspects. To provide equal rights for all requires that we respect the liberties of speech and belief and assembly, guaranteed by the Constitution, and these liberties in turn are hollow mockeries unless they are maintained also by a decent economic life. Those who are unemployed, or too poor, uninformed, or too uneducated to enjoy their constitutional freedoms of choice, do not really possess those freedoms."

The unending task to insure the enjoyment of equal rights, including equal job opportunity, by all citizens of the United States is a goal worthy of the best efforts of all of us. If this high goal is to be achieved in our lifetimes or those of our children, the active efforts of all men of good will both in and out of government must be dedicated to the end. The work of your commission is designed to bring that goal closer to reality. I salute you in your all-important assignment and wish you every success.

President Kennedy Rightly Urges Creative Thinking by TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "President Rightly Urges Creative Thinking by TVA," which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean of March 29, last.

The editorial follows:

PRESIDENT RIGHTLY URGES CREATIVE THINKING BY TVA

If any member of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board of Directors had any doubts concerning what the President of the United States feels this independent agency's role is, Mr. Kennedy's latest letter should have dispelled those doubts.

The President wrote: "The TVA is in the business of resource development and I want to feel that in your future thinking on the continuing problems of the valley region, you will be giving thought to the problems which go beyond the production and sale of power.

"We need much creative thinking in this area and the TVA has stood in the past for original and bold thinking. This vigorous and imaginative momentum must be continued."

This was President Kennedy's reaction to the Board's decision to locate its newest steam plant on the Clinch River in east Tennessee. The President had suggested favorable consideration of a site in southeast Kentucky, a seriously depressed region with idle coal fields.

Never did President Kennedy presume to dictate policy decisions to TVA, an independent agency, and it is in keeping with this approach that he has termed the Board's steam plant decision the proper one. A difference in capital outlay of $30 million he deemed complete justification for selecting the Clinch River site.

Nevertheless, the reminder Mr. Kennedy has given the Board is one which was needed. Since TVA constructed its first steam plant at New Johnsonville, its underlying philosophy has seemed to shift slowly away from the emphasis on "the business of resource development." Its "production and sale of power" role, a legitimate one, has received increasing attention.

This newspaper has called attention to this situation. It has suggested that the slide rule is a magnificent instrument, but that it should not entirely replace TVA's department of vision and farsightedness. When TVA came to this valley it thought in terms of river navigation, flood control, recreation, forest protection, improved agricultural methods, and saving eroding soil, as well as cheap electrical energy.

It dreamed of lifting a region by the intelligent use of all its resources, not by the coldly efficient and economic development of power alone, necessary though this might be.

The regional problems are not the same today, of course. Industrial development has become a major need, and therefore an abundant supply of electrical energy remains a major concern. But recreational and navigational demands have also grown and the possibility of constructing tributary dams to meet these and other needs is worth exploring.

Facts Pave the Way to Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Crosby, columnist of the New York Herald Tribune, recently in one of his articles referred to the fight against the program "The Untouchables" in a manner which was interpreted as maligning persons of Italian origin. Representing as I do the 19th Congressional District in which there are a great number of persons of Italian origin who are contributing to the success of the great city of New York and to the development of our country, I can attest to the contributions made by this segment of our population.

I deplore the references by Mr. Crosby and believe that his statements are divisive. The Americans of Italian origin are aroused by this column, and an indication of the resentment of persons of Italian origin to the unfair references can be gleaned by an article published in the Il Progresso on Sunday, March 26, 1961. The resentment of the Italian-Americans has been manifested against the program "The Untouchables" by pickets, boycotts, and conciliatory conferences. The leading organizations in this fight to eliminate the unfair stereotyping of Americans of Italian origin were the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, Inc., the Sons of Italy, the Columbian Association, and the National Italian-American League to Combat Defamation.

The column published by the Il Progresso sets forth the contributions by persons of Italian origin through the years, during the wars and defense of our country, and in the promotion of our economy and our country. This article answers fully any statements made by Mr. Crosby and any unfair inferences which might be derived from a reading of his article. The open letter to Mr. Crosby which was published on Sunday, March 26, 1961, follows. I am certain that the reading public will draw the proper conclusions after reading this open letter:

AN OPEN LETTER TO A COLUMNIST OF THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

DEAR JOHN CROSBY: In your column in the New York Herald Tribune, last Wednesday, you deplored the fact that an agreement was reached between the National Italian-American League to Combat Defamation and Desilu which produces "The Untouchables" on the basis of which future episodes of the television series would refrain from using Italian names for its fictional characters of hoodlums and delinquents. And you decry that "one more national group removes itself forcibly from the ranks of villainy." Of course your feelings are completely at variance with those of the great majority of Americans who resent the slurs on whole ethnic segments of the people who have caused "Abie" the merchant, "Paddy" the drunk, the dutchman "Schultz" and "Black Face" to be ban-

ished from the American scene and feel it is high time to do likewise with "Tony" the gangster.

Your statement "that it would be extremely difficult to write a history of organized crime in this country * * * without filling it almost exclusively with Italian names", is more indicative of prejudice than of accuracy. You offer no statistical proof of your wholly gratuitious assertion. Let us offer you the survey of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, which indicates that the Federal prison population with Italian names is less than 3 percent. This means that 97 percent of all Federal prisoners are of ethnic origin other than Italian. This despite the fact that Americans of Italian origin constitute about 10 percent of the national population. You describe the use of Italianate names or Sicilianate types in "The Untouchables" as "one of the few admirable things" about it, thus revealing an instinctive approval of the very sore point which Desilu recognized and promised to remove in the interests of better intergroup relations to which you are obviously opposed.

And when finally you reluctantly concede that Italians have produced "Toscanini too" * * * it is apparent that you have not gasped the significance or import of our contribution to the greatness of America in every field of human endeavor since its discovery by Christopher Columbus. Yes, the history of our country, which was named for Americus Vespucci, is replete with Italians like Marco da Nizza, who explored what is Arizona today and Francesco Chino who laid the foundation for the great cattle industry in the Southwest; and Enrico Tonti, who founded the first trading post in Chicago and was one of the founders of the colony of Louisiana. And his brother Alfonso Tonti who helped Cadillac found the city of Detroit and Umberto Beltrami who discovered the sources of the Mississippi. And Filippo Mazzei, physician and counselor to Thomas Jefferson, who incorporated the philosophy of Mazzei in the Declaration of Independence with the immortal words "That all men are created free and equal."

And wasn't it an American patriot of Italian origin who made possible the victory of Gen. George Rogers Clark which enabled him to open up the great Northwest? Yes, it was Col. Francis Vigo who financed the expedition and also furnished the military information which brought about the defeat of the Indians in this crucial period in American history.

And it might interest you to know that in the Capitol in Washington 90 percent of the art work, frescos, paintings, sculptures are the work of Italian artists such as Costantino Brumidi, Joseph Franzoni, John Andrei. And even the silver dollar was designed by the Italian DeFrancisci.

In the field of science, how can we evaluate the contributions to America and the world, of the genius and wizardry of Marconi? What is the impact on history of Dr. Enrico Fermi, who made nuclear fission a reality? And Drs. Ghiorso and Rossi of the University of California who discovered element 100 used in the hydrogen bomb? And Dr. Failla who designed the world's largest radium therapy apparatus?

Great educators like Angelo Patri, considered America's greatest child psychologist; Dr. Rettagliata, president of the Illinois Institute of Technology; Dean Emeritus Cosenza, of Brooklyn College; Dr. Edward Mortola, president of Pace College; Mario Pei, world-renowned philologist, whom George Bernard Shaw cited as a master of the English language; Dr. Francis Verdi, professor of surgery at Yale University, have left an indelible imprint on the minds of American students.

Many great captains of industry contribute to the daily enrichment of the Nation. Men like Giannini, who founded the greatest bank in the world; the Vaccaros of Louisiana, and the DiGiorgios, the fruit kings of America; the Cuneo brothers, operators of the great printing establishment in the world; Amedeo Obici, who founded the Planters peanut empire; Crespi, the cotton king of Waco; Ross Siracusa, head of Admiral television; Martino, president of National Lead Co.; Salvatore Giordano, head of Fedders air conditioning; Riggio, who was president of the board of American Tobacco Co.; our own Pope brothers, of the Colonial Sand & Stone Co., and countless others.

And builders of roads, tunnels, airports, and skyscrapers, engineers and architects * * * men like the Gulls, DiNapoli, Rizzi, Corbetta, DelBalso, Paterno, Petrillo, Lou Perini, et al.

In the field of labor we have such outstanding leaders as Luigi Antonini, first vice president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union; August Bellanca, vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Howard Molisani, Vincent LaCapria, George Baldanzi.

And in the entertainment field: theater, movies, television, and night clubs we give you just a few of the outstanding personalities such as Alfred Drake, Don Ameche, Ann Bancroft, Perry Como, Frank Sinatra, Jimmy Durante, Frankie Laine, Dean Martin, Frank Capra, Vincent Minnelli, Anthony Franciosa, Connie Francis, Joni James, Tony Arden, Dennis James, Ernest Borgnine, and Guy Lombardo.

And in baseball men like DiMaggio, Berra, Rizzuto, Colavito. And in boxing the undefeated champion of champions, Rocky Marciano. And the All-America football hero of Navy's gallant squad, Bellino; the great Columbia Coach Lou Little and a host of others.

We have produced outstanding men in other fields: the food industry; vintners, restaurateurs, and politics where space will permit us, in passing, to mention men like Senator Pastore and Governor DiSalle of Ohio; Rosellini of Washington, Volpe of Massachusetts, and Notte of Rhode Island, and the incomparable Fiorello LaGuardia.

But we are proudest of our contribution to the defense of our country in all the wars America has fought. We recall the story of Francis Spinola, who though he denounced Lincoln's fratricidal war which divided the country, nevertheless formed a brigade of volunteers to defend the Republic. He was wounded in battle, leading his men, was given the Congressional Medal of Honor and was promoted to brigadier general by President Lincoln himself. Since then the number of our Medal of Honor winners has become legion.

These are the kind of Americans, Mr. Crosby, who—many millions strong—have made and are making their proud contribution to the greatness of America and who justly denounce discriminatory presentations such as "The Untouchables" for their distortion of the true image of the devoted American of Italian origin.

IL PROGRESSO ITALO-AMERICANO.

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Madam President, much has been written and said recently about the John Birch Society. My good friend, Marsee Cox, the editor of the Terre Haute, Ind., Tribune, made a very candid analysis of the situation, I believe, in a recent editorial entitled "Doctrine of Hatred." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

DOCTRINE OF HATRED

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, who has become known as the spokesman of Republican conservatism, is of two minds about the controversial John Birch Society. Recently he told newsmen that while he disagrees with its far-right theories he is "impressed by the type of people in it." They are, he thinks, "the kind we need in politics."

They are also either remarkably naive or reactionary in the nth degree. And in fairness it should be noted at once that though GOLDWATER is "impressed" by those attracted to the group he has specifically disavowed some of its more extreme contentions. Among these are the claims that ours is not a fit form of government with which to fight communism, that Communists have influenced Supreme Court decrees, that recent Presidents from Roosevelt through Eisenhower have been Communists or Communist tools, that Chief Justice Warren should be impeached, and so on.

The John Birch Society, founded by a wealthy retired candy maker named Robert Welch, poses a familiar dilemma. GOLDWATER expressed a common attitude when he said, "They are anti-Communist and I don't see how we can be against that." Of course no responsible American can be "against" anticommunism. But the question is: Should not Americans be against communism by being vigorously for the principles which have made this Nation a great citadel of freedom?

We say "Yes." We say being for those principles, and working actively to preserve and strengthen them, is far and away the most effective way to fight communism. That is something the members of the John Birch Society have yet to learn. The society's perverted appeal resorts to tactics of both communism and fascism. Whatever may be said of the people attracted to it, its doctrine of hatred is emphatically not the kind of doctrine we need in American politics.

Visit to Washington by Students and Chaperones From Metairie Park Country Day School, New Orleans, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on April 12 it was my pleasure to have as my guests the senior class of the Metairie Park Country Day School. This fine institution, which is located in Metairie on the outskirts of New Orleans, has one of the loveliest settings of any school I have ever seen.

The school is dedicated to the pursuit of higher education and to the development of the kind of individual who will become a valuable citizen in this great country.

Every year, the senior class of the Metairie Park Country Day School visits our Nation's Capitol as part of its general educational program. I am particularly proud to have such an outstanding group of young Louisianians come to Washington and I look forward to their visit each year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the names of the 27 students and 2 chaperones from the Metairie Park Country Day School in Metairie, La.

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

METAIRIE PARK COUNTRY DAY SCHOOL, SENIOR CLASS

Thomas Coleman, Carolyn Coupland, Lynne Farwell, William Forrester, Ann Johnston, Guy Leefe, Karen Ludwig, Robert McClure, William Miller, Michael Norton, Carole Romano, Jane Rosenberg, Claude Schlesinger, Nancy Tousley, Ernst Wootten, David Grimm, Sharon Heath, Jane Henderson, Sherryl Jackson, Edna Miller, Paul Nelson, Suzanne Payzant, Walter Robinson, Donald Siegel, John Simonton, Howard Streiffer, Anne Taylor.

The chaperones: Mrs. James T. Stewart, Mr. George Bensabat.

Anniversary of Birth of John Hanson, President of the Continental Congress From 1781 to 1782

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, today marks the anniversary of the birth of John Hanson who served as President of the Continental Congress from 1781 to 1782. Born in Charles County, Md., in 1715, John Hanson is remembered as one of our country's great patriots.

He served nine terms in the Maryland House of Delegates and then went on to the State senate where he served from 1757–1773.

The Nation best remembers him as a Revolutionary leader, as one of the Founding Fathers of these United States, and as a signer of the Articles of Confederation.

My attention has been directed to an interesting article which appeared in the April 8 issue of the Mason City, Iowa, Globe-Gazette. It recounts the acceptance by the Congress of the bronze statue honoring John Hanson.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

A NOTED PATRIOT

From Charles Havlena, of Washington, D.C., a former Iowan and student of American history, the Globe-Gazette editor has received a reminder that April is the birthday-month of a great American, John Hanson, a Revolutionary leader and native of Maryland.

Hanson, whose birthday was April 13, hasn't received the recognition he deserves in history books, or at patriotic observances, Havlena maintains.

Hanson held the office of President of the Continental Congress for the 1-year term, 1781–82. As such he was 1 of 14 such Presidents in the period from 1774 to 1788, which included the Revolutionary War and the writing and adopting the Constitution of the United States.

Among these 14 Presidents of Congress the name of Hanson stands out, Havlena points out. His leadership in a critical time and his accomplishments in the face of many frustrations, places him as among America's great, the Washington scholar adds.

It was for this reason that the State of Maryland selected Hanson as one of the two most worthy patriots of that State to be honored with a bronze statue in Statuary Hall of the U.S. Capitol. The other was Charles Carroll.

Iowa has a special interest in this bronze statue. A distinguished Iowa Senator, Jonathan P. Dolliver of Fort Dodge, delivered the address accepting the Hanson statue in behalf of Congress January 31, 1903.

Another point of interest connects Mason City with the Havlenas. Mrs. Havlena will be remembered for her visit to this community last year to install the local club of Pilot International.

Water Resource Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, it has been a real treat for the people of Oklahoma to become acquainted with the new Southwestern Division Engineer of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Maj. Gen. Robert Flemming, Jr.

He recently appeared at a reception in his honor at Tulsa, Okla., and gave a "pep talk" which inspired the already enthusiastic Arkansas River Basin developers to even greater efforts. General Flemming said that we must use the full capabilities of the Corps of Engineers in the planning and constructing of the many feasible water development projects in our area. I fully concur in this belief, and I am heartened by the fact that the reaction from General Flemming's remarks has reached the White House. By his actions in recommending increased funds for our projects President Kennedy has shown that he is keenly aware of the need for and the benefits to be gained from complete development of the Arkansas River complex.

On Friday, April 7, 1961, General Flemming was the guest of the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce and he again provided the people of Oklahoma with a thought provoking address. Because I feel that his remarks will be of interest to the Members of Congress and others, I am requesting that the address of Major General Flemming be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF MAJ. GEN. ROBERT J. FLEMING, JR., DIVISION ENGINEER, U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DIVISION, SOUTHWESTERN, DALLAS, TEX. TO THE OKLAHOMA CITY FRIDAY FORUM, APRIL 7, 1961

In coming up today and talking to this audience on the subject of "Water Resource Development," I very frankly feel somewhat presumptuous. That feeling of presumption is caused by the fact that this is the home State of the greatest evangelist on the subject of water conservation and water resource development that this country and possibly the world has ever known. I refer, of course, to your senior Senator, Senator KERR. He knows infinitely more about this subject than I do. Having him in my audience makes me feel like a duffer playing a round of golf with Ben Hogan.

This afternoon I will not attempt to sell you on the necessity for water resources development in this country. To try to do that in Senator KERR's presence would be certainly overly presumptuous. Instead I am going to restrict my remarks to a very small aspect of the problem, but an aspect which I think is becoming more and more important, and soon, unless something is done about it, will surpass in importance all of the technical aspects of the problem. I refer to some of the brakes which have been placed on the formulation and presentation of public projects. It is my opinion, which I want to share with you today, that some of these brakes which were highly logical when first adopted are now beginning to operate to impede progress. This afternoon I am going to tee off on some phobias of mine which have developed from frustrations of long standing. I never have thought candor was a sin and I have frequently been accused of talking too much and too loud. This lack of vocal control has often led me to making extravagant statements and this afternoon I may make statements equally as extravagant With that introduction I want to emphasize that I am doing the talking, I am not repeating any party line, and I have neither requested no secured clearance on anything I say.

All public projects involve technical, economic, social, and political factors, and in using the word "Political" I am using it with a capital P and not the small p. Whether or not these projects are ever undertaken and carried into execution depends on the interplay of the factors in these four general fields. Of these four aspects, the technical, the economic, the social and the political, the technical and economic are fairly easy to set aside and analyze from a practical and finite viewpoint. The social and political are not capable of such precise and definitive measurement.

Now let's go back and think for just a minute about the two aspects, the technical and economic, which I said were susceptible of practical measurement. Engineering or technical laws or rules have been formulated over a period of years and to all intents and purposes are exact and measurable. In this respect, engineering or technology is a science. The modern theory of economics talks with the language of a science, but it does not meet any of the tests of a science. Its factors or quote laws unquote are not exact but are subject to interpretation and opinion. The point I wish to make to you today is that some of the ground rules of economic analysis which have been expounded to control the formulation and submission of public projects are not so much governed by the quote laws unquote of economics as they are conditioned upon a desire to influence the social and political aspects of the problem. That was a difficult statement to make; it will be more difficult to prove. But what I am trying to say is, that

we have now got things so cluttered up with sophisticated, elevated and evaluated jargon involved in the economic analysis of public projects that we can no longer use any common, ordinary horsesense. We have become so preoccupied with fiscal refinements that we can't properly or adequately evaluate human factors and social factors affecting a better life and a greater opportunity in the present; and, secondly, for the future.

Now what I have said about public projects in general applies particularly to public projects in the water resource development field. Compared to projects for highways, or schools, for example, water resource projects are more remote from the people they affect. Practically everyone drives an automobile now and nearly every family has children. If a highway develops potholes or if the accident rate rises it is fairly easy to show the automobile driver, who incidentally is a voter, of the need for a new highway, and if the schools are put on a double-shift basis it does not take much eloquence to convince the parents that more classrooms are needed. Water projects are a little bit different. It is much more difficult, and that's putting it mildly, to get the average citizen concerned about the dangers of salinity intrusion into fresh water acquifers and it is difficult to dramatize the problem of what we must do now to make water run out of a tap 20 or 25 years hence. All public projects must be carried into execution over opposition from four different sources. First, there is an intelligent and informed opposition which questions the wisdom of the solution and proposes reasonable alternatives. Second, there is an opposition, very vocal, from those whose own personal interests are adversely affected by the public interests involved in the proposed project. Third, there is an opposition which stems from the general apathy of the ignorant portions of the public toward anything outside of their own immediate concern, and fourth, and by far the most dangerous opposition is from the "let's don't do nothing" boys. These are sources of opposition to every public project, but the comparative remoteness of water resources projects as compared to highways and schools greatly increases the effectiveness of the opposition from the third and fourth sources. In other words, the opposition due to the aparthy of the ignorant public and the reckless opposition of the "let's don't do nothing" boys are much heavier millstones around the neck of a water resources project than around the neck of other types of public projects. That fact of life is a tremendous occupational hazard to the proponent of water resources projects. The opposition we must overcome is often much more unreasonable and much more fanatical than that faced by our colleague who is trying to build public highways.

The Senate Select Committee on Water Resources, the Kerr committee, has just rendered a report, which has become a best seller, showing that the need for water will greatly outstrip our current pace in the development of resources. I don't think any knowledgeable person would challenge that statement and if he was so stupid as to do so it would be very easy to shoot him down. But now let's take a look at the actualities of the situation. In my Division of the Army Engineers which covers the great Southwest, we have what many people consider a progressive and large program in water resource development. Of the 11 similar divisions in the United States I anticipate that the southwestern division will be spending about a fourth of the money appropriated nationwide to the engineers for this water resource work during the next several years. But the program we now have in the works does not come anywhere near providing for the needs that are predicted. Our present program will do only a fair job of protecting the status quo against an expanding population. In my book, however, preserving the status quo is not being progressive, it does not start catching up with the future, it merely backs eventually into the past.

I said earlier that I thought that "laws of economics" were being used not entirely as a tool of analysis but to a great extent as an excuse for inaction. Having stated this indictment I will now amplify on it. In America we have two basic schools of thought: One progressive, one conservative. We don't have true black and white—there are many shades of grey in between. Basically, America is progressive and the average American seeks progress and change but because of our background in the American heritage and because of folk lores stemming from the era of the rugged individualist and of the pioneer who by his own efforts conquered the West we tend to value highly some basic conservative ideas. Among these is our distrust of big Government. We do not like Government interference and we instinctively distrust it and yet, as our life is becoming more and more complex, our Government is becoming bigger and bigger. That is the paradox. Our collective environment, our collective progress, our collective existence demands governmental action; our individual thought, our individual sentiment resists. It follows, I believe, that the more remote a public project is from its immediate effect on the mass of citizens, the more difficult it is for the proponent to overcome this innate distrust or resistance. Certainly it cannot be denied that this facet of American life, this distrust of Government by each of us, offers a very fertile opportunity for opponents of public projects to jump on them with cries of holy glee. Many projects to answer crying needs have been suspended for years because of this type of opposition. I could prove that statement by citing dramatic examples of terrific flood damages which could have been prevented by projects authorized and designed but never built because of violent opposition from the "let's don't do nothing" boys and apathy of the ignorant public.

My indictment on some of our economic rules which we must follow is that these had been adopted more for the real reason to impede expenditures from the Federal budget than to secure a legitimate economic analysis of the project.

I cannot prove that statement but I'll try to show you what I mean. In doing this I may oversimplify a very complex question. For example, let's consider a multipurpose reservoir project which involves flood control, power, water supply and navigation usages. In analyzing this project, it should be a relatively simple process to add up all the costs and then estimate all the benefits and compare them, but when certain economic ground rules result in costs being arbitrarily increased, and prevent counting obvious benefits, it often becomes difficult to come up with a benefit-cost ratio greater than unity. Let's consider one aspect of the estimate of costs. We figure the life of any multipurpose project as 50 years. This means that we amortize the investment over 50 years, adding the totals of initial cost, interest, operation and maintenance and all the other things, divide by 50 and this is the yearly cost. Also, in this 50-year life business, we must assume that all benefits terminate at the end of 50 years. Under this thesis, Texoma, which was built in the 1940's, will cease being an economic asset in the 1990's.

Now, let's contrast this method of thinking with the way the average person buys a house. He finances it over a period of 20 years. At the end of this period, he either owns the house or he may have refinanced it to extend his payment period, reducing his annual payments by this refinancing. But—he does not figure that all benefits from his ownership of the house cease at the end of his financing period. He figures on living in the house after he gets it paid for or, in other words, he anticipates receiving benefits beyond this period of amortization. This logical approach is denied us in analyzing water resource projects.

Now let's consider some of the benefit computations. Broadly speaking, the figure which can be used as the benefits for flood control purposes must be based upon the damage the project will prevent to existing—and I emphasize existing—property. Yet, every time we defend an area against devastating floods we provide a magnet for accelerated development. Yet—and again broadly speaking, we cannot include benefits for protecting future improvements attracted by the project. Stream flow regulation is another aspect in which our ground rules for assessing benefits are unduly restrictive. With the increase of population and urbanization, low flow regulation as prevention of pollution is becoming increasingly important. Yet the only benefit we can compute for low flow regulation of releases from one of our multi-purpose reservoirs is for the specific purpose of navigation. If the reservoir contributes to a navigation improvement downstream we can assess a navigation benefit. If it has no navigation aspects, but if it does regulate low flows to flush filth away from an urban area, we cannot claim benefits. As an illustration of this use, I can cite the situation in New Orleans several years ago, during a period of extreme drought. The flow down the Mississippi River had been reduced to the point that salt intrusion from the gulf 50 miles away was beginning to adversely affect New Orleans' water supply. This problem was solved and the salt intrusion was stopped by making controlled releases of fresh water from the Fort Peck Reservoir in northern Montana on the Missouri River. That was a great benefit for the people in New Orleans and yet under our economic ground rules it could not be counted as an asset for Fort Peck.

The situation on municipal and industrial water supply in multi-purpose reservoirs is much brighter due to the almost single-handed efforts of Senator KERR in getting this question straightened out and getting legislation passed in the Flood Control Act of 1958. But, when we get into the question of whether to install hydroelectric power the picture again gets most cloudy. The ground rules for economic analysis of power are so complicated that I know I don't understand them and I doubt very much if many others do. America now needs power and will need more power. It seems to me that if we get even close to a justifiable project, we should give it the benefit of the doubt and include the power installation.

At every one of these water resources projects, recreation has become big business. Someone has said we are now developing into a race of "aqua maniacs"; it is a fair statement that recreation is changing some of our habits of living. Yet—it is only recently that we have been able to consider recreation as a beneficial purpose of a project. And even now our ground rules for putting an entry on the asset side of the ledger are far from liberal. We are now building two reservoirs, Eufaula and Keystone, within commuting distance of Oklahoma City. I'll make a sizable bet that even before those reservoirs are completed, the sale of outboard motors, boats, trailers, fishing rods, lures and all the other gadgets that go along with modern recreation are going to reach astronomical heights in Oklahome City, and after they are completed, a sizable part of the population is going to take off by plane, by car and maybe even by foot as often as he can for those reservoirs. Yet, from an "economic analysis"

viewpoint, neither Eufaula nor Keystone have any recreational benefits.

So much for my detailing of the indictment of these ground rules as not presenting a true analysis. And now I would like to answer the question—"So what?" I think the rules should be modified and liberalized.

This opinion is undoubtedly shared by everybody involved in the formulation and defense of these water resource projects and is understandable. Frankly, our present restrictions on the analysis of these projects make any proponent extremely vulnerable to criticism—almost as vulnerable as a duck on the opening day of the season. It would certainly be a relief to feel we were in a protected sanctuary for a change. But much more important than any effect on our ruffled sensibilities, these restrictions are an offense against you. You people are the intelligent public, you eventually decide whether or not these public projects ever reach the execution stage. I submit that it is an offense against your judgment to present to you a picture which is distorted economically on the conservative side. Those of us who are knowledgeable in this water problem know that we must work at a fast pace to keep abreast of the present and that we are really going to have to raise our sights to advance into the future. In view of the tremendous changes we have seen in the last decade, any crystal ball, no matter how cloudy, will picture even more dramatic changes in the near future. To be overly liberal in developing our natural resources might be temporarily extravagant. But to be overly conservative now might be permanently tragic.

Distinguished, Retired Methodist Minister Calls for Support of President Kennedy's Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received from the Reverend W. M. Cook, a distinguished, retired minister of Tennessee, a man advanced in years who has seen a lot of life and knows human nature and possesses wisdom. He has written to me an unusually frank and candid letter which I believe my colleagues will find of interest.

The letter follows:

SANTA FE, TENN., *April 11, 1961.*

DEAR JOE: I am Dr. Bill Cook's father and I knew your father well when I was on the Liberty Circuit of the Methodist Church, 1910–14. I am now a retired preacher, but I have not retired from my interest and support politically of what I believe in to advance the welfare of the common man, the farmer, the wage earner, public school education and the medical care of our aged, whose number have increased until the care of them is a national problem and a national responsibility. I know how hard pressed your two bodies of Congress are to bow to the demands of pressure groups. It takes statesmanship and courage of the nth degree to withstand selfish interests that are there to advance their own course—for example, the American Medical Association against care for the aged through the program tied to social security, which is the most sensible and workable plan advanced.

Doctors or rather the American Medical Association that dominates the entire medical fraternity down to the individual doctor and all our hospitals largely built by Federal support. Congress can fix the wages paid to workers but it must keep hands off of what doctors charge for their services, and insurance companies are pressing to advance their medical care policies, but I have not seen a policy issued that did not contain a clause giving the company the privilege to cancel it. Yesterday I was in the Maury County Hospital to visit an aged person, 80 years old, who told me that her company had canceled her policy.

Well, Joe, you may not know me but I am interested in you. Support President Kennedy, he has the goods.

Sincerely yours,

W. M. COOK.

Both New England and West Virginia Conditions Are Problems of the Nation and All Must Work in Unison for Their Solution, Senator Randolph Counsels in Letter to Boston Newspaper Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to have responded recently to an editorial in the Boston (Mass.) Herald which was entitled, "New England by Courtesy of West Virginia."

The editorial was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 7, 1961, on motion of the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. It had been inspired by an order issued by Secretary of the Interior Udall authorizing an increase of 100,000 barrels of foreign residual oil to be imported into the United States each day, and by certain expressed reactions to that order.

The editor of the Herald was sufficiently considerate of my right to make reply that he published in the March 26 issue of that important New England daily newspaper a substantial portion of the text of my March 10, 1961, letter in reply to his February 22, 1961, editorial.

Mr. President, in order to clarify my position and that of many of my fellow West Virginians, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the letter to which I have made reference.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1961.

EDITOR, THE BOSTON HERALD,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: On March 7, 1961, my esteemed colleague, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial from the Boston Herald of February 22, 1961, entitled "New England by Courtesy of West Virginia."

That editorial was inspired by an order issued by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall authorizing an increase of 100,000 barrels of foreign residual oil to be imported into the United States each day, and by certain reaction to the order.

I deplore the provincialism and so-called intersectional rivalries which seem to have been engendered by the whole question of importation of residual oil. It is especially disheartening when the discord principally involves two regions of the United States—New England and the Appalachians—which are suffering heavily from persistent and chronic labor surplus.

Writing as a West Virginian and as a U.S. Senator representing that State, I must inform you that I do not concur with the sentence of your editorial which reads: "It seems that what happens to New England is of small concern to West Virginia."

I state with sincerity the belief that the problems of New England and those of West Virginia are problems of the Nation and that we must all work in unison for their solution. In support of this belief, I cite two examples:

In speaking today in the Senate as an advocate of the pending area redevelopment bill, I stated that I concur with the antipirating provision of the measure and added:

"Our concern for the proposed legislation is motivated by no desire to benefit the State of West Virginia by the losses of another State or region. Our experience with the ravages of unemployment had been too long and too severe for us to desire any part in extending the problem to others. And I emphatically add, in view of some of the recent unfortunate differences of opinion that have arisen between my section and another, that the assurances I have just expressed are offered with particualr reference to my honored colleagues from New England.

"As Secretary of Commerce Hodges said when he was Governor of North Carolina, 'the country is growing. We want whatever part we deserve of the expansions that you are going to have in this growing economy.'"

Then, too, ever since my election to the Senate in 1958, I have been a vigorous proponent of a national fuels policy—and I emphasize the world "national." It is my view that before a fuels policy national in scope and application can be formulated, there must be a thorough study made of our fuels and energy resources. Accordingly, I have been the principal sponsor of resolutions to create a congressional study committee. A number of Members of the U.S. House of Representatievs have shared these views, as have a majority of the Members of the U.S. Senate.

A few days ago, the House Committee on Rules rejected a resolution for the creation of a joint committee of the Congress, similar to one I had introduced in the Senate on January 9, 1961, with 54 Senators as cosponsors. But the House Rules Committee did report favorably a House resolution to create a House Select Committee on a National Fuels Study.

On March 2, I introduced in the Senate a new resolution which would create a special committee to be known as the Senate Special Committee on a National Fuels Study. Today, 63 Senators of both Parties and from all parts of the United States, are joined as cosponsors, 7 from New England.

That same day, in remarks in the Senate, I said:

"The House resolution does not embrace language which, I am informed, the 10 Senators from New England States, along with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], consider to be essential to a national fuels study agenda satisfactory to them. Accordingly, I have introduced the new Senate resolution."

And I stated the following to be a primary reason why I submitted the new resolution:

"A comprehensive national fuels study should embrace the so-called 'New England amendments,' proposed in the Senate by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] on February 9, 1961, for himself, the nine other Senators of both parties from New England States, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from Wisconsin.

"The new Senate resolution I introduced embraces in full the language proposed by Senator PASTORE and his cosponsors, as properly should be the case. * * * With the so-called 'New England amendments' included, the agenda for the proposed committee is clearly in the national interest and definitely would take into account considerations relating to fuels and energy resource availability, production, and marketing, as well as consumer needs and interests.

"A thorough, factual, equitable, and impartial study of the Nation's fuel and energy resources is essential—and I underscore the admonition that such a study be impartial. I have never entertained any other concept of the mission of a committee entrusted with the responsibility to make a national fuels study."

I believe it is essential that we bring attention to bear upon all of the fuels and energy resource problems of all regions of the United States—including those problems which relate to the consumers.

We must study all fuels and evolve a policy embracing all of them, and of paramount concern must be the question of national defense posture and national security. This aspect is too often overlooked as we engage in day-by-day competitive commercial intercourse.

In the approach to every element of these grave problems, I certainly believe New England interests should be accorded courteous, thorough, and understanding consideration. I would hope that the same would be applied to the Appalachian region, including my home State of West Virginia.

I am optimistic that mutual solutions can be found, and in this connection I answer a question posed by your editorial.

My response is that New England should not be injured to help West Virginia.

But I add that neither should West Virginia be injured to help New England.

All are part of the Union, and in an economically healthy union there is strength.

Respectfully,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senator from West Virginia.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the seventh in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being, done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

LEGISLATION TO FORCE MIGRANTS FROM FARM LABOR MARKETS

"They do not have the strength to influence legislation. Perhaps we do."—Harvest of Shame.

Passage by Congress of legislation to regulate migrant labor conditions may mean the loss of work for many migrants.

That's the prediction of Walter Kautz, president of the Everglades Farm Bureau.

In a message to members of his group, Kautz said:

"Should the program 'Harvest of Shame' have the effect desired by its advocates, and farm labor legislation is forced down our necks, there is but one answer for survival—further mechanization of our farms to eliminate the need for as much hand labor as possible."

This will be necessary, Kautz said, because of the financial conditions of many farmers.

"We're not opposed to people being able to better their living conditions; we are opposed to legislation that will put the finishing touches to the cost-price squeeze that already has put many farmers out of business," he said.

The farm family unit already has disintegrated in many areas because of the cost-price squeeze, the president said.

Kautz said proper education—not legislation—is the answer to the troubles faced by migrant laborers.

"No one is opposed to better living conditions for farmworkers, migrating or otherwise," he said. "The proper answer isn't legislation but education."

"No one is tied to farmwork. As an individual's level of education rises, there is a natural tendency for him to want to better his living conditions, and along with this, his ability to do so increases as he learns. That has been the American way from the very beginning."

Protection of the Freedoms We Cherish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Madam President, Indiana's dynamic young Governor, Matthew E. Welsh, warned last week of the dangers to our freedom which exist in the manner in which we protect the very freedoms we cherish. Speaking to the Outstanding Young Man of the Year banquet of the Vincennes Junior Chamber of Commerce in Vincennes, Ind., Governor Welsh identified and described dangerous situations which are timely for our consideration. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the Governor's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS TO BE DELIVERED BY GOV. MATTHEW E. WELSH AT THE OUTSTANDING MAN OF THE YEAR AWARDS BANQUET, SPONSORED BY THE VINCENNES JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AT VINCENNES UNIVERSITY, AT 7 P.M., TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 1961

A wise philosopher once said, "Those who do not remember the past are condemned to relive it." These words constitute a warning to all of us today, for there are forces and ideas abroad, and at home, that would have us trade our freedom for a sense of internal security, and our liberty for peace overseas.

Communism has taken over nation after nation that failed to recognize the danger of the Red conspiracy against freedom in time to protect itself. Apathy and ignorance proved the downfall of the now captive Communist states, far more than the threat of war from the outside or revolution from within.

This is a part of the pattern of the past we should remember or we too will be condemned to relive it.

But other nations fell under regimes equally destructive of individual freedom and equally cruel and barbaric, at least partially under the quise of protecting themselves from communism. Freedom was lost in the name of freedom, for the people did not recognize that the ends can never justify the means.

They failed to realize they could not sacrifice individual freedom to protect it, that they could not substitute fear and terror for justice in the name of security. They forgot that public discussion and freedom of speech cannot be replaced with a forced conformity, and still keep their own freedom.

There are those among us today who preach the dangerous doctrine that any means are just and any are proper that are directed at those they suspect of being Communists. In this too is the trap that has destroyed nations.

America must remain, as it is now, aware of the danger of communism as the major force today threatening the free world and the way of life Americans hold dear.

It is not the name we oppose, but it is the vicious, treacherous conspiracy perpetrated by Communists. It isn't the word we repudiate but what it stands for.

We cannot permit ourselves to become irrational zealots seeing our neighbors as Communists, treating differences of opinion as evidence of treason and conspiracy, and falling victim to fear, distrust, and bigotry that is just as destructive to American freedom.

The sowing of hate, the spreading of distrust, or the setting of group against group within our community or State is also a denial of true freedom and does the very damage to our American way of life that the Communists, for all their efforts, have not been able to achieve.

Those who set themselves as self-appointed judges and juries over their fellow men, those who would deny freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom to think and write are the enemies of freedom, whether they are Communists or call themselves something else.

Those who use the accusation of Communist against others with whom they disagree, those who seek to convince by threat and by slander instead of facts and persuasion, are dangerous to freedom and democracy.

America will strengthen its basic rights and freedom when we emphasize what we are for, more than what we are against. We will become stronger when we restore to a greater measure the right to disagree, the

right to discuss and argue, the right to advocate or be different, without the threat of slander.

Freedom is not an anemic and weak principle that must cringe in fear when put to the test. In freedom, in liberty, there is strength, not weakness; pride, not shame; and victory, not defeat. As we struggle against the major threat to freedom in the world, the godless, materialistic, Communist conspiracy, let us not fall victim to fear, suspicion, and denial of real freedom among ourselves.

For if we do, we will have lost the very rights we thought we were defending. If we lose freedom, if we lose liberty, we have lost all. Whether we lose it to a Communist conspiracy directed from abroad, or a conspiracy against freedom at home, the result is the same.

Freedom must be defended constantly from attacks from whatever source they may come.

Congressman Charles O. Porter Points Way to Congress in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, with the growing interest and importance of Latin America, I would like to call attention to an excellent recent book on this subject by former Representative Charles O. Porter of Oregon. His book, entitled "The Struggle for Democracy in Latin America," published by MacMillan and coauthored by Robert J. Alexander, has received many prominent and favorable reviews.

The leading article in the March 25 Saturday Review "Challenge In Latin America," describes Representative Porter's book as "excellent within its field and scope," and commends it for its earnestness of purpose, the objective, scientific outlook as well as its discipline in utterance and balance in judgment. This book has also been given favorable reviews by Malcolm Bauer, the able associate editor of the Oregonian, the largest daily newspaper in my State, and by Karl E. Meyer, an editorial writer for the Washington Post, and a recognized authority on Latin America.

I recommend Mr. Porter's book to my colleagues in the Congress, as well as to the general public, and I know that it will stimulate earnest thinking on this vitally important area of the world.

Representative Porter's book is in keeping with the pledge made by President Kennedy in his inaugural message when the President declared:

To our sister republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds, in a new alliance for progress, to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty. But this peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers. Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas. And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house.

Mr. President, I believe that Representative Porter's book will help light the beacon for real progress in Latin America, and I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD the reviews that I have mentioned from the Oregonian, the Washington Post and Times Herald, and the Saturday Review.

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

[From the Sunday Oregonian, Apr. 2, 1961]

PORTER, COLLABORATOR WRITE OFF CASTRO AS BETRAYER

(By Malcolm Bauer)

Ex-Representative Charles O. Porter, who once looked upon Fidel Castro as a revolutionary hero, has confirmed his thorough disenchantment. The confirmation is in "The Struggle for Democracy in Latin America," (Macmillan, $4.50), in which Mr. Porter collaborated with Robert J. Alexander, an experienced writer on Latin American affairs.

Castro, the Porter-Alexander team charges, is "blowing out Cuba's brains" and has "probably passed the point of no return with respect to his tie-in with the Russian Communists." He is "the man who betrayed a great revolution," and they foresee for him the same fate as that which caught up with the man he overthrew, Batista.

But the burden of this slim book is criticism not of Castro but of U.S. policy in Latin America. The United States, the authors say, has been led by military and business interests to give unwarranted support to Latin American dictatorships, thereby earning the distrust of democratic elements.

"If the situation continues to deteriorate for many more years as it has in the last few," they warn, "it will not be long before any Latin American political leader who dares publicly to express friendship for the United States will be generally regarded by his fellow citizens much as the members of the Petain regime in France were regarded by most patriotic Frenchmen during World War II."

The Porter-Alexander prescription is threefold: "An abandonment of the attitude of taking Latin America for granted; a general position favoring democracy against dictatorship in the New World; and a program of real economic cooperation for the development of the Latin American nations."

Although some readers will believe the conclusions drawn are, in some cases, too extreme, this is a competent journalistic review of the principle events of the past few decades in Latin American affairs, with special emphasis on relationships between the United States and the lands south of the border. There is just one omission: There is no mention of Mr. Porter's considerable activity in United States-Latin American affairs during his service as a Congressman from Oregon.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mar. 26, 1961]

"THE STRUCTURE FOR DEMOCRACY IN LATIN AMERICA," BY CHARLES O. PORTER AND ROBERT J. ALEXANDER (MACMILLAN, 215 PAGES, $4.50)

(By Karl E. Meyer)

It is not so much our ignorance as lack of interest that irritates Latin Americans in their dealings with the United States. Surely it is only a mild hyperbole to say that until recently even well-informed North Americans were more curious about the Egypt of the early Pharaohs than about events to the south.

Doubtless there have been many reasons for this massive indifference—the feeling that Latin America was a sleepy sideshow; the deadly cliches of Pan-Americanism, so freighted with complacency; the generally dreadful newspaper coverage of everything except earthquakes.

But I would venture that a further reason has been the lack of first-rate, nonscholarly books about the region. The last country-by-country survey with any style or spice was Gunther's "Inside Latin America"—and that was published in 1940.

The present volume is a commendable attempt to provide a primer for the layman. It is both broad in scope and straightforward, if a bit wooden, in style, and it has the added merit of useful surveys of political trends in 10 republics.

In viewpoint, it is what we would expect from former Representative Porter and Robert Alexander, a Rutgers scholar, two men known for their liberal convictions. The authors have some caustic and for the most part deserved criticism of past U.S. policy blunders: the medals for dictators, excessive identification with U.S. business interests and the inadequate, scattershot economic aid programs of years past.

But their central criticism is that in the absence of a real overall policy for Latin America, the State Department has been vulnerable to powerful pressure groups which have put this country into unwise and inconsistent positions.

Despite President Kennedy's fresh start, along lines that the authors would probably applaud, this basic problem remains. Even since the advent of Fidel Castro, there is nothing like an informed popular consensus on what needs to be done in Latin America. It is as if the Marshall plan had been proposed in a country that was only dimly aware that Europe existed.

For this reason, one hopes that more books like the present volume will be written, read and debated by those politicians and editors whose interest in Latin America is so lamentably underdeveloped.

[From the Saturday Review, Mar. 25, 1961]

CHALLENGE IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Salvador de Madariaga)

For a person alive to the dangerous state of world affairs, and therefore to the importance of preserving friendship and respect for the United States, a trip through Latin America is a strange experience. Wherever he goes he will be struck by a widespread and intense anti-American feeling, particularly among students and professors as well as the professional classes. It seems to me that the international situation is the very worst for such a situation to develop at the very doorstep of the United States; for we are witnessing a great movement toward political liberty and national independence on two other continents in circumstances which by no stretch of imagination can be said to contribute to a stable order. At such a time, the world can ill afford to set a third continent in turmoil.

We are everywhere seeing the forms of liberal democracy jeopardized. It is being twisted and tortured by foreign oppression in Communist-dominated countries, as in Eastern Europe, or by a homegrown form of oppression, as in Yugoslavia or in Spain; it is being exposed to the hazards of inexperience and of a more vigorous than intelligent nationalism, as in a number of newborn Asian and African nations. Disorder and confusion are the inevitable dust clouds in the wake of such agitated events, and disorder and confusion are as favorable to communism as they are injurious to liberal democracy.

The affairs of men are ruled by a kind of law of sociological gravity that forces them to fall toward chaos if not held at a certain level of order by an intelligent hand. This intelligent hand is what we call government.

It is plain that in a number of cases too high for the peace of mind of the world the hand that keeps the affairs of men from falling into chaos is neither strong nor intelligent enough to fulfill its task. It follows that in wide areas of the world, circumstances are being created that favor communism, since communism thrives on disorder and confusion while liberal democracy requires calm and the rule of the law.

Such being the general picture, we must look on the considerable progress made by communism in Latin America as a serious threat to our civilization, particularly as such progress is observable mostly among the intellectual classes. In the United States, one gathers the impression that the intellectual is an oddity, a freak, at times a joke. His opinions are heard with polite deference and soon forgotten. As for his chances of a political career, they simply do not exist. A flavor of intellectuality has barred Adlai Stevenson from access to the White House, and one wonders whether Mr. Kennedy's success may not be due to the keen intelligence he devoted to hide his intellectuality (I am not saying "his intelligence") from his suspicious voters. The situation may be evolving. To be a Harvard professor is no longer a disqualification for becoming a member of the Presidential Cabinet; but to have published a book of poems might still be so.

In Latin America, however, a man may be writing poetry on Friday and become President or Minister of Foreign Affairs the following Sunday. Nor should one suppose that this phenomenon is limited to that form of power which derives from actual political functions. It cannot be doubted, for instance, that the high reputation which Pablo Neruda enjoys as a poet considerably enhances his power over Chilean public opinion as a Communist leader.

No more grievous mistake could therefore be made by the public opinion of the United States than to shrug its shoulders at the pro-Soviet and anti-American wave that is sweeping intellectual circles in Latin America. From the ranks of these pink professors, poets, doctors, and lawyers, the men will be recruited who will actually govern Latin America not merely 10 years hence, but maybe next year, maybe next month. The issue is immediate and urgent; and we must waste no time in facing it.

Two recently published books are relevant to what I am saying. One is entitled "The Struggle for Democracy in Latin America" (Macmillan, $4.50, 215 pp.), and is written by Charles Q. Porter and Robert J. Alexander, two names every well-informed Latin American has learned to trust and respect. The other, "Social Change in Latin America Today: Its Implications for United States Policy" (Carper, $5, 345 pages), is a collection of, six essays by as many distinguished American anthropologists. Each of these books is excellent within its field and scope. Both are examples of the best qualities one expects of serious American works: the bivalent knowledge, both of books and of men; the earnestness of purpose; the objective, scientific outlook; the discipline in utterance; the balance in judgment; the cautiousness in estimating present trends and future developments.

They fortunately differ in their approaches. The Porter-Alexander book is mainly political; the other mainly sociological and anthropological. The conclusions reached by both concerning American policy are, however, practically identical. There has been for years in Washington a regrettable lack of realization of the fundamentals of the situation south of the Mexican frontier.

The two chief failings of American policy, both books tell us, and rightly so, are too much subservience to American private—as distinct from public—interests, and an undeniable tendency to back dictatorships. Much more might perhaps be said on this score, but we should be grateful to the authors of these two books for having said as much. The 11th hour is striking and Mr. Kennedy may have to pack into the 12th much of the good will and intelligence that have been sadly missed for far too long in this field.

Despite the merits of the books, however, one may make a few critical observations. Representative Porter and Professor Alexander may be doing less than justice to the military when they write: "The armed forces (in Latin America) are probably the single, most serious impediment to the development of democracy." They themselves witness to the contrary in relating the fall of dictatorial regimes in Colombia and in Honduras. My own impression is that, in Argentina and Chile at any rate, the armed forces are today (and I stress the word) an efficient brake against any totalitarian stampede. I hope the authors appreciate my objectivity as a Spanish exile whose country is held gagged and chained by what is in fact a military totalitarian dictatorship.

May I also suggest that the Porter-Alexander "definition" of democracy is rather a description than a definition. "Democracy, as we understand it," they write, "consists basically of two things: the right of the majority of the adult population to choose their leaders; and the right of the minority to continue to function legally, to attempt to become a majority." That is a description that I of course accept. But as a definition I prefer one I once heard from the Belgian Socialist Senator de Brouckère: "Government by public opinion."

I do not put forward this alternative out of sheer pedantry, but because it leads me to my third line of criticism, this time covering both works. I refer to their somewhat negative attitude toward Spain and Spanish culture and history. It is too readily assumed that because the Latin American peoples were not ruled in the viceregal days by means of parliaments, there was no democracy then in the King of Spain's American realms. But a glance at the documents shows that the "realms beyond the seas" were ruled by public opinion to a considerable extent, and that a viceroy who tried to govern in defiance of public opinion risked riots and possibly his life.

I mention this fact because, to my deep regret, I find that both books repeat pseudo-facts or half facts which I have tried elsewhere to set right with the help of firsthand documents and, at times, of the works of first-rate American scholars in the field of Spain's history in America, such as Professor Hamilton for financial, and Prof. Irving Leonard for cultural affairs. One still has to read, in the Porter-Alexander book, that "Spain, Portugal, and France never forgot for one moment that the purpose of the colonies was to provide wealth for the mother country" (and similar statements appear in "Social Change"), when the facts are far from supporting such sweeping statements at all. There were no Spanish "colonies" in the New World, but kingdoms with autonomous governments, and the balance between the interests of the European and of the American kingdoms worked at times one way and at times another. How else could Latin America have remained, until the economically disastrous wars of emancipation, a rich congeries of communities whose common currency, solid gold pesos, was sought all over the earth as the world trade currency?

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the eighth in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omission of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

SANITARY EDUCATION: CAMPS CLEAN, HEALTHY

"In New Jersey, a few miles from Princeton, is this labor camp. There are two water taps and two outhouses. Families live in one room, usually in one bed."—Harvest of Shame.

Palm Beach County maintains a ceaseless war to protect the health of its migrant workers by keeping camp sanitary.

Joseph Alvarez, who heads the migrant sanitation program for the board of health, has the assistance of one other man.

Their biggest problem? The education of migrants to understand the value of keeping homes, persons, and camps clean.

"Many of the migrants lack a sense of responsibility, and the problems at some camps are not necessarily the fault of the camp owners, although they are held responsible," Alvarez said.

Knowing they are here only temporarily, some migrants are careless about throwing garbage and trash around their housing, the sanitation officer said.

"We are concerned with poor environmental health conditions wherever they are found—not just in the migrant camps," Alvarez said. "But our job would be easier if the migrants would help."

There have been cases, he said, of migrants tearing out plumbing equipment and owners knowing nothing about it until it was found by the sanitarians.

The sanitarians try to teach the migrants it will be best for them to look after their own welfare rather than depend on the camp operators and sanitarians, Alvarez said.

The county now has 25 labor camps licensed to operate, Alvarez said, and other housing is under supervision of the Hotel and Restaurant Commission although it must comply with State laws regarding health.

The county has been aware of its problems, Alvarez said, and has set up a program during the last 3 years to evaluate its needs and correct unsatisfactory conditions.

All housing operators now are required to comply with the minimum health rules, he said, including provision for sewerage.

What happens if operators fail to meet regulations?

They are not licensed to operate.

The State places the burden of correcting conditions on the housing operator.

Investigators have found the same defects occurring repeatedly in the same or similar quarters. In each instance, the violation is reported to the owner or operator for correction.

However, both the occupants and the persons held responsible are interviewed in such cases.

State standards permit two to four men to be assigned to a room.

The facilities, however, must provide a central toilet, bath, and laundry. Central messhalls regularly are inspected.

The State reports the area is witnessing a gradual change in new construction from the roominghouse with one- and two-room units, central bath and toilet facilities to buildings with private toilets and baths in the unit.

"It has been observed that the builder who considers the comfort and convenience of his prospective tenants beyond the regulations is more often rewarded with fewer maintenance problems," the State board reported in "Migrant Project 1959."

Minnesota 4–H Radio Speaking Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two award-winning talks given by Phillip S. Schneiderman and Neal Nordeling at the Minnesota State 4–H radio speaking contest this year be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend these excellent speeches to the attention of my colleagues. The contestants Phillip Schneiderman and Neal Nordeling are to be congratulated.

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

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-ONE RADIO SPEAKING CONTEST: HOW I CAN HELP PROMOTE WORLD PEACE

(By Phillip Schneiderman, West St. Louis County)

Victor Hugo once said, "There is a force greater than the force of armies. It is the force of an idea that has come into its time." The idea of peace has, after many centuries, come into its time, not as a desired ideal, but as an absolute necessity. I firmly believe this generation must lead the way in creating a structure of peace, built, not overnight, but brick by brick, testing each brick as we climb upward, and at last emerging, far removed from the dark shadows of the destructive forces now terrorizing the world.

My first brick would be laid in the home because the pattern of living with fellow humans must begin in childhood. Teamwork is a concept that must first be learned in the home. In the world of civic affairs men are finding that great accomplishments can come only through united effort. In a world where by virtue of the airplane no nation is more than a few hours' distance from any other, the people of the earth must learn to work together as a cooperative team. By international teamwork we can do much to eliminate man's enemies—hunger, disease, famine, and war. So, the parent who teaches teamwork is doing more than raising a well-adjusted child. He is helping to instill principles which will aid the child in being an intelligent citizen. Political strength, economic growth, and the security of the Nation demand personal development. A citizen who is underdeveloped physically, mentally, and morally is not an energizer, but a burden on society. Good education is a form of national defense. If I use my educational opportunities wisely, I will be taking the first steps toward becoming a developed citizen, and energizer.

My second brick would be a greatly expanded student exchange program. Many more foreign students should see that America is a country living its ideals instead of talking about them. I should like to be a living example of these ideals, and would welcome the opportunity to show a foreign student what my life is like.

A German boy observed in the Reader's Digest article "Let's Trade Teen-Age Citizens." "We usually think of America in terms of skyscrapers, Cadillacs, and gangsters. You can't realize how wrong you are until you see for yourself."

If you and I help, numerous foreign students will see a society in which men and women, families and communities, are realizing the good life—not in slogans, statistics, or propaganda, but actually in everyday living. World understanding is everybody's job and the best chance of obtaining it is through person-to-person association.

To make my ideals ring true, I must be more than aware of the prejudice I meet every day. I must try to gain personal understanding of minority groups and divergent opinions found in my own community. As President Kennedy has said, "We must practice what we preach in the Declaration of Independence, Constitution, and Bill of Rights. The world is watching."

My next brick is based on an observation often made by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. "People will not struggle for freedom unless they at least have enough physical strength to their fists up." Therefore, when we help people get rid of sickness, irrigate the deserts, drain the swamps, and increase the food supply, we are taking constructive actions for peace.

Because in the United States we live in a land of plenty, it is hard to visualize conditions elsewhere. So, the third brick is fighting famine, illiteracy, and poverty, and thus, indirectly, communism, which as Castro has said, "travels on empty bellies."

The tide of revolution, by the Castro revolt in Cuba, is part of a worldwide pattern. Because the doctrine of revolutionaries is to fight evil with evil, tyranny with war, fire with fire, and injustice with bloodshed, we must share not only economic and technical knowledge with South America, Asia, and Africa, but intellectual, moral, and spiritual knowledge. We must come together on a deeper basis than the exchange of goods and money To help in this development I can contribute to the Care program which is trying to improve the world's food supply. I can contribute to Radio Free Europe which is trying to win the minds of the people. I can contribute my time and effort as I am doing today to awaken my fellow citizens to the need for sharing rather than giving without thought. I can help further the idea that my privileges and rights are gained honestly only by trying to assume my responsibilities.

All nations now share the same vulnerability to surprise attack. My last brick would be to keep our Nation strong. We must realize that our private lives are interwoven with national interests. We would lose our privileges and liberties—many of us our lives—if this country, denied the strength it needs, lost the race with communism. We must remember that in a democracy sovereignty resides in the individual. You and I are America. You and I must be willing to subordinate our interests to national interests. Our efforts are the mortar that will cement these bricks.

The idea, the force, the direction for Americans in 1961 is found in St. Luke 12: 48—"For unto whomsover much is given, of him shall much be required."

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-ONE RADIO SPEAKING CONTEST: HOW I CAN HELP PROMOTE WORLD PEACE

(By Neal Nordling, Kittson County)

We live in a divided world—divided between East and West, between democracies and dictatorships, divided also between the well fed and the starving, between the educated and the illiterate. But one overriding hope unites all peoples. That is the hope of world peace.

In stunning one-two fashion, science plunged through two of nature's most challenging barriers. First the atom—in 1945 a new and terrifying instrument of death—was harnessed and put to work. Second, the inexorable pull of gravity was overcome, the conquest of space was launched. It began to seem quite plausible that man would himself soon ride free of his planet's gravity. It is unfortunate that despite the dawn of the space age and atomic age, we still have the new frontier of "inner space" to conquer. This is the inner space of our minds and this is the space that leads to world peace and security.

In discussing the conquest of inner space, I would like to consider the following: (1) Self-education, (2) education of our world at large, (3) food for peace, (4) student exchange, and (5) individual understanding and tolerance.

The first step on this ladder toward conquering this "inner space" would be to properly inform ourselves. Former President Eisenhower tells us that our American heritage is threatened as much by our own indifference as it is by the most powerful foreign threat. We've learned that a crisis anywhere in the world is not far from our own home. I can do my part by obtaining a broad education so that I might know how our Government and foreign policy operates. However, I must do more than just learn how it works, if I am to be well informed, I must also be well versed on current affairs.

The second step on this ladder might well find us concerned with the education of all peoples of the world. Statistics show that over 700 million men and women—nearly half the world's adults—cannot read or write any language. To aid the solving of such a problem requires cooperation of individuals everywhere. We can help stimulate political action through the strengthening of such organizations as the United Nations to help educate the world's illiterate people. I, and other individuals like me, can make known our opinions to legislators. I think our country can divert part of its foreign-aid-for-arms money to an aid fund for world education.

The third rung of our ladder indicates the growing need for such things as more food for peace—two-thirds of the world goes to bed hungry each night.

It is said that a drowning man will grasp at a straw. This is the case with many of these depressed peoples. This discontent breeds communism. Yet our bins burst with plenty. I can help share our abundance with our less fortunate brothers by giving my contribution to such organizations as CARE.

There is a much more direct approach and one which you and I can have a helping hand in. The fourth rung of our ladder is the exchange programs. These programs bring us the aspects of better understanding through people-to-people relationships. These are programs which will help break down the barriers between the East and

West and have been declared by former President Eisenhower to be the truest path to peace. Normally we think of other people when we deal in our own country but of foreign policy when we mention other countries. The exchange program seeks to have us deal with foreigners as other people, not by means of foreign policy. For example, when we think of China what do we see? Chiang Kai-shek and Formosa? Mao Tse-Tung and communism? Or 800 million Chinese people as individuals? These programs help foreign people see the real America and us to see the truth about them. As one German boy says, "We usually think of America in terms of skyscrapers, Cadillacs, and gangsters. Americans think of Germany in terms of Hitler and concentration camps. You can't realize how wrong you are until you see for yourself." Jane Addams of the famed Hull House further confirms this policy by her words, "One does good, if at all, with people, not to people." These programs I can help by contributing to a scholarship fund to help finance the exchange program and also I can take a student into my own home and help him learn about the real America. Since students of today are leaders of tomorrow, we must help them to know the truth. If we throw our pebble into the sea of understanding, there is no telling where the last small ripple will end.

The final rung of our ladder is individual understanding and tolerance. We must first give our talents in our own community before we can hope to spread our influence farther. Each of us must realize that hatred and prejudice wound our fellow men. Do I treat others as I would like to be treated in return? When we show respect and tolerance for the colored boy down the street, our brother and sister, our classmate and everybody—then we will be contributing to world peace. This is something everyone can and must do everyday. This takes but a little conscious effort yet how priceless it is.

As we reach the top of this ladder we will attain world peace. We have only stopped on the important rungs. After we become well informed, erase illiteracy, feed our hungry peoples, break down the barriers between the East and West through understanding and have individual understanding and tolerance for our brothers; such things as disarmament will evolve spontaneously because the causes will be removed. Professor Madagarada, political scientist at New York University, says that this hunger, illiteracy, and misunderstanding is the cause of a struggle of wills which results in arms races.

We must remember that we all have something to contribute. None of us is so poor that we do not have some gift and talent which added to the whole will make the sum total of a good world. "You and I." Those words hold the key. You and I, as individuals, are responsible for the successes and failures of our world. What we do, or fail to do, will add up to the strength or weakness of our world. God says: "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required." Have we done our share?

The Rewards of Voluntary Community Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, a constituent of mine, Mr. Arthur Murray Aibinder, of New York City, recently wrote to me describing the very wonderful work which he has done on behalf of children in the pediatric wards of New York City's hospitals. He describes his program as Operation Lollipop. I commend Mr. Aibinder for the fine work which he has done. I am happy today to call attention to a letter which he wrote to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor, urging that others participate in and benefit from volunteer work to help children in need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the above-referred-to letter from Mr. Aibinder to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor. I hope that his sentiments as expressed in the lines of verse contained in this letter will inspire others to follow his very heartening example.

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

VOLUNTEERS OF VITAL HELP

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

Permit me to share my happiness with you. During my free time I do volunteer recreation work among shut-in children. With a checkerboard, a few children's riddles, and a smile we spend many hours of priceless enjoyment together. At times I feel it is wise to permit a child to win a game of checkers, at other times I just cannot beat them. By becoming the child's friend he forgets his problems for a while. He will talk of the pleasant dreams all children discuss. Financially, I receive nothing. Spiritually, I feel like a millionaire.

There are many areas where volunteers can serve. They can be of vital help regardless where they are assigned.

A person lives each and every day
Going about in his very own way
He may be dull, he may be smart
Yet, you hear the beating of his heart.

His face might be a very pleasant one
If not, think before you make fun
Keep this thought in mind, of it never depart
This person also has a heart.

He might belong to the majority, he might belong to the few
He might read the Old Testament, or he might read the New
No matter what he may base his religion upon
The heart still goes beating on.

He might be a very cheerful guy
Or he might have reason to cry
Which adds up to one little thing
We are all but a human being.

—ARTHUR MURRAY AIBINDER.

Judge Paul Moss: Texas Fighter for Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Judge Paul Moss, of Odessa, Tex., is one of the outstanding citizens of Texas. He has been in the forefront of the fight for good and honest government in Texas for more than 30 years.

His first political service in Texas was as Ector County campaign manager for the late beloved Attorney-General and Governor James V. Allred of Texas.

During the intervening more than 30 years he has continued active in his support of causes for good government in Texas, having served as a State District Judge for a term, in his active life as a successful rancher, lawyer, and civic leader.

Judge Moss, a native of the Great Smoky Mountain region of North Carolina, was one of the most influential Harry Truman leaders in Texas. He is my good friend upon whom I have long relied for advice. He is also a brother-in-law of our own colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina, the Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON. His charming wife has long been active in the Texas Federation of Music Clubs, is a past State president, and is now an officer of the National Federation of Music Clubs.

Mr. President, on Thursday, March 16, 1961, the Odessa American printed a short sketch about Judge Paul Moss under the caption, "Wandering Ended in Odessa; Moss Chose Friendly Town."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in full in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

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

WANDERING ENDED IN ODESSA—MOSS CHOSE FRIENDLY TOWN

(By Tracy Byers)

The country was dusty, the old car was dusty, the riders were dusty, and the faded roadside signpost, "Odessa" was dusty, too.

But after a wandering journey from Wyoming through Colorado, New Mexico and northern Texas, Paul Moss and his young son, William, looked at the sign with interest and Moss wrote in a book later: "One look told me that I had found what I was looking for."

He was 40 years old, an ex-schoolteacher and a lawyer, who had tried life in oilfield towns in Wyoming, in Denver, and still was looking for the promised land that he found in Odessa.

It was 35 years ago in August 1926. Odessa was a village with about 500 residents, but the friendliest people he had ever met. There were windmills everywhere and outside toilets.

"Somehow it seemed as if I had reached the promised land," he wrote later in his book, "Rough and Tumble," published in 1954.

Moss and his son pitched camp the first night in a tent on a vacant lot east of the post office. This began one of the epic tales of the Permian Basin oilfield.

There has been no greater contrast in the life of any citizen, reflected equally in the changes in Odessa during the ensuing 35 years.

Today Mr. and Mrs. Mosses' beautiful ranch home a few miles southwest of the city limits has been the scene of the annual convention of the Texas Federation of Music Clubs, of which Mrs. Moss is a past president. National officers also attended the convention. Mrs. Moss now is one of the national officers. The rambling ranch home of the Mosses' nestles in the center of 31 landscaped acres, reclaimed from once barren mesquite land.

Similarly through the years in Odessa hundreds of miles of paved streets have devel-

oped as the city grew to 80,000 residents; the 2-story red brick schoolhouse has disappeared and 30 schools now serve the city.

During the years Moss was the first city attorney and drew up the first city ordinances; he was president of the school board in 1929 and 1930; was on the board of a bank but later sold his stock; was the first Odessan to serve as judge of the 70th district court, when it served half a dozen nearby counties. He was a charter member of the Rotary Club and the Odessa Country Club.

I have never changed my opinion that Odessa has the friendliest, happiest people on earth," Moss said cheerfully.

"There has been one change through the years that seems important to me. A man used to need to be a jack-of-all-trades to get along well in the world. I think that now we have reached an age of specialization, where a man must follow one business and look after it carefully," Moss said.

Shortly after he arrived here, the first oil boom hit Odessa. "In 1927 I made about $14,000, half of it from my law business and half from commissions on selling oil leases," Moss said.

A few years ago he sold some oil rights on his home ranch to Union Oil Co. for many million dollars, still retaining all surface rights to the land that stretches from the western city limits of Odessa for about 12 miles west along U.S. Highway 80.

These oil rights valued at millions of dollars were on some 7,000 acres of land that he had bought at $9 an acre late in 1939, and also included about 5,000 acres purchased earlier near Duro, just west of Penwell.

In 1949 he bought some 10,000 acres at $9 an acre between U.S. Highway 80 and West 27th Street. He ultimately had some 30,000 acres stretching along both sides of Highway 80, some of it in a continuous strip from Odessa to Penwell.

Moss recalls cheerfully buying of his first home place ranch acreage. "Humble and other firms had drilled on the place to no avail. When I bought the 7,000 acres everyone said there was no oil south of the Texas & Pacific Railway tracks, where my land was located."

Moss found an independent driller and persuaded him to try drilling again and they brought in a gusher about a mile from the Humble dry hole * * * "I've been looking up ever since," Moss said cheerfully. "The oil game is the most fascinating thing I've ever gone into. It's much like a horse race—you never know what's going to come in next."

Most recently Moss figured in international news when some land he bought on the Isle of Pines was "liberated" by the Communist government of Cuba, which also "froze" money he had in the island bank.

"I've just written it all off," Moss said, without giving his personal version of the Castro government. But as an adopted Texan, who has learned to yearn for water, he mourns the loss of "one of the most beautiful springs in the world," which was on his island land.

Sale of approximately 250 oil wells on his home ranch in the Union Oil Co. deal was passed by nonchalantly—and he didn't recall the exact number of wells.

He explained this easily enough. Aside from the wells on his home ranch, he had interests of various kinds in oil development in some 14 other counties, and numbers of individual wells were not so important. He had 10,000 home ranch acres in production spotted at 10, 20 and 40-acre spacings.

It recalled a statement he made to this reporter a few years ago at income tax payment time, when Moss sighed in some surprise as he said, "Imagine a North Carolina farm boy who feels that his tax payments really will be a help to the government." That was at the time when oil production was booming.

When he said "North Carolina farm boy," he really meant it. His father was seriously ill when Paul was between 12 and 14 years of age, and the boy plowed the fields and sowed the crops, helped by his mother.

Moss was born March 27, 1886 in Clay County in the Great Smoky Mountain region of western North Carolina. His mother was from Rabun County in the Blue Ridge Mountain area of north Georgia. His father's people were originally from Virginia, but had settled in North Carolina, and part of the family moved to the beautiful valley of the Tusquitee River, adjoining the Hiawassee River in the high hills of Clay County.

Moss first attended Hiawassee College in north Georgia. He received his law degree from Valparaiso University in Indiana.

He married Tommye Leigh Atkinson of Atlanta, Ga., a native of Spartanburg, S.C. in 1919. She was with him in Greybull, Wyo. and in Denver, before he started his first trip to Odessa. She had gone home from Denver while he and their son, William, traveled around, looking for the ultimate family home.

Mrs. Moss's sister, Gladys, is married to U.S. Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and occasionally visits here. After their arrival in Odessa, a daughter, Betty, was born to Mr. and Mrs. Moss and she now lives in Midland.

Moss's career has included being principal at the age of 20 of the school in Copperhill, Tenn. Then on a wintry night more than half the town, including the school, burned down. That was when he went to Valparaiso University to study law.

After graduating with honors from Valpariso, he headed west, touching in Casper, Wyo. during its oil boom, then going to Greybull, where he became city attorney.

Moss always had a yearning to move on, and he, Mrs. Moss and William left Greybull for Denver, where he stayed several years, before coming to Odessa.

Hearing of good hunting in the mountains of New Mexico, he went to Cloudcroft in 1935 and acquired a summer ranch home near Weed. The elevation of the present ranch house is 7,000 feet above sea level.

It was this summer home in the mountains that finally gave him his final anchor in Odessa. "It took me a long time to decide where to settle, but when I met Odessa and Texas I knew I had found my home," he said.

Visit to the U.S. Capitol by Louisiana High School Pupils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it was my pleasure on April 12 to have as my guests the senior class from University High School of Baton Rouge, La. Every year the senior class of this fine institution visits our Nation's Capitol as part of their general educational program.

University High is among the schools which maintain the highest scholastic standards in Louisiana and the chaperons and my two daughters attending school there inform me that the academic standards are higher now than they ever were. University High is part of the Louisiana State University College of Education and these students have the benefit of studying under some of the finest teachers in the State of Louisiana.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the names of the 57 students and 6 chaperons from University High School in Baton Rouge.

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

UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL, BATON ROUGE, LA.

Girls: Aggie Mullins, Peggy Powers, Ann Durrett, Sarah Brown, Lula Mae Hebert, Ree Smith, Ann Butler Bebe Taylor, Jan Hockaday, Merrill Faye Hines, Maggie Gerlicher, Topsy Dougherty, Janie McVea, Jackie Champagne, Mary Myers, Marilyn Pisa, Myra Cox, Caroline Spiller, Carol Guy, Lou Pace, Judy Kuehnle, Maureen Mitchell, Karen Carter, Carol Lynn Lowery, Mary Jo Kowaluzuk, Nancy Knight, Marcelle Martin, Marjorie Cox, Madelene Hubbs, Susan Owen, Lynn Meyer.

Boys: Kester Hawthorne, Richard Mason, Brother Hackett, Conley Juban, Steve Mendelson, Ted McMullan Gary Keyser, Philip Swire, Rudy Beard, McGee Grigsby, Roland Saurauge, Ken Jones, Richard Gill, Steve Carter, Bridger Eglin, Leon Lastrapes.

Chaperones: Mrs. George Cox, Mrs. E. Spiller, Mrs. M. Travis, Mrs. Kowalczuk, Dr. R. Gisby, Mr. Beeson.

Inflationary Trend of the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Madam President, the problem of inflation and prices has long been a concern of our Government. President Kennedy recently made a major statement expressing his concern over the inflationary trend of our economy and pointing out the value and virtue of full employment. The Evansville Courier commented editorially about the President's approach to these significant problems. I ask unanimous consent that these comments may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

ADMINISTRATION TACKLES INFLATION PROBLEM

The Kennedy administration came to grips for the first time last week with a persistent American problem—the question of inflation.

The problem has been with us ever since World War II. Presidents Truman and Eisenhower both pleaded for cooperation in bringing price stability. But as President Kennedy noted, "These exhortations have not had any great effect."

At present, the administration is also contemplating a voluntary program. The President told a manufacturers group last month that Government is "almost totally without direct and enforceable powers over prices

and wages freely set and bargained for. And this is as it should be."

The administration's effort is being made through an Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, convened in Washington last week. The Committee has been charged with a study of a staggering list of topics, including wages, prices, collective bargaining, living standards, productivity, and world trade. The first subjects it will tackle are the effects of inflation on U.S. exports and the problems of automation.

The President has expressed extreme reluctance to intervene directly in wage disputes or industrial pricing policy. Nevertheless, recent statements indicate vigorous approaches on related problems.

One will be an attempt to limit the pressure of consumer demand on prices. In 1957–58, and again in the present recession, it has been startling to see sale of luxury items increasing while the pace of industrial output slackened. The administration hopes to turn more buying power to industrial goods by an income tax credit for investments.

Another will be an intensive effort to stimulate full production. Indiana University's Prof. Robert Turner, now a Kennedy adviser, noted in an Evansville speech some time ago that costs no longer go down when production declines. If output is small, each purchaser must pay a crushing share of plant, executive, and distribution costs. The President, apparently subscribing to this theory, has insisted on several occasions that full production can contribute to price stability.

Kennedy feels that full production can cut costs by modernization of American production machinery. At present, he says, the average age of factory equipment seems to be going up. New machinery can mean greater efficiency and, theoretically, a reduction in price.

He notes that more production will mean a bigger tax take for the Federal Government. In last month's speeech to the manufacturers, he indicated that the increase could amount to as much as $12 billion and declared that even after payment for all administration welfare programs, "this amount of revenue would still leave a substantial surplus—a surplus essential to defend our economy against inflation."

The administration approach to the problem of inflation then will be based on increased output and increased investment. It will also seek to keep labor-management pressures for higher prices and wages within reasonable limits, through continuing talks. The combined undertaking looks gigantic, but the goals are high on the list of virtually every American's hopes.

Angela Parisi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the untimely passing of an outstanding American and Democrat, my good friend Angela R. Parisi. As one who had the pleasure of working closely with Angela Parisi, I can give testimony to the great loss which we have suffered. Angela's life was a tribute to all women as was her devotion to her children and family. The newspaper article which I now insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a brief account of Angela Parisi's accomplishments:

ALBANY, March 20.—Angela R. Parisi, member of the workmen's compensation board and a leader in State Democratic Party activities, died of cancer tonight at the Albany Medical Center Hospital. She was 46 years old.

In private life she was the wife of Leo Louison, a New York lawyer. They lived at 811 Avenue R in Brooklyn.

In 1955, Miss Parisi, then vice chairman of the State Democratic Committee and head of its women's division, was appointed by Governor Harriman as chairman of the workmen's compensation board.

During the next 4 years, she presided over many administrative changes designed to meet criticism of the board's operations. She was also a close friend and frequent companion of Mrs. Harriman.

In 1959, Governor Rockefeller appointed Col. S. E. Beechhurst to succeed Miss Parisi as chairman. She continued as a member of the board; her term was to have expired at the end of the year.

Miss Parisi, a native of Brooklyn, attended St. Agnes Seminary, St. John's College in Brooklyn and the Brooklyn Law School. For a time she taught history and government at Marymount College, Tarrytown, N.Y., and in the Brooklyn College adult education program.

Entering the practice of law, she became a member of the firm of Parisi, Nemser & Louison in Brooklyn. She also was an assistant corporation counsel of the city, active both in litigation and in legislative affairs.

CAMPAIGNED FOR O'DWYER

At the same time, she pursued an active career in politics. She headed the Young Democratic Clubs' campaign for the election of William O'Dwyer as mayor in 1945, and was national secretary of the Young Democratic Clubs from 1947 to 1949. She served on the platform committee at the 1952 Democratic National Convention, and was vice chairman of the State committee and head of its women's division from 1949 to 1955.

Interviewed at the convention, she said "women are ostriches if they're not interested in politics."

"While their first interest should be home and the children," she added, "home and the children are not secure unless they can project themselves beyond it."

Miss Parisi served many community civic organizations in various posts, among them the Red Cross, the Italian Board of Guardians of the Brooklyn Catholic Charities, the Girl Scouts and the Diocesan Council of Catholic Women.

She was a past president of the Brooklyn Women's Bar Association and of the New York State Federation of Democratic Women's Clubs. She was also a member of the Women's Trade Union League and the American Committee on Italian Migration, among other organizations.

Besides her husband, she is survived by two sons, Neil and James; a sister, Mrs. Juliet Somma, and a brother, John Parisi.

Freedom of Expression Among Public Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an excellent editorial from the Foreign Service Journal, entitled "Daring and Dissent," of the April 1961 issue. It stresses the importance to our national interest and welfare of having foreign service officers who exercise both moral courage and independence of judgment in the writing of their political reports.

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

DARING AND DISSENT

The Foreign Service has special reason to be thankful for President Kennedy's statement, in his state of the Union message, that the new administration "recognizes the value of daring and dissent" among public servants. For the Department of State and the Foreign Service are, or should be, engaged in a continuous process of reevaluation of our foreign policies, and this process can be stultified if there is no freedom of expression within our organization.

Nobody who has been associated with the recent hammering-out of foreign policies in the Department of State will have come away feeling that there was any kind of enforced conformity. There are, and there should be, opposing viewpoints and sharp debates. But this has not always been the case. We are thinking of a time, for instance, when a dispatch from the field which advanced facts and arguments that did not square with established policy could be withdrawn from circulation within the Department.

There should be no more of this. Even if an officer is wrong, provided he is loyal and keeps his views within the official family, he has a right—indeed, he has a duty—to make his best thinking on a particular problem available to the Department of State. The Department, on its part, should protect the officer against having labels put on him by outsiders who may disagree with his political views. Unless this is done, only orthodox views will be ventilated, and our policy formulation process will suffer. We have seen this happen to the foreign services of other countries. We have reason to believe, for instance, that the rigidity of Stalin's foreign policy was due in no small measure to selective and narrowly doctrinaire reporting from the field and an unwillingness to entertain new ideas about the actual world that surrounded the Soviet Union.

The right to think daring and dissenting thoughts is not a license for foolishness and wrongheadedness, but it is a guarantee that nothing will be taken for granted. In politics, yesterday's truths are often tomorrow's falsehoods. Officers who expressed skepticism about Russia's cooperative intentions during World War II performed an invaluable function in the policy formulation process, even though their views did not coincide with official policy. Officers today who question other assumptions of the day may possibly perform a similarly valuable function.

If an officer is consistently wrong or foolish, that will be reflected in his efficiency reports and he will presumably not advance to positions of responsibility and should, in fact, be selected out. But unpopular ideas are not necessarily foolish, and officers are also rated, and rightly so, for the factor of courage. We must hope that they will be given credit for courage if they give voice to unpopular thoughts, so that there will be no premium on "getting along with others" when that only means conformity and unimaginativeness. The policy formulation process is badly served if only those ideas are entertained that happen to correspond with the prevailing climate of opinion.

Let there be, then, within the limits of loyal service to the United States, a free play of ideas in the Foreign Service. Such

a free play of ideas is only possible, however, if the President and the Secretary of State will actually defend those of their subordinates who may some day, with the benefit of hindsight, prove to have been wrong. In giving our best judgment we cannot always be right, particularly since politics involves constant change, and a judgment made 2 years ago may look foolish today even though it was quite reasonable at the time when it was made.

We are heartened by the President's response in his February 15 press conference to a reporter's question whether "any employee of our State Department was responsible for or had any part in advancing the Communist foothold in Cuba" and, if so, whether he would "take steps to remove them from office." The President replied: "I think that probably miscalculations were made by our country in assessing in Cuba, but I have no evidence that anyone did it out of any other motive but to serve the United States."

The Foreign Service consists not only of geniuses. We are fallible human beings, but we are less likely to give bad advice to those in positions of ultimate responsibility if we are free from inhibitions about the limits of what is "safe" to say. Let this be understood also by Congress, lest there be a new tendency to penalize those who have in good faith advocated the taking of risks. To our readers, we say: Speak up. Let there be "daring and dissent." The President himself has said that he greets healthy controversy as the hallmark of healthy change.

The National Bellamy Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the National Bellamy Award was established in 1942 under the leadership of Miss Margarette S. Miller, of Portsmouth, Va. It was founded for the twofold purpose of giving recognition to the author of our national pledge of allegiance, Mr. Francis Bellamy, and of providing a stimulus to the teaching of patriotism and good citizenship in our public schools. Selected schools are invited to compete for the award by submitting a folio of materials in evidence of two things: the school's promotion of patriotism and good citizenship, and evidence of outstanding contributions made by the school's alumni. In 1957, Will Rogers High School in Tulsa, Okla., was selected to receive the 16th annual award, and holds the honor for its State for a 50-year period.

I am happy to present the address offered by Jon Miller, Rogers High School SCA president, to the 19th annual Bellamy Award presentation at Cony High School, Augusta, Maine, in 1960:

ADDRESS BY JON MILLER, SCA PRESIDENT, WILL ROGERS HIGH SCHOOL, TULSA, OKLA.

DAVID ELVIN. Now we have Jon Miller, student council president from Will Rogers High School, Tulsa, Okla. His school was given the 16th annual Bellamy Award in 1957. Jon has received the NRA expert rifleman award and is a member of the Will Rogers rifle team; he is secretary of the boys' glee club; a member of the Inter-City Student Council, and was a delegate to the Oklahoma White House Conference on Children and Youth this year.

JON MILLER. I am extremely proud to be in this wonderful school and in this beautiful city representing my State of Oklahoma, the city of Tulsa, and Will Rogers High School.

I am sure most of you have heard of the great American humorist, Will Rogers, for whom my school was named. "I never met a man I didn't like," was Will's most famous epigram. It was this epigram that Will used to melt the hearts of people east and west, causing the twain to meet. Will was not only a great humorist, but a great diplomat. No matter what a man's language, Will's smile had a way to unlock any foreign barrier. He also had a way with words, combined with a fine sense of humor. Once when Will was introduced to President Hoover he walked up to the President, shook his hand and said: "I didn't quite get the name."

As a school we are proud of Will Rogers and proud to have our cornerstone bear his name. We are equally proud of our school. Last week it was announced that 20 Rogers students had qualified as semifinalists for the national merit scholarship. This is quite a record for any school.

Will Rogers High School provides a wide variety of activities, designed to keep the minds of 2,400 students working to maintain the academic achievements which have made Rogers one of America's most highly regarded schools.

As a young State, only 53 years old, Oklahoma has produced many celebrities who have made her proud. Jim Thorpe, Warren Spahn, Mickey Mantle, some of our country's leading athletes; Patti Page, Dale Robertson, star of "Wells Fargo," and Anita Bryant, popular young singing star, a graduate of Will Rogers High School Class of 1958, are a few examples.

Oklahoma is also the home of the Five Civilized Tribes, and we are proud of our Indian lore.

From the city of Tulsa, the oil capitol of the world, and the colorful State of Oklahoma, and your Bellamy Award sister, Will Rogers High School, I present to you at Cony this official, authentic Indian peace pipe as a symbol of our friendship. I also have a copy of our school annual, the 1960 Lariat.

For your warm hospitality and the rewarding experience of being a part of this memorable event, may I express my deep gratitude. We trust that you will cherish the Bellamy Award as we have, and we extend our congratulations to you, the newest member of the Bellamy family.

Protection of President-elect Lincoln on His Journey to Washington in 1861

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Madam President, Paul Hillsamer, the editor of the Marion, Ind., News Herald, has written a very interesting article about a little-known historical coincidence. It relates to the courage and determination of a New York City police superintendent, John Kennedy, and his efforts to protect President-elect Lincoln on his journey to Washington in 1861. I am sure the article which describes the exploits of the President's namesake, will be of interest to many persons. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Marion (Ind.) News-Herald, Mar. 31, 1961]

THE EDITOR SAYS

The national columnists all missed a chance for an unusual column about 5 weeks ago.

John Kennedy rode the same train on which Abraham Lincoln, on his way to his First Inauguration, secretly traveled from Philadelphia to Washington, D.C. Kennedy climbed aboard in New York. He was not a casual passenger. His interest was Lincoln's safety.

Lincoln did not know John Kennedy was on the train. John Kennedy did not know that Lincoln was a fellow-passenger.

But both men were on their way to Washington for the same purpose; to prevent the murder of Abraham Lincoln to southern sympathizers in Baltimore.

All of this occurred on the night of Washington's Birthday, February, 22, 1861. Here is the background.

At the time to take the oath of office as President drew near, Lincoln chose to travel from Springfield, Ill. to the Nation's Capital by train—and slowly, his desire was to let the people of various States get a look at him, to confer with the several Governors and to speak, when possible to the State Legislatures. The journey took 12 days. Lincoln's train left Springfield, Ill. on February, 11, 1861, one day before his 52d birthday.

As the Lincoln train zig-zagged around the country, Springfield to Lafayette, Ind., Lafayette to Indianapolis, to Cincinnati, Trenton, N.J., New York City and finally back to Philadelphia, there were persistant rumors that he would be shot in either New York City or Baltimore. The latter city was his last scheduled stop before Washington.

The President-elect discounted these stories and appeared in New York without incident. But when he entered his hotel in Philadelphia on February 21, a young private detective named Allan Pinkerton wrangled admission to his room. (Pinkerton later became quite famous and was never adverse to recalling that it was "he who saved Lincoln's life.")

Pinkerton had information of plots hatched in Baltimore which shook Lincoln and his bodyguard, Hill Lamon, far worse than the tales they had already ignored.

Pinkerton had been to Baltimore and had wormed his way into various traitor's confidence and kept a mighty good record of what they said.

Lincoln called in an Illinois politician named Judd. After long discussion, Lamon, Judd, and Pinkerton urged Lincoln to immediately proceed to Washington in disguise.

No, Lincoln said, that was out of the question. He had promised a speech at Independence Hall and, also, he was to speak to the Pennsylvania Legislature at Harrisburg the next day. He was not going to break those commitments.

The same evening Secretary of State W. H. Seward warned Lincoln of plotting in Baltimore. The Secretary considered the information so private that he sent it to Philadelphia by a courier, his son Fred Seward. Lincoln asked young Seward if he or his father knew of Allan Pinkerton's investigation. Fred Seward answered "No" but, in effect, told Lincoln, "That simply means it is really serious. If Father and Pinkerton obtained this information independently of one another * * *."

Lincoln did not sleep well that long night. Between festivities and appearances on February 22, Lamon, Judd, and Pinkerton were joined by Judge David Davis and A. K. McClure in urging the President-elect to slip secretly through Baltimore. The question of charges of cowardice and public ridicule were considered and rejected. Finally Lincoln said, "I will do it." After further discussion it was decided that Mrs. Lincoln and his sons should remain on the regular train.

Lincoln changed to a different suit and hat and bundled himself up in an old fashioned overcoat. He and Lamon left Harrisburg quietly. Back in Philadelphia, at 10 p.m., Pinkerton met the 2 tall men (6–4 and 6–2) at the Pennsylvania Railroad Station and (in a closed carriage) drove them to the P. W. & B. station. One of Pinkerton's female detectives had reserved two berths in a sleeping car for "her invalid brother and his attendant" and Lincoln and Lamon were installed in these quarters quietly and smoothly. Pinkerton went into the next car, as a casual passenger. Thus they left Philadelphia. The train entered New York swiftly and silently and headed for Baltimore.

At 3:30 p.m. the train entered Baltimore. After a couple routine stops, it finally pulled into Washington at 6 in the morning, February 23. A drunken passenger singing "Dixie" had annoyed Lamon exceedingly. Otherwise the trip had been quiet.

Now, John Kennedy.

This particular John Kennedy was a handsome New York Irishman who never learned the meaning of the word "fear." When he reached 21, he went on the New York police force. By 1861, his sparkling courage and bulldog determination in crisis after crisis had elevated him into an unusual position. He was superintendent of police for Mayor Wood of New York City, not only because of being a Democrat and Irish-Catholic but also strictly on merit.

Kennedy, like all good policemen, not only faced trouble when it came but also looked for trouble brewing. For a solid week he heard lurid tales of what Baltimore's secession-minded citizens intended to do to Abraham Lincoln. Highly intrigued, Kennedy sent a top New York detective named Bookstaver to Baltimore to size up the situation. Bookstaver reported back, "They mean it."

John Kennedy had a problem. Mayor Wood was not a Unionist. He was already talking of New York as a "free city," independent of both North and South. He was certainly not the man in whom to confide.

Superintendent Kennedy had an opinion of all Baltimore politicians and it was not a high one. He joined everyone on both sides in contempt for President Buchanan and his advisers. (For one example why * * * there was a saying, at that time, "Tell it in Washington at noon and it's common knowledge down South before supper time.")

So, Kennedy decided on February 22 to go to Washington himself. He planned to tell Gen. Winfield Scott and a couple Washington police officers whom he trusted that they had better rush some special protection to Baltimore before Lincoln arrived there, as scheduled, the afternoon of the 23d.

John Kennedy caught the Washington train from Philadelphia around midnight on the 22d and laid himself down on a berth. He catnapped with a loaded pistol at his side and a knife in his belt. This courageous Irishman knew very well that a man traveling in behalf of Abe Lincoln that night was in danger of his life. He left the train in Washington at 6 and carried his warnings to the proper people. But by evening he realized that his information was outdated; that not only was Lincoln in Washington, but he had been Kennedy's traveling companion, separated only by two railway cars, all the way from New York.

And, by one of history's quirks, another John Kennedy stood up in Washington, D.C. just 33 days less than 100 years later and took the same oath of office as did Abraham Lincoln on March 4, 1861, 9 days after his train glided into the Washington depot.

This John Kennedy of 1861 (John A. Kennedy) went on in his chosen career and lived and died a brave man. His name is still legendary in New York.

The wisdom of Lincoln's action was indicated on the afternoon of the 23d of February. The regular train, which he was supposed to be on, pulled into Baltimore and was met by a mob of 10,000. If he had any friends in the crowd, their voices were not audible. The Baltimore Sun reported that many men crowded the platform and jumped on the cars "like monkeys" and "as thick as a hive of bees." Most of them, in those free-wheeling days, were armed.

Lincoln was viciously criticized in the papers for "sneaking into Washington." There was one story that he wore a "military cloak," another that he wrapped his head, face and neck in "scotch plaid." The editorial uproar continued for months. Someone wrote a parody of "Yankee Doodle" and it enjoyed temporary popularity, especially in the South and border States.

"They went and got a special train
At midnight's solemn hour,
And in a cloak and scotch plaid shawl
He dodged from the slave-power.
Lanky Lincoln came to town,
In night and wind and rain, Sir!
Wrapped up in a coward's coat,
Upon a special train, Sir!"

Lamon later wrote that "Lincoln regretted the midnight trip." But all evidence is that only a fool would have risked meeting the Baltimore crowd.

An Illinois Congressman named Washburne almost got himself shot or badly beaten when Lincoln, Lamon and Pinkerton left the secret train at Washington. Waiting on the station platform for someone else, Washburne saw the three men and hastened up saying: "Lincoln! You can't play that game on me." Pinkerton reached for his pistol and Lamon doubled up his huge fist. Lincoln hastily intervened, saying, "Don't strike him. It's Washburne."

So, that's the story. To the writer, the great drama at this time is that a man named John Kennedy rode that train—his only object being the welfare of Abraham Lincoln—and just less than a century later another John Kennedy moved into the White House. Bits of irony such as this do not make history but they certainly make history more interesting.

Time for a New Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville, Ind., News of March 22, 1961:

TIME FOR A NEW LOOK

The United States has spent about $133 billion on foreign aid in the last 20 years.

The program had a two-fold purpose: First, it was to assist both our allies and former enemies in World War II in restoring their economies. The second purpose was to win the peace and stop the growth of communism.

The first part of the program has been successful. So successful, in fact, that today the American economy is in grave danger because of the low-wage competition from these countries that we have helped so much to rebuild with the tax of American wage earners.

With 80 percent of all taxes coming from people with incomes less than $10,000 per year, the American laboring man has borne the brunt of paying for the factories in foreign countries that now are driving him from his job here at home. It should be pointed out here for clarification that most tax revenue comes from those earning less than $10,000 per year simply because such people are in the vast majority. Those earning in higher figures are, of course, taxed even more heavily—but there are far fewer of them.

The total debt of the United States is now more than the combined debt of the rest of the world. Many of the countries whose economies have been rebuilt to a large extent with the tax dollars of Americans are now in a position to help other underdeveloped nations, and there has been some talk about this happening. Unfortunately for the American taxpayer, it has been mostly talk so far, with very little action.

Instead of cutting off the aid program to these countries which are frankly in a much better financial position than we are, our Government continues it year after year.

As to the second purpose of the foreign aid program—that of winning the peace and stopping communism—this appears to have been largely a failure.

For example, we have given India, which is supposed to be neutral, more than two and a quarter billion dollars. Yet India votes rather consistently against the United States in the United Nations. Tito, of Yugoslavia, who has stated frankly, "In any future war, we shall march shoulder to shoulder with Soviet Russia," has received almost the same amount—more than $2 billion.

Poland and Indonesia, both openly communistic, have received another billion and still are receiving yearly hundreds of millions of American tax dollars. Communism, which was supposed to be stopped by this fantastic outpouring of American money, has now extended its borders to within 90 miles of the coast of Florida.

To those critics who say that anyone who is opposed to foreign aid is hard-hearted and unconcerned about the rest of the world, may we pose just one question? If America permits herself to be spent into national bankruptcy—if we do not maintain our fiscal integrity here at home—how long will any nation on earth be able to remain free from communism?

Make no mistake about it—peaceful coexistence to the Communist means a gradual triumph of the worldwide conspiracy to end freedom. Spending America's financial strength to nothingness is the surest way of achieving that goal—all by peaceful means.

We do not say that all foreign aid should be stopped. But we do say that it is time for a new look at the whole foreign aid program—its size and scope, its past cost and its past successes and failures—and time to reduce it drastically to a basis of current realism.

Beneath the Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to

insert into the RECORD, a poem entitled "Beneath the Cross," which is very timely and thought provoking. I commend it to the attention of all my colleagues and to the public generally.

The author of the poem is Giovanni Giuseppe Longo of Utica, N.Y. He wrote it at the conclusion of World War II, when he was serving in the U.S. Armed Forces. Mr. Longo is a native of Italy, where he was born in 1922 and came to this country at the age of two. The family settled in Utica, where he was raised and obtained his education. He studied at Utica College of Syracuse University until he entered military service in 1942.

From April 1943 to January 1946, Mr. Longo was stationed overseas, mostly on various islands in the Pacific. He was in the Signal Corps as a communications technician. He spent some time in Kobe, Japan, after the conclusion of the war and it was here that he wrote his poem. The tremendous destruction of this largest city of Japan by the constant bombings made such a deep and lasting impression on Longo that he began to set his thoughts down on paper in poetic form.

After he had completed writing the poem he felt that if it could be given wide distribution throughout the Nation, and possibly throughout the world, it might set other people to thinking about war and how to stem the tide of human destruction. Even if it does nothing more than just cause people to stop and think about this matter, the poem by Mr. Longo will have achieved its purpose and will have made a significant contribution to the welfare of humanity. It is for this reason that I am pleased to insert it into the RECORD:

BENEATH THE CROSS

(By Giovanni Giuseppe Longo)

We stand together thousands strong
And hearing, wonder, have we done wrong?
We are the boys who left our homes,
Gave our lives to win a throne.

The Throne of Peace, as it is called
Gave us strength to conquer all.
But now we hear the rumors roar
It's atomic energy which controls the floor.

Nations are ready to strike and fall
Because they fear an atomic war.
The atom's destructive, so they say,
If left unguarded day by day.

Nations unite, we cry below
The sparkling crosses "Row on Row."
Uncounted thousands lie at rest
In hopes we brought you happiness.

We must not feel we fell in vain
And wish that we could rise again;
Leave us here with our memories, gay,
With our job well done, and no dismay.

Instead of power, use your tongues
And let them blend to sound like one.
Bring peace and comfort to our souls
May God bless you as in days of old.

When atomic power is thrust aside
And nations heed each other's cries,
It's then our souls will lie at rest
For they will have found their happiness.

Hear our cries, you nations all,
While atomic energy controls the floor.
Do not forget what should be said
So your departed sons can lie to rest.

Miss Liberty Takes Another Bow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Miss Liberty Takes Another Bow," from the Christian Science Monitor dated Tuesday, April 4, 1961:

MISS LIBERTY TAKES ANOTHER BOW—U.S. SWEETHEART HAS 35-FOOT WAISTLINE

(By Kelvin Wallace Coventry)

Happy birthday to America's No. 1 sweetheart.

Old-fashioned? Yes. She's never made a best-dressed list. She gives her age as 75-plus. Her complexion has been described as "harbor green," but she's still the pinup queen for "freedom fighters" the world over.

She's a buxom lass at 450,000 pounds. She has a 35-foot waistline and carries the torch for every new American. She knows what it means to be an immigrant—she was once one herself. She's the Statue of Liberty.

It was 75 years ago that France's gift to the United States chose to disclose her Mona Lisa beauty to the world. The date was October 28, 1886, a raw, wet day for thousands of shivering paraders.

Out in New York Harbor, Miss Liberty stood hidden in mist and the French flag. Flying every banner known to the sea, hundreds of boats, rafts, sailing ships completely surrounded Bedloe's Island, her pedestal.

THE UNVEILING

Some 300 feet above the water, standing in the torch, Auguste Bartholdi pulled the rope to remove the tricolor which shielded the face. As the veil was dropped, Liberty's face shone through the haze.

Then, said the New York Times, "a hundred Fourths of July broke loose." Tugs bellowed, whistles screamed, and naval guns roared. Miss Liberty had taken America by storm.

It was a crowning moment for Mr. Bartholdi, the Alsatian sculptor who had put together the 200 tons of hammered copper and steel. He dedicated more than 10 years of his life to the statue of "Liberty Enlightening the World."

Almost 900,000 visitors a year now take the short ferry trip from New York's Battery Park, nose out into busy harbor traffic, to pay their respects to Miss Liberty.

Suddenly, there she is rising from the sea in the morning sunshine. She towers above you—almost breathing, it seems.

SYMBOLISM EXPLAINED

There is symbolism in the design of the statue. She steps away from the broken shackles of tyranny at her feet. The tablet in the statue's left hand, its sentiments inscribed July 4, 1776, refers to the Declaration of Independence—telling all comers of the American ideal that "all men are created equal."

You enter the statue through the high walls of old Fort Wood. Once inside, visitors then have a choice of either an elevator ride or a 10-story hike up a stairway to the observation balcony. From here it's a tortuous 12-story climb to Miss Liberty's crown.

Looking out through a series of 25 windows, which are the jewels of the crown, you can get a better look at the tablet of law in the left hand. To the north you can see abandoned Ellis Island, gateway for more than 40 million immigrants.

The "welcome mat" Miss Liberty stands on, once known as Bedloe's Island, was also known as Great Oyster, Minissais, and Love. But the name Liberty Island was widely used in the 1880's when funds were being raised for the pedestal of the statue. Five years ago, Liberty Island became the official name again.

At the base of the statue a bronze tablet bears the famous Emma Lazarus sonnet, "The New Colossus," with its uplifting lines: "send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me; I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Miss Liberty's last big birthday party, on October 28, 1956, was a whopper. Fort Jay, across the harbor, treated her like royalty with a 21-gun national salute. She was also given the gift of the American Museum of Immigration, still to be built at the base.

Care for the Aged: The Private Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday morning's Wall Street Journal there appeared an editorial on the subject of health needs of our aged and the advances that have been made in financing them through the medium of private health insurance programs. It also points to a need beyond that which these programs meet, the need to which the Congress should properly address its attention. I should like to put the editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 12 in the RECORD at this point:

PROGRESS ON A PROBLEM

Caring for the ills and afflictions of the aged has always posed a problem for civilized societies, as it does for ours today. But admitting the existence of the problem is not the same thing as assuming that, unless the Federal Government bestirs itself, the problem will become progressively worse.

On the contrary, there's reason to be optimistic about the private response of our society. As Barron's magazine reports this week, "Perhaps the most notable development in health insurance in the past 5 years has been the extension of coverage to those 65 and over." According to the insurance industry, about 50 percent of Americans over 65 now have some form of health insurance.

Some 290 voluntary health-insuring organizations are now issuing hospital or surgical policies to the elderly, and in an expanding variety of policies available to everyone. Aware of the great potential of this 65-and-over market, aggressive companies are driving down policy costs to unprecedented levels, at least as cheap as any proposed Government insurance plan.

The actual response to voluntary insurance is a long way from the caricature of the elderly as a mass of medical indigents who must look to Washington for succor. And the response should grow as competition to meet their needs quickens.

To be sure, some elderly persons cannot afford any premium, however modest; the community must care for the truly needy as it traditionally has. But the needy few

should not be used as an excuse to throw the blanket of Federal welfare over everyone, especially when so many elderly Americans prefer to stand on their own feet.

Lt. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, last month marked the end of a military career of one of our country's most distinguished military officers, Lt. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, Chief, Corps of Engineers. For many years, I have known and admired General Itschner and I have been extremely proud to boast that he is one of my constituents, maintaining his residence at Lakeside, Wash.

For nearly 37 years, General Itschner's contributions toward the development of civil and military projects under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers have been numerous and benefiting to our country. He was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in 1924 and was commissioned as a second lieutenant. His early service consisted of a variety of interesting assignments including his service as a field engineer with the Alaskan Road Commission, a tour of duty as assistant professor of military science at the Missouri School of Mines and various assignments with engineer district offices throughout the Nation.

During the early part of World War I, he headed Air Force construction for the Engineers and had charge of construction supporting the invasion of Europe, including the initial reconstruction of the vital port of Cherbourg.

After World War II, General Itschner was assigned as Chief of Military Construction Operations and, later, served as district engineer in Seattle, Wash. When Korean hostilities broke out, he served overseas as engineer of I Corps, where he took part in the advance of the Yalu River and the subsequent withdrawal. He was awarded the Purple Heart for wounds received in combat in March 1951.

In October 1956 General Itschner was appointed Chief of Engineers—the youngest officer in more than a century to head this important Army branch. Among the numerous civil and military works which he directed during this period were the completion of the U.S. portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway; advancement of the Columbia, Missouri, and Arkansas River Basin developments; modernization of the Ohio River and Great Lakes navigation systems; construction of ICBM launching bases; and building Camp Century, the nuclear-powered research center under the snow on the Greenland Icecap.

The general has now accepted a position as a technical adviser on the Indus River project in Pakistan with a private engineering firm.

I know my colleagues join me in saying "Thanks for a job well done and Godspeed" to Lt. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, U.S. Army, retired.

Our Struggling Contemporary Composers Need All the Official Backing They Can Get From the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of a music trade paper published in Germany, Musikhandel, makes much of the fact that President Kennedy recently failed to list a single composition by an American composer as among his favorites.

Former Vice President Richard Nixon, on the other hand, mentioned at least one American composition out of three as being among his favorites.

This prompted my dear friend Arthur A. Hauser, president of the Theodore Presser Co., of Bryn Mawr, Pa., to comment that—

Your interest in American music prompts me to believe that you share my annoyance at the foregoing statement (from Musikhandel). Richard Nixon mentioned at least one American composition out of three as being among his favorites. President Kennedy, however, mentioned none. International good will might have been served by his choice of music from various foreign countries, but on the other hand our struggling contemporary composers need all the official backing they can get, and if our President had mentioned at least one American composition, I am sure that his statement quoted in foreign countries might have helped our cause.

Perhaps President Kennedy is not familiar with American music. If this is the case, I am sure that our various musical societies will be only too happy to help him learn more about what is being done in America to improve our cultural standing among nations.

I include as part of my remarks the letter I have received from Mr. Hauser:

BRYN MAWR, PA., *April 10, 1961.*

Hon. CARROLL D. KEARNS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CARROLL: In the current issue of Musikhandel, which is a trade paper published in Germany, I noticed the following item:

"Präsident Kennedy erklärte bei einer Rundfrage folgende Werke als seine Lieblingskompositionen: "La Valse" von Ravel, "Der Nachmittag eines Fauns" von Debussy, die Ouverture "Benvenuto Cellini" von Berlioz, die Ballettmusik aus "Gounods Faust" und Szenen aus "Boris Godunow" von Mussorgsky.

"Sein Gegner Richard Nixon gab folgende Lieblingskompositionen an: das Musical "Oklahoma," Tschaikowskys "Schwanensee" und "Mexikanische Volkslieder."

Your interest in American music prompts me to believe that you share my annoyance at the foregoing statement. Richard Nixon mentioned at least one American composition out of three as being among his favorites. President Kennedy, however, mentioned none. International good will might have been served by his choice of music from various foreign countries, but on the other hand our struggling contemporary composers need all the official backing they can get and if our President had mentioned at least one American composition, I am sure that his statement quoted in foreign countries might have helped our cause.

Perhaps President Kennedy is not familiar with American music. If this is the case, I am sure that our various musical societies will be only too happy to help him learn more about what is being done in America to improve our cultural standing among nations.

With very kind personal wishes to you, I am,

Cordially yours,
THEODORE PRESSER CO.,
ARTHUR A. HAUSER,
President.

Neutral Communists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether or not our position taken in regard to the Laos crisis represents appeasement or firmness and the further question of whether the Communists must be kept at sword's length or embraced with peaceful coexistence is naturally a subject of intense discussion. Chicago's American, in an editorial on Saturday, April 8—entitled "Neutral Communists?"—gave a practical analysis of this complex issue.

The editorial follows:

NEUTRAL COMMUNISTS?

We have an idea the policy agreed on by by President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan will serve its immediate purpose, which is to prevent the low-grade civil war in Laos from blazing up into another Korea, but it is not likely to prevent a Communist takeover in Laos in the fairly near future.

At the Senate luncheon Thursday, Macmillan said he was optimistic that a Lao government in which Communists will be included can be truly neutral.

We can't imagine where Macmillan gets his supply of optimism. He doesn't get it from the history of governments in which Communists have been invited to participate, for these—in Poland, Czechoslovakia, mainland China, and elsewhere—have always evolved rapidly into all-out Communist governments. If Macmillan or Kennedy know any reason why the Russians would be inclined to keep the government in Laos neutral when they never have had any such impulse anywhere else, we would like to hear it.

The agreement between Kennedy and Macmillan means, apparently, that they hope they can find a way later on, through diplomacy, to keep the Communists from absorbing Laos, if they can manage to prevent the Communists from absorbing Laos by force of arms now.

It is a difficult undertaking, because the Communists are in a position to stall, and are stalling. The formula proposed to Russia by Britain, with United States approval, calls for a cease-fire, a truce team represent-

ing three nations to supervise it, and a meeting of 14 nations, including Red China, to shape a political agreement.

Russia has accepted the idea, but is delaying the cease-fire. And in the meanwhile Russia keeps supplying the Communist rebel force while it conquers more Lao territory. It will take a high quality of diplomacy on the western side to pin the Russians down and get the shooting stopped.

Wage Fight, Round 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent editorial from the Buffalo Evening News of March 30, 1961, relating to minimum wage legislation. I commend its wisdom and insight to the Members:

WAGE FIGHT, ROUND 1

In his last news conference, President Kennedy did his oversimplifying best to prod the House into passing his minimum wage bill intact. But he failed by 1 vote, 186 to 185. The House then went on to pass a slightly more conservative substitute, the Ayres-Kitchin bill. It was the President's first important defeat in a congressional roll call and the administration, obviously stung, evidently means to fight back in hopes that it can get the Senate to jam the Kennedy bill down the House's throat in conference.

Thus, the issue of Presidential prestige against House independence in some ways has come to overshadow the actual differences between the bill Mr. Kennedy wanted and the one the House passed.

Actually, the fight is over two main points, both of which were far more confused than clarified by the President's news conference remarks. The least significant point is what most of the political shouting is about: The House bill raises the minimum wage from $1 to $1.15 and hour; the Kennedy bill would do the same for this year, but would step it up to $1.25 by 1963. The President, who promised $1.25 all through the campaign and evidently feels that he still has to use that figure in all references to the minimum wage, had urged that Congress not begin at $1.25 but move up toward it only gradually. Most supporters of the $1.15 House bill would not be too upset if, in a final Senate-House compromise, the escalator to $1.25 in later years is added to the House bill.

The issue on which they will fight hardest for the language of the Ayres-Kitchin substitute bill—the real issue of substance between the two—is the yardstick for extending minimum-wage coverage. The Kennedy bill would bring under the Federal net virtually all retailers with a gross sales volume over $1 million a year. The Ayers-Kitchin bill, retaining the historic concept of interstate commerce, would leave purely local businesses to State regulation and cover only firms with five or more outlets in two or more States.

The House bill sponsors, in short, are fighting for a principle of limited Federal Government—although you would never guess it from the way the President characterized the issue in his news conference. "I find it difficult to understand," he said with asperity, "how anybody could object to paying somebody who works in a business which makes over $1 million a year $50 a week."

In the first place, Mr. President, we are not talking about businesses which "make over $1 million a year," but only about businesses with a gross sales volume that might. They may make practically nothing in the way of profits. And in the second place, the question is not whether anybody "objects" to paying a given minimum wage in such establishments. The question, rather, is How far does the long arm of Federal wage-hour authority reach into each community on an issue of this character? We think, and so does the House, that it will go far enough if it sticks only to those enterprises which, by some reasonable pretext, can be considered to be engaged in interstate commerce.

A Capital Budget: Its Meaning and Promise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that there be printed the following excellent memorandum on the concept of the capital budget. Legislative authorization for such a budget procedure would be provided by a bill introduced by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and companion bills which have been introduced in the House by my colleague from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] and myself:

A CAPITAL BUDGET: ITS MEANING AND PROMISE

IMPORTANCE OF THE BUDGET

(By Dewey Anderson)

The Government's budget is the most important and pervasive influence in the economic life of the Nation. For 1962 it expects to spend well over $83 billion which it collects or borrows. It is American business' biggest customer. It is likewise the biggest employer of labor. It either makes or stimulates more investment than any other source.

The expenditure of its funds develops more research and produces more innovations than all other efforts combined. Its moneys and programs are grouped under such expressive headings as:

	Fiscal 1962 (revised)	
	Millions	Percent
1. Major national security	$47,472	56.81
2. International affairs and finance	2,826	3.38
3. Commerce, housing, and space technology	3,814	4.56
4. Agriculture and agricultural resources	5,743	6.87
5. Natural resources	2,162	2.58
6. Labor and welfare	6,020	7.20
7. Veterans' services and benefits	5,301	6.34
8. Interest	8,693	10.40
9. General government	2,095	2.50
10. Allowance for contingencies	100	0.11
	84,226	100.75
Deduct interfund transactions	−667	−.75
Total	83,559	100.00

The Federal Government owes more money to more people than anybody. Its budget expects to pay interest totaling $8.7 billion in 1962. Its Treasury activities are the major determinant of the interest rates all borrowers will pay. Its general Government costs of some $2 billion a year provide for the legislative, judicial, and executive functions.

Many of the budget expenditures of the Government are made to render services to special groups or to defray the cost of current operations. These properly are a charge against current income, most of which is derived by taxation.

But there are two other groups of expenditures that have investment characteristics. One such class of expenditures is made to finance research and development, to develop a better trained and skilled labor force, or to increase the health and productivity of workers and efficiency of plant. Some among such expenditures yield a recognized profit and increase in wealth, part or all of which should belong to the Government which is responsible for the investment.

The other class of expenditures is for the purchase or improvement of physical assets such as forests and lands, dams, navigation facilities, parks and recreational centers, housing, urban renewal, water development, etc., whose costs can be determined and whose prospects are good for appreciation in value and profitable return over the period of their life. To budget such expenditures as current costs and chargeable against the taxpayers raises taxes unfairly, loses sight of their investment character and relieves future beneficiaries of their proper obligation to pay a just share of installation and operation.

The economic function of the budget is well expressed in the recent testimony of the present Budget Director before the Joint Economic Committee:

"The expenditures proposed are an important part of a national effort to close the gap between our actual and potential output and to achieve adequate economic growth. This is particularly true of capital expenditures of Government that are needed to reinforce private capital expenditures, and expenditures to improve the quality and productivity of our human resources. These expenditures are as essential to economic growth as are private investment outlays."

BUDGET REFORM

One main purpose of the budget is to give a picture of the costs of providing the services which have been voted by the peoples' representatives. This requires clear itemization of expenditures as related to services. The budget falls far short of telling this story.

Another important purpose of the budget is to give the public a clear picture of the state of the Nation's finances, as over against the needs which the Congress has agreed should be met, indicating what gap there may be between national income and outgo.

A third main purpose of the budget is to set forth in the message of the President, and the figures offered, the administration's conception of the size and character of the budget which it believes will maintain solvency, protect the Nation and insure the growth and development needed to use our manpower and resources effectively both for the short and long run.

Far from being viewed as a national housekeeping account as was true in the era before the World Wars, the budget is now widely accepted as a policymaking instrument. It moves in and out among the public and private transactions of the economy, providing capital, buying and selling goods and services, determining profits and making payments, stipulating by contract minimum wages, health, safety and employment practices, taxation, bookkeeping and reporting,

the renegotiation of excess profits, control of patents, and determination of the flow of raw materials and components. In these many fields, the budget itself acts as a silent partner with other agencies which are the active representatives of the Government.

The budget has become an aid to the President in laying down the levels of expenditure and amount and quality of services which each department or agency can present as its requests for funds from the Congress. In this way, it is actually a major force in determining the amount, kind and quality of Government services which will be allowed. Because of its technical knowledge and oversight, coupled with being a direct instrument of the President, in no small degree the budget is the epitome of Government itself. Every department head knows that his program depends on how convincingly he presents his case to the Bureau of the Budget, and that the Budget Director acts as the extended authority of the President.

How to prepare and present a readable and easily understood budget has long troubled experts in this field. For they are aware of the need to provide a clear and accurate statement of the Government's programs, their costs, the loans and income obtained to defray them. One worthwhile reform that should be initiated is a budget series in which each major section is presented separately in sufficient detail for the reader to know the program being budgeted and the funds required. Then, the overall budget could be expected to remain a summary rather than the dull technical treatise which the tremendous area covered requires it to be.

But the principal reform needed is to separate investment projects and expenditures from current operations.

THE CAPITAL BUDGET—MEANING OF THE DOUBLE BUDGET

There is altogether too easy acceptance among well motivated people inexperienced in budgetary matters of the desirability of a "capital budget." This stems from a well founded notion that investment and spending should be separated by with insufficient awareness of what that entails.

It is relatively easy to separate out such budget items as result in acquiring physical assets which have a measurable life and which may produce measurable results, such as a dam and hydroelectric installation. It is much more difficult to account for long-term investments in such projects as research, scientific training, health improvements, sanitation, etc. For while the expenditures can be measured the outcomes cannot.

It would be a major advance in budget modernization to apply the investment accounting approach to that group of expenditures which can be measured both in cost and return. Transactions on such capital accounts can be distinguished sharply from those which pertain to current revenues and expenses. They could be kept in separate books. Such a "double budget" system is accepted and notably successful in advanced countries like the Scandinavian nations. It is common practice among American business corporations as well.

The present practice is to combine all kinds of budgetary expenditures on one side of the ledger and on the other side all kinds of income. This permits for no true property account, no adequate calculation of depreciation of Government property, no segregation of debt to determine the precise location of Government obligations and the programs to which they relate, no division of Government earnings into sources and their relations to cost. So that present budgetary procedures is ill-suited to assist in the difficult task of formulating a rational long-range program of Government investment.

Probably a third of the present total of Government budget expenditures is for direct loans to farmers, business, public and private agencies, individuals, and foreign governments, and direct investment in Government-owned physical assets. Many of these expenditures are not a true levy on the taxpayer at all, for in time they are recovered and in some instances they yield substantial interest or profit, besides acting to upbuild the economy to produce more and larger taxable resources. The TVA loans are a good example. Reclamation, REA, and housing loans are others. The annual budget should not be loaded with such investment tiems, for they mislead the public and the taxpayers into a belief that they represent nonprofitable costs of Government operations and they unduly swell the budget totals.

If a third of the budget total is investment, and if the double or capital budget system were in force, then instead of a huge over $80 billion annual budget levy on the taxable wealth of the Nation we would be really talking about some $50 billion. Plus over $20 billion of investment made in furtherance of repayable projects which the peoples' representatives had determined were wise, desirable and in the national interest. Such a budget would be more palatable for the average taxpayer to swallow.

If, in addition, we could work out some modern means of financing Government repayable investments, such as revenue bonds probably coupled with a share of earnings, and RFC for governmental capital investments, or an interest rate which repays the cost to the Government of borrowing money, as is done with REA loans, then Government investments would be put on a sound footing and removed from the current operations budget paid for out of current taxation.

Such a method would be equitable. It offers the most promising chance of a tax reduction of as much as a fourth or more. It should enable us to get on with the sizeable job of extending our national plant and equipment to meet the needs of this and oncoming generations through financing projects such as forest, land, park and recreational developments, flood control, water supply, housing, urban renewal, electric power, fertilizer production, commodity credit and storage, and so forth.

Under such a system we could finance much larger capital investment programs than a tax conscious Congress can afford to risk with their constitutents on any annual appropriation basis. We could obtain much more of the costs from the direct beneficiaries of these investment programs, as we should, for they have no real claim on the Treasury for gifts from the taxpayers.

Finally, there should be ready public acceptance and no real difficulty in getting congressional approval of this capital account procedure, for the business world is quite familiar with it. To bring the accounting practices of the Government more into line with private business would increase public understanding of Government finances. Hence, public participation in the formation of national policy would be materially advanced.

Legislative action would be required to accomplish the fullest beneficial results of a double or capital budget and current expense system. Some have suggested tying the plan to the Council of Economic Advisers, and to any Council of Resources Advisers that might be established. Both have a stake in this system of budgetmaking.

The advisers to the President would evaluate economic and resource conditions. They would determine the amount and character of capital and resources investments the Government should undertake to maintain the output of the Nation at a level which would use its resources wisely and its employable labor force fully and productively.

It would be advisable to have two budget time periods in mind in making up this investment budget of the Government. Namely, the year ahead for which Congress makes appropriations and a period, say of several years for which Congress could be expected to make authorizations. Thus congressional oversight and responsibility would be preserved and its role in making broad policies respecting the future strengthened. But in doing so Congress would have the benefit of sound advice backed up by the detailed studies of the Government agencies directly concerned and screened by the advisers of the President.

Adoption of the capital budget procedure will not perform magic. It will not make available immediately the substantial resources, nor build a solid resources base under the economy. But it will put the budget into truer perspective, showing the taxpayer more correctly what Government is costing him and what it is contributing to his welfare, what it is investing in his future and the future of the Nation. It is a very much needed reform in budgetary practice. It should be adopted in the beginning days of the new administration.

Feed Grain Program Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some information I have received in regard to the feed grain program:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
House of Representatives.

Dear CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of March 10, 1961, with enclosure on 1958-crop grain loans of $50,000 or more, in which you requested listings for the 1959 and 1960 crops and other pertinent information.

In response to your request for 1959-crop-year loan data, we have attached schedules entitled as follows: "1959 Crop Corn Price-Support Loans Made of $25,000 or More and Amount Repaid by Producer" and "1959 Crop Price-Support Commodity Loans of $25,000 or More by Producer," which also reflects repaid loans.

Similar information for 1960-crop-year grain loans, exclusive of corn, should be compiled and available for release by the end of May 1961, and information on corn loans by July 15, 1961. Copies of this material will be sent to you just as soon as it becomes available.

The only 1958 crop, individual producer loan repayment data, we deemed necessary to have the field offices compile and submit to Washington is contained in the attached schedule entitled "Ten Largest 1958-crop Price-Support Commodity Loans Made and Amount of Repayments on Feed Grains."

Concerning your inquiry related to storage cost, the producers pay the storage in advance for the first year their grain is under the loan program, usually by deduction from loans made to the producer. The cost to the farmer varies according to location and kind of grain. When grains are forfeited and delivered to Commodity Credit Corporation,

they become a part of CCC's inventory, and no separate computation of loss or gain is made with respect to collateral acquired from an individual loan. The cost of maintaining such an accounting system would be prohibitive.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES T. RALPH.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE,
Dallas, Tex., March 28, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: We have your note from Gladewater, dated March 27, enclosing copy of a letter from Mr. A. P. McLachlan, Director, Commodity Stabilization Service, Commodity Office, New Orleans.

We presume your question is with respect to the storage payments made throughout the State of Texas and those specifically at Lufkin, Tex.

No storage or handling charges were paid in the fiscal year 1960 or in the first 6 months in the fiscal year 1961 to any facility located in Lufkin, Tex.

Storage and handling charges paid to facilities located throughout the State of Texas in the fiscal year 1960 and in the current fiscal year 1961 (through December 31, 1960) are as follows:

UGSA:	
1960	$74,324,053.32
1961	33,311,814.16
Rice:	
1960	1,024,367.00
1961	491,193.69
Peanuts:	
1960	236,817.54
1961	77,176.96
Total	109,465,422.67

Very truly yours,
C. H. MOSELEY, *Director.*
By TRUMAN J. CUNNINGHAM,
Acting Director.

Loans made, repaid, and collateral acquired on the 1959 crop of feed grain through Jan. 31, 1961 [1]

Commodity	Loans made				Repaid		Collateral acquired	
	Number of loans	Unit of measure	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Corn	273,027	Bushel	485,657,877	$527,370,871.76	68,605,992	$76,144,357.16	297,123,835	$323,646,109.12
Grain sorghum	49,573	Hundredweight	59,854,126	94,067,975.69	6,854,502	10,386,621.58	49,316,708	78,274,456.63
Barley	16,704	Bushel	35,102,469	25,099,588.09	22,168,019	16,279,386.05	4,157,777	2,801,813.14
Oats	4,834	do	7,934,568	3,734,795.67	7,858,599	3,698,970.92	60,317	28,833.83
Rye	823	do	915,902	798,181.02	318,683	273,866.91	597,219	524,310.27
Soybeans	53,900	do	45,320,782	82,135,936.46	41,467,387	75,258,797.93	3,828,703	6,829,106.83

[1] Loans on 1959 feed grain and soybean crops are still outstanding in the following amounts: Corn, $127,580,405.48; grain sorghum, $5,406,897.48; barley, $6,018,388.90; oats, $6,990.92; and soybeans, $48,031.70.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of February 17, asking questions about the emergency feed grain program recommended by the administration.

The administration is recommending this emergency program for two major reasons. These are: (1) the vital importance of the feed-livestock complex to our whole agricultural economy; and (2) the pressing need to bring to a halt the continuing increase in surplus stocks of feed grains which are already at very high levels, and, under existing programs, threaten to continue to increase.

The administration's recommendations constitute an emergency program for 1961. Early action is necessary if the program is to have the desired effect of reducing feed grain production this year. The short length of time available has prevented our giving the serious consideration that we think necessary before we could make a recommendation regarding marketing quotas for feed grains. Marketing quotas for commodities like feed grains where more than half of the production is used on the farm where it is produced present a number of serious problems. We intend to study a number of alternative ideas, including marketing quotas, in developing a longer range program for feed grains to be submitted later.

The number, the quantity, and the dollar amount of loans made on the 1959 crops of corn, grain sorghums, barley, oats, rye, and soybeans are as follows:

Commodity	Number of loans	Unit	Quantity	Amount
Corn	263,042	Bushel	470,377,031	$511,156,415.05
Grain sorghum	49,165	Hundredweight	59,263,436	93,181,912.29
Barley	16,140	Bushel	33,756,600	24,201,013.21
Oats	4,786	do	7,892,478	3,714,630.40
Rye	817	do	913,699	796,146.71
Soybeans	51,473	do	43,390,584	78,629,462.45

The dollar amount of loans made on 1959 crops of feed grains represents the initial outlay on price support for these commodities. Some of these loans were redeemed and the quantity of the commodities acquired by CCC was less than the amounts on which loans were made.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the CCC disposed of feed grains and soybeans acquired in previous years' price-support operations. The realized losses on price-support operations and the costs of the commodity export program that were incurred on the feed grains and soybeans disposed of in the fiscal year 1960 were as follows:

Commodity	Realized loss, price support program, fiscal year 1960	Cost of commodity export program, fiscal year 1960
Corn and cornmeal	$181,982,000	$8,088,000
Grain sorghums	17,988,000	3,773,000
Barley	20,938,000	3,742,000
Oats	10,000	2,303,000
Rye	925,000	1,056,000
Soybeans	10,344,000	----------

In addition to the realized losses on commodities disposed of during fiscal year 1960, the Commodity Credit Corporation still had on hand at that time substantial stocks of several of these commodities. It may well be several years before disposition of these stocks is complete. In the meantime, additional charges such as storage and interest will continue to accumulate. Hence, it is quite likely that there will be additional losses incurred when these stocks are disposed of.

According to preliminary reports of the 1959 Census of Agriculture, 1,989,411 farms reported corn harvested for grain; 223,263 reported sorghum harvested for grain; 1,028,847 reported oats harvested; 290,160 reported barley harvested; and 499,143 reported soybeans harvested for beans. Many farms, of course, grow more than one of these commodities, and there is no information available on the extent of the duplication. The information given above on the number of loans made provides the information that is available on the number of farms obtaining price support. Here, again, a farm may obtain price support on more than one commodity, and there is no information available on the extent of the duplication.

We are enclosing a table which will provide you with preliminary information from the 1959 Census of Agriculture on the number of farms producing the various feed grains and soybeans by States. Just as with the United States figures, there is a certain amount of duplication here since some farms produce more than one of the commodities in question.

World supplies of high protein meals and vegetable oils are short, and the higher support price for soybeans will encourage increased production that can be used to meet current and future world needs. In addition, the higher support price for soybeans will encourage diversion of part of the feed grain acreage to soybeans.

The support price for cottonseed is required by law to be at a competitive relationship with soybeans. As in the past, price supports on cottonseed will be available to those producers who wish to take advantage of them.

As we stated in the announcement, the price support level for the 1961 crop of upland cotton was set after long and painstaking study and consultation with all parties concerned. Although the result is not wholly satisfactory to any single group involved, it is, in our judgment, the best decision that could be made in the light of the current legislative and economic conditions and alternatives.

Sincerely yours,

WILLARD W. COCHRANE,
Assistant to the Secretary.

Number of farms reporting harvested acres of specified commodities, by States, 1959

State	Harvested for grain		Harvested				State	Harvested for grain		Harvested			
	Corn	Grain sorghum	Oats	Barley	Rye	Soybeans for beans		Corn	Grain sorghum	Oats	Barley	Rye	Soybeans for beans
Maine	57		2,483	46	42		West Virginia	19,922		4,342	992	127	48
New Hampshire	69		75		14		North Carolina	142,678	6,074	29,130	7,074	2,680	25,605
Vermont	138		1,112		12		South Carolina	55,187	825	17,228	2,310	1,069	7,745
Massachusetts	373		91		78		Georgia	71,043	1,127	9,461	574	1,123	1,552
Rhode Island	42		9		21		Florida	9,064		373			414
Connecticut	365		96		84		Kentucky	99,195	2,311	4,528	4,850	1,214	4,286
New York	18,623		38,159	2,640	1,178	158	Tennessee	94,608	3,266	9,840	3,269	951	7,056
New Jersey	4,940		1,555	1,385	699	1,018	Alabama	83,756	1,173	3,182			2,048
Pennsylvania	64,127		53,354	15,335	2,845	773	Mississippi	90,762	585	4,088			9,634
Ohio	104,975		68,619	6,452	2,772	42,489	Arkansas	33,048	1,661	3,362	402		21,479
Indiana	99,253	773	48,685	4,909	5,991	60,526	Louisiana	32,686	232	1,714			3,651
Illinois	131,295	1,200	73,182	5,400	4,323	88,268	Oklahoma	11,601	17,074	15,092	13,850	2,372	1,652
Michigan	68,700		54,149	7,828	5,218	8,924	Texas	64,861	59,349	17,853	6,194	462	
Wisconsin	90,101		106,844	3,216	2,199	4,068	Montana	124		7,756	15,497	332	
Minnesota	103,995		107,204	16,990	2,854	57,865	Idaho	1,761		6,486	9,171	195	
Iowa	155,167	3,051	127,849	1,325	841	64,374	Wyoming	694	10	2,982	2,800	111	
Missouri	94,973	19,242	32,832	12,885	3,064	42,757	Colorado	7,242	3,886	5,143	10,688	1,234	
North Dakota	5,423	25	32,601	38,665	3,648	2,958	New Mexico	2,261	1,697	475	937	112	
South Dakota	30,261	4,138	33,006	9,907	2,364	3,913	Arizona	176	802	67	1,021	8	
Nebraska	70,120	31,338	38,367	10,937	5,004	5,232	Utah	401		2,460	7,579	73	
Kansas	39,223	59,661	31,560	26,676	5,251	11,927	Nevada	32		101	380	10	
Delaware	3,660		522	762	879	2,959	Washington	1,957		5,289	6,700	772	
Maryland	16,067		5,081	5,055	1,835	4,417	Oregon	1,483		5,782	8,560	616	
Virginia	60,636	585	11,543	9,170	2,319	9,809	California	2,286	2,516	1,135	7,638		

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service.

Compiled from Bureau of the Census preliminary State summaries of 1959 Census of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 28, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of March 14, requesting additional information on feed grains.

There are a number of situations in which it would be very helpful if additional statistical information were available; however, such additional information can only be obtained by the expenditure of time and money. In some cases, decisions have been made that the collection of additional statistical data would not justify the cost. It may be that, as new programs developed by this administration become effective, we will find it necessary to develop additional statistical information. Be that as it may, figures that exclude duplications on the number of farms that produce feed grains are not now available. The same comment applies to information on the number of farmers who receive price support loans on more than one commodity.

As you requested, we are enclosing a table giving information on loans made, loans paid, and the amount of the commodity acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The table includes information for the 1959 crops of feed grains and soybeans. The number of loans made is the best information available on the extent of participation in the loan program. Also enclosed is a table which presents information, by States, on the number, quantity, and amount of loans made on the 1959 crops of feed grains and soybeans.

Sincerely yours,

WILLARD W. COCHRANE,
Assistant to the Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: We received your note dated March 27 on the bottom of a copy of our letter to you dated March 22 regarding information that you had requested.

Enclosed is a table showing the number of loans and purchase agreements made under price supports for 1958, 1959, and 1960 crops of grain and oilseeds in the five States which you mentioned.

You requested the number of farmers who participated in price supports in these States during these years. The figures which we are giving you generally refer to the number of individual farmers, but in some instances price-support is extended through cooperatives or associations of producers. Also, some individual producers obtain more than one loan on a commodity, a separate one for each storage location, for example. Our records are not maintained to show the number of producers who obtain price-support through cooperatives or groups, who obtain more than one loan on a commodity or who obtain loans on more than one commodity. I am sure you recognize also, that farmers who do not directly participate in a price support program obtain benefits to the extent that the support price influences the market price for the commodity he sells.

We regret that we did not interpret your first request correctly and we hope the enclosed tabulation will serve your purpose.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES T. RALPH,
Assistant Secretary.

Number of loans and purchase agreements made under price supports for 1958, 1959, and 1960 crops of grains and oilseeds, in selected States

	Wheat	Corn	Barley	Oats	Sorghum grains	Rye	Soybeans	Flaxseed	Dry edible beans	Rice
Texas:										
1958	2,327	28	2,104	5,867	43,412	62	978		3	1,936
1959	5,553	69	33	127	16,397		19			1,700
1960	10,196	44	161	218	22,016	1	20			1,375
Oklahoma:										
1958	40,210	12	3,619	1,595	690	38	589			
1959	14,293	31	240	56	225	4	89			
1960	27,703	63	785	61	840		57			
California:										
1958	485	67	239	40	39	4		173	199	40
1959	365	67	114	1	9			4	37	35
1960	136	22	205		9				58	141
Iowa:										
1958	2,327	70,928	196	5,658	5,341	30	58,393	82		
1959	1,207	110,007	58	1,012	444	3	24,832	2		
1960	1,080	83,310	68	1,010	385	3	11,433	24		

Footnotes at end of table.

Number of loans and purchase agreements made under price supports for 1958, 1959, and 1960 crops of grains and oilseeds, in selected States—Continued

	Wheat	Corn	Barley	Oats	Sorghum grains	Rye	Soybeans	Flaxseed	Dry edible beans	Rice
Nebraska:										
1958	71,366	49,349	1,452	933	54,895	704	3,656	.....	510	.....
1959	45,789	49,255	511	101	15,011	99	622	.....	216	.....
1960	47,814	44,542	437	199	35,560	429	263	.....	114	.....
U.S. total:										
1958	499,054	223,580	70,873	47,442	194,969	11,980	169,512	29,467	6,332	4,114
1959	252,137	294,280	19,701	5,086	53,179	1,045	58,656	909	4,100	3,514
1960	316,332	242,300	28,515	10,097	107,733	4,185	27,248	5,727	5,062	2,891

Source: Grain Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., Mar. 31, 1961.

Loans made on 1959 crops of specific commodities, by States, through Jan. 31, 1961

State	Corn			Grain sorghum			Barley		
	Number	Quantity	Amount	Number	Quantity	Amount	Number	Quantity	Amount
		Bushels	*Dollars*		*Hundredweight*	*Dollars*		*Bushels*	*Dollars*
Alabama	181	172,675	205,183	1	1,156	1,838	1	1,236	1,001
Alaska							2	1,416	1,384
Arizona				42	271,542	462,300	21	686,745	581,371
Arkansas	21	47,543	55,588	7	15,514	26,486	5	7,416	5,166
California	66	466,336	587,323	9	40,414	76,883	113	5,484,282	4,815,119
Colorado	350	668,657	748,552	104	186,957	250,657	90	184,169	119,745
Connecticut									
Delaware	30	81,216	99,896						
Florida	11	8,906	10,342						
Georgia	296	412,278	479,303				2	3,363	2,788
Idaho	22	40,176	47,658				345	688,522	458,394
Illinois	35,189	80,183,284	90,634,795	1	342	499	2	3,616	2,677
Indiana	12,469	27,545,688	31,128,053	7	7,886	11,675	2	4,239	3,368
Iowa	102,478	68,241,513	78,671,648	407	276,463	425,006	45	41,021	33,354
Kansas	10,605	14,031,024	15,421,670	16,815	10,579,098	15,913,691	897	864,695	628,476
Kentucky							65	143,862	264,584
Louisiana	10	19,134	11,131				11	26,731	48,650
Maine	212	245,732	139,957						
Maryland									
Michigan	40	43,466	22,596	1	520	494	134	94,719	173,934
Minnesota	1,363	2,253,193	937,326	60	43,573	37,938	10,899	6,974,863	12,205,753
Mississippi	88	406,428	227,586				323	992,633	1,774,185
Missouri	24	24,047	12,601	6	1,942	1,839	3,838	4,076,200	7,497,143
Montana	26	40,621	16,829	26	53,300	38,628			
Nebraska	95	93,387	43,264	76	73,813	60,656	558	380,236	670,315
Nevada									
New Jersey							5	4,130	7,475
New Mexico							3	577	1,001
New York	26	39,355	23,214	2	1,140	1,186	1	789	1,420
North Carolina	61	93,669	50,655	3	547	585	39	43,796	78,708
North Dakota	747	983,916	980,487				7,523	10,480,451	7,230,671
Ohio	8,851	14,528,013	16,896,138				5	1,676	1,326
Oklahoma	29	62,142	71,968	219	274,666	394,480	236	263,386	189,742
Oregon	50	133,457	163,829				279	745,973	594,124
Pennsylvania	158	172,820	214,053				2	736	583
South Carolina	235	293,204	334,341				6	6,252	5,186
South Dakota	5,512	6,586,255	6,623,780	87	58,455	86,731	469	393,522	300,015
Tennessee	113	261,329	308,354	1	636	1,011			
Texas	68	136,792	163,036	16,323	36,330,200	58,374,951	33	51,661	38,809
Utah	1	443	554				55	85,388	57,999
Virginia	50	95,463	118,097				2	782	597
Washington	223	777,306	935,160	17	12,191	19,874	663	1,740,226	1,297,974
West Virginia	6	12,161	14,959						
Wisconsin	2,028	2,795,857	3,152,388				2	927	779
Wyoming	7	17,937	20,448				19	24,946	15,342
Total	273,027	485,657,877	527,370,872	49,573	59,854,126	94,067,976	16,704	35,102,469	25,099,588

State	Oats			Rye			Soybeans		
	Number	Quantity	Amount	Number	Quantity	Amount	Number	Quantity	Amount
		Bushels	*Dollars*		*Bushels*	*Dollars*		*Bushels*	*Dollars*
Alabama	9	14,136	8,111				15	33,097	58,669
Alaska	1	2,164	1,687						
Arizona									
Arkansas	28	83,581	46,556				755	2,147,330	3,940,640
California	1	839	520						
Colorado	3	5,383	2,799	10	20,105	19,004			
Connecticut									
Delaware							2	348	626
Florida									
Georgia	178	440,523	238,679	3	2,221	2,421	18	25,855	46,318
Idaho	48	143,330	67,809	8	11,126	9,651			
Illinois	36	50,480	25,316				8,170	7,958,449	15,025,304
Indiana	15	21,599	10,984				1,875	1,835,832	3,411,592
Iowa	985	1,077,154	515,736	3	1,850	1,737	23,521	17,270,610	30,968,449
Kansas	49	35,179	18,419	96	58,881	51,482	819	702,817	1,246,195
Kentucky	1,893	3,151,886	3,698,395	2	1,795	2,854	3	5,238	4,231
Louisiana	1	2,176	2,546						
Maine							1	366	322
Maryland	104	231,947	285,312						
Michigan	4,883	6,378,329	7,359,768				20	16,277	12,845
Minnesota	24,765	39,224,976	40,266,952	7	4,081	5,665	3,023	5,316,166	4,021,721
Mississippi	101	231,136	263,839	6	9,286	13,994			
Missouri	13,126	24,769,809	27,941,225	1,364	1,167,642	1,860,163	27	28,548	23,199
Montana							2,368	7,596,837	4,367,198
Nebraska	47,740	91,997,693	98,461,018	13,852	9,741,250	14,847,557	417	346,125	263,071
Nevada							1	3,396	2,513

Loans made on 1959 crops of specific commodities, by States, through Jan. 31, 1961—Continued

State	Oats			Rye			Soybeans		
	Number	Quantity	Amount	Number	Quantity	Amount	Number	Quantity	Amount
		Bushels	*Dollars*		*Bushels*	*Dollars*		*Bushels*	*Dollars*
New Jersey	45	103,448	129,317				1	502	427
New Mexico				287	861,872	1,270,970	4	2,909	2,198
New York	180	214,647	266,189				3	2,471	2,174
North Carolina	393	595,439	698,708	15	12,680	20,691	17	16,994	13,609
North Dakota	627	1,068,621	429,387	211	188,222	151,651	542	411,587	701,031
Ohio	48	55,508	30,083	1	673	660	1,547	1,377,718	2,552,437
Oklahoma	54	79,105	42,889	4	2,510	1,771	89	107,212	188,335
Oregon	22	105,344	57,836	16	13,405	13,260			
Pennsylvania	11	11,978	7,038				4	2,200	3,920
South Carolina	156	636,723	350,432	2	968	1,055	147	275,144	490,650
South Dakota	356	402,819	171,235	85	76,237	63,938	260	136,919	237,948
Tennessee							188	224,854	410,622
Texas	124	195,967	113,229				19	38,726	69,003
Utah	1	966	589						
Virginia							10	16,092	28,897
Washington	102	163,533	81,136	199	353,753	331,668			
West Virginia									
Wisconsin	22	37,085	17,633	1	301	286	23	17,456	32,072
Wyoming	13	23,519	11,534	10	10,815	8,271			
Total	4,834	7,934,568	3,734,796	823	915,902	798,181	53,900	45,320,782	82,135,936

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the ninth in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that, by reading these articles and the ones to follow, the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter.

[From the Palm Beach Post-Times, Feb. 3, 1961]

BELLE GLADE RENTALS NOT AS HIGH AS $15

"The rent is $15 per week per room."—"Harvest of Shame."

There is no migrant housing for $15 per week per room in Belle Glade, according to the chamber of commerce.

An investigation committee organized by the chamber reported: "Most rates for one room do not average over $6 or $7 per week. Cheaper rates are charged for unfurnished rooms."

The rate for two rooms averages $9 or $10 with one-bedroom apartments scaling $11 to $12.50, the committee said, with the owners sometimes paying for electricity, water and garbage collection.

Housing is provided on a competitive basis, the chamber reported, and no instance was found in the community of migrant rooms bringing $15 per week.

The committee found small homes renting for $10 or $12 per week.

A survey last year showed 1,017 units with a value of $2,127,800 were completed during the preceding 5-year period.

This, the chamber said, included 166 buildings and provided 79 new homes, 33 duplex apartments, 20 apartment buildings and 69 rooming houses.

The quality of construction has improved, the chamber said, and contractors now mostly erect concrete-block buildings. Over 20 old buildings have been razed during the 5-year period, the chamber found.

Said the chamber:

"The housing authority, in a survey, identified some 90 former Negro tenants and over 40 white migrant families who have purchased their own homes in this area or nearby communities.

"This could not have been done without encouragement and concern for the migrants by local citizens and authorities. Is this not progress?"

Water Development in the Southwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Floyd E. Dominy, the Commissioner of Reclamation, delivered at the convention of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Phoenix, Ariz., April 12, 1961, on the subject of water development in the Southwest.

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

ADDRESS BY FLOYD E. DOMINY, THE COMMISSIONER OF RECLAMATION, AT THE CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS, PHOENIX, ARIZ., APRIL 12, 1961

It is a privilege for me to participate in the spring meeting of the American Society of Civil Engineers. It is also gratifying to see that your well-planned program for this convention reflects a growing national concern about our water resources and the need for research for their future development.

I was in Phoenix just a month ago with Secretary of the Interior Udall for the golden anniversary celebration of the Theodore Roosevelt Dam. This is a key structure of the Salt River project, and one of the first to be undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation. If anyone should question the worth and indeed the necessity of reclamation development, they have only to look around this prosperous and growing Salt River Valley, for reassurance. Its economy and stability are predicated on the water and power supplied from the Salt River project.

When this convention ends, many of you will be making a tour to see Glen Canyon Dam which is under construction on the Colorado River upstream from the Grand Canyon. This structure will be the key to utilization of water in the four States of the Upper Colorado River Basin, Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico.

There is a startling contrast in the manner in which these two structures are designed and built, as there is in the manner of operation of the Salt River project and the Colorado River storage project and participating irrigation projects. The contrast reflects the changes and progress which have been accomplished in order to meet the demands of the times. But we are not through. We cannot afford to be static in our field.

My personal prediction is that the pressures and demands for an increased water supply in the years ahead will pose such a problem that we will, of necessity, move further and faster than we have ever dreamed of in the past. And what is the key to this future progress?

It is research—research into every phase of water development and use. We must seek constantly for new ideas, new concepts—a new and vigorous approach to the problems that lie ahead.

Need I say that the engineering profession must be out in front in this research if we are to succeed. President Kennedy has challenged us all in these words from his special message to the Congress on natural resources:

"This Nation has been and is now especially fortunate in the blessings (of natural resources) we have inherited. Our entire society rests upon—and is dependent upon—our water, our lands, our forests, and our minerals. Wise investments in a resources program today will return vast dividends tomorrow, and failure to act now may be opportunities lost forever. We cannot now ignore our country's need for future development. Our available water supply must be used to give maximum benefit for all purposes—hydroelectric power, irrigation and reclamation, navigation, recreation, health, home, and industry."

Now I challenge you to pick it up. Don't be afraid or hesitant to get out on cloud 9. Some of our present successfully operating reclamation projects would have been considered pure fantasy 50 years ago. I say plan for the future with vision and imagination, then apply the hard rules of

economics and engineering to turn those dreams into reality.

I note that your program includes technical papers on canal linings, watershed management, erosion and sedimentation, water quality, and many other subjects, all of high importance as we approach the challenges ahead. Discussion of these papers here, and publication by the society, will bring together much of the known information in the civil engineering fields and point the way to plan wisely for the future.

It is proper that a program such as you have developed for this meeting is being presented at this thriving metropolis in the heart of Arizona's Salt River Valley. As I mentioned a moment ago, if there is one spot in the country that dramatically illustrates the vital importance of water-resource engineering and development, it is here in the middle of a great desert area. Reclamation makes desert living a delight. But there is more to it than that. In 1900, Phoenix had a population of 5,544. The phenomenal growth to a flourishing city of about 450,000 has been tied directly to water development. I am proud to represent the Federal agency that has had the major role in water development in Arizona since 1903.

This prosperous area and the tremendous yields in agriculture this valley now harvests from its available water supply, is a source of great satisfaction to all of us. This area affords many people with a delightful place to enjoy their leisure time. However, we must face the hard fact that Arizona is now using all of its readily available surface and ground water supply.

For continued growth of Arizona, as for many other Western States—yes, and of the country as a whole—we must depend upon development of complex projects to deliver new supplies over long distances, upon pumping against higher and higher heads, and upon new and future techniques to assure that every drop of available water is used wisely and well. The success of this effort will depend in a large part upon research in the basic sciences and development of new techniques.

I am well aware of the difficulties involved in securing funds for research. The projects built by us are paid for by those benefiting from their construction. As a result, most of the research we have performed has been in relation to specific engineering and design problems related to specific irrigation projects. Only comparatively small sums have been available for research of a general nature.

Last year, however, for the first time, Congress recognized the far-reaching application of our research efforts and appropriated $300,000 of nonreimbursable funds to the Bureau for this purpose. About one-half of this sum was earmarked for the study of means of reducing reservoir evaporation; of this we have allocated $61,000 to colleges for investigating various phases of this research program.

As many of you know, evaporation takes a toll of 14 million precious acre-feet of water every year from large lakes and reservoirs in our arid 17 Western States. Recent research has demonstrated that a monolayer of the compound, hexadecanol, which spreads over a water surface to a thickness of one molecule, will materially reduce evaporation.

Scientists discovered in the laboratory that hexadecanol will reduce evaporation by as much as 70 percent. But we need much basic research and experimentation to determine whether a monolayer can be applied economically to a large body of water. I am glad to report that progress has been made in this direction in large-scale tests conducted at Lake Hefner, near Oklahoma City, and in tests conducted last summer on Lake Sahuaro, a few miles from us here in Phoenix.

These later tests were made with the help and cooperation of the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, the U.S. Geological Survey, the U.S. Department of Health, and the Arizona State Fish and Game Department. At Lake Hefner, we realized a 9-percent savings in evaporation losses and something more than this at Lake Sahuaro.

It is apparent that we still have a long way to go before we approach anything like the laboratory results. There are many factors which must be scientifically investigated before we will know just how economically and effectively we can reduce evaporation.

The problem of reducing evaporation is only one of many highly complex problems on which more and better engineering information is needed to conserve and economically utilize our water resources. More information on the evaporation studies at Sahuaro Lake will be presented by Quentin L. Florey, of our research laboratory staff, on Thursday morning, at 9 a.m.

Nonbeneficial consumptive use by large areas of phreatophyte growth in several river basins represents a tremendous waste of water and is in many instances encroaching upon dependable water supply for existing irrigation projects as well as threatening future irrigation development. Our usable water supplies can be increased by eradication of phreatophytes, but research is needed in the areas of hydrology, ecology, and in methods of eradication and control.

In your trip to Glen Canyon Dam you will see many rock bolts which have been used to support the rock around the tunnel inlets and in the canyon walls. Also, you will see structural steel shapes used to support the crown of the inclined spillway tunnel. At present the spacing of these rock bolts and supports is determined largely by experience and judgment. There is a need for improved methods of determining the amount of support necessary for safe tunnel excavation and for determining the existing state of pressure in rock.

The Bureau of Reclamation has made its knowledge available to the public on the design of small dams by means of a publication which is proving very popular. We also recognize that there is a need for fundamental information on the behavior of rock foundations of large dams, so that we can design these dams more precisely.

Soils are our most abundant—and one of our most important—engineering materials for dams, canal linings and structure foundations. The science of soils engineering is very young and much fundamental information is needed. While the Bureau can now design earth dams with the assurance that they will be safe and serviceable structures, our scientists report that there is still a great and prompt need for basic research in the engincering and chemical properties of soil.

For example: the surface chemistry of clay particles as related to the minerals of the soil; electrochemical processes of increasing the porosity and improving the drainage of soils; physical properties of soils as affected by absorbed water as well as pore pressure; and better methods for measuring the pore pressures in earth structures.

Lined irrigation canals are expensive. Yet, in unlined canals as much as 50 percent of the water is frequently lost by seepage en route to the farm. We need a soil sealant that could be economically applied either in a dry canal or without unwatering the canal to reduce this seepage. Of course, we are always looking for cheaper ways to line our canals to avoid waste in conveying the water from the reservoir or stream to its destination. P. W. Terrell, of the Bureau of Reclamation, will present a paper on low-cost canal lining on Thursday afternoon, in which he will discuss some of our efforts to develop such linings.

Bureau construction consists principally of moving earth and placing concrete. There is still disagreement among engineers regarding the fundamental concepts used in the design of reinforced concrete. Prof. Phil M. Ferguson, past president of the American Concrete Institute, and one of the recipients of a research award at this luncheon, I am sure could discuss the needs for research in concrete at some length.

On large dams, there appears to be disagreement in both the allowable stresses which can safely be used and in the method of computing these stresses. Research is necessary to reduce the uncertainties, so as to permit lower factors of safety and thereby achieve greater economy in construction. The International Commission on Large Dams is doing a great deal to provide a better understanding of the various practices used throughout the world.

There is a continuing need for improving concrete so that structures can be built cheaper and last longer. As an example we need a concrete that is more resistant to the sulfates often found in high concentrations in soils of our Western States.

Hydraulics is still an inexact science in many ways. Despite a long history of laboratory and field research, we know the coefficients derived from experience and tests of small lined canals cannot be used in the design of large lined canals. Field research is needed on flow in large canals to establish their characteristics and to explain this nonconformity of accepted relationships.

Erosion is a serious problem and basic information is required for a fuller understanding of energy dissipation in closed and open conveyances so that we can build erosion-free structures. Also our hydraulic engineers recognize that little is known of the basic hydromechanics of rotational flow as illustrated by eddy and vortex formations in the intakes of some of our hydraulic structures.

Sediment is still a problem and I speak for both the designers and operators of hydraulic structures. We do not fully understand fundamental principles of turbulence and other factors that may be involved in sediment transport and deposition in meandering streams and artificial channels. We do not know, nor can we always employ the best method for controlling sediment in our structures and reducing sediment in canals. We need to study the improvement in such devices as sluiceways, guidewalls, and vanes and vortex tubes in diversion structures, in order to reduce the maintenance cost of periodic sediment removal. Adequate knowledge of canal shape and alinement influences would permit designs that would provide minimum operational difficulties and reduce erosion of canal banks and formation of sandbars that cut down canal capacity.

Water rights in these western arid and semiarid areas are one of man's most valuable possessions. As our water supplies become more fully developed and the competition for an adequate supply grows, the problem of allocating water according to established rights and equitably distributing it during times of shortage, requires improvement in present water measurement methods and devices, and the development of new ones. More accurate devices are needed to enable better assessment of charges for water and encourage more judicious application by the user. Improvement in the accuracy of measuring devices will make possible wider distribution of the available water for greater crop production and reduce waste.

I have been speaking mainly of the problems with which the civil engineer is concerned. The Bureau of Reclamation's forces consist of an integrated team of engineers, agronomists, economists, etc., and hence we are also concerned with research in other fields which affect the civil engineer, such as the elimination of aquatic weeds which clog our canals and reduce the capacity planned by the designer.

The Bureau is vitally interested in the frugal application and most economic use possible of water in the growing of crops. We are cooperating with the Department of

Agriculture and State colleges on experimental farms in this study. If we are to get the most mileage possible from our irrigation water supplies we must know more about the optimum water requirements of different crops grown in different soils and in different climates.

As one of the principal Federal agencies generating and transmitting the energy generated from water in the West, we are constantly seeking ways and means which will permit more economical generation and transportation of electric power. There is also a wide demand for means of extending the life of the metal gates and conduits on irrigation projects. Research is required in protective coatings and cathodic protection of metals as well as to achieve improvement in construction materials which may extend the life and reduce maintenance costs of project works.

These are some of the areas where we know immediate research would be profitable. There are many more. Activities in the saline water conversion reesarch program, and to establish methods of limiting the pollution of our water and to provide for its reuse are being stepped up by the administration to make full use of these potential sources of supply.

To point up the critical needs for research which could most profitably be pursued and stimulate the interest of foundations and educational institutions, the Bureau of Reclamation is joining with the ASCE and Colorado State University, in sponsoring a research symposium. The first symposium is on basic research in civil engineering fields related to water resources, and will be held June 12–15, at the Colorado State University campus, at Fort Collins.

About 50 leading engineers and scientists will participate in this symposium. I am pleased to note that 2 of these 50, Prof. Phil M. Ferguson and Prof. David K. Todd, are recipients of research award sat this luncheon. Professor Fardum, who is chairman of the society's research committee, will lead one of the panels.

Secretary Udall, who comes from this important reclamation State has lived with the water problem in Arizona and is acutely aware of the importance that water conservation and resource development can have on an area. He has accepted the challenge charted by President Kennedy for resource development. To implement this program, he has directed and urged us all in the Department to take vigorous and aggressive actions toward development of the Nation's physical resources.

Now, we must look to you as engineers to apply your knowledge and all the skills and technical tools available to both extend our knowledge and provide technical leadership in the development of our Nation's water resource.

Again I challenge you to pick up the reins of leadership in this important phase of civil engineering. Working together with vision and imagination, we can meet the needs of the future successfully.

Michigan Halts Showings of Distorted Films

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 7, 1961]

MICHIGAN HALTS SHOWINGS OF DISTORTED FILMS

LANSING, MICH., April 6.—Public showings of two controversial films by the State police subversive activities squad were ordered discontinued today by Gov. John B. Swainson.

The films, "Operation Abolition" and "Communism on the Map," have been shown to four high schools in the State and a number of private groups by the State police unit.

Swanson said: "The films have been viewed by several members of my staff who confirm criticism that the films are inaccurate and distorted and thus harm, rather than advance, the purpose of an intelligent anti-Communist program."

The controversial "Operation Abolition" movie was prepared for the House Un-American Activities Committee and purports to be an accurate showing of student riots at a committee hearing last year in San Francisco.

"Communism on the Map" was produced by George S. Benson of Harding College, Searcy, Ark.

Soviet Space and Orbit Success on Orbiting Soviet Military Major Recognized as One of World's Greatest Scientific Achievements—President John F. Kennedy Promptly Sends Congratulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call to your attention, and to the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, a very timely and pertinent editorial appearing in the New York Times on Thursday, April 13, 1961:

KENNEDY PRAISES SOVIET SPACE FEAT—ALSO SAYS UNITED STATES WILL REMAIN BEHIND FOR SOME TIME

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, April 12.—President Kennedy congratulated the Soviet Union today on its outstanding technical accomplishment in sending the first man into space. He also told Americans that the United States would be behind in space for some time.

The Presidential congratulations were extended in a personal telegram to Soviet Premier Khrushchev and in a separate statement issued by the White House.

And, Mr. Speaker, in connection therewith, I would like to call attention also to a portion of a front page article in the same paper, which article was captioned "Kennedy Praises Soviet Space Feat."

THE FIRST COSMONAUT

The successful launching by Soviet scientists of a man into space and his safe return after orbiting the earth in 89 minutes will be hailed as one of the great advances in the story of man's age-old quest to tame the forces of nature. It marks the crowning achievement so far in space technology, and provides the most dramatic evidence of Soviet leadership in the field of powerful rocket engines.

But the success of Soviet space science must be recognized as much more than the triumph of the scientists of one nation. Viewed from the broad perspective of history, the successful launching of the first man in orbit is a triumph of the human mind and spirit regardless of geographic, political or ethnic boundaries. For the flight of young Yuri Gagarin is the culmination of a long story dating back hundreds of years, to which the minds of many men of many nations have greatly contributed. The modern chapter of the story began with the Englishman, Isaac Newton. Its most recent chaper was the contribution of the American rocket pioneer, Robert Goddard.

Orbiting a man is only a steppingstone toward orbiting a space station as a jumping-off point for trips to the moon and beyond. It marks the opening of the era of interplanetary travel and of discoveries beyond imagining.

These discoveries may provide us answers to fundamental questions man has been asking ever since he learned to think, such questions as how the universe began and whether or not it ever had a beginning; whether or not the laws governing the universe he observes also hold true for the vast as yet unseen universe beyond; whether the laws governing the universe today were the same a billion years ago, or whether they have been changing and are continuing to change.

They also may provide man answers to questions even more intimate to himself, questions about the origin of life, about its future, and its possible ending; whether life as it exists on earth is the only form of life that can possibly exist, or whether other forms of life even superior to ours exist on other planets in the vast cosmic spaces.

For the present, however, the Soviet accomplishment must be regarded as of political and psychological importance in giving the Soviet Union once again the "high ground" in world prestige. From the military point of view, the launching of the cosmonaut once again presents striking evidence that the Soviet Union possesses much more powerful rocket engines than the United States for the launching of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

What the Peace Corps Will Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, no proposal of the Government in recent years has so captured the imagination of the Nation as the President's proposal for the establishment of a Peace Corps. The Indianapolis Times editorially pointed out the realities that must be faced by the members. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Indianapolis Times, Apr. 2, 1961]

WHAT PEACE CORPS WILL NEED

R. Sargent Shriver, director of President Kennedy's embryo Peace Corps, has been overwhelmed with applicants for jobs—which suggests that some have a notion that there will be more glamor than crime in the assignments.

Quite the contrary, as Shriver has been trying to make clear.

The realities of the job now have been pictured by others—speaking from experience.

"You'll get sick" said Warren Schmidt, director of oversea activities for the 4–H Clubs. "You can't avoid health hazards in the villages. You can't, for instance, turn down a friendly cup of tea—no matter how dirty the cup. As you get closer to the grassroots, these dangers increase."

Harry Pollack of the AFL–CIO put the whole idea in perspective:

The Peace Corps, he said, "won't solve our problems in the Congo, Laos, or Cuba. You're not going to replace the American Ambassador where you're sent." The Peace Corps "won't instantly transform all the underdeveloped countries. It is a new technique in international relations, nothing more."

Dan Kurzman, our man in the Congo, told the story of Guy Humphreys, who first went to the Congo to establish a mission in 1948. Humphreys is 44 (all Peace Corps persons need not be youths) and is the only American now resident in Stanleyville.

Humphreys has been arrested a dozen times, threatened at gunpoint, robbed, and his wife has had to go home for treatment of a strange eye disease. Despite all this, he intends to stay the rest of his life, and comments, "things aren't really so bad here."

This man demonstrates the spirit, the savvy and the stay-with-it-ness the Peace Corps will need if it is to be of any use.

He is an example of what many Americans, under private auspices, have been doing in a manner President Kennedy now proposes to do in addition under government auspices.

Foreign Trade Economics and the U.S. Fish Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a reprint from the February 1961 issue of Pacific Fisherman entitled "Foreign Trade Economics and the U.S. Fish Business," by Mr. Richard Kulze, president of the American Seafood Distributors Association:

FOREIGN TRADE ECONOMICS AND THE U.S. FISH BUSINESS

(By Richard Kulze)

I think we can all see that the entire structure of international commerce is in the course of a basic transformation that is likely to produce a new type of trading world within the next 10 to 15 years.

For centures, trade has been conducted between and among national states, each with its independent commercial laws and practices; each exercising control over the movement of goods across its frontiers.

Eight years ago—with the formation of the European Coal and Steel Community—the Western World began a new movement toward regional trade blocs that appears to be picking up momentum almost daily. It has swept over Western Europe and Latin America and is even beginning to penetrate to the newly born African states.

Only two of the world's major industrial nations—the United States and Japan—now stand outside of some sort of actual or proposed regional trade group. This isolation is leading to a reevaluation of trade policy at the business and official levels in both nations. No longer do we have a brotherhood of nations, the familiar brotherly ties. Trade has become and is becoming a series of family affairs between groups of nations.

At present some 25 countries are spinning off from the Old World trade system and clustering into trade groupings. There's EEC (European Economic Community)—or the Common Market—covering 165 million people in France, Germany, Italy, Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg. There's EFTS (the European Free Trade Association), and its 90 million people of Britain, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, Austria, and Portugal. There is the South American bloc being worked on—108 million people of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay, and with Mexico's 32 million also taking part.

In Central America, the 10 million people of Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica are organizing their trade zone.

All of the groups vary in form but they are all built and are building around one principle—a customs union. Each country within a group undertakes gradual elimination of all tariff and trade restrictions from all other members of the same group. At the same time, however, existing tariffs will be maintained on imports from nonmember states. The end result is a free trade zone within which companies can sell to each other freely. Outsiders, including the United States can sell into the zone only over the existing tariff wall. The regional trade bloc idea will give tremendous impetus to economic expansion within the free trade zone. Those standing outside the zone will benefit by the amount of economic expansion which spills over as a result of the additional demand for imports from all over the world.

What touched off this movement toward trade blocs? Many things. There are those who say that exporting countries were disturbed at the reluctance of the United States with its vast market, to join OEC, the administrative arm of the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade; who feared the on-again, off-again trade decisions in our country and the reoccurring tides of protectionism which sweep the United States from time to time.

But the main theme behind the formation of trade blocs must be that industry activity can tap its full potential only if its producing facilities are assured broad markets, such as exists here among our 50 States.

The formation of the varying trade bloc will have effects on U.S. markets, both here and abroad, and on U.S. business and U.S. policy. At the coming 1960–61 GATT conference in Geneva, we—and the other GATT countries—will be negotiating for the first time with the Common Market as an entity and not as separate countries. It will behoove us to obtain the best possible concessions from that group to which the United States has always exported in substantial quantity.

The forming of these blocs comes at a time when the United States is striving to increase its exports, and in order to insure continuing exports to those countries which will be trading freely with their family countries, U.S. exporters must continue to show the ingenuity for which they are famed.

And other nonbloc countries may find themselves losing historic markets and may look harder at the U.S. market. As distributors, we may find that some of our historic suppliers abroad may find it easier to ship to their duty-free neighbors than over our tariff wall, and we may have to look harder for the supplies needed for the American consumer.

This is the irony of our position in the American fishing industry. While we are concerning ourselves with the lack of fishery supplies for the American consumer, bill after bill is pending to limit or otherwise restrict the importation of seafood products—almost every species.

We are still in the midst of the grandiose shrimp tariff-quota investigation, and distributor after distributor has told me of the difficulties in obtaining shrimp supplies. With our ever increasing population, our distributors are, and must be, continually on the lookout for world supplies of fishery products for our consumer.

As the postwar world has recovered, the economies of those countries have improved, and they have become competitors for the world fishery supplies in which we participate, as well as becoming bigger and better markets for U.S. exports. U.S. distributors of lobster tails, as an illustration, have seen examples of being outbid for supplies by European buyers. I think we will see more of this as the world economy progresses, particularly in the now underdeveloped countries. There are 1¼ billion people living in 100 non-Communist underdeveloped countries and territories. These 100 underdeveloped countries are a great new economic frontier. To industrialized countries, like the United States, their economic progress means larger export markets. Gross income in those countries grew 3 percent a year from 1950 to 1959, but with 200 million new mouths to feed in the 10-year span, the net income was about 1 percent. If those countries can lift their per capita incomes by only 1 percent more a year during the coming decade, they can well double their imports from the United States alone. A rising economy in those countries means prosperity, and prosperity anywhere on earth is America's trading opportunity.

To us in the fisheries, exports are a minor part of our trade; but to our country, it is our lifeblood. Our tremendous exports, exceeding imports by $3 billion, constitute the major reason why you and I are in business today. Only because of the role which our exports play in the U.S. economy have we been able to maintain a liberal trade policy in this country. Only because of our exports of cotton and tobacco and machinery—and the jobs and the revenue which those exports produce for our country—have we been able to stem the tide of restrictive import controls on tuna and trout and we hope, shrimp.

But despite the fact that our exports still exceed our imports by a healthy surplus, protectionism continues to exist, and we can expect to have it with us in the time to come. The United States imported more goods last year than ever before in our history—$15.2 billion worth. To those worried about foreign competition, the total is bound to appear ominous, for after all, only 9 years before, in 1950, U.S. imports came to a bare $8.9 billion. The gain seems enormous, but is it?

Imports tend to run in line with our Nation's overall business activity. As incomes rise, people buy more, and as production expands, manufacturers also need more materials.

The U. S. gross national product—this is the total output of goods and services—had increased to approximately $280 billion last year. And imports can logically be expected to go up as gross national production rises. But what is more startling than the uptrend

in imports is that we are buying relatively no more abroad now than we did back in 1950. Imports in both years represented 3.1 percent of our gross national product.

The real significance of recent import figures lies not so much in their absolute amount as in the type of goods coming in. Since the end of the war, there has been a fair shift in imports to finished products. The growing capacity and technological skills abroad have made those countries able to compete here with remarkable success. In 1950, almost 60 percent of our imports consisted of crude and semimanufactured materials. In 1959, that figure had declined to about 45 percent, with more than half of our imports consisting of finished products. We have had this shift to only a limited degree in our fishery imports.

If the trade pattern shifts, more complaints are bound to be voiced about foreign competition. But as I said earlier, prosperity abroad can only be achieved by an increased economy, a better standard of living, and increased industrialization. What else can we reasonably expect the other countries of the world to sell in our marketplace if not the products of their industry? And a significant fact not to be overlooked as the economy of the world progresses—the frequent cliche of low-cost foreign labor—as the standard of living betters abroad, their labor rates comes closer and closer in line with our wages.

I have mentioned some big figures as we discuss U.S. exports of $18 billion and U.S. imports of $15.2 billion. Let's try to relate these figures to our fish industry, in smaller figures and with regard to people. Take the case of shrimp imports and the pending legislation that seeks to restrict imports from over 50 countries. In the case of the major exporter, Mexico, with its 32 million population, every Mexican annually buys $27.30 worth of U.S. goods. Each American buys $2.61 worth of Mexican goods. Each citizen of Ecuador buys $11.67 from the United States, each American spends 32 cents a year on Ecuadorian merchandise. Each Panamanian spends $83.60 on American goods; each American buys 14 cents worth of merchandise from Panama each year. It is the same with the other shrimp exporting countries: each Colombian spends $13.57 a year on U.S. merchandise; our purchase from Colombia is $1.91. Each citizen of El Salvador spends $18.41 for U.S. goods; our purchase is 28 cents a year. Egypt's per capita purchase from the United States is $2.16 compared to our purchase worth 9 cents. Costa Rica, $37.90, compared to our 21 cents. Pakistan, $1.30, compared to our 15 cents. Iran, $4.37, compared to our 25 cents. Israel, $50.81, compared to our 10 cents. Chile, $20.88, compared to 73 cents. Japan, $9.06, compared to $3.87.

And let's look at the countries which export ground fish fillets and blocks to the United States. Canada is the largest exporter, and Canada buys $3½ billion worth of U.S. goods. Canada is our largest customer. Each Canadian buys $196.23 worth of U.S. goods per year; every American buys $15.37 worth of Canadian goods. Every Icelander spends $85.14 on U.S. goods while each American buys 6 cents worth of Icelandic goods. Every Norwegian spends $19.77 for U.S. merchandise compared to our purchase of 29 cents. Every Dane is a $17.31 customer of the United States, compared to our purchase of 48 cents.

And let's look at the countries exporting lobster tails to the United States. Australia, $19.37, compared to our purchase of 57 cents. New Zealand, $18.82, compared to 65 cents. Cuba, $83.61, compared to $2.97. South Africa, $17.23, compared to 54 cents.

Our latest tariff complaint is lodged against Peru because of its fish meal exports to the United States. Every Peruvian buys $16.33 worth of U.S. goods compared to our purchase of 74 cents worth of Peruvian merchandise.

These are figures which bring this matter of balance of trade into better focus for all of us. The $18 billion which we receive in the United States for our exports plays a very vital role in our prosperity. The owner or employee of an American business receiving import competition from abroad finds it hard to appreciate this—and while we disagree with him we can understand his views. This is what makes tariffs and trade such a personal matter. How do you think these large customers of the United States feel when our industries suggest tariff controls on their exports? How would you feel or what would you do if a supplier from whom you bought $15 worth of bread wanted to make it difficult for you to sell him 50 cents worth of milk? With our $3 billion export surplus, however, it is unbelievable that in this country we have proposals to restrict trade in tuna, shrimp, lobster tails, typewriters, textiles, and the myriad of proposals pending in our Congress.

A Meritorious Know Communism Recommendation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, when I was home in my congressional district during the Easter recess, a new citizens group to promote Americanism was announced. The name of this organization was the Seattle American Leadership Council. Among its organizers were such outstanding men as Wellwood E. Beall, senior vice president of the Boeing Airplane Co.; Chester Ramage, secretary of the King County Labor Council, and James M. Cain, an insurance executive long active in civic affairs. The mayor of Seattle, Gordon S. Clinton, headed the council as honorary chairman.

This was a citywide group dedicated to combating communism in the community, concerning itself with principles and not with individuals. The council program calls for stimulating all individuals in the city to a renewed dedication to principles as set forth in the Declaration of Independence and like it, would seek an understanding of the goals and methods of international communism and to constructive thought and action to defeat the total challenge of the Communist conspiracy.

To carry out its program the group has organized a speakers bureau and I am convinced an effective program of stimulating the people of Seattle toward obtaining knowledge about communism and Communist tactics will result.

I am recommending to the Seattle Leadership Council that it study the recent resolution adopted by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association which urges the legal profession and the public to mobilize public support for teachers and school officials who wish to strengthen their school curriculums in this area.

The American Bar News of March 15, 1961 contained an article telling of the action whereby the house of delegates went on record favoring the Nation's high schools and colleges providing adequate instruction in the techniques and objectives of communism, so young Americans would be better prepared to meet the challenge to our system of freedom under law.

Mr. Speaker, it has seemed to me a citizens group such as The Seattle American Leadership Council, in cooperation with members of the legal profession, can be most effective and avoid the often made charge of witch hunting by following the Bar Association resolution which calls first, for encouragement and support of school and college programs presenting adequate instruction in the history, doctrines, objectives and techniques of Communism, thereby instilling greater appreciation of freedom under law and the will to preserve that freedom; second, to insure the highest quality of instruction, that educational authorities be urged to provide appropriate training of instructors and the production of scholarly textbooks and professionally excellent teaching materials.

I firmly feel the need of a citizens drive to awaken our youth to the privileges of Americanism and the threat of international communism. In this connection I would like to quote from the bar association conference committee's report covering its "know communism" resolution. This report, with which I am 100 percent in agreement, reads as follows:

> Public understanding and support for this educational program will be essential. It is to be hoped that our members and the State and local bar associations will assist in developing proper understanding and in mobilizing public support.
>
> This program will be beset with many obstacles. There are even those who deem it treasonable to mention communism in the classroom. Pressures and emotions will be brought to play upon any textbooks and educational aids. There will be those who fear that a well-meaning program may itself become infiltrated or perverted. A great host of patriotic educators, with proper public support, can see that these pitfalls and obstacles are avoided or overcome.

Film Documentary on Riot Withdrawn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Mirror of March 3, 1961, relating why Lockheed missiles and space division has stopped showing the film "Operation Abolition":

FILM DOCUMENTARY ON RIOT WITHDRAWN

SUNNYVALE.—The Lockheed missiles and space division said Thursday it had stopped showing "Operation Abolition" because controversy over the film report of the San Francisco city hall student riot had de-

stroyed its value as a security education tool.

Lockheed had purchased a print of the film and used it in showings primarily intended for section security coordinators to alert them to the activity of identified Communists in the San Francisco area.

John Riffle, public information director, said Lockheed no longer will make available its "Operation Abolition" print to civic groups. Previously Lockheed required for such showings that a panel discussion including criticism be provided.

At employee showings Lockheed security officers advised that Lockheed neither supported nor opposed the House Committee on Un-American Activities. A collection of published criticism also was provided for study.

The 45-minute film was produced from newsreel film subpenaed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from KRON and KPIX, San Francisco television stations. Fulton Lewis III, former committee staff aid, edited and narrated the film.

Critics of the committee and the film insist the movie gives a distorted picture of the college student protest against the committee's San Francisco hearing.

Committee spokesmen declare the film was edited only to make a cohesive film and eliminate duplication.

The film is marketed privately at $100 a copy by Washington Video Productions, Inc. George Johnson said his firm assembled the film's raw materials at its own expense as a business speculation.

Our Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the difficulty we face today is that the American people have been kept ignorant on national defense and at times even intentionally deceived.

In a dictatorship the people can be regimented into action. Not so with a democracy where the people will not budge unless they fully understand the facts. Without an enlightened American public, our country and the rest of the world is doomed.

Let us look back a bit. America went into World War II with the P–40 as our best fighter plane. The Jap Zero made mincemeat out of it. The P–40's we sent to England were not even uncrated. Our pilots used the English Spitfires instead. Although we started out wrong we had time to change our position.

In the next war this luxury will be denied to us. The enemy will strike immediately at the heart of our Nation with the devastating weapons they now have at their command. While we still have a retaliatory power in our Strategic Air Command—some experts say—if the Russians strike first, our retaliatory power will only be a postmortem force.

Let us remove the cloak of secrecy from the American people, as President Kennedy tried to do in his inaugural speech.

The facts will not frighten them. They will only make them mad and then we will get the proper action here in Washington. After all we are not fooling anybody—the Russians know more of our defense posture than some of our experts.

In order to properly alert our people, it may be necessary to have a full-scale congressional investigation. Since, however, Mr. James E. Webb, our new NASA Administrator, promised this morning at hearings before the House Science and Astronautics Committee that he will make an independent study of his own, therefore, such an investigation can be postponed—but not for long.

I want to see the country mobilized on a wartime basis, because we are at war. I want to see our schedules cut in half. I want to see what NASA says it is going to do in 10 years be done in 5. I want to see some firsts coming out of NASA such as a landing on the moon, which I know can be done if we go into immediate development of a solid fuel booster. Again I am told by experts that you cannot have such a program with a liquid booster because you cannot properly cloister such a booster to propel the huge payload necessary for such a project.

I was also assured by Mr. Webb that he is not just going to follow a program already established; that he will reexamine the projected 10-year program of NASA with the view of making constructive changes. With this kind of teamwork and with the energy and foresight of the Kennedy administration, I am confident that we can reach new frontiers first.

I want to assure the Members of the Congress that the members of the House Science and Astronautics Committee are alerted to the problem and will watch the program very carefully.

Our Social Security Program Plus Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, today our social security taxes are 3 percent each upon employer and employee on a wage base of $4,800. Under present law this will increase to 4½ percent upon each by 1969.

The tax costs of a Federal medical care program cannot be estimated exactly. It could equal what the American people now spend voluntarily for medical care; namely, about $18 billion per year. This would make it necessary to double the 4½ percent social security tax now scheduled for 1969. That means both employee and employer would pay 9 percent upon a wage base of $4,800. The social security tax would then be 18 percent of the covered payroll.

Of course, these doubled social security taxes would be in addition to the present personal income taxes of the employee, so the taxload upon the worker would be about double his present taxload. Will this added taxload for a Federal medical care program be the proverbial straw that breaks the overloaded taxpaying camel's back?

In discussing this problem the Wall Street Journal on Monday, February 13, 1961, under the heading "Questions on a Modest Proposal," said:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 13, 1961]

QUESTIONS ON A MODEST PROPOSAL

When a man comes promising to do good for little children and to ease the sorrows of age, anyone who questions him is bound to sound a little like a skinflint who would take candy from babies and push his grandmother out in the cold.

If you think not so, watch what is going to happen to those in Congress bold enough to raise questions about President Kennedy's proposals to meet the urgent needs of the Nation's children and the haunting fears of old age that beset the rest of us. Against the emotional wind blown by such imagery, reason is a feeble reed.

Yet somebody had better ask the questions. It is not merely that hidden beneath the tinsel there are a good many prickly nettles; the promise itself is not at all what it seems. For that promise is not simply that society will try to improve its way of taking care of its indigent and helpless, with which aim no man would quarrel; but rather that by this program the Government is going to improve the medical care of all the people. That promise, it seems to us, is pure deceit.

It is going to take some very probing questions even to uncover the tangible nettles tucked away in this program. Offhand, we can recall no program of such magnitude ever being submitted to Congress without a single line in the President's message as to what its cost will be, now or ultimately.

There are, to be sure, some figures given on what the Government says it is going to tax the people initially, but even they are not exactly what they seem.

The President speaks of raising social security taxes by only one-quarter of 1 percent and of lifting the base of this tax to the first $5,000 of income, a seemingly trivial price to pay for such wonderful benefits. But this quarter of 1 percent is pyramided; under present law social security taxes are already scheduled to go to 3½ percent for every wage earner in 1963; to 4 percent in 1966; to 4½ percent in 1969. This new proposal is in addition thereto.

And of course in addition to this, there will be an equal amount levied, so the law phrases it, upon the employer, the implication here being that since the employer pays it, it's a gift to the wage earner. But slice this as you will, it means that upon the paycheck of every man affected there will be a payroll tax of more than 9 percent—this 9 percent, mind you, over and above all income taxes, where the lowest rate already is 20 percent.

But if this in itself is no trivial sum, it still offers only a glimpse at the actual cost of this program. It was not without reason that this question was lightly passed over in the President's message. Nobody knows. And the way this program is proposed, nobody can possibly know—neither the President, nor Congress, nor you who are going to pay for it.

Consider: The proposal is that after an initial deduction, which must not be less than $20, the Government will pay "all costs" for up to 90 days in the hospital "for a single spell of illness." Or "all costs" of nursing home facilities for 180 days. "All costs" in excess of $20 for outpatient diagnostic services. With such an unlimited commitment it is no wonder that Government statisticians haven't yet come up with a cost figure.

Not even the administration pretends the cost will be covered by the $1.5 billion which is supposed to be raised by the "extra" social security tax. And whatever that mysterious figure is now, it, too, is only a beginning. Already the age of the proposed beneficiaries has dropped from 68 to 65 in a bare six months; the period of benefits has been extended from earlier proposals; and some new benefits have been added. What would happen to the program, once started, is incalculable.

But if you want to get some idea of the upper reaches of this commitment which the Government would now undertake, you can do a little arithmetic with the President's own figures. He says there are 16 million people over 65. Half of them have medical costs of $700 or more a year. There is a liability here of over $5 billion, just counting the half with major medical problems.

But enough of these nettles. There is no use in even trying to grapple with the limitless cost-increases that lie in future changes in the law, or what this wholesale "send-the-bill-to-the-Government" program will do to future costs. No one can guess at the effect on hospitals from overcrowding when the Government pays most of the bill.

For the costs are not the only things that tarnish the bright promises, although these are staggering sums for the whole country to pay in order to take care of the few truly needy.

The President assures one and all that this "very modest proposal" is not "socialized medicine." It is not being paid for by the general taxpayer, he says; only by employers and employes, as if the taxpayers were somebody else. And it is not, so we are told, going to touch the private medical system of the country.

Yet here is a measure for the Government to take over the responsibility of medical care for all of us in age, indigent, and self-reliant alike. We would have no choice in the matter. So doing, Government takes on the responsibility to see that the money is spent as public funds; it cannot in duty pay out public funds to just any doctor or to just any hospital. Nor will it; the medical facilities for which Government pays Government funds must meet Government standards, and those standards may be medical, financial, social, or whatever the Government would make them.

To pretend that this will not alter, in a deep and fundamental way, the health, and medical system of the country is specious. We have no doubt that the few and needy will get better medical care than before. But the price of providing for the needy in this way is not to be measured only in billions of dollars, however many of them there may be, but in what the great apparatus of Government will do to the medical care of all the rest of the people in a country which has achieved—without Government—the highest medical standards of any country in the world.

If this is not socialized medicine, it is nothing. And the President himself promises that this modest program for old people is not an end but a beginning—a "foundation on which to build."

Somebody had better ask questions about what it is that is being built.

Threat of Too Much Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to insert in the RECORD the following editorial printed in the April 3, 1961, issue of Life Lines:

THREAT OF TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT

Government affects all of us in our daily lives, and we affect government, too—or we can if we will. The institutions of government are made by man, and man must bear the responsibility for what happens to those institutions. And today patriots throughout the land are gravely concerned about what has been happening to our American heritage of good government.

For the first 150 years of our existence as a nation, the American people, a free people under God, honored the universal truths embedded in our Constitution and built the most powerful, the most prosperous, the most freedom-conscious Nation on earth.

But then something happened. We began to abandon these truths. The old checks and balances so carefully woven into our Constitution were disregarded in the interest of expediency. Federal authority was extended far beyond the limits originally outlined in the Constitution. This process led to a preemption of the powers of the States and, in many cases, a preemption of the rights of the individual.

The original conception of a division of powers among Federal, State, and local government has corroded. Massive concentration of Federal powers has cancelled out the division of authority on which freedom historically has depended.

Centralization of government has taken government farther and farther away from the people. Government has become so remote that the American people no longer feel they own it—that government is their servant. This lessening of a sense of participation on the part of the people presents an open invitation to extravagance and waste, corruption and inefficiency.

We have seen how this invitation has been accepted.

Centralized government has reinforced itself by creating a vast network of commissions, bureaus, and agencies endowed with an unhealthy combination of legislative, executive, and judicial powers. These bureaucratic creations are manned by appointed officials, persons who have never been elected to their positions of power but who nevertheless can and do act as judge, jury, and prosecuting attorney in matters of great import. This is not only in violation of the principle of separate powers as set down in the Constitution, but it is also contrary to the basic principle that government should be only by consent of the governed.

The concentration of government has led to an unhealthy battle for power among the various branches of the Federal Government. Worst of all, the removal of government from the direct contact of the citizen gives rise to apathy, discouragement, disgust, and confusion among the people.

This has created a dangerous climate in America—a climate in which the antifreedom propaganda of the mistaken flourishes.

As government has grown to colossal proportions and as it has become remote, the American people have begun to lose interest in it. They have begun to give up hope of influencing a creation so large and powerful. They are not sufficiently interested to acquire the knowledge they need if they wish to hold government accountable.

Too many Americans are losing their self-reliance. They look to the all-powerful Federal Government as a source of solution for all their problems, and the more they ask, the more the perverters of our constitutional government respond with still bigger government. The road on which we travel is the road laid down for us by the mistaken. It is high time that we turn around and retrace our steps or else we shall be lost. The turnaround can come only through the informed efforts of patriots.

THE MISTAKEN KEEP PUSHING

The people in America who are in a position to know have warned repeatedly that Communist infiltration in the United States is increasing. They continue to warn that there are more Communist spies in the world today than ever before. Yet many Americans who are loyal to our country continue to be used by the mistaken.

We can be quite sure that the mistaken conspiracy has given its full support to efforts to cripple the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. These are the only two congressional groups which constantly expose to public view the conspiracy's operations within the United States. Thus they are a main target for the mistaken.

These groups have performed an especially valuable service in turning the spotlight on Communist agitation among young Americans. The danger to our young people is very real. Some of them on the west coast were led—or misled—into rioting against a hearing of the House committee in San Francisco last May. Riot charges against the demonstrators were dismissed by a local judge for what he called "practical reasons," but he has made it clear since then that his action did not mean he condoned what happened in San Francisco.

The judge said: "I very definitely agree with the view of FBI Director Hoover that the city hall riot on May 13 was instigated by Communist subversives."

They were out to ruin our young people and to ruin America as well. A national party leader recently commented that Communist youth must find common ground with church youth groups—not, of course, for religious reasons but for the use of their facilities.

Unfortunately some Americans "pooh-pooh" the menace of communism within our own country, pointing out that it is simply a "belief" or the dogma of a political party which happens to differ with our two big political parties. That idea is both naive and dangerous.

Communism is a worldwide conspiracy against human freedom and the dignity of man. The members of this conspiracy in the United States constitute a deadly danger to our future. To dismiss lightly the existence of the subversive threat to the United States is to deliberately commit national suicide.

We must face honestly the gravity of the situation. We must give it top priority in our thinking and in our actions. The basic foundation of our opposition to the mistaken doctrine is an informed public opinion and a dedicated public character. Time is growing short. In another few years the anti-freedom forces will take charge of the world unless they are stopped. We are going to have to stop them. And the first step is to gain as complete knowledge as can be had

of the nature of the conspiracy. This is the challenge faced today by every patriotic American.

If you were a member of a conspiracy set upon destroying America from within, what plan of action would you follow?

The most obvious answer in view of the nature of the problem, would be first of all to lull the people, the lawmakers, and the courts of this country into the belief that there is no serious subversive threat to freedom in our Nation and therefore no cause for worry or concern. Since the numerical strength of the conspiracy in the United States is comparatively small, the strategy would be to induce patriots to look the other way while the conspirators plotted their destruction. That is exactly the strategy being followed by those who seek to end freedom for all Americans.

Patriots must not be deceived. They must remember that the attack on freedom takes many guises. It is well for us to give our attention to some of the things that happen when personal rights come into conflict with what the mistaken call the public welfare. When individual freedom is lost to any man, the freedom of all men is threatened.

How can patriots work to maintain freedom in America?

First of all, we must march straight down the road of personal enterprise. We must have faith in a man's reliance upon himself. If we fall victim to the Federal Government's "free" this and "free" that, we cannot escape weakening ourselves in character—and the only end is serfdom and slavery.

It is important and necessary for patriots to keep steadfastly in mind the truth that the growth of big Federal Government must be checked if we are to survive as a nation of free individuals. It is important and necessary for every American to refuse to allow government at any level to do for him what he can and should do for himself. It is important and necessary that the power of the government not be centered in Washington, but instead be returned to the State capitals, the county seats, and the city halls of America and most of all to the individual American citizen.

It is not too late to save freedom if patriots will act with knowledge, with decisiveness, with firmness. There is work for all men and women who love freedom and who feel a deep-seated loyalty to America and all that America means.

There is work for you to do. You can encourage patriotism wherever you find it in evidence. You can join with other patriots to bring about the widest possible participation in public affairs. If you are the president of a corporation or the head of a business, you can poll your stockholders and associates to determine how many of them would be willing to participate fully and actively in public affairs.

You can further education in freedom's cause through your patriotic letters to newspapers. You can check to see that patriotic radio and television programs are being correctly carried in the newspaper time schedules. You can speak your praise to sponsors of such programs. You can help secure loyal Americans as speakers for luncheon clubs. You can work for a revival of patriotic songs and you can encourage the frequent and proper display of the American flag.

Never forget that the mistaken are on the job constantly. Patriots must be no less diligent. Our freedom is at stake. Western civilization is at stake. Our Christian way of life itself is at stake.

This is a time to sound the cry—"Patriots, unite."

We must arm ourselves with knowledge, we must regather our strength, and as united patriots we must draw near to the eternal truths on which our freedom is founded.

Guidelines for the Minimum Wage—Statement of Prof. Gottfried Haberler to the Senate Subcommittee on Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the important issues that has been raised in this House in recent weeks is that of the minimum wage. I participated in the debate on this matter and, in connection with earlier discussion of it in the 86th Congress, testified before the House subcommittee studying it. At these time I tried to give a framework within which this body could view the minimum wage, keeping an economic perspective.

In the Senate subcommittee hearings on the minimum wage a similar statement has been made by Prof. Gottfried Haberler, Galen L. Stone, professor of international trade at Harvard University. Because of the importance of this economic framework in understanding the minimum wage and its effect in the society, I should like to place Professor Haberler's statement in the RECORD at this point:

GUIDELINES FOR THE MINIMUM WAGE

INTRODUCTION

I have been asked to submit a statement on the proposed minimum wage legislation to the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and am happy to comply with one reservation: I am not in a position to make quantitative-statistical analysis of the probable magnitude of the impact of the proposed increase in the minimum wage. But I am convinced that it is possible to reach definite conclusions concerning the direction of changes to be expected from an increase in minimum wages and hence on the advisability of the proposed legislation—conclusions which are solidly based on general considerations and broad economic facts and prinfciples which are widely if not universally accepted by economists of different schools.

A RISE IN MINIMUM WAGES IS AN INFLATIONARY MEASURE

There can be no doubt, in my opinion, that a rise in minimum wages by 15 or 25 percent is a highly inflationary move. In industries and firms covered or proposed to be covered by the legislation, wages which are at the minimum level will be immediately raised by 15 percent or 25 percent. In the great majority of cases, this will either lead to price rises or to a reduction in employment.

Wages that are only a little higher than the present minimum will likewise go up with the same result on prices and/or employment, because employees will insist on the existing differentials between actual and minimum wages being maintained and employers will find it necessary to accede for the purpose of maintaining morale.

I understand that there exist a number of wage contracts which stipulate the preservation of existing differentials.

But even where no such explicit contractual obligations exist and where present wage rates are much higher than the legal minimum, there will be a natural tendency on the part of the unions to strive for the preservation of the existing wage differentials. We can therefore expect that a substantial rise in minimum wages will exert a strong upward pressure on the whole wage structure. This expectation, no doubt, is one of the most important reasons why unions so strongly endorse a rise in the legal minimum wage.

There may be isolated cases where employers will be able to improve productivity and thus to absorb part of the increase in cost caused by higher wages without raising prices in full proportion. It should be observed, however, that such improvements are going on all the time anyway. To assume that it should be possible to speed up the process of gradual improvement in productivity with the stroke of the pen by raising money wages so that a sharp wage rise need entail neither a rise in prices nor a fall in employment—such an assumption is entirely unrealistic; it is wishful thinking of the most dangerous and irresponsible kind.

WAGE INFLATION DOES NOT RAISE THE LEVEL OF REAL WAGES

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that a general rise in money wages and the resulting price rise cannot raise the general level of real wages, except to the minute extent to which it is possible to squeeze something out of the real income of fixed income receivers. This does not exclude that certain segments of employees where money wages for any reason whatever are adjusted more quickly than that of the great mass of the population can get a temporary benefit at the expense of the rest of the people before the general wage and price level has been fully adjusted. But it certainly is true for wage and salary earners in general that their real income cannot be increased by inflation.

THE DOUBLE DANGER OF INFLATION

A. The balance of payments

It should be commonplace to observe that at the present time any inflationary move is especially dangerous in view of the precarious position of our balance of payments.

It is often said that our inflation during the last 5 or 6 years had nothing to do with the deterioration in our balance of payments since 1958. It is true that our inflation during these years has not been very severe by historical standards or by comparison with inflation in many or most (not all) other countries. But the plain fact is that our "little" inflation has been too much for our balance in view of the fact that our industry is now subject to increased competition at home and abroad from the industrial countries in Western Europe and Japan, which with massive American assistance and aided by sound financial policies have staged a surprisingly quick and sustained recovery from the destructions of the war.

I cannot discuss here the whole complicated story of the balance of payments deficit and how we got into it. In lieu of such a discussion, I attach a copy of a paper of mine on "The Economics of International Markets" where the international payments problem is analyzed as well as the question of remedies.

B. Wage inflation, recovery from the recession and economic growth

The inflationary push resulting from the jacking up of money wages induced by the proposed rise in minimum wages would endanger not only our external balance but would also be a drag on and danger to the internal economic recovery and growth.

The American economy finds itself at present in a recession—in the last stage, it is hoped, of the fourth postwar recession. All sorts of measures have been taken or are under active consideration for the purpose of increasing overall expenditure and effective demand. It is to be expected that the

economy will soon resume its expansion which was interrupted by the recession around the middle of last year.

In view of the numerous programs of increased public expenditures on defense, health and welfare, education, urban renewal, etc., that are underway or under active consideration, there is no danger that the coming expansion will peter out at an early stage. The real danger is that it will again produce inflationary price rises. It should be remembered that the last business cycle upswing, which lasted from April 1958 to about June 1960, was damped down and shortened by measures that had to be taken to check inflationary psychology and price rises which had made their appearance early during the upswing.

It is often objected that the inflation was mild by historical standards and therefore did not warrant strong anti-inflationary financial measures.[1] The inflation issue cannot be fully discussed here. Let me simply say this: It is true the inflation was not severe by comparison with earlier peacetime business cycle upswings before or after the war. But what should not be overlooked is that the economy has become much more sensitive to inflation than it used to be for the simple reason that we have had chronic, though intermittent inflation for the last 27 years or so with no interruption of falling prices.

This heightened sensitivity to inflationary price rises still exists and we can be sure that inflationary psychology would be quickly revived if prices started to go up again at a somewhat accelerated rate. If we want a long and healthy period of expansion, we must avoid any unnecessary inflationary measures.

It is acknowledged also by modern Keynesian economists that sharp wage-rate changes in periods of economic expansion must adversely affect employment.

This is well brought out in the following passage in Prof. Alvin H. Hansen's authoritative book "A Guide to Keynes" (economic handbook series, edited by Prof. Seymour E. Harris, New York, 1953, p. 193):

"Money wage rates (wage units) tend to rise before full employment is reached owing to pressure from labor groups whenever profits rise. Such wage-rate changes are liable to be discontinuous—a succession of semicritical points. To the extent that this occurs the increase in aggregate demand is unnecessarily dissipated on higher prices with correspondingly less effect on output and employment. Insofar as marginal cost rises as output increases, some part of the increase in demand must be dissipated in higher prices. But if in addition money wage rates also rise, employment suffers as a result of the higher wages of the already employed workers."

Hansen speaks of wage rises due to pressure from labor groups. The same, of course, holds of wage increases decreed by law such as increases in legal minimum wages.

INCREASE IN LEVEL OF REAL WAGES NOT AFFECTED

I should like to emphasize once more as strongly as I can that nothing that is said in this statement or the attached paper contends or implies, or is meant to contend or imply, that the gradual rise in the level of real wage rates, which is going on in our economy over the years, has to be slowed down. All that is said is that money wage rates should not be pushed too fast. If that can be achieved, the balance-of-payments deficit will disappear and the coming expansion of the economy will be put on a healthy and more enduring basis. As a result, real hourly earnings and overall real national income will rise faster than if inflationary developments were permitted.

I conclude that the proposed rise in minimum wages is economically and socially unsound and Congress should reject it in the true interest of labor itself and of the economy as a whole.

[1] Another objection to anti-inflationary monetary and credit policy was to the effect that inflation was of a kind—cost push inflation—which allegedly makes it incurable by financial policies. But whatever its merits—I have serious objection to this line of reasoning which I need not elaborate at this point—this argument does not apply to the present problem, because the proposed hike of minimum wages does precisely constitute a cost push.

Reed College Student Council Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

REED COLLEGE STUDENT COUNCIL RESOLUTION ON THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

We, the Student Council of Reed College, call for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities because of the vagueness of its authorizing resolution and because of its reprehensible activities: i.e., because of its means of investigation and its use of propaganda, and because the committee's investigations have destroyed numerous individuals and groups.

The Supreme Court of the United States has declared that a standing committee of the House or Senate of the Congress of the United States whose area of investigation is not clearly defined is unconstitutional (see *Watkins* v. *United States*). According to Mr. Justice Black of the Supreme Court, the House Committee on Un-American Activities' authorizing resolution, which defines its area of investigation, is ambiguous, and unclear (see dissent in *Barenblatt* v. *United States*). Therefore, in his opinion, the committee is unconstitutional.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities does not allow constitutional safeguards to witnesses. These safeguards are: (1) being informed in advance of the charges leveled against them; (2) being confronted with witnesses who testify against them, and subjecting them to cross examination; (3) the compulsory process of obtaining witnesses in their favor, and the right to be represented by counsel; (4) testifying at the hearings in their own defense.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has endorsed the preparation of falsifications. For example, the committee has publicly endorsed the movie "Operation Abolition" which deals with the San Francisco hearings and surrounding events in May 1960. People present at the San Francisco hearings in May 1960, writers and journalists have branded the film as a gross distortion of the truth. Mr. William Wheeler, chief west coast investigator for the committee, has admitted in public debate that the film contains distortions.

Witnesses who have attempted to protect their constitutional rights before the House Committee on Un-American Activities have suffered disastrous consequences. Such people have lost their jobs. Some have been barred from social, recreational, and religious organizations. In the case of lawyers, professional reputations have been seriously damaged. The reputations of lawyers have often been impugned with those of their clients, when their clients were uncooperative witnesses before the committee.

The preceding resolution was approved by 89 percent of students voting in referendum in the Reed College student body.

When the Earthquakes Struck Chile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago one of our sister republics in South America, the Republic of Chile, was struck by a natural disaster of appalling magnitude. A horrifying combination of earthquakes, tidal waves, volcanic eruptions, and landslides desolated an area almost as large as the whole of Great Britain. The response of the United States to the news of plight of the Chilean people ravaged by this catastrophe was immediate and unstinted, on both the private and public levels. A massive airlift was organized in a matter of hours, and within a few days over 1,000 tons of emergency supplies and more than 800 doctors, nurses, and other personnel were funneled into the disaster area.

The spontaneous sympathy of the United States for the stricken people, and the willingness and ability to translate it with remarkable speed into terms of concrete assistance, did much to repair and advance our friendly relations with Chile and with all of Latin America. The story of this effort and its results is one from which several lessons and a good deal of wisdom may be drawn to aid us in the development of our relations with our Latin American neighbors. It has been told with graphic detail and telling effect by James Winchester in a recent article in Latin American Report, condensed in the Reader's Digest. In the belief that this article will be of vital interest and great value to many of my colleagues, I have asked that it be printed here for their convenience:

WHEN THE EARTHQUAKES STRUCK CHILE

(By James H. Winchester)

Last Fourth of July, thousands of citizens of Valdivia, in southern Chile, stood in the raw, bone-chilling winter wind as the flags of the United States and Chile flew side by side and a Chilean army band played "The Star-Spangled Banner." Valdivia's mayor then addressed the city's guests of honor: four dungaree-clad soldiers of the U.S. Army. "We can never begin to show our appreciation to you and the people of the United States," he said. "You have moved into our hearts forever."

On the same day, at the U.S. Embassy in Santiago, Ambassador Walter Howe received a penciled letter which read simply: "Thanks. May God bless your country." Behind these expressions of good will and gratitude is a remarkable record of international humanitarianism and generosity.

It began before dawn in southern Chile on Saturday, May 21, 1960. A series of intense earthquakes, followed by tidal waves 24 feet high, volcanic eruptions and landslides, convulsed 90,000 square miles of the land, bringing death and ruin to an area almost as large as all of Great Britain. Within 4 days, the cities of Valdivia, Puerto Montt, Osorno and Concepción were ravaged. In the beautiful Chilean lake country, mountains crumbled, new lakes were formed; one 25-mile stretch of high ground dropped 1,000 feet. On the coast, many small communities were engulfed by the heaving ocean, and entire fishing fleets were lost with their crews. In the village of Castro, as the first tidal wave came in, the fishermen got into their boats with their families and put out to sea. The tremendous undertow pulled them to their deaths. At Ancud, people ran to higher ground to escape the tidal waves, only to be swept back into the ocean by landslides.

There was horror everywhere. At Puerto Montt a 6-year-old boy was buried in debris up to his neck. When he was dug out, rescuers found he was holding the bodies of two smaller brothers he had been trying to protect. In all, 2,000 died, 5,000 were injured, more than 50,000 homes were destroyed. A quarter of Chile's population of 7,500,000 was left suffering in cold and hunger. Property damage reached half a billion dollars.

As news of the disaster spread, international aid began to flow toward the stricken nation. First to arrive were the Argentines, with planes and trains loaded with clothing, food, medicines, doctors and nurses. Every other Latin-American country was close behind. Canada's extensive aid, sent by air, included a fully staffed field hospital. Through the Red Cross, 33 other nations dispatched planes, technicians, supplies and money. Private organizations, too, rallied to Chile's relief.

The United States responded with a massive effort. From May 26 to June 1, the U.S. Air Force sent 74 four-engine cargo planes to Chile, carrying 1,000 tons of emergency goods and 800 doctors, nurses and technicians. Included were two 400-bed Army field hospitals, a dozen jet helicopters, portable radio stations and water-purification units, tents, blankets, clothing, and rations. Beyond this, $4,500,000 in nongovernment aid came from the United States. President Eisenhower's emergency funds provided a quick, no-strings-attached $20 million relief loan.

The U.S. response was impressively swift. On Sunday evening, May 22, even as the quakes continued, Roberto Vergara, then Chile's Minister of Finance, Economy and Mines, had called on Ambassador Howe to ask, "Can you help us?" By Friday morning the first Military Air Transport Service Globemaster had unloaded its cargo of tents, blankets and emergency rations at hard-hit Puerto Montt, 500 miles south of Santiago. On its return flight to the capital, the plane evacuated 103 of the earthquake's injured. Only then, after 50 hours without sleep, did the crew go to bed.

A steady stream of cargo planes funneled into Chile from half a dozen U.S. bases, their crews and passengers gathered, for the most part, on 2 hours' notice or less. Capt. Tom Duff of Pittsburgh, Pa., a pilot, walked into the orderly room of MATS' 20th Air Transport Squadron at Dover, Del., to check out for a 2-week leave—and left for Chile 1½ hours later. "I was reading in bed when I was called," says Maj. Helen McCormick, an Army nurse with Fort Belvoir's 7th Field Hospital. "The same time the next night I was in Santiago, more than 5,000 miles away."

Puerto Montt had only a single, poorly paved unlighted 6,000-foot runway, and the radio in a DC–3 parked at one end of the strip served as the only navigational or landing aid in the area. But the huge Globemasters flew in the Army's 15th Field Hospital from Fort Bragg, N.C. The 7th Field Hospital had to go by train and truck from Santiago to Valdivia, a tortuous 72-hour trip. Two hours after arrival it was erected and operating. Where they hadn't brought along what was needed, Army personnel improvised. At Valdivia, a male nurse fashioned an incubator out of wire splints and plastic bags to save a premature baby.

Most welcome of the U.S. supplies were the two mobile water-purification units, each capable of handling 30,000 gallons a day. Their GI operators had them working within 4 hours after arriving at Puerto Montt and Valdivia.

The fact that the Americans pitched in to work was widely commented on by Chilean newspapers, radio, and TV. "You sent people, not just supplies," the Chileans said. They noted, too, the absence of any patronizing or offensively nationalistic attitude. A leading Valparaiso newsman, not always friendly to the United States in the past, marveled that the field hospital in Valdivia had no sign anywhere reading "U.S. Army." Chileans were amazed to see Negro and white medical troops living and working together in harmony. They were impressed, too, by the fact that U.S. officers and enlisted men worked shoulder-to-shoulder at every task.

Chile's man and woman in the street made clear how they felt. Taxicab drivers, shoeshine boys and storekeepers refused to let the visitors pay for anything. "It was 2 a.m. when we left Santiago to return home," says T. Sgt. Norman Hoffman, a MATS crewman from Dover, Del. "But the kitchenmen at our hotel insisted on getting up to cook us a hot breakfast. Neither they nor the hotel would take any money from us. And at the airport over 5,000 people came to see us off." On a train from the south, the passengers made up a collection to buy flowers for a group of U.S. medical technicians going back to Santiago.

The North Americans returned home with unqualified admiration for the Chileans—and their resourcefulness. "Señora Kathy Bulgarin de Lisboa, a schoolteacher, attached herself to our unit the day we arrived in Valdivia," reports Capt. Dale Wagoner, executive officer of the 7th Field Hospital. "She translated; she got us fuel; she wangled transportation. Her husband, a road engineer, came in with his men and built us roads. We couldn't have operated efficiently without her."

The four soldiers honored on the Fourth of July at Valdivia were the last U.S. personnel to depart. The hospitals, supplies and equipment were left behind as gifts.

Letters of thanks continue to pour into the U.S. Embassy in Santiago. "We've been criticized for the fact that though we always profess friendship for our Latin American neighbors, we've never been too quick to show it in concrete terms," say Ambassador Howe. "The airlift, and the caliber and attitude of those who accompanied it, have done more to cement United States-Chilean relations than anything we have ever done here."

"In many years of official visits and propaganda, the Americans didn't succeed in doing what they have now done in a few days," editorialized Santiago's La Libertad. Newspapers in many Latin American countries published enthusiastic reports and editorials.

The United States' ability, and spontaneous willingness, to respond quickly in this emergency was not lost on Latin American politicians, either. They had the opportunity to compare the U.S. action vividly with what Soviet Russia did. A week after the quakes struck, and after the U.S. Globemasters were arriving daily by the dozens, Russia announced that it, too, would send a relief plane from Moscow. One week after that the lone Russian plane finally arrived.

The United States has not yet got itself squared away "south of the border." But the Chilean airlift was a step in the right direction. The feeling is growing that the United States can be counted on to help its friends when the going is tough.

Soil Conservation in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I just received a communication from M. F. Schweers, State conservationist for the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in Wisconsin, to which was attached a copy of a letter he sent to the State's 360 soil conservation district supervisors acknowledging their 1960 annual reports.

Soil and water conservation is near and dear to my heart. One of the first soil conservation experiment stations in the country was established in my congressional district back in 1931. It is located on a picturesque bluff overlooking the city of La Crosse and the Mississippi River.

In June of 1933 a number of CCC camps were assigned to soil conservation work in southwestern Wisconsin. A majority of these were located in my congressional district.

In October, 1933, the Nation's first large scale soil and water conservation demonstration project was undertaken in the 92,000-acre Coon Creek watershed located southeast of La Crosse.

Wisconsin was one of the first States to pass a soil conservation district law. That was in 1937. Every county has since been created as a soil conservation district.

In 1942, I became a cooperator with the Richland County Soil Conservation District, shortly after the county became a district. We planned for and carried out a contour strip cropping system, including the needed fertility and rotation programs. We also did pasture renovation.

The first and only pilot flood control project in Wisconsin was located in my congressional district in 1953.

With the passage of Public Law 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, in 1954, the Mill Creek watershed in my home soil conservation district was the first in the State to submit an application for planning assistance.

Conservationwise, we have a lot of firsts in my congressional district. I am proud of my record made by my constituents and I am equally proud of the advancement of the soil and water conservation program in the State as a whole.

Accordingly, I believe the letter Mr. Schweers sent to the supervisors detailing conservation progress and plans in

Wisconsin warrants inclusion in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Madison, Wis., March 30, 1961.

To: Soil conservation district supervisors.
From: M. F. Schweers, State conservationist.
Subject: Acknowledgment of your 1960 SCD annual reports.

The 1960 annual reports for your and the 70 other countywide soil conservation districts (SCD) of Wisconsin are the best ever. They are all very readable, readily understandable, and interestingly phrased. And, they were all in our office by March 15, a new record. Congratulations on both scores.

I enjoyed reviewing each and every one of these documents. It provided me with a nice résumé of accomplishments, problems and effected or proposed solutions, and plans for the future.

Each year your material is bound in eye-appealing covers and increased numbers of pictures are being employed to real advantage.

A BIT OF PHILOSOPHY

Quite a number of your reports contained some interesting quotes, some personal philosophies. So, it seems fitting to reproduce a few of these to set the stage for the remainder of this epistle.

"Being a hunter and fisherman and a lover of wildlife, I am interested in the preservation of God's handiwork in its natural state as He created it. One of the first steps is the conservation of soil and water and related resources. This can be done and has been done in our district by the people living on our farms who have participated in the soil conservation program and noted the benefits they, their neighbors, and friends have received."—Walter Diercks, chairman, Langlade County SCD governing body.

"We all love this great country of ours. We are proud of the freedom that it provides. Its greatness and strength are the envy of many nations. However, we must realize that only through the efforts of each one of us can we maintain that heritage. The farmer is important in food production. He has done a very efficient job in his field. In order to continue to provide all these nourishing elements, we must see that we have a soil that is well protected. Thus we have a great job. The Barron County soil conservation district is proud of its record in watching over the soil within its boundaries. We pledge the same effort in years to come."—George Webb, chairman.

"In simplest terms, there are two principal ways you measure progress of districts—first, by the effectiveness with which districts and their governing bodies function as responsible units of local, self-government and, second, by the measurable, physical accomplishments in applying soil, water, timber, and related practices and structures in the watersheds and on the lands of the country."—Statement by Wm. E. Richards, NASCD president, taken from the Door County SCD report.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

To a large degree we can measure the success of soil conservation districts by the amounts of conservation work planned for and applied on the land. We must never forget that it is our fine farm families who made all this possible, for they make the planning decisions and install the needed practices. What has been done is a tribute to their wisdom, foresight, and cooperativeness.

"Proud" is the word most of you used in expressing opinions on attainments made in your district during the past calendar year. And, these achievements were made in the face of inclement weather and unfavorable soil conditions. We wholeheartedly agree with your appraisals.

The following table shows 1960 and total conservation accomplishments made by Wisconsin farm families, with technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service unless otherwise noted.

	Unit	1960 accomplishments	Total to date
NORMAL SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT OPERATIONS			
District cooperators	Number	2,215	40,062.0
Basic conservation plans	do	2,178	25,865.0
Revision of basic plans	do	[1] 466	
Soil surveys	Acre	[1] 644,220	14,067,676.0
Contour stripcropping	do	52,324	1,023,161.0
Contour farming	do	[1] 51,180	521,071.0
Field stripcropping	do	368	5,010.0
Wind stripcropping	do	3,603	37,495.0
Plow planting	do	[1] 1,148	2,548.0
Diversion construction	Mile	152	2,166.0
Terracing	do	129	4,106.0
Grassed waterways	Acre	1,253	15,042.0
Surface field ditches on existing cropland	Mile	458	7,112.0
Land smoothing	Acre	[1] 2,791	14,640.0
Tile drains in existing cropland	Mile	409	4,945.0
Bedding	Acre	49	1,775.0
Land clearing	do	1,429	13,752.0
Pasture renovation	do	29,390	313,287.0
Field windbreaks	Mile	63	967.0
Woodland protection	Acre	[1] 33,522	599,175.0
Tree planting [2]	do	[1] 16,860	90,572.0
Woodland improvement [2]	do	[1] 7,812	116,175.0
Fishpond treatment	Number	[1] 37	91.0
NORMAL SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT OPERATIONS—continued			
Hedgerow planting	Rod	18,301	194,831.0
Wetland development for wildlife	Acre	[1] 609	1,368.0
Wildlife area treatment	do	1,024	21,665.0
Wildlife area protection	do	[1] 6,461	45,671.0
Streambank protection	Mile	14	97.0
Erosion control structures	Number	[1] 348	1,652.0
Floodwater retarding structures	do	[1] 101	195.0
Pond construction	do	310	1,553.0
Stockwater development	do	[1] 146	431.0
Drainage structures	do	[1] 259	1,748.0
PUBLIC LAW 566 ACTIVITIES			
Planning:			
Applications received	do	[1] 11	28.0
Applications approved by State soil conservation committee	do	[1] 13	28.0
Work plans prepared	do	3	8.0
Operations:			
Approved for operations	do	3	8.0
Floodwater retarding structures	do	[3] 3	7.0
Grade stabilization structures	do	[4] 0	0
Channel improvement	Mile	0	1.4

[1] Items for which new records were established during the past year.
[2] The Wisconsin Conservation Department provided technical assistance on these measures.
[3] 3 other installations are about 90 percent complete.
[4] 6 structures merely require "finishing touches."

Yes, in reviewing the above table we will have to agree that 1960 production was very good. In fact, last year might be considered as the best one we have ever had in the history of soil conservation district operations here in Wisconsin.

INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

Just about every one of your annual reports had something to say about the fine interagency cooperation that exists in your respective soil conservation districts. That is swell, that is the way it should be. In fact, without it the enviable production record established here in Wisconsin would not have been possible.

As a reminder of the specific responsibilities of the several contributing agencies, we refer to those you mentioned with their respective assignments as they pertain to SCD and related programs.

The Extension Service has the responsibility for educational activities. The State soil conservation committee approves Public Law 566 watershed applications for planning assistance and provides guidance to SCD governing bodies. The Soil Conservation Service gives technical help to soil conservation district cooperators in the development and application of farm conservation plans, and has the leadership for planning and installing Public Law 566 works of improvements.

The Wisconsin Conservation Department assists farmers on woodland and wildlife management. County agricultural stabilization and conservation committees provide cost sharing through the agricultural conservation program to accelerate the installation of soil and water conservation measures. The SCS fulfills specified technical responsibilities under this program. The Farmers Home Administration is a source of credit.

County ASC committees transferred more than $278,700 to the SCS in 1960 under ACP-SCS 5 percent agreements. Of this amount, the Service earned $236,500. This money was used to employ additional aids to take care of the increased workload resulting from this program.

OTHER COOPERATION

Most of your reports mention other sources of assistance to your district. Evidently the newspapers and radio and TV stations are cooperating exceedingly well. Teachers are doing a commendable job on youth education in soil and water conservation. County highway committees and commissioners are cited for their fine help. Many county boards are making appropriations to soil conservation districts.

Vocational agriculture instructors are interesting youngsters and farmers in the values of becoming SCD cooperators. Bankers' associations, civic and sportsmen's clubs, industry, are among the other groups contributing to your program, according to your reports.

SPECIAL PROJECTS AND EVENTS

During the past year every soil conservation district in Wisconsin completed a conservation needs inventory. These reports show present land use and the changes expected by 1975. They also point up the kinds and amounts of needed conservation practices.

Seven reports were printed in 1960. Most soil conservation districts plan a publication in 1961.

Seven 1-day area workships on conservation needs and zoning were sponsored throughout the State by the State soil conservation committee during late November and early December. These meetings were very much appreciated, so your reports indicate. As a result of these sessions and the availability of conservation needs information, several counties have started to develop land use plans.

Soil Stewardship Week was given a lot of special attention during 1960, so you state.

Sixteen soil conservation districts entered the 1959–60 Goodyear Awards program. The Marathon County SCD won first place in last year's event, with Waupaca coming in a close second.

Attendance at the 1960 version of Farm Progress Days was very good. Last year's affair was held at Marshfield, with land smoothing and forage harvesting being highlighted.

Some activity has been started on the dealer-district program. Farm equipment dealers are ready, willing, and able to help you supervisors. All they want is an invitation to one of your meetings to learn what you are doing and how they can help. Give it a try, won't you?

Last, and by no means least, is the State conservation speaking contest. Nearly 1,600 contestants participated in this activity last year. The entrants get better year by year, so it seems.

New agricultural buildings were constructed in the Polk and Green County soil conservation districts last year. These house all the agricultural agencies and provide a real convenience to the farmer.

STATE ASSOCIATION

Your 1960 annual meeting at Stevens Point was well attended and very interesting, according to your comments. We fully agree with your appraisal.

As a result of resolutions adopted at this session your president has been invited to attend all meetings of the State soil conservation committee and the Wisconsin Conservation Commission. Two bills have been introduced in the legislature. One has to do with adding the words "and water" after "soil" in the designation of soil conservation districts and State soil conservation committee. The other recommended a State appropriation for direct assistance to soil conservation districts.

I have had the pleasure of being one of four agency consultants who participate in meetings of the board of directors of your State association. I can't say enough nice things about this fine group of supervisors regarding their interest, their sincerity, their friendliness, and their enthusiasm in wanting to do everything possible to make Wisconsin's soil conservation district programs click. It's unfortunate that more supervisors can't see this group in action. It's stimulating, I assure you.

LOOKING FORWARD

Anticipating increased production in 1961 is the outlook expressed in most of your reports. We, too, are optimistic. Given the right kind of weather, the current calendar year could well surpass the best of the past.

We have letters from a number of districts asking for additional personnel to take care of expanding workloads. Under present circumstances we are able to satisfy only a limited number of requests. In analyzing total manpower needs against the amount available, you will have to make some decisions on a first-things-first basis. Like most any operation, you seemingly won't have time to accomplish everything you want to see done. Being a farmowner, I can speak with some authority on this subject.

As mentioned in previous years, having too much work is better than not enough. A situation like this presents a challenge and taxes our ingenuity to the utmost.

Thank you.

Our administrator, Don A. Williams, and my SCS associates here in Wisconsin join with me in expressing sincere appreciation for the many courtesies and favors you and your fellow supervisors have extended to us.

Sincerely yours,

MARV SCHWEERS,
State Conservationist.

Unemployment and the Impact of Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the the following report:

UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE IMPACT OF AUTOMATION

(The following report is the result of a survey made by Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND, Democrat of Pennsylvania, on the subject of Unemployment and the Impact of Automation, as requested in November 1960, by Congressman ADAM C. POWELL, chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, of which Congressman HOLLAND is a member.)

As someone so aptly stated it just recently—"the only growth that can be noticed in America in the recent months, is the ever-increasing list of unemployed."

Our latest unofficial figures estimate approximately 6 million people out of work, and many more if we count workers on part time and those in jobs below their capacities.

We have been informed that during this decade—from 1960 to 1970—there will be an average of 1½ to 2 million graduating from high school each year and in 1965 this number will jump to about 3 million. Some, of course, will continue their education, but we know that over two-thirds of them cannot afford to atend our colleges and universities and will be seeking employment.

There are already 500,000 fewer full-time jobs in America today than there were 3 years ago—and fewer man-hours of work are being provided in the private sector of the economy than there were 8 years ago, although the labor force has increased 5½ million during this period.

By 1970 there will be 87 million Americans willing and able to work and, as President Kennedy said during his recent campaign, this means that we must create almost 30,000 new jobs every week for 10 years just to keep pace with this growth. Without a sharper rise in jobs, our unemployment problem could easily become a nightmare.

Fortune magazine, in its January 1961 issue, notes that "the vital task ahead is one of job creation, and the vital energizing currents here are national—not regional—in scope."

Every effort must be exerted to secure full employment and make full use of our talents and skills if we want to have full production and maintain an expanding economy.

In brief, then, Government participation and aid are essential if we are to find solutions to our unemployment problems, and find them we must if we want our way of life to continue and our free enterprise economy to survive.

Since 1953, each peak of the business cycle has found unemployment a little higher than at the previous peak. With each recession, there are more unemployed than in the previous one and our unemployment is widespread among those workers considered the most employable people in the labor force * * * experienced, non-casual-workers, between the ages of 25 and 55.

As a result of the research done on this subject, I have come to the conclusion that we need long-term planning if we do not want to continue periodic recurrences of the present situation.

Automation has entered our lives—and it is here to stay.

It is already remolding our economy as well as many of our institutions and whole new concepts and systems of management are going to have to be initiated if we are to cope with it.

The second half of the 20th century could—through the advance of technology—witness the creation of an economic paradise on earth, or, if not handled correctly, we could see the violent end to all civilization because of it.

With rational planning for a balanced economic and social growth I feel the challenges raised by automation can be met successfully.

In many cases it is quite difficult to pinpoint elimination of jobs due to automation. We have found that in numerous industries, the permanent reduction of the work force—due to technological changes—are apparently postponed until a general downturn permits layoffs which can then be blamed on national or international conditions. However, when recovery occurs, many are not called back to work.

When new mechanical or electronic devices are installed, assurances are given workers in many industries that they will not be hurt or fired. However, when they leave—due to retirement or resignation—no one is hired to deplace them.

It seems that one of the greatest problems with automation is not the worker who is fired, but the worker who is not hired.

Automation is already here in—

Steel: 250,000 workers today are doing the work of 500,000 of 12 years ago and, last June, General Electric announced that a pushbutton steel mill was on its way.

Autos: In a Ford plant in Cleveland, one unit does more than 500 different operations. Within 1 hour it turns out 100 engine blocks.

Coal: 400,000 coal miners of 10 years ago have been replaced by machinery and now 200,000 miners—who work only part time—produce sufficient coal.

Oil: A small group of men run a $40-million plant by remote control from a panel board.

Radio: Where 200 men were required to assemble 1,000 radios a day, the job can now be done by 2 men.

Telephone: At one New York City hotel, where automatic phone equipment was installed, 60 telephone operators lost their jobs.

Textile: One man—who used to operate 4 looms—today operates 30 looms.

Sheet-metal work: Today 4,400 workers produce the same amount it took 45,000 to produce in 1939.

Stores: Automatic devices take orders and fills them, reads cash register tapes at day's end, records that which is sold, the money taken in, the stock that needs to be replaced, takes paper money and makes change.

Banks: Automatic devices sort checks, debits and credits depositors' accounts and makes out monthly statements.

Government: Automatic devices audit 135 million social security accounts, scans in-

come tax returns for errors and unusually large deductions, aims and fires missiles, tracks space satellites, plays war games to lay out new strategies, sorts and handles mail, plots the course of storms, sends out weather maps over the Nation.

Airlines: Makes reservations, guides planes in blind takeoffs and in landings, keeps accounts.

Railroads: Controls the movement of trains, schedules freight and keeps accounts for railroads.

Cities: Turns lights on and off as needed, with electronic eyes that react to darkness, whether due to nightfall, early twilight, storms or other causes.

Manufacturing: Guides, with punched tape, tools that turn out parts for autos, planes, missiles, and other things at a fraction of the former cost; runs, by computer, steel rolling mills, oil refinery systems.

And, here are a few of the miracles of tomorrow that are due to come and for which we must prepare ourselves:

Help, by computer analysis, in the diagnosis of illness.

Provide pushbutton telephone service that will include home extensions for intercom systems.

Operate a pushbutton steel plant that will be completely automated—from taking the customers' orders to delivering the finished product (probably the one referred to by GE in the above statement).

Transmit written messages over great distances in a few seconds' time, through the U.S. postal service.

Operate fully automatic trains.

Translate foreign language conversations, or written works in a flash (some of this work is being done now, but one man is still needed to edit the translations; they expect to do away with the one-man job).

Whole plant automation is expected * * * a system of computers to automate the entire manufacturing process was demonstrated by IBM last June. The machine monitors all the basic functions of manufacturing—sales forecasting, materials planning, inventory management, plant scheduling and work dispatching, and evaluating the results.

A machine that types directly from dictation.

The economic, social, and political problems arising from our great technological developments in the days ahead will be even more difficult and complex than we now are experiencing.

Today we have on the average of 150,000 unemployed each month losing their unemployment compensation benefits and the only outlook at the moment is possibly an extension of these benefits for 13 more weeks * * * then they will have to go on the rolls of the public assistance departments of the various States.

When men and women—who are the sole support of their families lose their jobs and are told—at the age of 40—they are too old to be considered by other industries, the future is bleak; not only for them, but for their families. We must remember that the children of these families today must be prepared to be the leaders of our Nation tomorrow—and, if they are to be raised as wards of the State, their concept of our system of government and our economy will not be too enthusiastic.

These problems are of our own making. We must find answers to them. We must find ways to retrain these men, if necessary, so that they can support and educate their families and return to work as they want to do.

We are in a new world, with new challenges, and we need new thinking. We cannot afford to waste any more time.

This report, I know, merely scratches the surface of the present conditions and indicates why we are in our state of decline.

Much more can, and should, be divulged by holding public hearings and securing accurate figures of our unemployed and their prospects for the future.

This will be the job of the Holland Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation which will be in full operation very shortly.

Sources of material:

Reports submitted by international unions affiliated with the industries discussed in the report.

"Union Meets Automation," New York City Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO.

"Automation—Its Impact on Business and People," by Dr. Walter Buckingham.

"The Red Challenge to Technological Renewal in the West," by Robert McKinney.

Department of Labor Reports, U.S. Department of Labor.

"Manpower—Challenge of the 1960's," U.S. Department of Labor.

Special articles in New York Times, Washington Post, labor periodicals, management periodicals, innumerable magazines, and syndicated columnists in various newspapers.

RÉSUMÉ OF REPORTS SUBMITTED BY VARIOUS UNIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE IMPACT OF AUTOMATION

Auto workers: 1947–60—production increased 50 percent, employment decreased 2.9 percent, sales increased 93.4 percent, production payroll increased 21.6 percent.

The first half of 1957 and 1960—employment decreased 3.2 percent, production increased 14.9 percent.

An estimated 160,000 unemployed auto workers in Detroit will never return to automobile factories due to automation.

Boilermakers, iron shipbuilders, blacksmiths, forgers, helpers: 1958–60—6½ percent unemployed. Construction Industry, man hours worked, down 41.2 percent. Boiler manufacturing and plate fabrication, man hours worked, down 41.2 percent. Forging industry, working only 27 percent. Railroad maintenance, employment down 49.5 percent.

Majority of any of these plants are working only 3-day week.

Brewery workers (flour, cereal, soft drink, and distillery): 1950–60, Employment decreased 25 percent due to mechanization and automation in the following industries: (a) Breweries, (b) Malt beverages (beer), (c) Distilled liquor, (d) Soft drinks, (e) Malt processing, (f) Yeast processing, (g) Cigar making.

Building and construction workers: 1959–60—Unemployed, 8 percent November 1960—16 percent December 1960.

(NOTE: Automation effect has not been calculated in figures as yet, however, prefabrication is being felt considerably in construction industry.)

Building services: 1945–60—Automatic elevators replaced 40,000 elevator operators. Commercial recreation: Bowling alleys automated eliminating pinball boys. Vending machines have replaced sales clerks.

Custodial work: Cleaning machines have replaced janitors and charwomen; dishwashing machines have replaced workers in hospitals, schools, institutions, hotels, etc.

(NOTE.—This report is from New York City only. National figures are being tabulated.

Chemical workers: 1953–60—Production increased 80 percent. Employment decreased by 13,000.

Clothing workers: Unemployment in this industry is seasonal. Cutting work is automated to some extent.

Communication workers: 1955–60—Telephone business increased 25 percent. Employment decreased 5.5 percent—33,000 jobs.

(NOTE.—Telephone calls increased 60 percent from 1946 to 1960.)

Electrical workers (IUE): Electrical machinery industry: 1953–60—Production and related worker employment is down 80,000 jobs. Production output is up 20 percent.

Electric lamp industry: 1950–59—Employment down 1,500 jobs; production up by 42 percent; productivity of worker up 52 percent.

(NOTE.—Westinghouse Electric Corp. makes a completely automated lampmaking machine—output is 32 million incandescent bulbs per year, raw material fed to machine and 100 feet later completed bulbs emerge. Machine inspects, rejects imperfect products, packs bulbs, boxes in cartons, conveys to trucks and boxcars for shipment.)

Radio and television industry: 1950–60—Wiring, soldering, and component assembly automated, with the result that 50,000 jobs eliminated.

Electrical workers (IBEW): Radio: 1953–60—Federal Communications Commission authorized 1,300 stations to operate automatically. Result, 3,900 jobs eliminated as each station has approximately three jobs per station.

Television: 1958–60—Loss of 25 percent of jobs due to automation.

Telephone industry: 1959–60—Elimination of 2,122 jobs.

Electric utilities industry: 1927–60—Annual kilowatt-hour output increased 850 percent; employment increased only 11 percent.

(NOTE.—Utility plants now double size and output with no increase in employment.)

Electronics: 1947–56—Output in United States increased 325 percent; employment increased 50 percent.

Longshoremen: Negotiated contract with provisions to set up mechanization and modernization fund, $5 million a year for 5½ years to be put into fund for retraining, relocating, providing severance pay for those replaced by machines or mechanization.

Mineworkers: Bituminous coal: 1950–60—production per miner increased 100 percent. 1937–57—45 million tons more coal produced annually with 50 percent less workers. Anthracite coal: 1930–60—Elimination of 80,000 jobs.

Oilworkers: 1947–57—Operating capacity increased from 5.3 to 8.4 million barrels daily; production workers eliminated from jobs, 10,000.

Office workers: 1955–60—25 percent of jobs eliminated due to electronic machines. NOTE.—It is estimated that within the next 5 years, 4 million more office and clerical jobs will be eliminated by automation.

Post office clerks: Automation entering this field—however, those now employed have been assured their jobs will not be eliminated but they will be "frozen" and upon their departure or resignation the jobs will not be filled by others.

Railway and steamship clerks: 1946–60—37.1 percent reduction in work force due to automation. Jobs were not filled when vacated by workers retiring or resigning.

Railroad workers: 1940–60—1,000,000 jobs eliminated. NOTE.—Southern Railroad example: Operates 6,200 miles of line. Has completely dieselized; has four automatic freight yards; has centralized traffic control system; has mechanization maintenance work; has smallest repair shops use technology; has office automation—programs accounting and statistical work on electronic computer. Saved $850,000 in first year.

1946–56—Increased gross business 6 percent; efficiency up 116 percent; profits rose from $19.5 to $40.5 million, 100 percent; employment dropped from 40,000 to 22,000, 45 percent.

Retail clerks: 1947–60—Output rose 150.8 percent; employment is practically all part-time, but not by preference. NOTE.—Automation has been felt here—wrapping and packing devices, meat cutting, vending machines, etc. Serve yourself supermarkets, 35 employees in warehouse replace 150 clerks. Elimination of independent stores.

Rubber workers (tire and tube): 1947–58—Produced 100 million tires yearly; employment reduced 30 percent—31,000 jobs, work hours reduced 29 percent.

Years 1958–59—Employment remained level, production increased 22 percent.

Seafarers (Maritime workers): 1952–60—Employment down 27,500; larger and faster ships with smaller crews. NOTE.—American owned or controlled vessels registered under foreign flags—purpose of this is to avoid American wages and working conditions, American taxes and safety standards.

Year 1946—65 percent of total cargo carried in U.S. ships.

Year 1959—9.1 percent of total cargo carried in U.S. ships.

Steelworkers: 1937–59—Employment down 18.5 percent, elimination of 95,000 jobs; productivity up 121.1 percent; ingot production increased 65 percent; steel shipments increased 80.9 percent.

In 1941, 20 men were required to produce 1 ton of steel.

In 1960, 12 men were required to produce 1 ton of steel.

(NOTE.—Today we have 125,000 steelworkers unemployed; those still working have averaged this year a 34-hour workweek.

Teamsters: Trucking: Due to the increased weight and size of the trucks, the productivity per driver has increased as larger loads can be carried and fewer trucks are used. Practice of "piggybacking" is cutting into employment of truck drivers for long-haul assignments. Outlook is for business to increase but additional jobs will not result from this increase.

Terminals: This section of industry is largely automated today in loading and unloading due to conveyors, hoisting devices, inclined tracks, preloaded carts, closed circuit TV, etc. Automated and electronic data processing is being used to handle billing and related activities, including inventory data. Payroll processing, maintenance of personnel records, maintenance and operating cost and control, preparation of various reports, etc.

Dairy: Automated machinery being used to large extent in all sized dairies. Ice cream plants, milk processing plants, frozen food, from raw products to finished boxing or bottling. Even automatic cleaning of pipelines at conclusion of operations.

Canning: Extensive use of automation in this industry. 1947–58—Output per manhour increased 40 percent; employment was decreased 12 percent.

(NOTE.—Actual figures have been difficult to obtain for this report as records have not been prepared as yet.)

Textile workers: 1947–59—Production jobs decreased 38 percent; production output increased 5 percent; productivity per manhour increased almost 70 percent.

United Electrical workers: 1953–60—Electrical manufacturing industry as a whole; employment down 10 percent; production up 20 percent.

1956–60—General Electric: Jobs lost, 40,566; sales increased $259.5 million.

Lamp division: Value of shipments increased 24 percent; hourly employment decreased 1,200.

Steam turbine generator parts division: Hourly employment decreased 16,802.

CCC 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of March 22, 1961, entitled "CCC 1961":

CCC 1961

If it is carefully limited to sawing away at the backlog of conservation projects now existing in the United States, the administration's proposed domestic youth corps program merits enactment this year.

Like the quite different new oversea Peace Corps, this revival of the 1930's Civilian Conservation Corps should be started on a modest scale. Its usefulness should be tested on such existing programs as soil and water conservation surveys and the Park Service's project 66 for improving national park facilities.

The approach proposed by the administration is—again like the Peace Corps—modeled directly on a bill submitted last year by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, the upper chamber's fountain of youthful ideas.

It's aim is twofold: both to speed conservation of national resources and to attack delinquency among jobless teenagers. Young boys from 17 to 19, mainly school dropouts, would be enlisted in the neo-CCC to serve for a year for token expense money, room and board. They would dig ditches, construct watercourse retaining walls, plant tree seedlings, assist in soil conservation efforts, and aid engineers and surveyors—instead of falling into gangs or dabbling in drugs and disillusion.

The value of what used to be called honest labor in the open air should never be underestimated. Cynics on this subject consist mainly of those who have never tried the outdoor life. Probably no better preventive of delinquency caused by sheer big-city boredom could be contrived.

The lawmakers will, of course, wish to make sure that provisions for an eventual 150,000-man corps are sufficiently flexible to permit decreases, preventing empire building and make-work projects in future years.

Tomorrow's Challenge in Water Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "Tomorrow's Challenge in Water Pollution Control," delivered before the 14th Purdue Industrial Wastes Conference held in Lafayette, Ind., on May 5, 1959, by Gordon E. McCallum, the distinguished and able Chief of the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control, U.S. Public Health Service.

The rapid rate of urbanization in our modern society adds to existing problems and creates new ones in water pollution control. The last basic waste treatment process was developed in 1916, 45 years ago. What was considered as "complete" sewage treatment can hardly be so classed today when great quantities of foamy detergents and complex chemicals are daily spewed into our water supplies. Research is faced with a great and immediate challenge to provide the answers in this field.

On February 9, 1961, I joined Representative JOHN BLATNIK in introducing legislation which, if enacted, will help to overcome the 45-year lethargy of research and bring it into the struggle to clean up and conserve our water resources.

Mr. McCallum's address testifies to the long-range concern of the officials most immediately concerned with the administration of the water pollution control program. I congratulate him on the frankness of his appraisal, a characteristic which I find very refreshing and increasingly rare, and I commend his address to the consideration of my colleagues.

The address follows:

TOMORROW'S CHALLENGE IN WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

(By G. E. McCallum, Chief, Division of Water Pollution Control, Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.)

I am grateful for the privilege of being with you today. It is always an honor to participate in the Purdue Industrial Wastes Conference and to have the opportunity of sharing our views with you and having yours in return. Today I am to discuss "Tomorrow's Challenge in Water Pollution."

My prognosis does not stem from experience as a researcher. Rather, it is a belief now voiced by some of our most experienced water pollution control administrators—men who have studied or witnessed the anachronistic development of water pollution control practices.

On every hand we see planning to meet tomorrow's needs. Business, welfare agencies, and government combine their capabilities for such things as supermarkets, superhighways, revamped schools, and modern hospitals. Such forward-looking philosophy has been expressed by one corporation's slogan, "Progress Is Our Most Important Product."

I wish I could look ahead to this conference some 20 years hence and hear some successor appraise the accuracy with which we predict tomorrow's challenge. Past experiences, right or wrong, may point the way.

Until perhaps about World War II we were largely concerned with pollution that caused public nuisances and waterborne diseases. We were also concerned with taste and odor problems in drinking water and with the destruction of fish by toxic substances and by oxygen depletion. Dilution often generously helped solve our problems—or at least allowed more time in which to develop solutions.

A review of the early progress in research and investigations of stream pollution reveals that the work was motivated by the need to find answers to immediate or anticipated problems. That great milestone reached in 1887 in the founding of the Lawrence Experiment Station, in which Mills and his coworkers, Drown, Hazen, and Sedgwick, demonstrated the biological nature of sewage treatment, is an outstanding example of an effort to meet a need. In the years that followed progress was rapid in the understanding of biological oxidation of wastes and their effects on receiving waters. The need for those studies was amply demonstrated by the speed with which their findings were put in practice.

Other needs resulted in more milestones. We might include among them the trickling filter and separate sludge digestion. Interestingly, perhaps, the last basic sewage treatment process to be developed was activated sludge in 1916.

Thus for 43 years no fundamentally new sewage treatment processes have been developed. Although many refinements in the art have been made and the effectiveness and capacity of treatment increased, the fundamental principles have remained the

same. We cannot deny that they have served, and served well, the purpose for which they were intended—treatment of municipal wastes of that era.

In the meantime we are being confronted by municipal wastes of a changing character and increasing amounts which are closing in on our dilution reserves.

Respecting the past as prologue, we find that many conditions which faced those early investigators were quite different from those of today. In 1900 only about one-third of the 75 million persons of this country lived in urban areas. Water use and production of wastes were corrsepondingly less. The character of municipal wastes was quite well understood and found to be amenable to the treatment developed. Most important, however, was the advantage of a favorable dilution factor which we are gradually losing. Significant to ponder is the realization that our municipal waste treatment processes are not necessarily devised to cope with all conditions today. What will an appraisal of their suitability reveal in 1980? Is it presumptuous to hope for a new breakthrough of the significance achieved by Mills, et al.

We all recognize that this need of a new milestone stems from the inevitable reuse of water. The reuse of waters in such rivers as the Ohio and the Miami is reported to be in excess of three times dependable low flow. Will our waste treatment practices be adequate to meet the high rate of turnover by 1980 when predicated total water use will exceed available supply by 100 billion gallons per day, and when a six-time reuse of many streams is projected?

The task of collecting, treating, and disposing of the wastes from today's metropolitan areas is already taxing the limits of our present knowledge. Problems of tomorrow's supercities stagger the imagination. Troublesome conditions prevail in waters below a growing number of our cities, even though "complete" treatment is employed. Chicago, Indianapolis, Columbus, and Dayton are reported to have experienced trouble.

It has been noted that under sustained conditions of low stream flow, the dilution factor available to these cities varied from 0.14 cubic feet per second per 1,000 population in Columbus, Ohio on the Scioto River, to 0.65 cubic feet per second per 1,000 population in Dayton on the Miami River. Population increases of 2 percent annually in these cities, as predicted, will further reduce dilution by 35–40 percent by 1980. Compare these dilution factors with the 4 cubic feet per second per 1,000 population often considered necessary for assimilation of primary effluent, or 0.6 cubic feet per second per 1,000 population for "completely" treated sewage whose B.O.D. has been reduced by 90 percent. Admittedly, this rule-of-thumb criterion is crude—but the warning it gives is ominous.

The Chicago Sanitary District, whose sewage system has been cited by the American Society of Civil Engineers as one of the seven wonders of modern engineering, is gravely concerned with the effects of its highly treated wastes. The effluents discharged to the Illinois waterway have a population equivalent of 1 million persons. Testimony has been presented before congressional committees that not only nuisance conditions, but health hazards, exist in the Illinois Waterway.

Each recent session of Congress has acted upon bills authorizing increased diversion of waters from Lake Michigan to the Illinois Waterway. H.R. 1 in the present Congress is the latest. Proponents of these bills contend that additional diversion is needed for dilution of Chicago's treated wastes. Several Great Lakes States are opposing diversion, even on a temporary basis for study purposes. They maintain that increased diversion would adversely affect shipping, hydroelectric power generation, and property values throughout the entire Great Lakes area.

Litigation on this issue is now pending in the U.S. Supreme Court.

This is but one example of like problems confronting water pollution control administrators. I select it simply because it is a situation with which I am somewhat familiar, not as a research man, but because of my position as a water pollution control administartor. Possibly I should apologize for using a personal experience, but personal experiences are those which have the most impact upon us. Each year my staff and I must do a great deal of work as technical consultants and witnesses at congressional hearings on legislation pertaining to this problem. Furthermore, we must collaborate with the Justice Department on the litigation in the Supreme Court.

What must be done about Chicago's treated sewage? Is more diversion to the Illinois Waterway the answer when so many witnesses contend this would be detrimental to other uses of the Great Lakes? Is dispersion of Chicago's treated sewage into Lake Michigan feasible, as has been proposed to both the Congress and the Supreme Court? What effect would this have on present water uses of Lake Michigan?

The Chicago situation is a classic example of the profound social, legal, technical and environmental difficulties which have evolved from a metropolitan waste disposal problem. We find ourselves indirectly involved not only in an interstate controversy, but one involving international relations, because of a difficult pollution problem. If we cannot treat wastes sufficiently to avoid nuisance conditions under our best, most modern practices today, how shall we meet the water needs of future generations?

I don't profess to have the answer to these problems. But, limiting our concern to tomorrow's municipal wastes, could we agree that one of our great challenges is the development of practical—and perhaps novel—methods of attaining higher degrees of waste purifications?

Perhaps we would do well to pause here for a moment to consider what we accomplish by today's complete sewage treatment and, possibly more revealing, what we do not accomplish. I would like to show a few slides based on information furnished the Public Health Service by the city of Chicago and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. It is recognized that some of the material added to the water by municipal use and which is not removed by treatment, is not necessarily significant in the alleged pollution of the Illinois Waterway. Again, I should like to emphasize that this case is being used only as an example of what I consider to be a very great research need. Similar situations, of an even more serious nature, exist throughout the country.

I would like to point out just how good a job we are doing in our modern sewage treatment processes.

On the slides showing effectiveness of complete sewage treatment, the bar on the left (slide 1) and the one at the top (slides 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8) represent raw Lake Michigan water. The middle bars show raw sewage, and the third bar on each slide shows the treated effluent.

You will notice that several of the slides show figures in tons per day. We have been requested by congressional committees and other Federal agencies to present data on the Chicago problem in this manner. The flow on which these data are based is about 1.25 BGD, or 1,900 cubic feet per second.

SLIDE 1: DEGRADATION OF WATER QUALITY AFTER ONE MUNICIPAL USE EVEN AFTER COMPLETE SEWAGE TREATMENT

You will observe that one usage increases the solids from 170 to 654 parts per million—136 parts per million of which are removed by treatment—leaving 348 parts per million, or 1,787 tons of added impurities in the form of dissolved organic matter and minerals.

Sixty percent of the added solids is in the form of dissolved minerals—40 percent in the form of dissolved organic matter.

SLIDE 2: EFFECT OF MUNICIPAL USE OF WATER QUALITY—TOTAL SOLIDS

In one use, total solids are increased from 170 to 500 parts per million, which is the maximum recommended concentration in the Public Health Service drinking water standards.

SLIDE 3: NUTRIENTS REMAINING AFTER COMPLETE TREATMENT

Nutrients are increased by municipal water use from 0.35 parts per million to 7 parts per million and reduced to 5 parts per million by sewage treatment.

Thus, 2 to 30 tons a day of nitrates and phosphates are discharged in the effluent. These are reported to be a cause of trouble in this case.

One can only speculate what effects these amounts of nutrients would have if discharged to Lake Michigan.

SLIDE 4: ORGANICS REMAINING AFTER COMPLETE TREATMENT

Organic matter is increase from 0.5 part per million in the lake water to 223 parts per million in the treated sewage.

Of special interest is the high proportion of dissolved organic matter which is not removed by complete treatment. This represents an addition of more than 1,000 tons a day of pollutants to the receiving stream.

SLIDE 5: DETERGENTS REMAINING AFTER COMPLETE TREATMENT

Of the 223 parts per million of organic matter left in the treated sewage, we have been able to identify only 7 parts per million which are the detergents shown on this slide. This adds up to about 35 tons a day in the effluent.

SLIDE 6: MINERAL SALTS REMAINING AFTER COMPLETE TREATMENT

This slide shows that none of the dissolved mineral salts added to municipal water by use is removed by conventional sewage treatment. Two hundred and eighty-three parts per million, or 1,400 tons a day of mineral salts are discharged in the effluent.

SLIDE 7: EFFECT OF MUNICIPAL USE ON WATER QUALITY—CHLORIDES

Chlorides are increased from 6 to 90 parts per million by one municipal water use. This is of interest because three uses of this type would result in the 250 parts per million maximum concentration recommended in the Public Health Service drinking water standards.

SLIDE 8: BOD REMAINING AFTER "COMPLETE" TREATMENT

The BOD is increased from 1 parts per million to 125 parts per million through one municipal use, and is reduced by treatment to 18 parts per million. Thus some 100 tons per day of BOD are discharged in the effluent.

This 85 to 90 percent removal of BOD looks good when compared with what is accomplished with dissolved organic matter of dissolved minerals by treatment. And, this relatively high removal should look good because one of the major jobs a modern sewage treatment plant is designed to do is remove BOD. Nevertheless, according to testimony presented to the Congress, it is the BOD remaining in the effluent that is the primary cause of trouble in the Chicago situation.

The solution to the problem at Chicago is being sought through legislation and litigation. Would it not be solved better, however, by research to develop practical methods of attaining higher degrees of waste purifications?

Here in this room are represented the technical skills that must meet tomorrow's challenge in this field. The mysteries confronting us must be unraveled. This is not a responsibility to be taken lightly. It will require the best efforts of each of us.

Tax Deferment for Self-Employed Retirement Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention and purpose to support H.R. 10, a bill which is designed to enable our fellow citizens who are self-employed to establish voluntary retirement plans. This legislation is designed to give the millions of citizens who work for themselves equal tax treatment with that enjoyed by the many millions of workers benefited by tax deferment on their pension plans.

This bill is not new in its purpose, although it incorporates several new features. For more than a decade similar legislation has been introduced and on two occasions has passed this House. Simply stated, the bill would permit the self-employed farmers, barbers, plumbers, druggists, and all the other types of small businessmen, to postpone the payment of income taxes on certain amounts set aside for retirement until they start drawing their pensions. Thus the self-employed worker would regain equal status with the some 20 million employees of corporations who today enjoy this tax advantage.

In addition to eliminating the unfair discrimination against the self-employed, the bill would greatly encourage the establishment of private pension funds which would supplement the Social Security program. At the very time this Nation considers proposals to aid retired people through medical care and increased social security benefits—requiring greatly increased expenditures of taxpayers' funds—this bill would offer an alternative or supplemental aid to the retired self-employed requiring no expenditure of Federal funds.

Mr. Speaker, many have written that the strength of our great country has its foundation on the solid American middleclass. The millions of citizens who are self-employed for the most part belong to this group and possess the qualities of courage, enterprise, and initiative so essential to the survival of our way of life. Today there are distinct indications of a tendency for individuals to seek government or corporate employment rather than small business or professional positions, often largely because of the retirement benefits not available to self-employed persons. I, therefore urge that this Congress act swiftly to remove this inequitable and discriminatory feature of our tax structure and encourage individual thrift and initiative.

Better Answers to Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the editorial section of the Christian Science Monitor, titled "Better Answers to Communism," dated April 4, 1961:

BETTER ANSWERS TO COMMUNISM

It is understandable that many individuals desire a more active, personal part in combating world communism. But current demands for congressional investigation of an organization whose leader has charged three American Presidents with being Red tools underscore again the pitfalls which beset the anti-Communist path.

J. Edgar Hoover, who probably knows as much as any American about fighting communism, recently stated that the "job of curtailing and containing communism is one for legally constituted authorities with the steadfast cooperation of every loyal citizen." The FBI chief does not deny the individual a role but he warns against reckless charges and vigilante action.

The FBI has made good use of citizens who as undercover agents under its specific directions infiltrated and exposed Communist groups. But Mr. Hoover knows how the work of professionals can be hampered by reckless charges. False tips can divert the trackers, and continued mistaken "wolf, wolf" alarms create apathy.

Alertness is urgently required. Too few Americans are awake to the real nature of this evil. But excessive fear breeds a rejection of democratic processes. It leads decent, honorable citizens to use dishonorable and authoritarian means to combat the evils they fear.

It too often fosters a totalitarian attitude which attacks everyone who will not fight communism in one prescribed way. It induces a self-defeating, self-righteous distrust and tearing down of men who lead freedom's cause in key sectors.

Indeed it would be easy to conclude that such damage to a healthy America was planned in Moscow. And some thoughtful moderates will contend that this radicalism of the right splits, discredits, and weakens the very forces in America which should be most effective in combating the opposite extreme—that which in the name of "liberalism" often appears to be "greasing the Communist skids" by moving toward submergence of individual and local interests in a paternalistic superstate.

But of course the best answer to either tendency will not be found in suspicion and hate. It lies rather in a greater understanding of and devotion to the religious ideals and constitutional concepts which give vitality to free societies. Exposure of mistakes is in order. But new negative denunciations are no cure for old.

The core of totalitarianism is disregard for the individual. The core of free societies is concern for the individual. This has its roots in religious teachings that man is the son of God. Persons who keep this distinction clear in their thought and action can indeed have an active and wisely effective part in combating communism.

Positive trust in divine guidance and protection should displace a conspiratorial distrust. Positive rededication to a religious sense of brotherhood should lessen concern with divisive organizational "fronts." More positive reliance on the spiritual force of truth, justice, and freedom (when exemplified) should ease obsessive fears of subversion.

Study of and appreciation for precious civil liberties and individual rights should be a more positive answer than either the maligning or misinterpretation of them. Active efforts to set up noble goals and to provide the equality of opportunity which will permit every individual to achieve his full potential is a more positive answer than any anticommunism which adopts totalitarian methods to fight totalitarianism.

James R. Hoffa Mounts a National Drive Against the Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the Meadville (Pa.)—where the main shops of the Erie Railroad are located—Tribune of April 10, 1961 carried an Associated Press report on the latest activities of James R. Hoffa who has urged his "1,700,000 union members to pepper their Congressmen with demands for support of legislation pending in the Senate that Hoffa said would stop the Interstate Commerce Commission from allowing special low rail rates to haul freight in competition with trucks."

According to Mr. Hoffa the ICC is allowing railroads to charge excessive rates for freight handled solely by the trains and then to put rates into effect in competition with trucking that are below the actual cost of operation.

The Associated Press reports that—

Hoffa urged Teamsters members to threaten Members of Congress with loss of political support if they oppose the pending legislation, and to form women's auxiliaries, enlist support of businessmen, carry on house-to-house campaigning, and be ready to make a march on Washington.

Mr. Hoffa is now concentrating a large part of his efforts in an attack against piggyback transportation, and Members of Congress. I am ready for him, and I think other Members should get ready, too, to repel this attack.

Bills have been introduced in the Congress which, if they become law, would result in the railroads being unable to compete for the transportation business, and thus assure the supremacy of those competing forms of transportation which have been so powerfully assisted by the Federal Government.

If these bills are adopted, the railroads will be left with only that part of the transportation business which other forms of transportation—such as the trucking industry now dominated by Mr. Hoffa—find unprofitable.

Clair M. Roddewig, president, Association of Western Railways, has pointed out that—

These newer modes of transportation are engaged in a campaign to force Congress to restore the competitive shelter which they have enjoyed since their birth.

Meanwhile they are continuing their efforts to intimidate the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has been extremely hesitant about loosening the competitive restraints on railroad transportation as clearly intended by the Transportation Act of 1958.

They have the support, too, of powerful allies who are the special beneficiaries of these newer forms of transportation, or whose selfish interests are otherwise identified with them. James Hoffa and his powerful Teamsters Union are in the front ranks.

It would appear that the competitors of the railroads have a great deal of confidence in their political strength, demanding, as they do, that Congress rescind a long and carefully considered policy that it adopted only a couple of years before.

The Federal Government is in the transportation business up to its neck, according to Mr. Roddewig who has said that—

Government owns the highways—a public investment of $150 billion in these transportation facilities.

Government owns the inland waterways—a public investment of more than $5 billion in these transportation facilities.

With Canada, the U.S. Government owns the St. Lawrence Seaway—an investment by this country, to date, of $131 million in this transportation facility.

Government owns the airports—a public investment of about $5 billion in these transportation facilities.

And this list could be extended considerably. It would include the Panama Canal; navigation aids for air and water transportation; harbor improvements; and so on.

How much money is involved: Who knows? Whatever the total, it is many times more than the investment of private capital in railroad rights-of-way, tracks, bridges, tunnels, signals, and the other roadway facilities of the railroads.

These roadway facilities used by railroad trains are comparable to—indeed, are the counterparts of—the roadway facilities owned by government at various levels, and used by the motor vehicles, barges, ships, and airplanes which are owned and operated by private interests in competition with the railroads.

The railroads and the privately owned pipelines are the only forms of transportation whose roadway facilities are not owned by the Government.

And it should be reasonably clear that unless the Government takes its feet off the necks of the railroads, it won't be long before the Government will own them too.

Mr. Roddewig makes out a convincing case for the railroads, and there is a very real danger that, unless a more realistic approach is taken to the problems of the railroads, they will, indeed, soon be owned by the Government.

Some wag has pointed out that one way for the Government to solve the railroad problem would be to turn their management over to James R. Hoffa.

If Hoffa were in the driver's seat, perhaps he and his friends and allies would change their views about the railroads being an outmoded form of transportation.

Perhaps Mr. Hoffa could even persuade the Federal Government to take the necessary steps to keep the railroad industry in this Nation alive.

Another proposal would be to lease the railroads to some European country and then to help that country out with mutual security funds.

In any event, and all levity aside, the railroad industry will not long survive with both James Hoffa and the Federal Government competing with each other to do this great industry in.

Mr. Speaker, the railroads are indispensable. They are the only form of transportation that can move anything anywhere, at anytime. They require less manpower and fuel per ton of freight moved than any other form of land transportation, and the unit costs go down as the volume of freight moved goes up.

This ability to reduce costs through volume, and to obtain volume through reduced charges, is to the advantage of both consumers and industry. Everyone will be deprived of these advantages by unwise regulations which tie the hands of the railroad industry and which prevent the railroad industry from competing with other forms of mass transportation.

I include as part of my remarks an article by Victor Riesel which was published in the Erie Morning News of April 10, 1961. It gives an important insight into the mind and activities of James Hoffa:

JIMMIE HOFFA MUST BE KNOWN BY THE COMPANY HE KEEPS

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—Jimmie Hoffa, who despite certain rumors is as mortal as the rest of us, should be known by the company he keeps, like the rest of us. For some years now his union has been going steady with the Pacific longshoremen led by Mr. Harry Bridges, who numbers among his friends and associates many of the Soviet's U.S.-hating global labor leaders. And that's an understatement.

Thus it is of intense interest to our citizenry that Harry Bridges, president of the West Coast Longshoremen's Union, flew from San Francisco to his convention in Honolulu on March 30—and just about the same time Teamsters' President Hoffa dispatched two of his own union's representatives to the Hawaiian convention of this union, long friendly to the Sino-Soviet bloc.

If the two representatives of Hoffa's union do their duty at the leftwing longshoremen's convention and return with official reports of the parley the small print should make interesting reading to Brother Hoffa.

It is, for example, the belief of Bridges and his high command that the Cuban revolution has increased that island's agricultural output, reduced unemployment and raised wages. Bridges & Co., also feel that if through the efforts of the United States the Cuban revolution fails, it will be a blow to the Cuban people.

It is Mr. Bridges' privilege to be sweet on Castro, golfer and revolutionist. But Mr. Hoffa has publicly in the past few years asked Bridges and the Pacific Coast longshoremen to be his partners in a national transportation federation—and a federation all of whose union contracts would expire on the same day. Is it therefore unreasonable to expect some comment from Hoffa on his friend's attitude towards Cuba? No compulsion mind you, just sort of a moral issue now.

Furthermore, Harry Bridges and his union officially are for trade with Peiping China—which is not exactly a benign growth in the troubled underbelly of Asia. What is Mr. Hoffa's attitude on that pro-China trade position taken by this union with which he is linked on the west coast?

Hoffa should look as closely at what happened during the weeklong convention there, not too far from Pearl Harbor, as he does at an employer's offer. The Teamsters chief would then observe that the Bridges leadership believes that U.S. economic and military aid to some of our Asiatic friends will create explosions in South Vietnam and South Korea. Likewise Hoffa will note mighty little criticism of Communist forces where the Sino-Soviet bloc is brinking close to global war.

What thinks Mr. Hoffa of all this?

And though there can be noted no harshness towards the Iron Curtain bloc, there was warning that the civil liberties of the United States are endangered by the actions of congressional leaders.

Of course there is no insinuation here that silence on Hoffa's part means conformity with his colleague in the Teamster-sponsored Conference of Transportation Unity. It is just that constant silence on Harry Bridges' political opinions and the editorial stands of Bridges' newspaper, The Dispatcher, appears to put Hoffa in an awkward position. There was, for example, not too long ago a double-page spread in the longshoremen's publication, which appeared to speak highly of present-day Hungary.

Hoffa might send right down to his expert research department. He will be told that on February 24, 1961, The Dispatcher ran a feature called "ILWU Members Take a Look at Hungary." This is a firsthand report of a group which arrived in Budapest August 6, 1960—some 6 months before the big feature was printed. There are many hard-working American truckdrivers who are of Hungarian descent. They might like to hear what Hoffa thinks of such a report which makes all things seem so peaceful in the land occupied by Chairman Khrushchev's tank divisions.

Public Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of legislation to expand and develop the public junior colleges, I was pleased to note that the American Association of School Administrators meeting in San Francisco, Calif., St. Louis, Mo., and Philadelphia, Pa., adopted, among others, a resolution urging the expansion and rapid development of 2-year public junior colleges. Under unanimous consent, I include this resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD.

RESOLUTION EXTENDING PUBLIC EDUCATION

As the economic, social, and technical aspects of our civilization become broader, deeper, and more complex, it becomes increasingly imperative that we both intensify the preparation of all citizens and extend the opportunities for additional education to increasing proportions of our total population. Recognizing the growing need for opportunities to pursue higher education and recognizing that universities and colleges may be relieved greatly by the community college, the American Association of School Administrators urges the continued expansion and rapid development of 2-year public junior colleges, community colleges, vocational and technical schools, or other similar public post-high-school educational opportunities, and further recommends that vigorous measures be taken to continue to improve the quality of existing programs.

Rural Areas Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, in 1955 a request was made for an appropriation of $15 million to be used in the rural development program. Under the rural development program submitted the main objectives were an increase of income for small farmers with efforts to be made in making the land provide a higher level of living. In addition, better management of timber resources on our farms was to be considered and the credit needs for small farmers was to receive immediate attention. Under the vocational training program plans were to be made for the acceleration of vocational training of our young people on the farms and better health services with improved nutrition was to be given every consideration. Pilot counties were designated in many States and the objectives of the program were fully carried out.

Every dollar expended in the rural development program under the original appropriation and in the small additional amounts which have been used in the Extension Service each year has produced untold benefits for our farmers. No State in our Union has received more benefits from this program than has the State of Kentucky. One of the low income counties in the Second Congressional District in Kentucky was selected as one of the three pilot counties for Kentucky. This county is Butler County and the impact of the rural development program is directly responsible for many improvements in this particular county. Accomplishments such as a new health unit, an increase in local employment, erection of three modern buildings on the main street of the county seat town, a new Post Office building, construction of new homes and business houses, improvement of roads and schools, erection of a building for use as a meeting place for the rural development group and improvements generally in living conditions on the farms in Butler County are tangible examples of the effectiveness of this program. The people of this county are convinced that the rural development program is the soundest approach yet devised to gaining long range economic development and growth in our rural towns and communities. These people understand that the program's effectiveness depends upon their continued interest. The success of the rural development program in this county is recognized throughout the State of Kentucky and, Mr. Speaker, the same could be said of many low income counties throughout our country today if we decided to continue the rural development program as originally planned.

Mr. Speaker, recently our new Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, established a Board for rural areas development and, at the same time, issued Memorandum No. 1448 which pertains to the rural areas development program.

As pointed out by the Secretary in his announcement, the rural areas development program, in order to be successful, must stimulate local initiative to develop more jobs, more efficient family farms, new skills for willing hands, and greater opportunity for the youth who must soon decide whether to stay in his home community or seek a job elsewhere. The rural development program was a successful program and this program, together with other programs, such as the small watershed projects and the FFA program have been successfully operated, and the experience gained from same should now give us the necessary incentive to operate a rural areas development program successfully.

I know that every Member of the House will be interested in reading the announcement and the memorandum incorporated herein.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith the announcement and memorandum referred to above:

SECRETARY FREEMAN ESTABLISHES BOARD FOR RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1961.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman moved today to begin mobilizing the U.S. Department of Agriculture for maximum assistance to State and local groups in a broad program of rural area development.

He established a Rural Areas Development Board with membership from 11 departmental agencies and named John A. Baker, Director of Agricultural Credit Services, as chairman.

A Rural Areas Development staff was also created to serve the Board. It will be headed by John M. Lovorn, formerly of the Farmers Home Administration.

The Secretary said the new Board will be responsible for redirecting the programs of the Department so that they will be of greater help to farming communities and small towns attempting to develop means to earn more diversified income.

Major responsibilities of the new Rural Areas Development staff will include: Recommending areas for priority attention; reviewing departmental programs to assure that they are providing maximum help to local groups; maintaining liaison with other Federal Departments on the program; preparing inventories of service provided by the Department of Agriculture in program areas.

Secretary Freeman emphasized that, while the Board will initiate and coordinate the supporting programs of the Department, State and local leaders will be primarily responsible for initiating and carrying forward area programs and individual development projects to stimulate economic growth in rural areas.

"Through this program, the full resources of the Department will be directed toward the provision of tools for use of local development efforts to eliminate underemployment and the blight of chronic poverty in rural America," he said.

"We know that a program of this type will help promote new industries in areas where a factory is the breath of life to a whole county. It can mean developing a new market for old products and it can mean development of new products for new markets.

"But where today we have a few good examples of rural development we want a thousand success stories tomorrow. The Department will supply substantially expanded leadership and support to help farmers and small town residents and their organizations and local and State government units to convert desire into ambition, and hope into action.

"To be successful, this program should stimulate local initiative to develop more jobs, more efficient family farms, new skills for willing hands, and greater opportunity for the youth who must soon decide whether to stay in his home community or seek a job elsewhere.

"We intend to build this effort on the base of experience gained in such programs as rural electrification, development of cooperatives, farm credit, extension, FFA, small watershed projects, rural development, and other programs in soil, water, and forest improvement and conservation of natural and human resources."

The 11 agencies represented on the Rural Areas Development Board are: Agricultural Marketing Service, Agricultural Research Service, Commodity Stabilization Service, Economic Research Service, Farmers Home Administration, Farmer Cooperative Service, Federal Extension Service, Forest Service, Rural Electrification Administration, Soil Conservation Service, and Statistical Reporting Service.

RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Memorandum No. 1448.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1961.

1. Objective: Underemployment in rural America is a serious problem. More than 35 percent of the farm families had incomes under $2,000 in 1959. The full resources of the Department of Agriculture must be directed toward the elimination of this serious low-income underemployment problem State and local authorities throughout the Nation are aware of this situation and are attempting to stimulate economic growth and income opportunities in areas of underemployment. All Department of Agriculture agencies must commit their resources toward the support of the State and local authorities in this work. The Department expects, through the means established in this memorandum, to assure needed assistance to local initiative, leadership and coordinated action in meeting the economic needs of rural areas, in keeping with the broad responsibilities of the Department.

2. Direction of rural areas development program: The Director of Agricultural Credit Services is hereby designated to supervise and direct the rural areas development program and to coordinate and focus the resources of the departmental agencies in their assistance to the State, local, private, community, Statewide organizations, farm organizations and interested individuals working toward the improvement of underemployed areas.

3. Rural areas development staff: In order to provide for effective departmental participation in this effort, a rural areas development staff is hereby established, under the general supervision and direction of the Director of Agricultural Credit Services. The duties of the rural areas development staff will be to—

(a) Recommend the delineation of development areas, on the basis of the economic subregional grouping of rural counties, for use by the Secretary in formally designating such areas.

(b) Maintain a continuous study to determine how programs of the Department can be (1) brought to bear on the particular problems in each designated rural development area, (2) assure that program agencies are giving effective technical assistance to private groups and local and State governments in formulating a comprehensive development program and are making their full resources available in supporting project plans for each designated area.

(c) Prepare for each designated development area a departmental rural area de-

velopment program inventory, consisting of an itemization of the services and programs, and proposed improvements thereof, currently provided by the Department. The inventory for each designated area shall be periodically revised as required by changing conditions.

(d) Maintain continuous liaison with appropriate departments and agencies of the executive branch to assure coordination of effort and utilization of all available resources in the total program.

(e) Prepare and publish current reports on local achievement and progress in formulating and implementing rural development programs in designated areas.

4. Rural Areas Development Board: There is hereby established, within the Department, a Rural Areas Development Board, whose function shall be to provide advisory aid to the Secretary and the Rural Areas Development staff in appraising and determining program needs, and to provide liaison with Department agencies in planning and carrying out a fully coordinated action program. Establishment of the Board is designed to assure effective participation by appropriate agencies and offices of the Department and application of all Departmental resources to implementation of the program. The Board will consist of representatives of the following agencies: Agricultural Marketing Service, Agricultural Research Service, Commodity Stabilization Service, Economic Research Service, Farmers Home Administration, Farmer Cooperative Service, Federal Extension Service, Forest Service, Rural Electrification Administration, Soil Conservation Service, and Statistical Reporting Service.

The head of each designated agency shall designate a responsible permanent representative to serve on the Rural Areas Development Board who will represent the interest and activity of his agency in the rural areas development program.

The Director of Agricultural Credit Services shall be the Chairman of the Board; the Director of the Rural Areas Development staff shall be the executive secretary.

Each agency represented on the Board shall develop operating policies and procedures for effectuating its part in providing services and technical assistance to private groups and State and local governmental agencies in moving ahead rapidly with the Rural Areas Development program. Agency plans for implementing their responsibilities in the program shall be presented to the Chairman of the Rural Areas Development Board for review and approval.

5. Agency and staff office cooperation: The Rural Area Development Board and staff shall draw upon other departmental agencies and staff offices for information and assistance needed in carrying out their responsibilities.

6. Local participation: Priority attention shall be given to requiring that initiation of activities under the Rural Areas Development program and maximum participation therein shall rest with citizens and organizations and groups of citizens and State and local governments and instrumentalities thereof in rural areas.

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

The Padre of the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the House today was led in prayer by one who has justly earned the honor of being called "the padre of the Americas." The Reverened Dr. Joseph F. Thorning is the pastor of St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor, a historic church in the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland. But Father Thorning ministers to a congregation that extends far beyond the geographical boundaries of his parish. His intimate knowledge of our Latin American neighbors has justified the respect in which he is held by his friends in both the Americas. It explains his presence in the House today in anticipation of Pan American Day.

Father Thorning's humanitarian interest in the welfare of our good neighbors reflects Thomas Jefferson's attitude toward Latin America when, as Secretary of State, he said:

> Nor are we acting for ourselves, alone, but for the whole human race.

And I know that Father Thorning's interest in the affairs of Latin America is a reflection of his concern for the future of all mankind.

It is not often that a Member of this House can welcome a constituent of such distinction to participation in the proceedings of this body. I take a particular pride in extending that welcome to Father Thorning today, and thank him for the prayer that he has offered.

Military Survivors, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the State Legislature of California on March 23 adopted House Resolution 174, relative to an organization known as Military Survivors, Inc. The resolution which was introduced by Assemblymen Luckel, Schrade, Hegland, and Mills pays tribute to Military Survivors, Inc., and under unanimous consent I include the resolution as a portion of my remarks:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 174

Resolution relative to commending Military Survivors, Inc.

Whereas Military Survivors, Inc., is a nonprofit organization devoted to assisting the surviving dependents of U.S. Armed Forces personnel throughout the United States and in some outlying areas; and

Whereas the membership of Military Survivors, Inc., is composed of widows, retired service personnel, and other survivors of service personnel with a keen awareness of the problems and hardships confronting persons who have lost loved ones in military service; and

Whereas since its formation in August of 1955, Military Survivors, Inc., has by mail, telephone, and personal contacts helped hundreds of survivors of servicemen in all branches of the uniformed services; and

Whereas the organization has contributed to the passage of legislation substantially benefiting thousands of military survivors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That Military Survivors Inc., is hereby commended for its fine work and accomplishments; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of this assembly pay tribute to the founders and members of Military Survivors, Inc., for their inspiring devotion to so worthy a cause; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly prepare and transmit a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to Military Survivors, Inc.

Secretary McNamara Shows Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with permission to revise and extend my remarks I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article entitled "McNamara Speeding Many Inquiries, Using Answers at Once To Strengthen Defenses." This article was written by Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U.S. Army, retired, who is the military analyst of the Post-Dispatch in St. Louis. The article indicates that Secretary McNamara has an understanding of management techniques and is proceeding in a courageous way to bring about necessary improvements toward reorganization of the sprawling activities in the Department of Defense.

This is one of the most encouraging developments in recent years, since it must be apparent to everyone concerned that there must be a firm hand at the helm of the Department of Defense if we are to take the lead in the race with the Soviets upon which depends not only our security and safety but the solvency of our economy. I am particularly pleased that Secretary McNamara is using the authority at his disposal in eliminating unnecessary duplication and waste in supply and service functions in the defense agencies. I congratulate him on his efforts and suggest that he be given full encouragement in his important work.

The article follows:

MCNAMARA SPEEDING MANY INQUIRIES, USING ANSWERS AT ONCE TO STRENGTHEN DEFENSES—ONE HUNDRED AND SIX QUESTIONS ALREADY SHOW RESULTS IN MISSILE SPEEDUP, INCREASED BOMBER ALERT, CENTRALIZED SPACE ACTIVITY, CLOSING OF EXCESS BASES

(By Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U.S. Army, retired)

The 106 questions (there may be more by now) to which Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara has demanded answers with various close deadlines have the Pentagon staffs working nights to a degree not known since the Korean war.

Some of the answers have already been made public in the President's message on the defense budget. These come under the headings of "strengthening and protecting our startegic deterrent and defense, strengthening our ability to deter or confine limited war," and "savings made possible by progress."

Among the decisions were the acceleration of Polaris, Minuteman and Skybolt missile programs, provision for increased ground alert by bombers and the provisions of ad-

ditional funds for important existing satellite programs.

Hard questions and difficult decisions had to be made in the answers that resulted in the cancellation of two Titan squadrons in favor of more Minuteman missiles, the accelerated phaseout of the B–47 medium bomber, the elimination of the Snark missile, the cutback of the B–70 program to four prototypes and the cancellation of the nuclear-powered aircraft program.

Another answer to one of McNamara's questions was the directive issued March 6, placing almost full responsibility on the Air Force for military space activities. This had been the intent of a directive issued in September 1959 by former Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy, but his intent was being eroded by the Army and Navy efforts to develop their own often-competing space programs.

The controls prescribed by McElroy were inadequate. Now McNamara has tight control; no new space program can be funded unless it has been approved by the Director of Defense Research and Engineering and by either McNamara or his Under Secretary, Roswell L. Gilpatric.

The manner in which all services were letting their imaginations soar over space programs that were far beyond the state of the booster art, and many of which never could have succeeded under any circumstances, fully justified the tighter control prescribed in this answer to one of McNamara's questions. The savings that will be effected from this question and answer will amount to hundreds of millions of dollars.

Another answer, only the beginning of the answer to this question, resulted in the closing, announced March 30, of 52 excess defense installations in the United States and 21 overseas. Other announcements of this nature will follow as the investigation of the need for all of the 6,700 defense installations proceeds.

The monetary savings from the actions announced thus far are expected to amount to $220 million annually. Even more important, 21,000 military personnel will be released from these operations and will be made available for other duties. This was the reason that it was possible for the President to ask for an increase in military personnel of only 13,000 men.

McNamara hopes by further actions of this nature, and through combination of functions now performed in duplicate by the three services, to make it unnecessary to call for an increase in personnel strength of the armed services. He is confident, he remarked, that the United States can fulfill its military commitments with the 2,500,000 men in uniform it now maintains, if they are used effectively.

In answer to another question, the announcement was made March 31 that responsibility for military construction would be consolidated in 17 of 42 Army Engineer districts. Military construction is now being carried on by 31 engineer districts.

The reassignment of work loads is expected to result in the reduction of about 1,700 of the Corps of Engineers' 40,900 employees. At the same time all missile-site construction has been consolidated in one office under an Army engineer brigadier general who has been made subordinate to the Air Force.

The most recent answer to another of McNamara's questions was made with the announcement that the Department of the Army will be responsible for the establishment and management of a single geodetic and mapping program. For mapping and geodetic measurements by satellite, the Air Force will provide the launch vehicle and recover the payloads.

The Army will process the data and make the basic maps. From the basic maps the Air Force will make its aeronautical charts and the Navy will make its hydrographic charts insofar as these include land areas.

The Air Force will also be responsible for conduct of aerial mapping and geodetic systems requiring the service of manned high-performance aircraft. But these operations will be conducted in accordance with a schedule provided by the Army, which will process the raw data and photographs.

This directive will centralize under the Army all the processing and computation of raw data and photographs into maps. Some of the equipment used is extremely expensive. The directive will prevent the duplication of such facilities and the manpower that would be used if each service were to proceed to do the whole task by itself.

These decisions are arrived at in different ways. The directive giving the Air Force control of most military space operations was worked out outside the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The draft directive was supplied to the chairman and the three service secretaries for comment within 6 days.

The Navy objected violently to the directive, since it had started a large space program. The Navy program duplicated other Air Force, Army and National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs to some degree. And there was complaint that the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the service secretaries did not have enough time for study.

The answer to this complaint given by many observers in the Pentagon is that, if the many problems requiring solution in which there are service differences were given to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, they never would be solved.

If McNamara is going to accomplish anything to improve the efficiency of the Defense Department and the unified operation of services, these observers say, he is going about it in the only way possible. During the last 13 years, every previous secretary has been frustrated by one of the other services in attempting to carry out the idea of the unification legislation.

In the case of the assignment of mapping and geodetic responsibility to the Army, the problem was given to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, rather than a civilian committee, to find the answer. The directive issued is substantially as recommended by the Joint Chiefs. The Air Force objected strongly, but was overruled.

McNamara's 106 questions are the product of 2 lists of problems in the Pentagon that McNamara and Gilpatric believed needed corrective action or, at least, investigation.

Gilpatric calls the method a management tool. By formation of expert committees, or reference to the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a committee, he poses a problem that requires a solution. He sets a deadline for a reply and the reply must include a directive to put the answer into effect.

Dissents are given a hearing. All concerned have a chance to object or comment, but this process is not permitted to go on indefinitely. The discussions and changes are agreed on in a limited time.

The speed of action that McNamara insists on has the Pentagon gasping. There is little time for the plots and stratagem that individual services have used in the past to frustrate previous secretaries.

In organizational matters, a special management planning group under Solis Horowitz in the office of Defense Counsel Cyrus Vance is responsible. He has three not-too-senior officers, one from each service, each of whom is an expert in the organization of his service.

McNamara refers organization weaknesses to Vance for investigation. One of Horowitz's officers is assigned as action officer. He gathers information and makes a study. From this a report is prepared in collaboration with his colleagues.

This goes to McNamara for review. If he decides a change is indicated, the management group prepares the draft of a directive. This is the basis for obtaining the comments and criticism of the Chiefs of Staff, the Secretaries, and other agencies involved. After all this is reviewed by McNamara, and after further discussion by him with his military and civil advisers, the directive is issued, possibly after it has been modified in response to objections, as was the case with the military space order.

The Secretary of Defense has vast powers in the organization and operation of the Department of Defense. These were greatly increased by the Reorganization Act of 1958. McNamara is the first Secretary of Defense with the courage to use these powers to cut through the objections of special service interests and their allies in Congress.

In particular, the so-called McCormack-Curtis amendment is a grant of great authority. After many efforts in Congress to attempt to force the Defense Department to proceed with a reorganization of the supply and service functions that were overlapping had been frustrated, House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Webster Groves, proposed legislation, which was adopted, that gave the Secretary of Defense an almost free hand in reorganizing supply and service activities.

The amendment seems rather innocuous on first reading, and that is the reason that it was accepted by Chairman CARL VINSON of the Armed Services Committee.

It reads, in part: "Whenever the Secretary of Defense determines that it will be advantageous to the Government in terms of effectiveness, economy, or efficiency, he shall provide for the carrying out of any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as he deems appropriate."

According to an authentic Pentagon source, no major reorganizational changes are planned at present in the Defense Department. These large and difficult problems will be put off until late this year when the new Defense officials will be sure enough of their ground to make more far-reaching moves than those now in process. They will be the result of thorough study, will improve efficiency and effectiveness of the operations and will save money and personnel.

Jewish Women of Maryland Favor Kennedy Proposal for Federal Aid to Public Schools Only

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, in view of the nationwide interest in the request of President Kennedy for Federal aid for public schools, I believe that the resolution adopted by the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations of Maryland will be of interest to all Members.

Therefore, under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix a copy of this resolution, endorsing the administration's recommendations and opposing Federal aid to other than public schools:

RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

Whereas one of the basic principles upon which our democracy was founded is the separation of church and state; and

Whereas Federal aid to other than public education is a direct violation of that principle and can lead only to the detriment of the welfare of our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations of Maryland, consisting of 71 constituent organizations and representing 30,000 women in convention assembled on Thursday, March 23, 1961, urges that the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Maryland vote for the passages of H.R. 4970 and H.R. 5266; and be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Maryland, and the Senators from the State of Maryland.

Education Without Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, at a recent Freedom Forum held in San Diego on January 20, 1961, one of the speakers was the distinguished president of Pepperdine College at Los Angeles, Mr. M. Norvel Young. Mr. Young's comments as an educator and patriot will be of great interest to my colleagues and I urge their thoughtful consideration of his remarks.

Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Young's speech as a portion of my remarks:

EDUCATION WITHOUT FEDERAL AID

(Remarks of Mr. M. Norvel Young, president, Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, to the Freedom Forum, San Diego, Calif., January 20, 1961)

What will education be profited if it gains billions of dollars in Federal aid and loses its own freedom? What should a teacher or a school give in exchange for its freedom? The history of 19 out of 21 notable civilizations studied by Arnold Toynbee points out that "they died from within and not by conquest from without." Great republics like those of Greece and Rome gradually exchanged their local freedom and its responibilities for more and more centralized control and its promised protection and aid. They became less and less free and finally they lost both freedom and aid.

Of course, this is not to minimize the tremendous needs of higher education and of education at the secondary and elementary levels. But must we take our educational problems to Washington for solution?

Here are some specific reasons why we believe in improving our educational process without Federal aid:

1. Basically Federal aid always means Federal control. As Justice Jackson stated in a Supreme Court decision regarding controls in agriculture: "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

There are, for example, 12 direct controls under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and this is but a drop in the bucket of the amount of money and of the extent of controls which will be forthcoming in the decades ahead if we do not reverse the present trend. The National Defense Education Act definitely affects the curriculum and the emphasis of the schools which are aided. Moreover, the granting or withholding of large amounts of money has a way of influencing the thinking of the most resolute and independent administrator.

2. Federal aid is objectionable because it will reduce local and private responsibility for the education of our children and our young men and women at the college and university level. There is a kind of Parkinson's law that "interest diminishes as responsibility is removed." The primary responsibility for the education of our youth is upon the home. The family is still the basic unit of our society. The closer the education of our youth can be kept to the home, the longer we will preserve our freedom. The trend has already developed for the average American parent to take little or no responsibility for the normal education of his children. This, the average parent has come to believe, is instead a job solely for the "professionals." More responsibility is ultimately being transferred from the local school board and placed in the hands of the State. Ultimately, this trends toward removing responsibility from the State and placing it upon the Federal Government.

3. The prospect of Federal aid also undermines and deactivates interest in solving the problem at the local level. The White House Conference on Education in 1955 found that "no State represented has a demonstrated financial incapacity to build the schools it will need during the next 5 years." Approximately 230 of the more than 42,000 school districts in America have reached their bonded limit. Our citizens are taking responsibility at the local level and would do more with the proper public promotional effort and if the prospect of the Federal Government stepping in to assume these responsibilities were not an inducement to inaction at the local level. Between 1949–50 and 1959–60 there was an increase of 38 percent in school population and an increase of 124 percent in revenues raised for schools. Let us stimulate and encourage local and private responsibility rather than discourage it by saying to those citizens who are willing to sacrifice for their children's education: "You are foolish. Why don't you relax and let the Federal Government do this for you."

4. The last objection which I will mention, although certainly these are not the only ones which could be listed, is this: Federal aid will tend to break down our historic separation of public and privately supported education or it will further increase the disparity between the support of the two systems. I believe in the values of our dual system of education. We need the tax-supported and the voluntarily supported schools and colleges. They complement each other and serves as a check upon each other and help to assure our continuing freedom of speech, of religion, of education. The wide variety of educational opportunities possible under our dual system is calculated to serve us well in the changing world we face.

Federal aid which is restricted only to tax-supported schools will increase on individuals and corporations which are now voluntarily supporting both tax-supported and voluntarily supported schools. Private education needs more voluntary support and such support is growing. In 1960, corporate aid to education topped $150 million and it is growing rapidly. If this aid is restricted to tax-supported institutions it will add impetus to the present trend for more and more education to rely upon tax support.

The economic pressure upon private schools and colleges is tremendous today. What will it be in the decades ahead if Federal aid is granted in billions of dollars to those institutions which are willing to submit to Federal control?

Now let us turn to a few suggestions as to what can be done to help solve our problems in education without Federal aid.

1. Parents can become more concerned about the needs of schools in their own districts and take more interest in school board elections, in PTA work, in support of local or State bond issues. Businessmen need to be alerted to the importance of more support for teachers and proper housing for an expanding army of students.

School revenues have increased three times as fast as school population in the last decade and we have not begun to exert the influence which can be exerted to do a better job at the local level. If the same amount of time and effort were expended to stir up concern at the local level as has been spent to stir up pressure for Federal aid we would be showing much greater progress.

2. Much more voluntary support needs to be given by individuals and corporations and foundations. Irving S. Olds has expressed the growing conviction of more and more businessmen: "Unless American business recognizes and meets its obligation to higher education, it is not properly protecting the long-range interest of its stockholders, its employees and its customers." More and more corporations are recognizing the enlightened self-interest of voluntary corporate support of higher education.

The council for financial aid to education has done an outstanding job of stimulating concern for voluntary support to education. This type of activity could be multiplied with the wholehearted cooperation of teachers, parents, and professional leaders labor leaders as well as leaders in industry. There is more money in the stewardship of foundations than ever before. Bequests for education are at an alltime high. Surely we can step up this voluntary support. If any action is undertaken at the national level, why not let it be the encouragement of voluntary support by giving tax credit or tax exemption for larger gifts by corporations and for tuition paid by individuals.

3. If there are, as contended by some, those school districts that are too poor to do an adequate job of education, may we suggest that aid be given by a concerted effort on the part of foundations and corporations and possibly even by direct aid from wealthy districts or States. This may sound unrealistic, but Americans are spending millions for causes that are no more worthy. The proper promotion of an aid to underprivileged school districts could result in millions of dollars in support without Federal control. Many of the school districts which are not giving adequate support would take a searching new look if they realized that their needs were the concern of others. Many of them could do better if they would.

The best of educational opportunities for our American youth can be provided without sacrificing local control and responsibility, if we approach the challenge courageously and with dedication and determination.

Recently Pepperdine College rejected Federal loans available for the financing of dormitory construction and chose to meet the needs of the increased student body through the issuance of bonds sold through private channels. It did so because it hoped to encourage others to rely on their own resources and initiative rather than resort to the sometimes easier but infinitely more potentially hazardous route of Federal subsidization. Only such action directed toward the traditional American cause of self-reliance and independence can halt the present trend toward the proliferation of Federal control and supervision and pass intact our free institutions to succeeding generations.

The New Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pine Bluff (Ark.) Commercial of April 1, 1961:

THE NEW PERIL

We have been trying to work up a proper degree of concern and indignation about the John Birch Society, and have not so far made the grade.

The society may well be the menace it is being painted to be. We remember a fellow who laughed at Joe McCarthy.

But the Republic has stood off the Soviet Union since 1945 and, with considerable help, whipped two sets of Fascists plus Mussolini's legions more or less simultaneously in the period immediately preceding.

It lived through the Know-Nothings, the Klan, the Silver Shirts, and the aforementioned McCarthy, and will, from all indications, also survive the Citizens Councils.

We are experienced, as a Nation, with crackpots and authoritarians. If the John Birch Society is not about the nearest to impotent of the lot, we are, as a newspaper, a good way wide of the mark.

It has been alleged that the John Birch Society is a hate group; hence dangerous. Certainly it is made up of people who know how to hate, and who enjoy the sport. But they are also, and more profoundly, people shaken to their being by fear.

Whether the founder (who girded for his present large responsibilities in his brother's candy factory) knows it or not, the John Birch Society is built upon the proposition that mankind is doomed, and that there is now time only for a desperate rearguard action.

The society is convinced that all forces of change are exclusively in the service of the Kremlin, and that they threaten the civilized world at every point of contact.

What we have here is a fellowship of fear. In its articles of faith, the society resembles nothing so much as one of those sects which have from time to time taken to the basement and sealed up the cracks around the door in the conviction that the world would end at 5:27 a.m. a week from Thursday.

Consider the men and things which the John Birchers or their founder have already conceded to the Communists: They include the President and his predecessor, the Supreme Court, the Nation's city managers, the urban renewal advocates, the proponents of fluoridation, the United Nations.

These people don't need condemnation. They need help.

They need, each of them, a quick course in American history, a heart-to-heart talk with a trustworthy friend and then, perhaps, a good, long rest.

The evidence is that John Birchism is incurable, but we can try.

Nor does John Birchism seem to us to be contagious. The presumption on which the organization has been viewed so generally with alarm is that it is a virus likely to infect innocent people.

All of the evidence we've seen indicates that the people already had the virus, and have simply gotten together to share its miseries.

We suppose that there may be people in meaningful numbers willing to take the oath of allegiance to an outfit which is willing to forfeit the American system of government for something the John Birchers call, quite gratuitously, the American way of life.

But we doubt that there are many men of sound mind willing to accept the collateral dictum that Dwight Eisenhower is a Communist.

To the extent that they have done anything, except to each other and themselves, the John Birchers seem to us to have performed a substantial public service.

They have alerted their fellow Americans to the existence on the far, far right of the political spectrum of people every bit as confused, troubled, and willing to be led around by the nose as their opposite numbers on the far, far left.

The society also has provided an interesting litmus test for some of our noisier politicians.

Senator EASTLAND, for example, has just spoken well of them.

Until they move beyond their present activities, which appear to consist pretty exclusively of whipping up each others' hysteria and of occasionally slandering men so eminent as to be substantially invulnerable to such attacks, we think the John Birchers more a nuisance than a peril.

If we must have people willing to believe in the things the society stands for, we may as well have the society.

The existence of such a group is bound to cut down on the number of Birchists running around unencumbered by the label, and thus likely to be mistaken for responsible citizens.

Peter Hofstra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report that the Holland-American community of New Jersey has lost a renowned leader. On Easter Sunday night, Peter Hofstra, a vice consul of the Netherlands, succumbed in his 75th year.

Migrating with his parents to the Paterson area, where he held successive jobs in his youth as a sweeper, delivery boy, and butcher boy, Mr. Hofstra studied law at New York Law School and was admitted to practice in 1915. In the span of almost one-half of a century, Attorney Hofstra built one of the most widely respected law firms in the State. Hofstra & Hofstra has represented several municipalities in Passaic and Bergen Counties and is counsel for many area banking institutions.

As vice consul of the Netherlands, Mr. Hofstra had served as official escort in New Jersey for Queen Wilhelmina and later Queen Juliana on their visits to the United States. In December of last year, Queen Juliana appointed Mr. Hofstra a member of the Order of Orange-Nassau for his dedicated service to the Netherlands.

Tall and erect, a veritable giant among men, Peter Hofstra is mourned by all who ever had the pleasure of making his acquaintance. He leaves surviving his devoted wife, the former Cora De Lazier; and two children, Peter R., like his father a member of the New Jersey bar; and Mrs. Alfred Fauver, who resides in Quincy, Mass.

The Role of SAC in the Aerospace Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, on March 16 I had the great good fortune to attend a luncheon given by the civic and business leaders of Little Rock and Pulaski County, Ark., marking the 15th anniversary of the Strategic Air Command. The principal speaker on this occasion was Lt. Gen. J. P. McConnell, commander of the Second Air Force, Barksdale AFB, La., and himself a native Arkansan.

General McConnell delivered an outstanding address, and under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a copy of this address in the RECORD:

THE ROLE OF SAC IN THE AEROSPACE AGE

It is always a pleasure for me to come back to my native State. And I was happy that I could accept the invitation to speak here today. The wild blue yonder I once dreamed about as an Arkansas youngster has expanded into the limitless reaches of space. That is why a new term was needed to properly designate the indivisible expanse embracing both the earth's atmosphere and the vast space beyond.

This new term is aerospace, and is readily understandable to you who are so close to Little Rock Air Force Base where preparations for the coming of the intercontinental Titan II ballistic missile are being made.

Since SAC's inventory of weapons includes both manned bombers and intercontinental missiles, it is today an aerospace force with a twofold mission. Although I'm sure you know what SAC's mission is, I want to state it briefly and simply so it can be easily kept in mind as we explore the complexities of its significance. In peacetime, our mission is to maintain an aerospace counterforce capable of deterring Communist aggression, and if this fails and war comes, to mount simultaneously nuclear retaliatory attacks against the enemy's war-making capability to the extent that he no longer has the capacity or even the will to wage war.

Although we state SAC's mission in two parts, it is in reality indivisible—indivisible in the same sense that air and space are indivisible and that the present and the future are indivisible.

SAC's mission cannot actually be partitioned into segments because if we did not possess the aerospace-nuclear capability of instant retaliation, stating a peacetime mission would be meaningless. Moreover, SAC's mission is an integral part of the overall United States Air Force mission, underlying which is the overriding purpose of helping to preserve world peace.

Since the most serious and immediate military threat to world peace is the Soviet's powerful aerospace capability, SAC's role as the long-range global aerospace force of this Nation assumes an ever-increasing significance.

I am sure that you who live so close to our personnel at Little Rock Air Force Base realize that SAC people are dedicated people. Our professional specialists, airmen and officers alike, are well aware of the grave responsibility entrusted to them.

Sometimes, unfortunately, some people misinterpret SAC's dedication. Indeed, some segments of public opinion believe that SAC promotes the manned bomber at the expense of the missile and the spectacular space vehicles that are yet to be.

More than anything else, I want to emphasize that SAC is dedicated to only one thing—its mission, not the manned bomber or any weapon.

The reason for this is clear when it is understood that weapon systems are tailored to the mission; the mission is not tailored to weapon systems.

As a matter of fact, SAC's mission has remained realtively unchanged since the command was established in 1946. During that time weapon systems have changed drastically because of the rapid technological progress that has marked the past decade or so. Our business was and is to prevent war from starting by maintaining a capability to mount nuclear retaliatory attacks that would destroy the enemy's war-making capability.

Modernizing our strike force has been a continuing function in the past and today we are integrating intercontinental ballistic missiles and airborne missiles into our inventory as rapidly as they become available to us.

A considerable portion of the SAC effort today is concerned with plans for the future when new types of aerospace hardware will augment the proven and reliable weapon systems, and replace some of those that will become obsolete.

However, in the understandable excitement over future possibilities, too many people seem to lose track of the fact that what we are going to have in the future does not contribute to today's deterrent force. This does not imply that there's no need to be concerned about the future, but it does point up the fact that today SAC's manned bombers—the B–47, B–52, and B–58—constitute the principal war-deterring weapon systems in the free world's arsenal. This doesn't mean that SAC's manned bombers are the only deterrent to a Soviet attack, but, in the words of Gen. Thomas S. Power, SAC's Commander in Chief, "There can be no doubt that, for the immediate future, they (SAC's manned bombers) will continue to contribute the major share to our deterrent posture. In fact, over 90 percent of the total firepower in the free world, as measured in TNT equivalents, is being carried in SAC bomb bays today."

This fact helps explain why we are so concerned with the protection of SAC's manned bomber strength. Whatever the future may bring, the survivability of SAC's deterrent strength must be one of our major concerns. In view of the Soviet's giant strides in modernizing its aerospace force, it is imperative to understand that a modern war would have to be fought with the force remaining after the first attack. If an enemy should succeed in knocking out the bulk of this Nation's military strength with a surprise attack, the best we could achieve would be only a token response in the way of retaliation.

Therefore, the key to maintaining an effective deterrent is survivability. So long as the would-be aggressor knows that he cannot possibly knock out our retaliatory punch with one sudden blow, he is likely to be deterred from starting a general war, or for that matter, even a limited war.

Another fact often overlooked by those who forecast the demise of aircraft is that just because today's aircraft will someday certainly be obsolete does not mean that tomorrow's aircraft will be obsolete tomorrow. For instance, plans for the future include providing some piloted aircraft which will reach altitudes called "space equivalent," as well as lower altitudes, that is traveling at altitudes from 10,000 feet to hundreds of miles beyond the earth's surface. Some will be, in effect, piloted recoverable missiles. Others will be manned bombers carrying air-launched ballistic missiles.

Thus, while the aircraft is no longer the only aerospace weapon system, radically advanced versions of it will be with us as far into the future as any military aerospace expert can see today.

The point I am making here is that the advent of missiles did not make the manned systems obsolete, either for the free world or the Communist world. The advent of missiles did indicate, however, the coming of the day when the emphasis will shift temporarily from manned to unmanned systems. For instance, the day is not too far distant when the missile badge will be as familiar sight in these parts as the pilot's wings are today. The construction work now going on in this part of Arkansas to support two Titan missiles squadrons is similar to that either started or scheduled to start at 19 other SAC localities.

Meanwhile, even though we are still in the early stages of phasing in the first generation of ballistic missiles, SAC and the Air Research and Development Command are well along in the program of developing a second generation missile, the Minuteman. A solid-propellent-type ballistic missile with intercontinental range, the Minuteman will give us a flexibility in our missile force that we do not now possess. Some of these missiles will be positioned in hardened underground sites scattered throughout the country while others will be mounted on specially built railroad cars which will move freely and continuously around rail networks. You'll probably recall that the Minuteman was successfully launched on its initial test at Cape Canaveral, Fla., a little more than a month ago. This was the first time that a U.S. missile had been tested as a complete structure on the initial full-scale launching. The success of this full-scale Minuteman launching was one of the most encouraging tests ever conducted by the Air Force.

Looking beyond the missile and advanced versions of manned aircraft, SAC's plans include a time when control of space may well mean a superior military position here on earth in a future war. In this connection, Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Chief of Staff, recently said: "Lacking specific guarantee that the benefits of space science and technology will be used solely for peaceful purposes, it is essential that we consider the application of this knowledge to our military capabilities. There is no dividing line between air and space and they must be considered as one medium—aerospace.

"Advancing technology will inevitably carry with it the opportunity for improved aerospace capabilities. Therefore, we must move steadily toward operations in space—not merely because it is there challenging us, but because it is vital to our Nation's security to do so."

Along this same line, General Power has said: "The conquest of space is more than a race for scientific firsts and national prestige. Whether we like it or not, it still is primarily a question of survival."

In my terms, this simply amplifies the age-old saying that the future belongs to those who prepare for it. Our future doesn't just happen; it is built on the foundations of today's efforts.

This country's military and civilian planners today are busily engaged in work on plans and programs for the future. All the military services, including the Air Force, are interested in vehicles that would give us better communications systems, better reconnaissance systems, and better navigational aids.

But whatever the future vehicles are made available to us, SAC, as a combat-ready organization today, must base its activities on what we have available to us today.

For example, how do we get our warning time today to insure that enough of our counterforce would survive an initial attack? In the case of a surprise attack by intercontinental missiles, we would have precious little, if any, warning time since they can travel 6,300 miles in about 30 minutes.

Against aircraft, however, this country and Canada have in operation an effective air defense system comprised of a network of radar equipment and facilities stationed in three lines across the North American Continent.

The first is the DEW, or Distant Early Warning line that extends from Alaska across the northern Canadian territory to Greenland. The second runs from ocean to ocean across mid-Canada. The third roughly coincides with the United States-Canadian border.

Tied in with an electronic computing system called SAGE for semiautomatic ground environment, this warning system is under the joint control of United States and Canadian forces. This joint command is the North American Air Defense organization which is more commonly known as Norad. Headquarters for Norad are at Ent AFB near Colorado Springs, Colo. It is comprised of American Air Force and Army units and Canadian military personnel. A closed television circuit as well as communication lines connect SAC and Norad headquarters.

This whole system is predicated on the indication that if the Soviets launched a surprise attack on us today, it would be primarily a manned bomber attack. Since SAC's global support facilities and centralized organization more than match the Soviet's manned strike capability, the assurance that Norad could give us sufficient warning time practically guarantees that SAC could get its alert force airborne before it could be attacked on the ground.

Thus we have reasonable assurance that a significant portion of SAC's strike force would survive a surprise attack. Moreover, the fact that portions of our force are maintained both on an around-the-clock 15 minute ground alert and on airborne alert is as well known to the Soviet Bloc as it is to you people here. All of this constitutes an effective deterrent for it assures survival of much of our manned bomber force.

As defense against the growing Soviet missile capability, this country has under construction today a warning system that will alert us of a Soviet attack by ballistic missiles. This system is called BMEWS—B-M-E-W-S—which is derived from its name, Ballistic Missile Early Warning System. It will give us the 15-minute warning time to which we are geared today with our ground-alert operation.

The first BMEWS station, located near Thule in Greenland, is now operational. A second station is programed for completion this year in Alaska, and the third and final one in England is expected to be ready sometime next year.

The BMEWS long-range radar warning station in Greenland was completed first because it covers the area that includes the most direct missile route from Soviet territory to this country.

But what are we doing now in the face of the possibility of a missile attack over the unprotected sides of the vast Arctic region? After thoroughly testing the airborne alert tactic, we recently got the go-ahead order to incorporate it in our daily, routine training exercises.

This means that we are now keeping a portion of our bombers in the air where they are invulnerable to a surprise attack. Gen-

eral Power recommended that the airborne alert be put into effect because a military commander always must assume he will have to operate under the worst possible conditions.

Airborne alert aircraft stay in the air until their replacements, other combat-ready bombers, are in a designated flight pattern. The bombers are refueled in the air by KC–135 tankers as often as necessary to insure the needed range and endurance. Ordinarily airborne alert missions last about 24 hours.

Flight plans have been worked out to provide maximum coverage of potential enemy targets. Each bomber on an airborne alert training mission flies a preplanned in-and-out pattern, dictated by fuel and range considerations. Today, airborne alert missions are part of the regular crew training program conducted by all SAC B–52 units such as the one stationed at Blytheville Air Force Base. These missions are flown under the most realistic simulated combat conditions.

Airborne bombers equipped with air-to-ground missiles will greatly enhance the value of our airborne alert. I refer here to the Hound Dog, a supersonic guided jet missile that is now coming into our inventory. The Hound Dog's carrier initially is the advanced B–52G that has demonstrated a capability to fly more than 9,000 miles without refueling.

And, sometime this year a still further advanced version, the B–52H, is scheduled to be delivered to SAC. Earlier models of the B–52 can be modified to carry the Hound Dog.

A B–52 carrying a pair of Hound Dogs with nuclear weapons in their warheads can fire the missiles many miles away from their targets. The Hound Dog has a jam-proof inertial navigation system which guides it with unerring accuracy. It is not a ballistic missile, its power source being an air-breathing jet engine. The missile-carrying B–52's will also have their full nuclear payload in their bomb bays. Thus, this bomber-missile combination might well use the Hound Dogs to destroy the enemy's defenses and then proceed on to drop additional bombs on other targets. Or, the bomber might use both the Hound Dogs and its internal bomb load on targets deep in enemy territory.

The evolution of the manned vehicle into an airborne missile-launching platform has other important considerations. We have in the early stages of development an air-launched ballistic missile called the Sky Bolt, which is in the 1,000-mile range class. Moreover, a few months ago SAC activated its first B–58 wing at Carswell Air Force Base in Fort Worth, Tex. This base is a 2d Air Force installation as will be the second base to get the B–58, Bunker Hill Air Force Base in Indiana.

The B–58 Hustler is the free world's first supersonic bomber. It can operate at twice the speed of sound at altitudes well above 50,000 feet. It can be refueled in flight and carries its nuclear payload in a pod suspended beneath the fuselage. In January this year, the B–58 set two new world speed records of 1,284 miles per hour, on a run of slightly over 621 statute miles and the other of 1,061 miles per hour on a run of over 1,242 miles.

Also, the Air Force has under development for SAC the B–70 bomber. This aircraft is designed to fly some 2,000 miles per hour. It will be capable of aerial refueling, will operate at altitudes above 70,000 feet, and in spite of its speed and size is being developed to use the runways that can accomodate today's B–52s. The B–70 will enhance our capabilities under our air-launched ballistic missile program.

I am sure that by now you have a better idea why SAC seems to be emphasizing the manned vehicle. In addition to the implications of the foregoing, I'd like to point out that manned aerospace vehicles can perform functions that missiles can't, such as seeking out and destroying moving targets; conducting surveillance, and making reconnaissance runs to assess the results or our bombing.

The emphasis we place on manned vehicles stems from these facts: They are the overwhelming bulk of the force today; they can do the job today; and in vastly improved forms, augmented by air-to-ground missiles, they will be an essential part of the force for as far ahead as we can see.

Let me say again: SAC is not wedded to its bombers. It is wedded to its mission; SAC will have manned bombers only so long as they are necessary to accomplish the mission. SAC has learned well the lessons of the past. We will be the first to discard the outmoded and adopt the new. But the bomber is not like the horse. The horse was used in war for thousands of years, and its capabilities did not change from start to finish. The bomber has been used in war for only about 44 years, and its capabilities are still improving fantastically. To discard it would be foolhardy.

And thus, dedication to mission will continue to be the driving and motivating force in the lives of SAC people. This is the force from which our motto, "Peace is our Profession," was derived. That motto will be valid just as long as SAC's mission is valid. And SAC's mission will be valid just as long as there are dedicated Communists running nations that possess aerospace capabilities on a par with that of the free world.

In my opinion, it behooves every American to stop and consider the grip that the communistic philosophy has on those who subscribe to it.

In this connection, I'll refer to a statement made recently by Congressman WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota. Speaking at the National War College, Mr. JUDD stated that ever since he had left China after serving as a missionary medical doctor before and during the early ascendency of Communism in that country, he has been a salesman for but one idea: Communists act like Communists. Explaining further, he said:

"The Chinese Communists do not act like Chinese. They were born Chinese * * * they speak Chinese * * * they look like Chinese * * * but they are not Chinese. They have rejected every value and principle of Chinese culture and thought. It is not possible to be a Communist and have any respect for the basic virtues and values of the Chinese civilization.

"Chinese Communists act like Communists. They are not Chinese patriots * * * they are part of a world revolution."

Having gained some first-hand experience among Chinese during and after World War II, I have been deeply concerned over the way communism has destroyed the basic virtues of Chinese civilization that I had known.

We must always keep in mind that the Communist objective, regardless of any easing of world tensions now and then, remains the same—conquest of the world. World domination is the goal of communism and because its adherents continue to proclaim it, the free world has had, I believe, ample strategic warning that its very survival is at stake as much in cold war as in a hot one.

So, while diplomats and statesmen struggle in the front lines of the cold war, the military might of this Nation must remain a true deterrent to a shooting war. SAC's role in this aerospace age is to maintain the strength that represents the bulk of the free world's deterrent against aggression.

In the light of this background, compare our Nation's policy of nonaggression with that of Communist nations. The United States has clearly stated its national policy—we will never strike the first blow in any war. On the other hand, the Soviets have an equally clearly announced policy of aggressive expansionist strategy. Moreover, both the Soviets and Communist China have announced to the world that their combined goal is the destruction of capitalism, or more specifically, the United States. And, of course, we know they are producing and developing aerospace weapons to support their ambitions.

Thus, a powerful aerospace military force with a high survivability factor becomes a vital instrument of U.S. national policy for deterring war, and at the same time allows us to speak from a posture of strength in world affairs.

The Air Force, in common with all our Armed Forces, is in being for only one purpose: to help preserve peace and guarantee the future of this country. SAC's role as the principal deterrent to general war is being performed by people who are dedicated to its mission, not to any one type of weapon. SAC has met and is meeting its responsibilities.

And I am confident that with the understanding and support of you and all who are neighbors in our other base communities, the Strategic Air Command together with our other Armed Forces will continue to fulfill the overall defense mission of this country.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee, pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel duty-bound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I have re-

quested that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD:

RIVERSIDE, R.I., *April 5, 1961.*
The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: It has been the policy of the American people to rally to the cause. This has been especially true when an aggressor nation has tried to subjugate other nations. This has happened many times in our present century and once again Russia is attempting (and accomplishing I might add) to subjugate practically all the Near and Middle East nations.

Before a third world war begins, not to mention countless revolutions, I think that something must be done to aid these subjugated nations. I believe that your Committee for Captive Nations (H. Res. 211) is just the thing. Only the Committee will rally to the cause in a peaceful manner. Let's not shed any blood where it is not necessary. Russia can be conquered without a war and I believe that the Committee for Captive Nations can contribute to it.

Very truly yours,
ELLEN ANN WHITAKER.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Jersey City, N.J., March 27, 1961.
The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our 75,000 members have been informed in our official organ the "Svoboda" and our English language "The Ukrainian Weekly" of your introduction on March 8 of the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. We wish to congratulate you on this stalwart action.

We Ukrainians have long advocated the recognition by the United States of the fact that captive nations behind the Iron Curtain are our potential allies in the cold war with the Kremlin. A Committee established to gather information concerning these captive nations would be advantageous to our Government in formulating policies and it would be a morale builder for all peoples behind the Iron Curtain who are struggling for their independence.

Our members were also heartened to learn of the support of various other Congressmen of your resolution and are currently urging their own Congressmen to lend you their support.

We, the executive committee of the Ukrainian National Association, wish you the heartiest success in your courageous undertaking.

Yours respectfully,
JOSEPH LESAWYER,
Vice President.
JAROSLAW PADOCH,
Secretary.
ROMAN SLOBODIAN,
Treasurer.

SHARON HILL, PA., *April 3, 1961.*
Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: My personal friend Mr. Isakjan I. Narzikul, president of the Turkestanian-American Association, has informed me that you are sponsoring a resolution establishing a committee on the captive nations. Presumably this committee will develop facts regarding Soviet imperialism of the last 40 years. Armed with facts such a committee should be able to recommend courses of action for our legislative and administrative bodies.

It is my hope that such action will be to (1) maintain hope in the freedom-loving peoples who are today Soviet colonials and to (2) present to the entire world the facts of Soviet colonial-imperialist policy.

Many of us feel that our country has too long been on the defensive vis-a-vis the Communist world conspiracy. An intelligent well-planned offensive is desperately needed. Your resolution may be a first step in this direction.

Very truly yours,
JOHN M. MCLARNMON, Jr.

TURKESTANIAN-AMERICAN
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Collingdale, Pa., April 3, 1961.
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It has been my experience that many of my fellow U.S. citizens know nothing of Turkestan, its people or its potential as a force on the side of the freedom-loving peoples of the West.

Prior to its conquest in 1922 by the Communist imperialists, Turkestan was a free country. It is located in south central Asia, north of Afghanistan, extending roughly from the Caspian Sea to east of the Aral Sea. It was a country of approximately 16 million people of Turkic origin and devout Moslems in religious practice.

Since its conquest the Communists have conducted a relentless campaign to destroy Turkestan's literature, its cultural uniqueness and its strong love of freedom. The country has been partitioned into five Soviet Republics, many of its people have been driven to other parts of the Soviet Union and many Russians imported into it. It has been deprived by the Communists of almost all contact with the outside world.

One of the few avenues of contact that Turkestan did have was the Voice of America programs beamed to it. This was a regular channel of information from 1951 to 1953, and again from 1955 to 1958. Since 1958 the Communists have enjoyed an uncontested propaganda advantage in this large politically important country.

Many of us in the Turkestanian-American Association know that the Voice of America was listened to in Turkestan and we are convinced that broadcasts should be resumed. The United States will defeat the Communist conspiracy by taking the initiative at every point of weakness in the Soviet colonial empire. Turkestan is such a point.

The Turkestanian-American Association represents all Turkestanians in the United States. We are very pleased to see you introduce a resolution establishing a special committee on the captive nations. We support it wholeheartedly and hope you will persevere.

Sincerely yours,
ISAKJAN I. NARZIKUL,
President.

THE BALTIC NATIONS COMMITTEE
OF DETROIT, INC.,
Highland Park, Mich., March 28, 1961.
The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the Baltic Nations Committee of Detroit, I would like to express to you my deep appreciation and gratitude for introducing the bill H.R. 211 to create a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

We certainly hope that this bill will be passed by the House of Representatives in the near future.

Sincerely yours,
SIGURDS RUDZITIS,
Chairman.

Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Machinist, newspaper of the International Association of Machinists, recently published a question and answer feature on automation. Entitled "Automation: The Revolution in Your Life," the article brings out many of the facets of automation which have been least understood by the public. The answers are based on studies by the IAM Research Department and IAM officers.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation, I think the article is most timely, and should like to call the attention of all the members to the article which follows:

AUTOMATION: THE REVOLUTION IN YOUR LIFE

(These answers are based on studies by the research department of the International Association of Machinists and on the report of grand lodge officers to the 1960 IAM convention.)

Question. Why all this talk about automation? Isn't it just another step in the mechanization of our lives?

Answer. Automation is creating a revolution in our lives. The invention of machinery added power to our tools. In mechanized plants, machines replaced hand labor. The machines still needed operators. Automation, a word unknown less than 15 years ago, is the mechanization of thought. In an automated plant, machines operate the machines. Mechanization increased production a hundredfold over hand labor; automation increases production a thousandfold over mechanized labor.

Question. Does this mean push-button factories?

Answer. It can mean factories operating only with maintenance crews. There already are a few. More often automation means a big reduction in the need for machine operators. In some instances, automation also reduces the need for more highly skilled workers.

Question. Isn't automation most practical in the big plants?

Answer. Not necessarily. The great majority of all metalworking firms in the United States produce fewer than 25 items in each production run. Now, with the introduction of tape-controlled multi-purpose machine tools, these small shops can switch quickly from one run to another by simply switching tapes. One automated machine tool is the Milwaukee-Matic. According to its manufacturer, it "can interchange 31 different cutting tools and perform hundreds of operations in sequence without a touch from a machinist."

Question. What kind of operations can be automated?

Answer. Automated machinery can do bookkeeping, control inventory, make up payrolls and do other office work. There are machines now that see, hear, and feel. There are machiness that adjust to variable production conditions. There are machines that have memory units. There are automated machines that inspect the product they are turning out, reject substandard units and correct the errors they make. There are machines that change their own parts when they break down or wear out and lubricate

themselves. The U.S. Air Force has an electronic computer which is the key part of a machine which translates Russian printing into English. By the end of 1961, its capacity is expected to reach 2,400 words a minute.

Question. Aren't these machines too expensive to be practical?

Answer. Automated equipment soon pays for itself by the amount of manpower it replaces. Automated machines have reduced labor costs by as much as 75 to 90 percent. On one part, for example, the Boeing Airplane Co. reduced machine time from 25 hours to 1½ hours by automation.

Question. Does this mean a lot of layoffs?

Answer. It frequently means layoffs. In some cases it means that the employees will be transferred to other jobs, to other departments or to other plants. In other cases, it means layoffs in plants not automated that are unable to compete with automated plants. Usually, it means the loss of job opportunities for younger workers when employees are not replaced after they quit or retire.

Question. But, doesn't automation create more jobs?

Answer. Automation makes it possible to produce more with fewer employees. Between 1950 and 1960, factory production in the United States increased 43 percent; yet there were actually fewer production workers in factories in 1960 than 10 years earlier. In mining, production increased 26 percent; yet the number of employees declined 25 percent. On the railroads, employment declined 36 percent while rail traffic dropped only 5 percent. Unless demand for goods and services rises much more than it has, the jobs created by the introduction of automation will not make up for the jobs eliminated by automation.

Question. Are labor unions trying to block automation?

Answer. No. Most union members know that there cannot be a moratorium on technological change. Labor knows that there are tremendous needs in America. There are millions of families living on an un-American standard of living. Our country needs schools, hospitals, slum clearance, housing, and modern roads. And, we must maintain our military strength at a level that will deter aggression by the Soviet Union or any other world power. Labor does not seek to block automation; it does insist that management cannot be allowed to forget community problems and the personal hardships being created by rapid technological change.

Question. How can unions protect their members?

Answer. Through negotiations with management, unions can make sure that some of the savings on manpower are shared with employees through legitimate wage increases, shorter hours of work, and longer vacations. Many union contracts require management to give advance notice before the installation of new equipment so that changes in jobs and work schedules can be negotiated. Many union contracts give employees transfer rights, moving allowances, and retraining opportunities during working hours.

Question. But suppose a man is laid off?

Answer. Union contracts help to cushion the shock of unemployment by providing for severance pay, supplementary unemployment benefits, early retirement, and other provisions.

Question. Would a shorter workweek help?

Answer. Yes. Automation means greatly increased output per man-hour. We want and need this increased output. But we can't afford to have millions without jobs. A shorter workweek makes more sense than continued high unemployment. In many industries, the 32- or 35-hour workweek will have to come through national negotiations or national legislation. Any piecemeal approach will encourage some employers to run away, to move their plants out of the area or out of the country.

Question. Can't anything else be done?

Answer. The basic answer to the problems created by automation lies in the prosperity of our country. When business is booming, displaced men can find other jobs, and so can hundreds of thousands of young workers who are coming out of the schools every year. If we can get our economy moving ahead, automation will still create problems, but they will be more manageable.

Inez Lovelace Earns Title as "State Woman of the Year"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared on Sunday, March 26, in the Knoxville News-Sentinel a wonderful article about Miss Inez Lovelace, a native of my hometown of Union City, Tenn.

She has made such an outstanding record I feel that I should bring it to the attention of the Members of the Congress.

The article follows:

INEZ LOVELACE EARNS TITLE AS "STATE WOMAN OF THE YEAR"

(By Mary Anna Winegar)

Inez Lovelace is a lady who helped lead the entire State in progress in home economics.

Miss Lovelace, housing and home furnishings specialist for the Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service, was recently named State Woman of the Year by Progressive Farmer magazine. She's an expert in her field, and she understands fully the possibilities and needs of present-day home economics.

Miss Lovelace has been interested in home economics all her life. She was born in Union City, studied home economics at West Tennessee State College in Memphis, and earned her bachelor's and master's degrees in home economics at the University of Tennessee. She taught home economics at Union City High School and at Lincoln Memorial University in Harrogate.

COUNTY AGENT IN 1926

In 1926 she began her career in State home economics, when she was named Knox County's home demonstration agent. She became agent for Washington County in 1940, then came back to Knoxville in 1943 and was named home management specialist for the extension service.

A quick look at records of home economics progress in the State will prove Miss Lovelace's ability as a leader. During her first year as Knox County's home demonstration agent, the number of leaders used in girls' 4–H work tripled, the girls' 4–H enrollment increased from 100 girls in 18 clubs to 1,342 girls in 47 clubs and the number of home demonstration clubs doubled. She increased the number of activities of the home demonstration clubs and initiated the better homes tour. Knox County won national awards for 3 years under her leadership.

Washington County's record is similar.

SHE'S SEEN PROGRESS

As a homemaking specialist, Miss Lovelace has traveled throughout Tennessee about 3 weeks of each month, encouraging leaders, telling of improved homemaking techniques, conducting training schools and workshops, and helping the State's homemakers improve their homes.

She's a member of countless home economics associations. She spends much of her spare time in home economics activities: She likes to sew, makes hats, likes gardening, manages a house here and in Gatlinburg, refinishes furniture and works with crafts. She's active in her church, Cumberland Presbyterian, and has been vice president of the Altrusa class there. During vacations she travels; she's been through most of the United States and to Hawaii and Europe.

"I stay busy most of the time," she said.

Her career has been particularly satisfying, Miss Lovelace said. "I've stayed with this thing long enough to see people develop. I've seen 4–H girls grow into community leaders."

Here's home economics as Miss Lovelace sees it, its present and its future:

Home economics training, as always, is double-barreled: it trains for careers and for homemaking. The demand for trained home economists is increasing, too. Specialists are needed in many areas.

And training is needed more and more by the homemaker. She has to be so many things now—a manager, a child psychologist, a nutritionist, even an engineer, with her new appliances. There's just so much more to homemaking now than cooking and sewing.

BUSY AS GRANDMOTHER

Despite help from modern appliances, the housewife is just as busy as her grandmother was. She's a community leader. She has more leisure time, in which she is getting acquainted with her family. Homemaking isn't all drudgery now. The housewife has more choice in how she'll spend her time.

And of course, so many housewives are working. This calls for more managerial ability: She has to hold down a job and not let her family suffer.

The average homemaker today comes nearer being a partner with her husband. She understands the money situation and the whole family process of management. And she keeps up with what's going on in the world.

Modern canning and freezing methods and new appliances relieve the housewife of much of the cooking duties her mother had; but the art of cooking won't fade. I think women essentially like to work with food, experiment with recipes, cook for their families.

REQUIRED COURSE URGED

Faced with this many-sided role as housewife, girls in high school and college would do well to take some home economic courses, not matter what they're majoring in. "There are foods, textiles, interior decorating, sewing, child psychology. Probably every girl—and every boy, too—should take a little of it. It might be well to require a certain amount of it in school curriculums."

For the future, change is evident everywhere. Home economists are concentrating in these three areas:

1. Serving more individuals effectively: The extension service works well here, of course. Home economists are trying to reach people they haven't reached before. They're going to work with those people who aren't in an organized group (such as a home demonstration club): young homemakers, women who work, senior citizens.

Next year, for instance, they want to reach factory women. Rather than have meetings with them, the extension service will put up displays on homemaking. The displays will be in the factories where the women work and in beauty parlors and other places they frequent.

2. Research: There are, of course, many new products coming on the market. Research is being done on homemaking for handicapped persons—kitchens, clothing, appliances for handicapped homemakers. Under consideration is a national consumers' research department which would try to help the homemaker learn what products are available and which ones are best.

3. Strengthening education: Home economists want to make home economics education meet coming needs. Ways of family living are changing, and home economic training must change, too.

Bethesda Mailboxes Draw Attention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article taken from the Rock Hill (S.C.) Evening Herald on a project undertaken by the Bethesda community to improve their community by painting and repairing rural mailboxes. Mr. Jim Parker, of Rock Hill, S.C., the rural carrier in that area, has been working on this project for several years and I congratulate both the community leaders and Mr. Parker for their service:

BETHESDA MAILBOXES DRAW ATTENTION

(By Dean Wohlgemuth)

Chances are, a person driving down any road just about anywhere in the Nation, won't pay a bit of attention to any of the hundreds or even thousands of rural mailboxes he may pass.

That is, unless he happens to drive through York County, Bethesda community.

He still may not notice the mailboxes at first, but soon he will realize there is something different about mailboxes there. He starts to look closer, then begins to realize what it is—every mailbox is neatly painted, with red posts, white boxes, and blue lettering.

This contrasts with any other mailboxes he may have seen, which were unpainted, dilapidated, unsightly. Instead of hanging haphazardly atop a post which itself is an overexaggeration of the Leaning Tower of Pisa, Bethesda mailboxes are all in good repair, perched erect on a straight, sturdy post.

All this didn't just happen. The idea was born several months ago, when rural Mail Carrier Jim Parker, who delivers mail on Rock Hill, route 5, through Bethesda community, took a trip to the west coast.

Parker said he noticed that everywhere across the Nation, mailboxes were the same as those in York County, and on his own route. They needed an overhauling, for appearance sake.

Parker wrote to the Post Office Department district office in Atlanta, asking if something could be done about it. The office replied that improving the appearance of mailboxes was a good idea, if Parker could get a community or civic group to take it over as a project. They set forth only one condition—that the boxes themselves be painted white.

Parker went to work. He got the Bethesda Community Club interested, and they took over the project. They made arrangements with the State highway department to do the actual painting, and the club furnished the paint.

The job began about the first of the year. Now, of the approximately 135 mailboxes in the community, about 95 have already been painted. The remaining 35 will be done as soon as possible.

Members of the community club said that whenever necessary, the highway department is replacing posts.

The idea is now catching on in other areas. Parker says mailbox painting has begun to crop up along at least two other rural routes in the area, one a Rock Hill route, and one York route.

The Navy and Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert into the RECORD a thought-provoking article by Spencer M. Beresford, entitled "Preface to Naval Strategy in Outer Space." The article was published in the March 1961 issue of U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings.

Mr. Beresford is counsel for the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, and is well-known to all members of the committee and to many other Members of Congress. He is a graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School and has served in the Navy during World War II. He was also a member of the faculty of the Naval Intelligence School at Anacostia, and is to this day a member of the Naval Reserve. Mr. Beresford is an authority on space law and is the author of many articles on this subject. As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee I have found him extremely helpful and cooperative at all times.

His article reads as follows:

PREFACE TO NAVAL STRATEGY IN OUTER SPACE

(By Spencer M. Beresford)

The unresting progress of mankind causes continual change in the weapons; and with that must come a continual change in the manner of fighting."—ALFRED T. MAHAN.

Technology proceeds independently of international politics. It is the policy of the United States that "activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes." In the United Nations and elsewhere, the U.S. Government and many individual Americans have pressed for an international agreement on the legal control of outer space. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that these efforts may fail. Technology moves relentlessly forward. Prudence requires us, therefore, to plan and prepare for the possibility of space warfare.

Concern is intensified by the thought, which has occurred to many, that military space systems could tilt the balance in favor of offensive as against defensive operations. While it harbors no desires for foreign conquest, the United States is nevertheless interested in maintaining effective deterrent power and in being able to wage limited wars of defense. Will the emergence of military space systems impair our national abilities in either of these respects?

In the perspective of national strategy, space power can contribute greatly both to waging limited wars and to the deterrence of general war. It may seem surprising to speak of using space weapons in limited wars. In all probability, however, space warfare can be limited more readily than warfare on the surface, since it need not involve extensive casualties or property damage. Space power can also make important contributions to the strategy of deterrence. Its very diversity will complicate an adversary's decision to attack, by adding to his problems of intelligence, coordination and targeting. Thus a substantial capability for space warfare may tend to stabilize the strategic balance.

In the cold war, demonstrations of space capabilities will continue to influence world opinion and thereby the international position of the United States.

THE ROLE OF THE NAVY IN OUTER SPACE

From a technological standpoint, the age of space warfare is almost at hand.

What part will the Navy play in this new field? What advantages can it exploit? What problems must it face?

Space is recognized as a medium that holds great promise, and at the same time, great danger for the United States and the free world. The Navy has unparalleled capabilities, some actual and some potential, for exploiting this promise and for guarding against attendant dangers.

In the first place, it is generally understood that the military significance of space activities, at least for a long time to come, will depend on their relation to the earth's surface. For example, missiles and space vehicles must be launched, observed, controlled, and recovered by surface facilities and equipment. In addition, any military objective of space activities necessarily relates to the earth's surface (e.g., for observation, location, communication, or attack).

The Navy can control from and operate on about 72 percent of the earth's surface. That is the extent of the world's oceans and seas. In contrast, Soviet territory covers less than 5 percent of the earth's surface, and U.S. territory less than 2 percent. Naval operations over this vast area can continue for long periods without support. It is also the mission and function of the Navy to control and operate in the airspace above the oceans and seas.

On the high seas, including their depths and airspace, all nations enjoy complete freedom of passage. Elsewhere, foreign ships, aircraft, and missiles are not usually free to pass except by specific permission of the territorial state. For this reason, among others, test firings of long-range missiles, flights of manned space vehicles and the like are and doubtless will be conducted over international waters. In particular, operations at sea are necessary for search and recovery, as in Project Mercury, and for the observation of missiles and space vehicles, as by instrumentation ships of the Atlantic and Pacific Missile Ranges.

In the future, an increasing proportion of missiles and space vehicles will be launched at sea, for reasons of safety, security, reduced costs, easier logistics, and greater choice of launching site and direction. For example, sea launches of nuclear rockets will minimize surface contamination.

Other advantages result from scientific, technical, and operating experience found only in the Navy. For example, an artificial space environment most closely resembles a submarine environment. Naval experience in submarine operations and techniques can contribute substantially to the

development and use of manned space vehicles.

In wartime operations, an even more significant naval advantage than extensive coverage of the earth's surface would be the capability of naval forces for mobility and concealment. This advantage manifests itself most clearly in undersea operations. Surface forces also present targets of uncertain and changeable location, and can concentrate and launch attacks with missiles at unexpected times and places.

At the same time, naval astronautics must face a number of problems: the difficulty of launching missiles from moving platforms; the limitations (as to space, weight, and other factors) imposed by a seagoing environment; and the special requirements of antisubmarine and amphibious warfare.

On balance, however, it seems clear not only that space techniques can enable the Navy to carry out its present missions more effectively, but that the Navy enjoys important advantages for the conduct of operations in outer space. In time, the new naval capabilities that outer space accords may lead to new naval missions.

THE NATURE OF SPACE WARFARE

At the outbreak of World War II, the rocket as a weapon had been largely forgotten for more than a 100 years. It was used in that war, however, for many purposes. The infantry used it against tanks and aircraft. The Navy used it for barrage fire on landing beaches. Both Army and Navy air forces used it to attack ships and other aircraft. It was used most memorably by the Germans in the form of the V–2 for long-range strategic bombardment.

Since World War II, the accuracy of rocket fire—formerly its greatest weakness—has been radically improved, while its destructive power has increased many times. Internal and external guidance systems and the means of stabilization in flight have now been developed to the point where even ballistic missiles—which are guided at least in the sense of being pointed by their launching apparatus—are accurate enough for many military purposes. However, the technological development that has added most to the military value of the missile is the nuclear warhead. Missiles are fast becoming the principal means of delivering nuclear weapons.

It would be hazardous to say how soon we will find ourselves technologically in the age of space warfare. A reasonable guess is 5 to 10 years. For example, Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, U.S. Army (retired), has written that "By 1965, missiles and satellites will have shrunk the world to such an extent that militarily the earth itself will be a [single] tactical theater." Still later, in 10 to 20 or 25 years, "true" space weapons will be in the hands of the armed services, bases will be established in outer space, and manned, maneuverable space vehicles will be able to cruise the cosmos.

Considering the time required for the evolution of new strategic and tactical doctrines, it is not too soon to examine the probable capabilities and limitations of space weapons and the general outlines of space strategy.

From a military point of view, the chief characteristics of space vehicles are high speed and altitude and long range and flight time. The immediate use of these characteristics is reconnaissance. High speed and altitude would facilitate surprise attack. Long range and flight time would lend themselves to freedom from support, including support by land and sea power.

The wartime use of outer space would probably differ from other forms of warfare in its objectives, its weapons, and its medium of operations. For some time to come, at least, its objectives would be more limited than those of land, naval, or even air warfare. At first, space systems would merely assist or complement armies, fleets, and air forces. Space weapons themselves, of course, would far surpass all other weapon of war in speed and range. In maneuverability, assuming an adequate source of energy, they would compare quite favorably with aircraft. In fact, they would enjoy all the military advantages of aircraft without some of their principal limitations (e.g., susceptibility to turbulent weather, low visibility, and icing). For example, controllable attack satellites would share the advantages now held by aircraft over ballistic missiles—particularly the ability to be recalled from their targets at the last moment. Orbiting spacecraft have no counterpart, moreover, other than forts on land, for endurance and self-sufficiency. Lastly, the medium of space operations—"the heavens' pathless way"—is even more uniform, featureless, and free from natural obstacles than are the oceans or the air. At certain altitudes, barriers such as the Van Allen radiation belts indeed exist; but these can probably be overcome without undue difficulty or loss of effectiveness.

Given such military characteristics, space weapons and techniques bid fair to convert into fact the prophecy of Gen. Thomas S. Power, U.S. Air Force, that "the present concept of three-dimensional warfare will eventually expand into what may be termed warfare in four dimensions, warfare in which the operational relationship between space and time will become the most critical factor."

SPACE POWER

In a paper on naval strategy, space power might be described as "the space arm of seapower." Historically, the tools by which the sea is controlled have varied greatly. They now include aircraft as well as ships. Why not satellites as well as submarines? On the other hand, in order to analyze how space power may affect campaigns at sea, space power must be considered partly in contradistinction to landpower and seapower. Giving it a new name may help us discern its strengths and limitations.

Seapower is traditionally defined as the ability of a nation to control transportation over the seas in wartime. It is certainly possible that space power, in like manner, may someday enable a nation to control wartime transportation in space itself. That day, however, is probably far distant. The transportation of cargoes and personnel through outer space is, and will probably remain for some time, too costly for general adoption. In the foreseeable future, outer space is likely to be important for military purposes, first, because of its effect on surface activities (including transport and communications) and, secondly, as an avenue of attack. In this respect, as in others, spacepower stands in much the same relation to airpower as airpower does to seapower.

The use of outer space as an avenue of attack may be compared to air strikes or the bombardment of land objectives from the sea. There is, however, an essential difference. Naval bombardment is only an incidental and relatively minor use of seapower. On the other hand, air strikes are a major function of airpower, and it seems almost certain that attacks on land or sea objectives will become a major function of spacepower.

At this point, it is well to recall that air power depends in large part on land and sea power. An airplane in a position to bomb a target is only the final link in a long chain of causation. Advanced airbases are often seized by armies. In turn, the armies may have been landed from ships. The planes themselves, their fuel, cargoes, crews, and supplies are often brought by ship to the forward areas. True, the dependence of air power on land and sea power, already much less than in the past, will doubtless be further lessened by the longer range and greater endurance of aircraft (e.g., those powered by nuclear engines). Yet the heavy expense of flying aircraft over great distances, compared with the cost of ocean transportation, is likely to ensure that local air superiority will still derive, in many cases, from land operations or command of the sea.

Space power, however, may prove to be more independent than air power. Even missiles of intermediate range reach a top speed of some 10,000 miles an hour. The maximum speed of long-range missiles (ICBM's) is 15,000 miles an hour or more. These speeds are of the same order of magnitude as orbital velocities at similar altitudes (about 18,000 miles an hour), which would permit a missile to strike any point on earth. The difference in cost between short and long ranges is thus far less for spacecraft than for aircraft, and the incentive to move missiles by land or sea into forward areas, rather than fire them the full distance, under their own power, is correspondingly reduced.

One advantage of very-long-range missiles is that they greatly increase the choice of launching sites and flight paths. A missile with a range of 9,000 nautical miles or so reaches near-orbital velocity; it can hit any point on earth from any other point, and (with the use of mobile launching sites) from any direction. The difficulty of defending against such a missile can be seen by considering the problem of detection. At present, each radar installation designed to detect ballistic missiles scans a rather narrow fixed sector in the direction of known or suspected launching sites. Missiles of very long range, if launched along suitable flight paths, could avoid detection by such installations.

Nevertheless, the savings to be made by launching missiles from advanced bases would be substantial, and would doubtless induce belligerent nations to transport some of the tools of space power by sea. In addition, distance will still be a major factor in strategy. The shorter the range, the more effective (and the cheaper) an attack from outer space would tend to be. At shorter ranges, missiles could be fired more accurately, and would allow less reaction time for detection and defensive action.

CONTROL OF OUTER SPACE

As a strategic concept, "control of space" refers to the ability to use outer space for one's own purposes and to deny its use to the enemy.

The concept of control has long been a commonplace of land warfare ("take the high ground and hold it"). Its extension to sea warfare by the British Navy brought about a revolution in naval strategy. The classic example is the command of the seas exercised by the British Grand Fleet in World War I. In air warfare, the concept of control has had a limited but still significant application. Local air superiority is recognized as essential to many kinds of military operations, and was a tenet of the German blitzkrieg doctrine. The air operations conducted out of Henderson Field on Guadalcanal provide an example from American experience.

What, then, is the application of the concept to space warfare? Presumably, it will be more limited to space warfare than it is to air warfare—if only because outer space is boundless, while airspace, although significantly three dimensional, ends at a relatively low altitude. The medium of outer space, or even that portion of it which lies immediately around the earth, is naturally less subject to military control than the land, the sea, or air.

At best, however, control of any medium is an ideal, a limit, a strategic working con-

cept. In practice, it is never fully attained—never complete in degree, nor unbounded in space or time. For example, commerce raiding and undersea warfare have usually been possible to an inferior naval power, such as Germany in both World Wars, however great the maritime control exercised by the dominant sea power.

Yet the temporary use of a limited portion of land or ocean surface has often been of great strategic or tactical value. The temporary use of airspace, in particular, is relatively valuable and easy to acquire. An example is the bombing of Tokyo by 16 Mitchell bombers from the carrier *Hornet* in April 1942, when the surrounding oceans and airspace were dominated by Japan. By extrapolation, it seems likely that the temporary use of portions of outer space (e.g., by the launching of long-range missiles) would be (1) still easier to acquire and (2) all that may be needed to inflict a damaging and perhaps decisive low.

On the other hand, in the present and immediately foreseeable state of space technology, the control of large portions of outer space, in the sense of denying their use to an enemy, may not be feasible at all. Because of their range, their altitude, and above all their speed, spacecraft will be very difficult indeed to detect and intercept. The fact that exclusive control of outer space may consequently not be feasible, even to a limited and temporary degree, calls for a rethinking of strategic concepts.

At present, all that can be done is to suggest approaches to the problem. Not only space technology but operational concepts themselves must be imagined and projected into the future.

The first step is to concentrate upon the critical portion of outer space. Initially, this is likely to be geocentric space—the space immediately around the earth, out to a distance of, say, one earth-radius from the surface. Geocentric space is that portion from which it would be most important to exclude an enemy. At present and for some time to come, as we have seen, the military value of space operations will depend upon the extent to which they can affect our own and enemy capabilities on the surface. Geocentric space is also that portion of outer space from which exclusion of an enemy would be practical.

Secondly, the history of naval warfare suggests that we should consider the value of bases and the possibility of controlling points and areas (or, rather, volumes) of convergence in outer space (e.g., along lines from the launching points to the probable targets of long-range missiles). Focal areas and terminal areas provide the parallel in naval strategy. Because they could not completely control all the seas, the British found it advantageous to establish bases and advanced positions, as, for example, at Gibraltar or with the concentration of the fleet at Scapa Flow during World War II.

The necessity of bases for the control of outer space was stated by Gen. Thomas D. White, U.S. Air Force, as follows:" * * * to control space we must not only be able to go through it with vehicles that travel from point to point, but we must be able to stay in space with human beings who can carry out jobs efficiently."

The military advantages of bases in outer space seem bound to attract the strategic planner. Operations at such a base would be virtually free from the difficulties presented by the earth's atmosphere (especially the reentry problem), weather, and gravitational field. From such a base, the earth could be kept under constant surveillance. Relatively little energy would be required to fire a missile earthward.

Artificial space bases (space stations) could serve many useful purposes, but might prove highly vulnerable unless equipped to detect and evade attack. They could be used, for example, as storage depots, staging or transfer points, and reconnaissance and missile-launching sites. On the other hand, they might prove at least as vulnerable as aircraft, since they would not be difficult to detect, and their positions in orbit could be determined accurately in advance. Manned spacecraft seem especially vulnerable if hit, although better able to take evasive action. It would be premature, however, to pass judgment now on the vulnerability of spacecraft or even satellites. Neither the physical conditions of outer space nor the future techniques of space flight are well enough known for anyone to say with certainty how vulnerable an artificial space base would be.

In contrast, large natural space bases such as the moon seem virtually indestructible, mainly because of their size. The military advantages of a moon base were elaborated by Brig. Gen. Homer Boushey, U.S. Air Force (then the Director of Advanced Technology), in a speech to the Aero Club of Washington, D.C., in January 1958. General Boushey concluded that the moon "represents the age-old military advantage of 'high ground.'" While this argument has since been questioned, criticism of its logic largely relates to the general or offensive use of a moon base and not to its value for defense (retaliation). There seems good reason to agree that exclusive possession of a moon base would increase the strategic deterrent by making it virtually impossible for a foreign country to destroy American retaliatory capacity by surprise attack. The point is emphasized by the fact that, in the near future, space weapons will probably add more to offensive than to defensive capabilities.

Thirdly, no more than a very partial and temporary control of outer space is necessary for reconnaissance—which has been called the first and most obvious military use of outer space. Like the moon base, reconnaissance from outer space could help correct the balance between offensive and defensive capabilities. It provides better means of defense against ballistic missiles and other space weapons. Later, it could itself become part of offensive weapon systems.

Space reconnaissance can be conducted by a variety of means—optical, photographic, radar, infrared, and electronic intercept. It seems impossible to specify any maximum altitude at which military photography could be carried out. Nevertheless, with available photographic equipment at satellite altitudes (more than 100 miles), about all that can be seen and identified are lines of communication, urban areas, large airfields, naval facilities, and industrial installations. Detailed target analysis is not yet practicable from photographs taken at such altitudes, nor is the detection of small military installations, such as missile sites. Missile firings, however, could be detected and located from even greater altitudes by nonphotographic means.

As a means of reconnaissance, space power could be viewed as merely an operational extension (though an important one) of land, sea, and air power. On the other hand, reconnaissance from outer space can cover incomparably greater areas of the earth's surface, and be maintained for longer periods, than any form of reconnaissance previously known. Satellite reconnaissance in particular permits the frequent repetition of the same view, providing verification and revealing movement and other changes.

In the future, space reconnaissance may be as easy and as useful for tactical as for strategic purposes. For example, the commander of an army or a fleet could launch reconnaissance satellites whenever the tactical situation required quick and accurate information on enemy forces and targets over a large area.

Many other military uses of outer space have been suggested, including navigation, communication, weather, and mapping satellites and interceptor spacecraft. All these will doubtless be developed in the fairly near future. It may be noted that none of them is apparently subject to such stringent altitude limitations as reconnaissance spacecraft.

Perhaps a word should be said about bombing from outerspace. It is hardly possible to approach the subject without plunging into controversy. Here again, however, final judgment would be premature.

Unlike the airplane, the spaceship cannot rely on gravity alone as a propellant for its bombs. Bombing from outerspace would involve imparting velocity to the bomb or missile (which would otherwise continue in orbit for example, along with its parent satellite). In comparison with alternative methods such as surface-to-surface or airborne delivery, therefore, large amounts of propellant may be needed, adding to the weight of the spacecraft and the cost of bombarding the target.

Nevertheless, it has been concluded on the basis of careful study that bombing from satellites and other spacecraft is technically feasible. If a fairly flat trajectory is allowed for descent, it is said, the propulsion requirements become quite acceptable. Many other questions must await a weapon system analysis and actual experiment—for example, vulnerability and reliability, costs (not only of the bombing satellites but of the whole supporting system), recoverability and the use of decoys and other means of cover and deception.

Whether bombing from spacecraft will be, in the future, either effective or available at reasonable cost will evidently depend upon the development of space technology.

The formidable military advantages of space power will be partly offset by new and perplexing problems. For example, the problem of distinguishing military spacecraft from scientific satellites, meteors, and other objects in outer space will give rise to a need for some means of investigation and identification. Such difficulties emphasize the value of vigorous research, development, and operational planning.

CONCLUSION

Historical precedent and strategic principle point to the wisdom of combining all arms of sea power—air and spacecraft as well as ships and submarines. The prospects and dangers of space warfare call for the constant development of new techniques and for a proper balance of forces. In the event of future wars, there is reason to believe, control of the seas and consequently final victory itself may fall to the nation that best combines space power with the older tools of war.

Port of Los Angeles: Long Beach Customhouse Should Be at the Harbor, Saving Amount of All Federal Taxes Payable by 10,000 Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it takes 10,000 U.S. taxpayers who each pay $200 of their scant earnings in taxes to accumulate $2 million. Yet the U.S. Government now proposes to waste and

squander more than this amount of money by persisting in a stupid error in judgment. I am not advising that many taxpayers to go on strike, but I take this means of again pointing out to the Bureau of Customs and the General Services Administration a burden just plain sanity, let alone fiscal responsibility, places upon them. It is to place the customhouse for the twin ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach in the harbor area where it should be, not 22 miles inland where it should not be. The present plan is to include this facility in a Federal office building to be constructed in downtown Los Angeles at a cost in excess of $30 a square foot. Over $2 million of that cost will be incurred for appraisers warehouse space which could be built in the harbor area at an estimated cost of $5 a square foot. This and other wastes of taxpayers' money by reason of the misguided intentions of these mentioned Government agencies are detailed in the following editorial appearing in the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram on March 27:

HARBOR CUSTOMS HEADQUARTERS WOULD SAVE MAN-HOURS AND MONEY

We commend to the attention of the U.S. Bureau of Customs the action taken last week by its sister Federal agency, the Bureau of Land Management.

The Interior Department announced it was moving the Los Angeles office of the Bureau of Land Management to Riverside.

Bureau of Land Management Director Karl S. Landstrom said the move will place the Bureau's southern California headquarters on the doorstep of the lands and resources it administers. The decision to move, he said, was based on findings that the downtown Los Angeles location had created many hardships on both the public and the Bureau.

We suggest this action warrants serious attention by the new U.S. Commissioner of Customs, Philip Nichols, Jr., and by the Los Angeles District Collector of Customs due to be named shortly.

The Los Angeles customs headquarters are located in downtown Los Angeles. More than 90 percent of its revenues comes from goods entering through the ports of Long Beach and of Los Angeles. The customs headquarters is located 22 miles away from those ports.

Each year, the Bureau of Customs spends $50,000 to transport merchandise samples the 22 miles from the piers to the appraiser's store in downtown Los Angeles.

Every day, the customs dispatches eight examiners from downtown Los Angeles to the harbor area to examine merchandise that is too fragile or too bulky to be transported to the appraiser's store. The customs allows 1 hour travel time for these employees to reach the harbor area and another hour to return. Thus each of the eight employees loses 2 hours a day in transportation. This totals 16 manhours or 2 man-days each day lost in transportation.

The Los Angeles custom house is the only one in the Nation not located adjacent to the harbor area it serves.

Yet, the Bureau of Customs has proposed the Government spend more than $4 million to provide new customs quarters in a Federal building in the civic center.

Most of this customs space would be warehousing facilities for the appraiser's stores. Good warehouses have been built in the harbor area for $5 a square foot. But the customs proposes to construct a warehouse in the traffic-choked Los Angeles civic center at a cost in excess of $30 a square foot.

We propose that the new officials of the Bureau of Customs restudy this absurd scheme. We urge them to follow the splendid example of the Bureau of Land Management and to relocate the customhouse in the harbor where it belongs.

Sure it will cost some money to chop the customs facilities out of the federal building plans. The General Services Administration estimates it will cost about $150,000 to redraft the designs to eliminate customs from the federal building. But at a difference of, say, even $20 a square foot in construction costs between a harbor customs and a downtown customs, that $150,000 would save in excess of $2 million in taxpayers' money.

It may be an inconvenience for some customs employees and customhouse brokers to drive a little farther to work each morning—down to the harbor rather than to downtown Los Angeles. However, this inconvenience will be tempered by lighter traffic and ample parking space available in the harbor.

Some of these people may even want to relocate their families in the harbor area and get out of the Los Angeles smog.

In any event, the savings to the taxpayer and added convenience to the general public will more than compensate for any temporary inconvenience to a relatively few individuals.

Kill the Offensive Student Affidavit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have long been distressed by the provision of the National Defense Education Act which requires applicants for student loans to sign a sweeping disclaimer of any affiliation or belief in movements to overthrow the Government of the United States. The affidavit of nonbelief singles out American college students in general, and those in need of financial support in particular, as special objects of official suspicion. The affidavit constitutes a gross insult and offense to many thousands of patriotic young Americans by capriciously bringing them under suspicion of disloyalty to the United States.

I have recently introduced a bill to eliminate the disclaimer affidavit, to which I hope the Congress will give prompt and favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a thoughtful and well-conceived editorial on this matter which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 11, 1961. The editorial entitled "Kill the Offensive Student Affidavit," follows:

KILL THE OFFENSIVE STUDENT AFFIDAVIT

That hotly debated affidavit requirement in the Federal student loan program more or less dropped out of the news last year, as the Nation's attention was claimed by two gentlemen named Nixon and Kennedy—one of whom, Mr. Kennedy, himself sponsored a Senate bill to eliminate it. But the requirement is still there (the Kennedy bill passed the Senate, then died in the House), and it remains as offensive as ever.

The present law requires an applicant for a student loan not only to swear allegiance to the United States, but also to sign a sweeping declaration that "he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional means."

As a statement of pure belief, this goes far beyond a mere declaration of nonmembership in the Communist Party. It becomes a coercive intrusion by Government on the individual conscience.

The dispute has not been over the oath of allegiance, which most readily accept, but rather over the affidavit of nonbelief. From all the recipients of Federal aid, this singles out needy students as special objects of official suspicion. By extension, it reflects distrust on all the youth of America—though even J. Edgar Hoover would have trouble producing a 1961 documentary, "I Was a Teenage Communist."

More fundamentally, though the Federal Government is rightly concerned with its citizens' actions it has no business demanding to know their purely private beliefs as a condition of receiving Federal benefits. And it ought to keep its doctrinal fingers out of the academic pot.

The affidavit is silly and futile anyway, of course, because a real Communist would hardly balk at the mere signing of a false oath.

New York's Congressman JOHN V. LINDSAY has introduced a new bill to eliminate the requirement. The time for action is now, before another year's rush of applications brings another crisis of conscience to students and colleges alike. (More than 70 colleges and universities have protested the affidavit; many, including Yale, Harvard, and Princeton, have flatly refused to participate in the loan program because of it.)

The affidavit insults a whole generation. It invades the privacy of the mind in that one area—the college—which should be its supreme sanctuary. It grossly offends the Nation's educators. And it accomplishes nothing.

It's high time to throw it out, unmourned.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses received President's message on regulatory agencies.

Senate considered minimum wage bill.

House passed bill extending veterans' housing loan programs.

Social security amendments bill cleared for floor action by House Rules Committee.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 5410–5456

Bills Introduced: 45 bills and 5 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1570–1614; S.J. Res. 73; S. Con. Res. 20; and S. Res. 121–123. **Pages 5423–5424**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. Res. 117, changing the name of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Commerce (S. Rept. 146);

S. Res. 121, to print as a Senate document the 63d annual DAR report (S. Rept. 147);

S. 452, 215, 746, 757, 865, 945, 949, 1064, 1217, 70, 71, 186, 265, and 759, private bills (S. Repts. 148–161);

S. Res. 123, relating to S. 327, a private bill (S. Rept. 162);

H.R. 5189, to exempt from tax income derived by a foreign central bank of issue from obligations of the U.S., with amendments (S. Rept. 163);

S. 133, granting consent of Congress to boundary compact between States of Arizona and Nevada (S. Rept. 164); and

S. Res. 122, providing payment of gratuity to a survivor of a deceased Senate employee (no written report).

Pages 5413, 5423

Bill Rereferred: Committee on Finance was discharged from further consideration of S. 1416, relating to certain elections under the Internal Revenue Code by shareholders of G. L. Bernhardt Co., Inc., of Lenoir, N.C. **Page 5436**

President's Message—Regulatory Agencies: Special message from President on regulatory agencies was received and referred to Committee on Commerce.

Pages 5519–5522

Senate Committee on Commerce: S. Res. 117, changing the name of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Commerce, was adopted. **Page 5413**

Printing—DAR: Senate adopted S. Res. 121, to print as a Senate document the 63d annual DAR report. **Page 5413**

Survivor Gratuity: S. Res. 122, providing payment of gratuity to a survivor of a deceased Senate employee, was adopted. **Page 5413**

German Chancellor: Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, of the Federal Republic of Germany, visited and briefly addressed the Senate. **Page 5509**

Minimum Wage: Senate took up and considered H.R. 3935, Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961, adopting Javits amendment (to committee amendment in nature of a substitute) providing for a study of problems involving rates of pay of hotel and food service employees. The committee substitute provides $1.25 minimum wage to be reached in 28 months by presently covered workers, and in 40 months by newly covered workers, the minimum wage in the interim to be $1.15.

Pending at adjournment was Dirksen amendment (in nature of a substitute for committee substitute) identical with House-passed bill of $1.15 minimum wage, except for $1.05 minimum wage for newly covered employees instead of $1 in House-passed bill.

Pages 5456–5512, 5525–5526, 5528, 5532–5549

Quorum Call: During Senate proceedings today one quorum call was taken. **Page 5507**

Confirmations: The following nominations were confirmed: 7 civilian, including those of Leland J. Haworth, of New York, to be member of AEC; Gerald A. Brown, of California, to be member of NLRB; David Lowell Ladd, of Illinois, to be Commissioner of Patents; and Stanley S. Surrey, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; 20 judicial; and 1 to a U.N. group. **Page 5549**

Nomination: Nomination of Phillips Talbot, of the D.C., to be an Assistant Secretary of State, was received. **Page 5549**

Appendix

Apportionment of Seats in the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit a copy of a letter by Prof. Walter F. Willcox, with reference to the apportionment of seats in the House of Representatives. This letter is addressed to the chairman of a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House, and to my mind, is an important item to be considered:

ITHACA, N.Y., *March 27, 1961.*

Hon. JOHN TABER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TABER: I enclose a copy of a letter which I have just written to the chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, with the request that you will have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and send me two copies of the issue containing it.

Yours respectfully,

W. F. WILLCOX.

MARCH 27, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANE: Since 1900 Congress has used one or the other of two methods of apportioning seats in the House of Representatives among the States after a census; the method of major fractions was used after the censuses of 1910 and 1930 (after 1920 Congress for the only time in history did not apportion) and the method of equal proportions after the censuses of 1940 and 1950. The results of these methods differ usually by only one seat.

I write to you to give my reasons for thinking that, after the census of 1940, a seat was apportioned to Arkansas which should have gone to Michigan; after that of 1950, one was apportioned to Kansas which should have gone to California, and after that of 1960, the prospect is that Congress will apportion to New Hampshire a seat which, if the following argument is accepted, should go to Massachusetts.

The figures below give the evidence on which I base my conclusion:

Date of censuses	States involved	Seats involved	Population distribution	
1940	Arkansas and Michigan	24	6.471	12.529
1950	Kansas and California	36	5.491	30.509
1960	New Hamsphire and Massachusetts	14	1.476	12.524

Under the 1960 figures, either method would give New Hampshire and Massachusetts together 14 seats, but if their combined population, 5,755,499, is divided by 14 and the quotient, 411,107, divided into the population of each, the results are for New Hampshire 1.476 and for Massachusetts 12.524.

Do not these figures indicate that after the 1940 census, Michigan with a quotient of 12.529 had a stronger claim to the doubtful seat than Arkansas which had a quotient of only 6.471?

In the same way, after the 1950 census, it is my claim that California with a quotient of 30.509 should have received 31 seats instead of 30 and Kansas with a quotient of 5.491 should have received only 5 seats instead of the 6 allotted to it.

So, too, under the 1960 figures, Massachusetts is likely to receive only 12 seats, although its quotient of 12.524 would entitle it to 13, and New Hampshire with a quotient of 1.476 should receive only 1 instead of the 2 now likely to go to it.

Yours sincerely,

WALTER F. WILLCOX.

Welfare of the Domestic Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial column by Col. W. D. Workman of Columbia, S.C., a highly influential and respected newspaper columnist and author. The article entitled, "Industry in United States Hurt by Overseas Friends," has been printed in a number of newspapers in the Southeast, including the April 7, 1961, issue of the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C. Colonel Workman presents some important facts to show that something must be done—and very soon—to protect the welfare of our domestic textile industry and its many employees.

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

INDUSTRY IN UNITED STATES HURT BY OVERSEA FRIENDS

(By W. D. Workman)

The United States today faces an American dilemma as formidable and as nearly insoluble as the dilemma of race relations which concerned Gunnar Myrdal in the 1940's.

The current problem arises out of the Nation's free trade policies. International affairs, now more important than ever, require that the United States maintain cordial trade relations with the friendly and neutral nations of the world. But those relations are becoming strained in the light of the undeniable damage being done to the Nation's domestic economy by foreign imports.

The damage is widespread, and is increasing. Hardly a day passes that Congress is not importuned by some State legislature or trade association to stop the inflow of foreign-made commodities ranging over such diverse fields as baseball gloves, bicycles, optics, musical recordings, barbed wire, nails, plywood, and a host of others.

Atop the list of aggrieved industries is textiles, which holds the No. 1 position for several reasons. In the first place, the Nation's textile industry stands among the top three nationally, in terms of numbers of workers employed and of total impact on our economy. Furthermore, according to a special Senate subcommittee report of 1959, the Department of Defense has ranked the textile industry second only to steel in terms of military essentiality.

The industry is active in 43 States, and employs more than 900,000 persons even after continued job losses in recent years. Its companion industry, apparel manufacturing, employs more than a million workers. If the two are regarded in combination, they give employment to one out of every eight factory workers in the land. Obviously, what hurts these industries must hurt the Nation.

And the industry is hurting—through no fault of its own. Technology has been a handmaiden to the textile industry, and no other manufacturing process in the country is more scientifically advanced or automatically operated. Research has been continuous and effective, and sales promotion has been equally stimulated.

Yet, despite everyy laborsaving device, research development, or new product use, large segments of the textile industry are now being driven to the wall. The villains of the piece are foreign imports, which are flooding into the United States in vast and growing numbers. These imported goods, manufactured at a fraction of the cost of American-made products, can undersell domestic production in every instance.

And, to make matters worse, many of the imports are of good quality and workmanship, thanks to America's postwar handouts of both money and know-how to foreign nations.

To cite just one example of the problem, a large finishing plant in the southeast is offered unfinished "gray goods" from Japan, delivered at the mill for an appreciable savings over the same grade of cotton textiles manufactured in an American mill only a dozen miles away from the finishing plant.

The difference lies in the fact that Japanese goods are manufactured at meager wage rates which are illegal in this country, and are made out of cotton (probably American) which can be bought by Japan on the world market at 8 cents a pound less than the same cotton would cost an American manufacturer.

The problem is further complicated by the fact that textile manufacturing is becoming universal throughout the world. Where once Japan posed the greatest threat to the United States, imports now are flooding in from such widely separated points as Hong Kong, Portugal, Pakistan, Egypt, France, India, and Spain. And since there are wide differentials of cost and price among these countries, it becomes virtually impossible to raise a tariff wall high enough to protect the domestic industry without shutting off all trade with many longtime friends of the United States.

Relief is now being sought by the textile industry—the fixing of quotas by country and by category of goods. Textile manufacturers realize the Nation's stake in world commerce, and they are willing to pay their share of the costs involved. What they do ask is a better set of rules for competition—along with an understanding of the close relation between the Nation's economic welfare and the national security.

The most hopeful note that textile men have gotten from the new administration actually came before the election. Back in August of last year, John F. Kennedy had this word of encouragement in a letter to South Carolina's Governor, Ernest F. Hollings, a spokesman for the industry:

"Imports of textile products, including apparel, should be within limits which will not endanger our own existing textile capacity and employment, and which will permit growth of the industry in reasonable relationship to the expansion of our overall economy."

The textile men hope these words have not been forgotten.

Proposal To Equalize Tax and Benefits in the Social Security System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Frank Dickinson of Bronxville, N.Y., has offered a proposal which would attempt to cure the present imbalance of tax burdens and benefits in the social security system. He points out that presently America's young taxpayers are footing the bill for social security recipients whose payments, in relation to benefits received, are minimal and urges that there be a graduated social security tax to help even out the amount of tax paid and benefits received. This proposal was the subject of a recent editorial in the New York Sunday News of April 2, 1961. I would like at this point to insert the Sunday News editorial on this subject in the RECORD at this point:

REJIGGERING SOCIAL SECURITY

If the Kennedy administration has its way, the current Congress will increase and extend assorted benefits under social security, particularly with regard to higher payments to widows of insured workers, optional earlier retirement for male workers, and easier qualifications for retirement.

The President wants to do this by small, across the board increases in the premiums paid by employers and employees. Those premiums now come to 3 percent paid by the employer and 3 percent by the worker on the first $4,800 of income.

These increased benefits may be advisable; we don't know. But an interesting article in a recent issue of the Journal of Insurance, by Frank G. Dickinson, questions the wisdom of charging all age groups the same premiums for their social security.

It doesn't seem fair, for one thing, to assess a man who enters the social security system at age 20 the same or increasing percentages for 45 years, while a worker at, say, age 60 will have to pay the flat premium for only 5 more years before he starts collecting.

This unfairness, Dickinson believes, will dawn on the younger age group sooner or later, and may trigger a serious tax rebellion which could wreck the social security system.

Why not, then, Dickinson suggests, rejigger the premium rates so that the under-32 group would pay less, the 32–49 group the same as now, and the group aged 50 and over a good deal more?

Under the Dickinson plan, the younger age group's rate would be cut to 1½ percent, the middle rate would stay at 3 percent, and the premiums paid by older persons would go up to 4½ percent. Further increases, contemplated by the social security law since it first took effect in 1937, would be made proportionately as time went on.

The effect, as Dickinson sees it, would be to bring social security closer to the principles on which sound insurance businesses operate, and to cut down the danger that benefits due under social security may sometime become so huge as to ruin or seriously impair the whole setup.

Without going overboard for the Dickinson proposals, we'll say we do think they should be carefully considered by everybody—particularly Members of Congress—interested in improving the social security system.

The Case for the B–70 in an Age of Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in this crucial cold war, it is extremely encouraging to see the intense interest which has been given to President Kennedy's defense budget. Such extraordinary attention to our military preparedness should surely result in a program which will keep our Nation strong and secure, and it is my hope that all of our citizens, whether in the military or in civilian life, will continue to study and discuss the proposals which have been presented.

One of the most important items in President Kennedy's defense message concerns the future of the B–70 supersonic jet bomber.

An extremely thought-provoking and informative article on this subject was included in the April 17 issue of Newsweek magazine and I ask unanimous consent that this item, which was written by Gen. Carl Spaatz, former Air Force Chief of Staff, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE CASE FOR THE B–70 IN AN AGE OF MISSILES

(One controversial economy of the Kennedy defense budget was a sharp cutback in the B–70 superbomber program. Newsweek's contributing editor on military affairs, Gen. Carl Spatz, former Air Force Chief of Staff, here states the risks he sees in this decision—and argues the case for the jet bombers.)

The revised military budget, as explained to a Senate committee last week by Secretary McNamara, is generally sensible and reassuring. However, it contains one serious flaw. This derives from the new administration's hesitancy about developing the B–70 supersonic jet bomber.

Chairman RICHARD RUSSELL of the Armed Services Committee, after listening to McNamara's defense of a small experimental appropriation for the B–70, expressed the opinion that the project should be dropped altogether or be brought to the production stage as soon as feasible. He indicated that he personally favored the latter course and thought that the committee would agree.

McNamara had argued that missiles would be capable of filling the Nation's need for strategic air strength by the time the B–70 could get into production. He had agreed that the scientific breakthroughs exploited by the B–70 should be developed experimentally but that quantity production of a new manned bomber should await further refinements.

In the meantime, he suggested, the present B–52, equipped with Skybolt missiles, would supplement the Nation's arsenal of missiles adequately.

This will doubtless be true if the Soviet Union is considerate enough to desist from developing and producing a B–70 of its own. But if the Russians should develop a 2,000-mile-an-hour plane with the characteristics of the B–70, our B–52's would be swept from the skies in any intercontinental war. And our missiles might or might not do the job. It is for this reason that the administration's course is so risky. If, on the other hand, the Soviet Union places sole reliance on guided missiles and we include the B–70 in our arsenal, we shall have an incalculable advantage. The thinking machine never will be invented that can substitute for the human mind in maneuvering an air vehicle. The Minuteman and the Polaris, much as we need them, can never be wholly satisfactory substitutes for manned aircraft.

The best missile will be next to useless without the up-to-the-minute reconnaissance only a manned plane can still supply today. Reconnaissance satellites can do only part of the job, at best, and will be vulnerable to attack by countersatellites in any war of the future.

As a bomber, too, the B–70 would have advantages over ballistic missiles. It could strike more rapidly because it could cruise the fringes of enemy territory and release its rockets a thousand miles or more from its targets. It could be recalled in flight and thus would have a safety factor missiles lack. It would be less vulnerable than any missile, even the Polaris, because it could maneuver in the limitless oceans of the air.

It would be as useful in nonatomic as well as atomic war. It could carry large payloads of conventional explosives. Missiles, by contrast, are next to useless unless armed with atomic warheads. Any investment we might make in the B–70 would not be wasted in the event of nuclear disarmament agreements.

The kind of slow and cautious development McNamara seems to have in mind will not be sufficient to give the B–70 a thorough test or to permit its full exploitation as an important component of our weapons system.

Back in 1937, the U.S. military command considered abolishing from its budget all funds for the development of the B–17. Fortunately, they decided against it. Without the B–17, the Second World War certainly would have been prolonged at a heavy cost in lives and treasure and might have been lost. We can only hope that the B–70 decision also will be reconsidered before it is too late.

Advertising Never Sold Them Anything

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a few leading economists, in-

cluding Presidential adviser J. Kenneth Galbraith, have suggested that our standard of living is too high, and that we would be better off leading a simpler life. Galbraith in his book "The Affluent Society," is extremely critical of advertising and declares that it creates a bias in the mind of consumers in favor of private spending and against public spending.

An eloquent argument against this point of view appeared recently in an advertisement, prepared by Erwin Wasey, Ruthrauff & Ryan, Inc., advertising agency of Philadelphia.

It was published as a public service by the Philadelphia Daily News.

I ask unanimous consent to include this important and timely message in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a portion of my remarks:

HERE'S A FAMILY WHO CAN HONESTLY SAY: ADVERTISING NEVER SOLD THEM ANYTHING

The family lives in Russia. We are using them to illustrate a point.

Unlike most Americans, these people seldom see or hear any advertising. Only a few posters and handbills, random announcements in newspapers and magazines and, lately, some commercials on the government-run radio and television.

So, these people can honestly say advertising never sold them anything.

Advertising never "sold" them an automobile.

Advertising never "sold" them a telephone.

Advertising never "sold" them a dream house, color television, an FM radio, a hi-fi record player, frozen lobster, packaged soups, modern furniture, an electric mixer, power mower, air conditioning, automatic defrosting, home permanents, outboard motor, spinet piano, home workshop.

Some people might point out that life is much simpler in Russia than America. It is. And no wonder.

There are not nearly so many choices to make. Not nearly so many new things presented to people by manufacturers trying to serve them. Not nearly so many new things for people to want, because advertising helps show them how a product can make life easier, pleasanter, more worthwhile. Yes, and more dignified.

No automatic dishwasher ads tell human dishwashers how to get out of the kitchen faster.

No travel ads tell families they, too, can go South for the winter sun.

No cake mix ads. No ice cream ads. No automobile ads. No ads to rub it in that they haven't got much cake—or ice cream—or a car.

Now, let's imagine that suddenly all this is changed.

Let's imagine that advertising as Americans know it begins to urge Russian families to light their homes more efficiently, or join book clubs to read Plato or best sellers, or grow greener lawns or bigger chrysanthemums, or lay the tile on their own patios, or deep-wax their cars, or eat more delicious and healthful breakfasts, or have wine with dinner, or vote the Democratic ticket, or vote the Republican ticket, or dress smarter, or sleep under an electric blanket, or look prettier if you're a woman, or handsomer if you're a man, or sit down at the piano and surprise your friends, or drive across your country just for the fun of it.

We wonder if these people and the millions like them would say "No thanks. We prefer the simple life."

We'd like to suggest that the next time you read an ad or see a commercial you think of the Russian families to whom advertising has never sold a thing.

And that you look at that ad as an advertiser offering you a choice to do what you want with your dollars to satisfy your wants in your pattern of living.

It's as simple—and honest—as that.

Death of Louis P. Marciante

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the death of Louis P. Marciante in New Jersey last week has saddened his friends throughout the Nation. As president of the State federation of labor, Mr. Marciante made many lasting contributions to the labor movement in his home State and in the Nation. He worked during the long, difficult years when labor was first finding a foothold in our society. Later, he helped to develop new concepts and new responsibilities for labor.

An editorial in the Newark News of March 31 pays tribute to Mr. Marciante and sums up the reasons for his accomplishments to New Jersey and to labor. The editorial carefully points out that Mr. Marciante was often a critic, even of labor itself. But his criticism was the kind that brings growth and accomplishment. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

An editorial in the Trentonian, Trenton, N.J., of the same date also pays tribute to Mr. Marciante. It makes specific notice of his service to his community, including his work on the Trenton Board of Education. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Newark News, Mar. 31, 1961]

LOUIS P. MARCIANTE

It was Louis Marciante's destiny to lead the State federation of labor through a tempestuous era and all who knew him will agree he was the man for the job. In that quarter century labor's role grew more complex, just as industry and government grew more complex, and where other labor leaders of his generation were lost in the eddies, Mr. Marciante stayed in the main current of the labor movement.

His contribution to New Jersey's industrial growth was considerable. For behind his outspoken manner and aggressive championing of labor's cause in all areas, there was a moderation that gave balance to the federation's program and brought it closer to its goals.

Those who follow Louis Marciante as leaders of labor will do well to examine the course he steered. For as bluntly as he criticized legislatures, Governors and industrialists, he criticized labor itself. And when it came from him, labor listened—and benefited—as the record of that quarter century suggests.

[From the Trentonian, Trenton, N.J.]

LOUIS P. MARCIANTE

Louis P. Marciante was a labor leader of the old school but at the same time he was one who was blessed with the enlightened attitude that in order for labor to make progress, its leaders had to share the responsibilities of civic leadership.

Mr. Marciante, whose death occurred Thursday at age 62, was unrelenting in his effort to win the best that was attainable for members of organized labor, but his policies were not so unyielding that they failed to take into consideration the fact that labor relations is a two-way street. Thus he was consistently conscious of management's problems as well as labor's.

As he made his way up from the ranks to the highest positions of labor leadership and eventually the presidency of the New Jersey American Federation of Labor, Mr. Marciante also rose to prominence in civic and national affairs. He served Trenton for 12 years as a member of the board of education, and Presidents and Governors called upon him to carry out demanding assignments.

In all his activities, he was a rugged individualist who was motivated by strong and unswerving convictions. He was an outstanding pioneer in his chosen field, and as such organized labor owes a lot to him.

Rev. Thomas J. Tierney, of Quincy, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday evening it was my privilege to attend a testimonial dinner in honor of Father Thomas J. Tierney, St. John's Church, Quincy, Mass. Father Tom, as he is affectionately known in Massachusetts, has dedicated his life to his fellowman. I will not try to elaborate at this time his many, many accomplishments. I would like to include in the RECORD a few of the highlights of his activities mentioned at the dinner by Chief Justice Paul C. Reardon, Massachusetts Superior Court, and the text of a citation presented to Father Tierney by Mr. Henry Bosworth, well-known newspaperman and writer for the Boston Traveler. An editorial that appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger is also included.

The fine example set by Father Thomas J. Tierney in his combination of religious teaching, civic action, and love for neighbor has made our community richer. I was proud to be present at this dinner and to be associated with the Right Reverend Stephen F. Moran, pastor of St. John's Church, Rabbi Jacob Mann, Beth Israel Synagogue, Rev. Chester A. Porteus, rector, Christ Episcopal Church, civic leaders, public officials and citizens from all walks of life who were in attendance.

The material mentioned follows:

TESTIMONIAL DINNER TENDERED TO REV. THOMAS J. TIERNEY, APRIL 9, 1961, SURF BALLROOM, NANTASKET

PROFILE OF REV. FATHER THOMAS J. TIERNEY, PRIEST, PATRIOT, HERO, HUMANITARIAN, LEADER—FRIEND

Born: Lowell, Mass., June 9, 1903, son of beloved John and Elizabeth McLaughlin Tierney.

Boyhood: Loved to chase fire engines.

Schools: Lowell High School, Boston College, St. John's Seminary.

Ordained: Holy Cross Cathedral, June 5, 1931, by William Cardinal O'Connell.

Assignment: Blessed Sacrament Church, Cambridge, June 1931.

Sideline: Chasing fire enignes.

Appointment: First archdiocesan fire department chaplain by Cardinal O'Connell, serving with Cambridge fire department.

Heroism: Rescued two children over aerial ladder from third floor burning building on Brookline Street, Cambridge, in 1941.

Gave conditional absolution and final rites to over 100 victims of Cocoanut Grove holocaust, 1942. Also directed and assisted in smashing windows and battering down interior partitions of ill-fated night club to provide more exits for trapped patrons. His action saved many lives.

Attempted to rescue six members of a family from blazing Brewster Street, Cambridge, home, 1948. All six members perished. Father Tierney helped recover bodies, was overcome from smoke inhalation and taken to hospital.

Patriotism: Presented special citation by President Franklin D. Roosevelt for bond selling rallies during World War II.

More recognition: Presented Kate Smith Award in 1948 for his heroic actions at the Cocoanut Grove and Cambridge fires.

Transfer: Assigned to St. John's Parish, Quincy, April 24, 1950. Cambridge's loss—Quincy's gain. A big gain.

Patient: Spent 6 weeks at Quincy City Hospital as patient shortly after his arrival in Quincy. During this time he became friends with doctors, nurses, attendants, and patients. Since then he has returned to the hospital every single day to visit and cheer patients of all races and creeds.

Sideline: Still chases fire engines. Appointed chaplain of Quincy fire and police departments.

More work: In 1952 became city parade director. First Christmas parade attracted only 5,000. Now draws over 100,000 each year.

Nonsectarian fire service: Rescued the Blessed Sacrament when fire gutted interior of Blessed Sacrament Church, Houghs Neck, July 29, 1955.

Manned hose with firefighters to stop flames in blaze at First Baptist Church, Wollaston, June 26, 1956.

Carried out sacred Jewish book Torah from Temple when fire broke out and threatened Quincy Jewish Community Center, April 27, 1959.

His day: Mayor Amelio Della Chiesa proclaimed October 3, 1960, "Father Tierney Day" in tribute to his "love for his fellowman."

His night: First Quincy Citizens Award presented him for outstanding public service, April 9, 1961.

His future: Continuing helping others—regardless of race, color, or creed.

(And, chasing fire engines.)

PROGRAM

Toastmaster: Frank E. Remick.

Invocation: Rabbi Jacob Mann, Beth Israel Synagogue.

Welcoming address: Raymond C. Warmington, general chairman.

Head table: Paul J. Cifrino, president, Quincy-South Shore Chamber of Commerce; Hon. Edward A. Crane, mayor, city of Cambridge; Dr. Joseph P. Leone, director, Quincy City Hosiptal; Chief William Ferrazzi, Quincy Police Department; Chief Thomas F. Gorman, Quincy Fire Department; Rt. Rev. Stephen F. Moran, pastor, St. John's Church; Hon. Paul C. Reardon, chief justice, Massachusetts Superior Court; Hon. James A. Burke, Congressman, 13th Congressional District.

Presentations: Col. Walter C. Fuller, commander, Quincy Veterans' Council; David Alexander, mayor; Amelio Della Chiesa; Henry Bosworth.

Benediction: Rev. Chester A. Porteus, rector, Christ Episcopal Church.

Committee: General chairman, Raymond C. Warmington; cochairmen, Larry Antonelli and Lester H. Glasser.

Steering committee: David G. Alexander, John Allegrini, Henry Bosworth, Lawrence S. Butler, Joseph Burke, Thomas R. Burke, Peter Cooke, Daniel V. Cremins, Robert Leo Eng, Walter C. Fuller, John M. Gillis, John A. Golden, Jr., Paul A.M. Hunt, Edward T. Lewis, John M. Lyons, Dr. Alfred V. Mahoney, James S. McCormack, James R. McIntyre, James J. Mullin, John T. Rohde, Dennis F. Ryan, Alexander Smith, John C. Walker, and John F. Wipfler.

Honorary chairmen: Rt. Rev. Stephen F. Moran, Rabbi Jacob Mann, Rev. Chester A. Porteus.

General committee: Gary Aluisy, Carl W. Anderson, George R. Andrews, Francis F. Anselmo, James D. Asher, Frank L. Avery, Hyman Asnes, Joseph C. Avitabile, Vincent Banco, Nicholas Barbadoro, Raymond F. Barrett, George S. Bennett, Francis X Bellotti, Fulvio L. Berini, Melville S. Berman, Fred Bergfors, Luigi Bolea, Everett J. Bracchi, Joseph E. Brett, Leslie M. Brierley, John H. Brownell, Vincent Buonfiglio, Arthur I. Burgess, Thomas S. Burgin, George G. Burke, James A. Burke, J. Clarence Canniff, Sidney S. Canter, Paul S. Carosi, Gordon D. Carr, Joseph P. Carroll, Richard Carroll, Walter H. Carroll, Louis S. Cassani, Thomas J. Cavanaugh, Robert Cherubini, Henry H. Chmielinski, Jr., Paul J. Cifrino, Ralph Chiminiello, John A. Chisholm, Clarence P. Churchill, Joseph S. Cipolla, Frank D. Coffman, Paul Coleman, Paul A. Coletti, James Collins, Adolph J. Concheri, J. C. Coppleman, Robert A. Curry, Matthew Cushing, Allan Curtis, Maurice J. Daley, William Daley, Leo Darr, Amelio A. Della Chiesa, William DeLargy, Arthur DePetro, Frank A. DeSilva, James Y. Deupree, Robert M. Deware, A. George DiAngelo, Russell L. DiMattio, Daniel Donaher, Henry Donaher, Jr., Jeremiah Donovan, Joseph Duffy, Ambrose Duggan, Francis Duggan, William C. Ellis, Kenneth P. Fallon, Jr., George C. Fay, William A. Ferrazzi, Arthur L. Fitzgerald, John P. Flavin, Herb Fontaine, Alfred L. Fontana, James F. Fostello, Harry Freeman, James T. Gartland, Gerald S. Gherardi, Umberto Giarrusso, Irvin B. Gifford, Everett Goodhue, Thomas F. Gorman, Dr. Paul A. Gossard, Joseph Goulding, Dominic A. Grazio, Joseph B. Grossman, Rubin A. Grossman, John F. Hallisey, Charles W. Hedges, John A. Hedlund, Lawrence G. Henley, John R. Herbert, Paul Hurley, James D. Hutchinson, John E. Johnson, J. Henry Johnson, Lloyd C. Johnson, Stephen T. Keefe, Jr., J. Walter Kemp, Cornelius V. Keohane, George J. Kilduff, Delcevare King, Richard J. Koch, Edwin J. LaCroix, William B. Lamprey, Myron N. Lane, Percy N. Lane, Joseph J. LaRaia, Edward S. MacDonald, Robert L. Macomber, Thomas F. Maloney, Thomas M. Maloney, Dr. Edward S. Mann, L. Paul Marini, William J. Martin, Walter E. Martinson, Lawrence H. Mattie, Vincent A. McCabe, Francis X. McCauley, George B. McDonald, Joseph P. McDonough, James F. McCormick, Jr., James F. McConnigal, George A. McIntire, David S. McIntosh, Frank McKenzie, Paul A. McLaughlin, William H. McNeill, Ernest J. Montillio, John Morley, Thomas V. Morrissey, Judge James A. Mulhall, Joseph Nassano, John D. Noonan, Edward J. O'Brien, George E. O'Brien, Albert Oliverio, Henry F. Paquin, William A. Palmer, Jr., Harry Pavan, Nicholas A. Pepe, John J. Quinn, John J. Quinn, Joseph G. Ray, George Reardon, Judge Paul C. Reardon, Frank E. Remick, James F. Reynolds, Jr., Charles W. Riley, Russell S. Riley, J. Everett Robbie, Charles N. Ross, Leroy L. Rounseville, William Russell, Aldo M. Saluti, A. Mario Salvatore, Augustus E. Settimelli, Charles L. Shea, William J. Shea, Morris Silverman, Louis Simons, Harold H. Slate, John D. Smith, Walter L. Smith, John J. Sullivan, Joseph A. Sullivan, Heslip E. Sutherland, Martin C. Sweeney, Richard T. Sweeney, Olin A. Taylor, Dr. Charles H. Thorner, Gordon S. Troupe, Anthony J. Venna, William L. Villone, Michael T. Walsh, Alexander E. Warmington, Paul A. Waters, Chester J. Weeden, Alrick Weidman, Milton B. Wiggin, Edward Whittaker, George A. Yarrington, Daniel L. Young, James Zavatone.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHSETTS COMMENDING AND CONGRATULATING REV. THOMAS J. TIERNEY, CURATE OF ST. JOHN'S CHURCH IN THE CITY OF QUINCY

Whereas Rev. Thomas J. Tierney, curate of St. John's Church in the city of Quincy, has played a prominent and active part in the organizing civic parades and activities in the city of Quincy; and

Whereas in addition to his many and exacting duties as a curate, he has served with distinction as chaplain of the Quincy Fire Department and the Quincy City Hospital; and

Whereas he has exerted an inspiring influence in the community by his devoted and dedicated service to the city of Quincy and its inhabitants, far above and beyond the call of duty; and

Whereas in grateful recognition of his unselfish devotion to their welfare, his many friends, from all faiths and walks of life, are tendering him a public testimonial on the 9th day of April, 1961: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby commends Rev. Thomas J. Tierney for his good works and extends its congratulations to him on the occasion of his testimonial and its best wishes for continued health, success and happiness; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary to the commonwealth to Rev. Thomas J. Tierney.

Adopted.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

The above resolve was introduced by State Representative Joseph E. Brett, of Quincy, and passed unanimously by the Massachusetts House of Representatives.

DON'T QUIT

I

When things go wrong, as they sometimes will,
When the road you're trudging seems all uphill,
When the funds are low and the debts are high,
And you want to smile, but you have to sigh,
When care is pressing you down a bit—
Rest if you must, but don't you quit.

II

Life is queer with its twists and turns,
As every one of us sometimes learns,
And many a fellow turns about
When he might have won had he stuck it out.
Don't give up though the pace seems slow—
You may succeed with another blow.

III

Often the goal is nearer than
It seems to a faint and faltering man;
Often the struggler has given up
When he might have captured the victor's cup;
And he learned too late when the night came down,
How close he was to the golden crown.

IV

Success is failure turned inside out—
The silver tint of the clouds of doubt,
And you never can tell how close you are,
It may be near when it seems afar;
So stick to the fight when you're hardest hit,—
It's when things seem worst that you mustn't quit.

REMARKS OF CHIEF JUSTICE PAUL C. REARDON AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER TO THE REVEREND THOMAS J. TIERNEY AT NANTASKET, MASS., APRIL 9, 1961

It is indeed a long time since Father William Halley came to St. John's as its first priest in 1852 and since 1853 when Bishop Fitzpatrick dedicated the new church in the presence of Josiah Quincy, mayor of Boston, Charles Francis Adams, Minister to England during the Civil War, and George Tyler Bigelow, later chief justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, among others. It is also many years since 1872 when the church was enlarged and took on its present proportions. It is well for us who are its parishioners to remember that on all three occasions members of the community of the town of Quincy which was then, of course, largely non-Catholic, contributed money and assistance in other ways to the end that the new church and congregation might be off to a good beginning. We remember those contributions with gratitude and we like to think that over the years they have in a sense been repaid by the good works which our priests have performed in Quincy. Those who are older here may recall, for instance, Father Ambrose Roche, who served for a time on the Quincy School Committee. There were others in the long line of curates at St. John's who have earned the respect and affection not only of its people but also of the people of Quincy generally. But as I think back over my own time in the parish I can bring to mind beyond Father Tierney no curate who has so returned to the city and all its citizens regardless of their belief and in such full measure the kindness which was made manifest to the young church in its early days. I was born two doors from St. John's. I attended its parochial school, as have all of our children, and I have lived my entire life in the parish. In voicing my own pride in what Father Tierney has given I simply reflect those sentiments which I am certain all the parishioners of St. John's, whom I have the privilege to represent here, would want me to express in their behalf to you. You know him for his large contributions to Quincy in various ways. We know him and we love him as the diligent priest, the around-the-clock worker in our particular vineyard, the humane and wise counselor whose sermons ring with good sense carrying hope and cheer to the depressed, the assiduous visitor, to those who are housebound or bedridden, in truth the "comforter of the afflicted" and the "health of the sick." We admire him for what he is and what he has done and we are happy beyond words that you rather like him too. What better life can a man possibly lead and what riches can compare with that type of wealth which generates this evening's tribute?

In a prayer for generosity Ignatius Loyola wrote:

"Teach us, good Lord, to serve Thee as
Thou deservest,
To give and not to count the cost,
To fight and not to heed the wounds,
To toil and not to seek for rest,
To labour and not ask for any reward
Save that of knowing that we do Thy will."

This is a touching expression of the motive which governs Father Tierney's life, and, aware of this, the people of St. John's desire through me to add their voice in saying to a beloved priest in the poet's words:

"When God go with you, priest of God,
For all is well, and shall be well."

TEXT OF CITATION PRESENTED BY HENRY BOSWORTH—CITATION IS A COMPANION AWARD WITH PLAQUE AND EXPLAINS THE PLAQUE

QUINCY CITIZENS AWARD TO REV. THOMAS J. TIERNEY, ST. JOHN'S CHURCH

In recognition of his many contributions to the many from all religions, fields of endeavor, and walks of life.

Since his ordination in 1931 as a humble and devoted servant of God, Father Tierney has given the one precious gift that all men possess but few men give: himself.

This gift he has given freely, unselfishly, and happily to one and all—all and one—regardless of race, color, or creed.

Since coming to Quincy April 24, 1950, he has made this historically, industrially, commercially, and residentially proud community humanely and civically wealthy by his presence.

He has spent countless hours of his own time comforting and cheering the sick at Quincy City Hospital in their hour of spiritual need.

As chaplain of the Quincy Police and Fire Departments he has suffered the ordeal of men battling cruel flames in bitter cold. He has aided those who fell in the line of duty and performed heroically himself in those challenging moments when a man is called upon to be a man.

As city parade director, many more hours have gone to spreading the fame of Quincy by bringing thousands and thousands of visitors to the city.

As parade director he has been a strong and true friend of the veteran. The fluttering flags, marching feet, blaring trumpets, and rolling drums serve as a stirring but solemn reminder of the sacrifices these men made for their country.

These are but a few of his deeds. He has done many more quietly and privately. Only he, God, and those many he has helped in many ways, share that knowledge.

Therefore, be it known that on this 9th day of April 1961, a Quincy Citizens Committee from all faiths and walks of life proudly presents to Rev. Thomas J. Tierney this award for outstanding public service.

But—perhaps the finest citation of all to exemplify this man are seven borrowed words—his favorite words:

"I must be about My Father's business."

[From the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Apr. 10, 1961]

FRUITFUL LABORS

The Reverend Thomas J. Tierney, of St. John's Church in Quincy has given sympathy, understanding, counsel, and good cheer to Quincy citizens of all denominations. As Congressman JAMES A. BURKE declared Sunday night, Father Tierney's goal has been to bring people closer together; what better evidence could there be of his success than the gathering of 1,100 people of all creeds and from all walks of life to honor him?

Another particularly appropriate comment came from Superior Court Chief Justice Paul C. Reardon, himself a parishioner of St. John's. Father Tierney, he pointed out, has been outstanding in his combination of religious teaching with effective civic action.

Many a Quincy City Hospital patient has been grateful for Father Tierney's visits. It is fitting, therefore, that the chief gift at Sunday night's testimonial should have been the furnishing in the hospital of a chaplain's room for all faiths.

Father Tierney has given freely of himself and has reaped abundant gratitude. We wish him many more years of fruitful labor.

Tribute to Senator Henry Dworshak of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Twin Falls, Idaho, Times-News of March 23, 1961, commenting on the record of our colleague the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

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

GOOD DEAL OF MERIT

When Idaho's Senator HENRY DWORSHAK told the Appropriations Committee "it's time to face our own problems" he echoed the sentiments of many people across the Nation. He referred to the Federal Government's concern over foreign economic conditions, adding, "I think it is time that we wonder what is happening to the United States."

Senator DWORSHAK said he was sympathetic with needs of Africa, Asia, and Europe. Certainly in this atomic space age no one would suggest ignoring the world's problems to the extent of building some sort of maginot line along the seacoast. That would be foolhardy if not impossible during what amounts to a global conflict with communism.

The Idaho Senator pointed out, "We send hundreds of Americans abroad to devote months of time in devising ways to cut our tariffs, to give competitive advantage to people everywhere in the world and to create more problems at home." He added that unemployment, the plight of agriculture and the inability of American business to compete in world markets should be considered. "Still we are asked to provide more funds for activities devoted to further jeopardizing our markets."

Senator DWORSHAK has a point and a big one at that. Many people question the value of billions of dollars in foreign aid when one of the "rewards" of such generosity is the nickname of "Uncle Shylock." Americans aren't likely to forget soon the reception accorded Vice President Richard Nixon and his wife in South America when they were literally doused with spit from a Communist-inspired crowd.

Anti-American riots in Japan a few months ago forced cancellation of a visit by President Eisenhower. Signs reading "Go home Yankee" have been commonplace around the world. There are dozens of examples.

Communist inspired? Certainly. But what has happened to all the good will and gratitude that should be expected of billions and billions of dollars in U.S. aid poured into virtually every country on the face of the globe? Is it asking too much to expect a little appreciation in return? Perhaps it is, and maybe there is no greater truth than "You can't buy friends."

In that event, Senator DWORSHAK's statement is more impressive than ever. There is no doubt "it's time to face our own problems."

Senator DWORSHAK made one more statement that taxpayers everywhere should repeat time after time until it is burned into all minds.

"Regardless of false impression some people try to create, the U.S. Government has no bottomless money barrel. The Federal Government cannot spend one penny that it does not take from taxpayers."

Yes, that foreign aid and any domestic Federal aid comes right out of your pocket.

Reducing Its Punch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions we hear the critics of the Corps of Engineers talk long and loud relative to public works projects.

I enclose an editorial from the daily State Gazette, of Dyersburg, Tenn., relative to the wonderful project which the Congress approved and relative to the value and benefit of the Dyer County levee.

It is such a fine editorial I wanted to place it in the RECORD so others may have a change to read it.

The article follows:

REDUCING ITS PUNCH

In the first sizable test since its construction, Dyer Countians in the Mississippi River bottom area have learned the value of the levee.

During the recent rise the county had considerable floodwaters, but nothing compared to that which visited on the rich farming western section of the county of many years ago.

Stages reached on the U.S. Weather Bureau gage at Cairo several days ago would have meant many thousands of acres of land underwater and hundreds of residents of the flooded area evacuated in bygone days.

Most persons refer only to the disastrous 1937 flood in this area, but there have been many floods in Dyer County in other years when the crest at Cairo was considerably below that of 1937.

In the latter part of the 1920's long before the historical flood of 1937 and at other times prior to the "big flood," waters repeatedly covered the river bottom area in both early spring and June floods.

It was not unusual then for sizable boats to dock at Big Boy Junction, just beyond Finley, and for all routes to the Mississippi River to be closed. Apparently the levee has made such instances events which belong to the past.

Every sizable rise in the Mississippi at Cairo, with the water subsequently to pass this way, no longer means the inundation of thousands of acres of land and the evacuation of residents to be looked after by the Red Cross and other local agenices.

Even at Cairo the level of Mississippi River rises can be controlled to a great extent by dams on the tributaries which feed it. The Cumberland empties into the Tennessee, the Tennessee into the Ohio and the Ohio disgorges its floodwaters into the Mississippi at Cairo.

However, during high water situations these waters destined for the Mississippi eventually the gulf, passing along the Dyer County reach, controls by dams, straightening of channels of tributaries and levees have resulted in harnessing of the waters to an appreciable extent and floods which once had to be contended with no longer pack the destructive punch they once did.

Protest Against Certain Tax Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Turnpike Authority is an agency created by the Legislature of Kansas to construct and finance a turnpike consisting of 236 miles of highway. The Federal Government has designated a large portion of this highway as a part of our Interstate Federal System and its operation is dependent on revenues received from traffic. It is important that no action be taken by the Congress that will reduce travel or revenues received therefrom.

The Kansas Turnpike Authority adopted a resolution opposed to increased taxes that might reduce travel.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION, KANSAS TURNPIKE AUTHORITY

Whereas the Kansas Turnpike Authority is an agency created by the Legislature of the State of Kansas, and

Whereas said authority, pursuant to legislative authorization has constructed a turnpike extending 236 miles through the State of Kansas, and is now operating same, and

Whereas the construction of said turnpike was financed through the issuance of revenue bonds, the interest and principal to be paid from tolls received from operation of said turnpike, and

Whereas there is now issued an outstanding $155,968,000 of revenue bonds issued for the construction of said turnpike, and

Whereas a substantial portion of the revenues received from the operation of the turnpike must come from commercial traffic including the operation of trucks, buses, and other similar transportation agencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Kansas Turnpike Authority, duly assembled in its regular meeting on the 27th day of March 1961, That said authority go on record as protesting any tax increases recommended to Congress to be imposed on diesel fuel, heavy trucks, tires, innertubes and tread rubber; be it further

Resolved, That the Kansas Turnpike Authority states that such increased taxes would materially reduce commercial traffic upon the Kansas Turnpike and any reduction in revenues would prejudice the interests of the revenue bondholders and the payment of interest and principal on said bond; be it further

Resolved, That the Kansas Turnpike Authority does hereby direct that a copy of this resolution be furnished to the appropriate congressional committees and does further direct that State Senator Donald S. Hults and the authority general manager, John Kirchner, appear in person before such committees to oppose such increase in taxation.

Approved this 27th day of March 1961.

KANSAS TURNPIKE AUTHORITY.

The Fabulous Miracle Mile: Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in Los Angeles, Calif., there is a fabulous section known as the Miracle Mile. Thirty years ago Wilshire Boulevard along which the Miracle Mile was built was a narrow dirt road surrounded by open fields. Today this 1-mile area on Wilshire Boulevard is known throughout the world as a business and shopping center second to none. It is surrounded by the largest buying power on the west coast with 70,000 people within walking distance alone. And annual retail sales in this Fifth Avenue of the West exceed $239 million annually.

The fantastic development of the Miracle Mile in the short period of its history matches the unbelievable growth and expansion of Los Angeles itself.

The phenomenal development and expansion of the Miracle Mile and Wilshire Boulevard can be illustrated from a personal experience I had many years ago.

I recall on a beautiful sunny Sunday afternoon, Mrs. McDonough and I were driving out Wilshire Boulevard till we came to that part of the boulevard that had not yet been paved. It was just a narrow dirt road, and I stopped at a small lean-to real estate office to inquire about the cost of a lot fronting on Wilshire Boulevard. This was in the area of the Miracle Mile and the real estate agent showed me a lot with 100-foot front on Wilshire Boulevard priced at $1,750. If I had bought it, that lot would be worth more than $300,000 today.

There is perhaps no place in the world where the most unexpected and unanticipated things have occurred which have increased land values and made successful many business ventures that otherwise appeared to be total losses than in southern California.

There is no place in the world today where more people are trying to get to than Los Angeles, Calif. At the rate of 250,000 each year, people from all over the world are pouring into Los Angeles—uprooting themselves from old home surroundings to find a new way of life in a vibrant new community throbbing with industry and enthusiasm. New homes, new jobs, new recreation, and greater hope in the future.

Los Angeles is very conscious of its responsibilities to all these new residents and is providing all the necessary requirements to make life and living more pleasant and abundant for them. Yes, the thing about Los Angeles is that Los Angeles knows what it is about.

In his book "Fabulous Boulevard," Ralph Hancock describes the phenomenal development of Wilshire Boulevard and the Miracle Mile as follows:

Thirty years ago Wilshire Boulevard west of La Brea was a meandering dirt road flanked by barbed wire and barley fields. La Brea Avenue crossing at right angles was another dirt road, little more than a service road for the oil wells in the neighborhood. One could have bought either corner at this intersection for the price of an automobile today. The vast barren acreage of the Hancock ranch, the last of the old Rancho La Brea, spread north of Wilshire to the hills. The land lying to the south of the future boulevard was part of two old ranchos, Rodeo de las Aguas and Las Cienegas. There was not a residence or a building, except for an occasional ramshackle farmhouse, within a mile and the principal structure on Wilshire was a billboard with this advertisement on it: "Wilshire Boulevard Center—A. W. Ross, Development."

Today this same section of Wilshire is the busiest portion of the boulevard and known from coast to coast as the Miracle Mile.

Destiny—has picked Los Angeles to do a gargantuan job. Whether one ponders over the memories of the past or marvels at the wonders of the present, here, one realizes, moves the course of empire, its cross section a boulevard, its climax 1 mile in with a man-made miracle has occurred.

A. W. Ross was the original developer of the area known as the Miracle Mile, and originally sold the land in this area to investors as commercial property. In the late twenties, the campaign began to bring big merchants to the Miracle Mile, and soon leading merchants from downtown Los Angeles opened branch stores beginning with Desmond's, Silverwood's, and others which now include Phelphs-Terkel, Mullen & Bluett, the May Co., and Coulters, the oldest department store in Los Angeles.

The Miracle Mile expanded rapidly, and to again quote from Mr. Hancock's vivid account:

In 1948 came Ohrbach's, the Prudential Insurance Co., Carnation Milk, and others to build still larger buildings. The Prudential-Ohrbach building is one of the most extraordinary structures.

Today both sides of Wilshire Boulevard, from La Brea to Fairfax, a measured mile, are nearly solid with substantial brick, stone, and stucco buildings tenanted by modern shops, stores, and markets. Among the tenants and owners are practically all the national chains, marketing consumer goods—drugs, foods, variety items, women's wear, men's furnishings, shoes, specialties—as well as some of Los Angeles' largest department stores, Coulter's May Co., Ohrbach's.

This, then, is the Miracle Mile of Wilshire Boulevard, a section of the boulevard that is 6 miles west of the older downtown district and extending from La Brea to Fairfax Avenue. It was here that the decentralization of business started in Los Angeles. It is the geographical center of the purchasing power of Los Angeles; most of the oldest and best established stores in Los Angeles have chosen it, and the two largest financial institutions in the world have selected it also, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. for its Parklabrea housing development and the Prudential Insurance Co. of America for its western home office. Thirty years ago it was a barren field. Twenty years ago the first big stores opened and the mile began to take on the air of a busy community. They call it the miracle of the Miracle Mile.

On March 23, the Miracle Mile became the site of a new landmark in the history of the progress of Los Angeles when the new Lee Tower Skyscraper, the tallest commercial building in Los Angeles and the city's first 22-story office building, was dedicated and formally opened.

I had the pleasure of attending the formal opening of the Lee Tower as principal speaker at this important event which was attended by most of the outstanding businessmen and community leaders in the southern California area.

The Lee Tower is an ultra-modern, blue-colored skyscraper of steel, concrete and glass with a helistop on the roof, a sky-view restaurant on the 22d floor, a rooftop recreation area for employees, and the most modern design throughout. It has been designated as the West's most outstanding commercial building, and was designed and built by the owners, W. Douglas Lee and D. Everett Lee.

This is the beginning of the skyscraper era in Los Angeles, and the Lee Tower is but the forerunner of many as Los Angeles grows toward the sky. Unlike New York, the skyscrapers of Los Angeles will not form dark canyons of stone and steel, but will be carefully planned and spaced so that the natural beauty of the city will be enhanced.

The fabulous development of the Miracle Mile is but a reflection of the fabulous and fantastic growth of Los Angeles itself. In Los Angeles we have passed through the cycles of primitive agriculture to the highest type of food production, the whole cycle of the motion picture production era to TV production, from the early exploration and production of petroleum to the highest type of gasoline refining, from modest production of metals to the massive production of iron, steel, and aluminum, from some of the early experiments in aircraft to the Nation's center of supersonic—B–70 and X–15—aircraft, and beyond this to the production of missiles and rockets including the F–1 million and a half pound thrust single rocket engine. Most of this has occurred and been accomplished within the past 40 years.

Los Angeles is a city of the future with its past only a brief preview of its future. No prediction for the future growth of Los Angeles can be too fantastic, no prophecy too difficult to fulfill. This city set like a jewel against a backdrop of lofty mountains with the blue waters of the Pacific as its western boundary will fulfill its destiny as one of the world's most important and enchanting cities.

There is nothing new to the new frontier. Los Angeles has been the new frontier of the Nation for the past 50 years.

The Eavesdropping and Wiretapping Problem Demands Attention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, New York State has led the Nation in its treatment of the ever-growing problem of electronic eavesdropping. Much of the progress which has been made in my State in dealing with this subject is the result of the work of the New York States Joint Legislative Committee on Privacy of Communications under the chairmanship of Assemblyman Anthony P. Savarese, Jr.

In a recent report this committee has again emphasized the importance of Federal legislation in the field of eavesdropping and wiretapping. The report contains an excellent analysis of the legal problems involved in this field and makes it clear that only Congress can remedy the present confused and illogical situation.

I was delighted to learn yesterday that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary is to hold hearings on the subject of eavesdropping and wiretapping during the month of May. I know that when the conditions which now exist are thoroughly studied, there will be widespread agreement as to the necessity for prompt congressional action. At the present time literally hundreds of cases are in limbo as a result of the uncertain status of the law on wiretapping.

In anticipation of the hearings by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I believe it would be helpful to all Members of the Senate to have available the analysis of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on the eavesdropping and wiretapping problem. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the relevant portion of the joint legislative committee's report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

PART I: EAVESDROPPING-WIRETAPPING

Many criminal offenders have gone unprosecuted in New York State as a result of the Federal determination that it is a crime to present wiretap evidence, as authorized by New York law. We cannot now determine how many, but the number is substantial.

In our 1960 report we noted that two major cases had come before the U.S. circuit court of appeals, in which the defendants sought injunctions against the admission of wiretap evidence obtained under authority of New York law. The injunctions were denied; but this decision was accompanied by

stern dicta. Circuit Judge Sterry R. Waterman said it would be "presumptuous to assume that any New York trial judge will acquiesce to the commission of a crime against the United States in his presence in his courtroom by a witness testifying under oath;" but he admonished the U.S. attorneys of New York that it would be "a most extraordinary affront to this court" if such a crime were committed and remained unprosecuted.

Consequently, the Nassau County court—reversing the standard New York practice—refused to receive wiretap testimony and directed acquittal, for lack of evidence, in the pending trial of John O'Rourke, vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, that union's most powerful leader in the East. This was a major racket prosecution. O'Rourke, with 14 others, was accused of using a fake union local to extort money from jukebox operators. He went free, but though much of the case was wrecked, five defendants were convicted and given substantial sentences.

The other wiretapping case before the circuit court was also unusual. Burton N. Pugach, a Bronx attorney, was accused of having conspired with three others to throw acid upon a young woman who had rejected him as a suitor. She was partially blinded and severely scarred. When arrested, Pugach was found in possession of an unauthorized gun. After successfully contesting a finding that he was insane, Pugach was tried for the gun offense and sent to jail for a year. While he was in custody, his attorney carried his wiretapping plea to the Supreme Court.

The Pugach plea was based on the finding of the Supreme Court, in the 1957 Benanti case, that New York's law enforcement wiretapping was in violation of Federal law. Pugach asked the Federal courts to forbid introduction of wiretap evidence against him, since it would cause him irreparable injury. Though he was granted a stay, his petition was denied.

The 7 to 2 majority opinion of the Supreme Court, rendered on February 27, 1961, was a single sentence affirming the decision of the courts below, and citing two cases of a decade ago. One, *Stefanelli* v. *Menard*, refused to enjoin the introduction of illegally obtained evidence because such interference with State trial procedures would result in "insupportable disruption." In the second case, *Schwartz* v. *Texas*, the Supreme Court had refused to reverse a conviction based on wiretapping evidence, since Texas then operated under the common law rule that competent evidence was admissible, even though illegally obtained. (It is under this doctrine that many New York convictions, based on wiretapping evidence, have been sustained.)

In a minority opinion Justice William O. Douglas, with the concurrence of Chief Justice Earl Warren, said the court should now overrule the Schwartz case and construe the Federal law against wiretapping evidence (sec. 605 of the Federal Communications Act) to bar use of wiretap evidence in State trials. He maintained it was illogical to permit such use when the disclosure of wiretapping had been construed as a crime. He cited a book which told of widespread police wiretapping in New York and criticized what he called "an avid taste for violating the law" on the part of New York police.

While voting with the majority to refuse the pretrial injunction sought by Pugach, Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., objected to the citation of the Schwartz case, indicating that he too was ready to overrule this doctrine, upon which rests much of the independence of our State judiciary. This disposition of three Supreme Court Justices makes very clear the pertinence of this committee's study of evidence rules, to be discussed in part I–A of this report.

"Wiretaps for State Trials Upheld by Supreme Court" was the newspaper headline on the Pugach decision, but it is apparent that this was oversimplification. Actually the decision did nothing to soften the spot on which Judge Waterman's dictum placed New York's judges and prosecutors. Of course, we cannot predict exactly what will happen at Pugach's imminent trial.

The bad situation as to New York wiretapping procedure, to which the foregoing litigation is incident, is something which can be really remedied only by action in the Congress, as this committee has emphasized before. Concerned as we have been, in this committee and this legislature, with protection of privacy and civil rights, we have always supported strongly the detection of crime through eavesdropping methods under proper regulation of the courts. We do not consider it necessary at this time to detail again our strong criticism of the vague inadequacy of the 31-word clause in the Federal Communications Act, which is the sole basis for the Federal court decisions. But we do reiterate our plea to Congress for definitive action.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING of New York and our district attorneys have properly taken the leadership in seeking action in Congress. The State commission of investigation and this committee have emphasized the need.

Senator KEATING's bill was reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1960, but died on the calendar. During the election year it was clearly impossible to obtain legislation, but it is not too much to hope that the new Congress will eventually take cognizance of New York's law enforcement plight. The new Attorney General's record is not one of hostility to wiretapping as carried on in New York under court authority. The contrary is true. We may hope that he will be more influential with Congress than previous Attorneys General have been.

We understand that Senator KEATING has become a member of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights and is pressing for action there on the Celler-Keating bill, which would validate New York procedure. This subcommittee, plagued by the incapacitating illness and death of previous chairmen, is now headed by Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., of North Carolina, and he has promised to give attention to this subject. This legislative committee can only hope for action, and stand ready to give its utmost support, as occasion may arise.

Because of this committee's continued concern with electronic eavesdropping, other than wiretapping, and our legislation requiring court orders for the law enforcement use of secret microphones, we note with interest another U.S. Supreme Court decision, rendered March 6, 1961, in the case of *Silverman* v. *U.S.*

In this the Court unanimously reversed a gambling conviction which had been obtained through an ingenious electronic eavesdropping device. District of Columbia police had inserted a metal spike into the wall of a row house used as a betting office; the spike made contact with a heating duct, which in effect became a huge microphone. The Court held that this physical intrusion, without a warrant, constituted a violation of the fourth amendment's guarantee against unreasonable search and seizure.

The Court had been asked to reconsider the entire subject of the constitutionality of electronic eavesdropping, but found it unnecessary to weigh such "large questions" now. Nor did it modify the Goldman decision of 1942, which held that it was not a violation of the fourth amendment to put a microphone against the wall of a house. The lower courts held that the intrusion of the spike, by perhaps five-sixteenths of an inch, was too trifling to establish a difference from the Goldman case. The Supreme Court disagreed.

Justice Potter Stewart, for the unanimous Court, said that in previous cases "eavesdropping had not been accomplished by means of an unauthorized physical encroachment" but in this case the police had usurped part of the house, the heating system.

"This court has never held that a Federal officer may without warrant and without consent physically entrench into a man's office or home, there secretly observe or listen, and relate at the man's subsequent criminal trial what was seen and heard," wrote Justice Stewart.

"We find no occasion to reexamine Goldman here," he added, "but we decline to go beyond it, by even a fraction of an inch."

This decision may be of great importance in the piecemeal, inch-by-inch definition of our civil liberties which is gradually accomplished by judicial review.

The broad questions here involved have been given the utmost consideration by this committee and the legislature, in the passage of our New York laws prohibiting private eavesdropping and requiring a court order (i.e. warrant) for police use of electronic eavesdropping. This case gives new emphasis to our previous assertions that Congress, in this entire area, has abdicated its power and abandoned its duties to the courts.

New York State has pioneered in protecting its people from eavesdropping, whether by wiretap or secret microphone, and the Silverman case serves to emphasize that Congress has neglected its duty in this area. Comprehensive Federal legislation is much needed as to all electronic eavesdropping. This cannot be adequately dealt with by fraction-of-an-inch Supreme Court decisions.

Providing Home Loans for Veterans in Housing Credit Shortage Areas

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, no one has more admiration for the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the House Committee on Rules, than I, or for any member of the Committee on Appropriations than I, but I have this admiration for them not because of their committee position but because they are duly elected Members of the House of Representatives of the United States, the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Now you can take the Constitution of the United States and read it from cover to cover and you cannot find anywhere that the Founding Fathers said there should be an Appropriations Committee, as the debate on this rule would lead you to believe here. The Constitution tells how laws should be made and how money should be appropriated. Let us look at what the Constitution says. Article I, section 7, states:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

That is what the Constitution says. The House shall originate the revenue measures, not any committee of the House.

How about money to be drawn from the Treasury? Section I, article 9 provides:

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

Note that the appropriations are to be made by law, not by the Appropriations Committee.

Who shall make the laws? Article VI of the Constitution states:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land.

Every bill that has been referred to by those who talk about back-door spending has been passed by the Congress, the duly elected representatives of the people. A part of that Congress are the members of the House Committee on Appropriations. If they do not like any bill that is being presented it is their prerogative and duty to stand here in the well of the House to oppose it and by their vote show their disapproval.

Congress in its wisdom decided that for good management we should have various committees in the House, but there is no committee of the House that is superior to the Congress itself. When Congress decides that there shall be a call upon the Treasury, that is the supreme law of the land. There is no veto power placed in any committee of the House or Senate. That is what the Founding Fathers said. If we want to change it, it is within our prerogatives, but until that times comes this bill is perfectly legitimate. There is nothing in it that is illegal. There is no back-door spending. It is spending by Congress as authorized by Congress, and should be approved.

The Economics of Hospital Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the April edition of the Progressive carries an article by a highly regarded writer on medical problems, Selig Greenberg, of the Providence, R.I., Journal and Evening Bulletin. It is an exceptionally clear presentation of the economics of hospital care. Mr. Greenberg expresses a view with which many of us in Congress have long been in sympathy, which is that what happens in medicine affects each and every American; therefore the business of medicine is the public's business.

I commend this article to everyone interested in a concise analysis of a rather complex problem, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

CRISIS IN THE HOSPITALS
(By Selig Greenberg)

The Nation's hospitals—the outposts of our phenomenal medical progress—are now confronted with a profound crisis, at the very time they are advancing toward ever greater miracles of healing and lifesaving. Soaring hospital costs and hospitalization insurance rates have brought a rising tide of public concern, expressed in demands for greater efficiency in hospital operation, and for reforms in the prevailing patterns of health insurance. Across the country labor unions, business firms, citizens' groups, and public officials are calling for controls on skyrocketing costs, curbs on services which are either wholly unnecessary or could be furnished less expensively, and a more rational and coherent system that will get the most out of the medical care dollar. Increasingly, warnings are heard from responsible sources that the squeeze of spiraling costs may price voluntary insurance out of the market and force full Government control of our whole complex of health services.

There is probably no more explosive issue in the entire controversial field of medical economics than that of hospital costs. For it is here, more than in any other area of medical care, that the problems of the technological revolution in medicine are rapidly coming to a head.

Hospital services now not only account for the largest single portion of the Nation's health care bill, but they are at the heart of our system of medical practice. As medicine grows more intricate and its tools more elaborate, the trend inevitably is toward increasing concentration of medical services within the hospital. And it is the very triumphs of medicine which are catapulting costs. Nowhere is this more evident than in the hospitals, which have become a large-scale and complex business requiring the coordination of a great array of professional skills and huge capital investment in expensive facilities and equipment.

Basically, the crisis of hospital function and financing stems from the fact that we are both the beneficiaries and the victims of the remarkable progress of medicine which has brought us better health and longer life but also has enormously complicated the rendering of medical services and raised their costs. The resolution in medicine is far from over, and hospitals have yet to fulfill their growing potential. Further scientific advances will unavoidably mean still costlier diagnostic and treatment procedures, more elaborate, and expensive equipment, and an even greater need for technical personnel. A continued rise in hospital costs thus appears inescapable. So it is all the more vital to eliminate the waste, duplication, and lack of integrated planning now common in the hospital field. If there are ways of operating hospitals more efficiently and economically—as many authorities believe there are—the public certainly has the right to insist on getting full value at the lowest possible price consistent with high quality.

Good hospital care clearly cannot be produced cheaply. But if costs are to be kept within acceptable bounds and quality improved, we will need a much higher degree of self-discipline by the medical profession and a far greater readiness on the part of hospitals to yield some of the privileges of their cherished autonomy than have so far been evident. It is no exaggeration to say that the future of the organization of medical care and practice in the United States depends on the extent to which the doctors and the hospitals can be prevailed upon to recognize that their business is the public's business.

The statistics of rising hospital costs and utilization are instructive and sobering.

For a number of years, hospital room charges have been advancing at a much faster rate than any other item in the United States Department of Labor's consumer price index. The overall index, which is pegged at 100 for the 1947–49 period, had risen to 124.6 by the end of 1959. At that time the index for all medical care services put together stood at 150.8. But for hospital room rates it was 208.9.

In 1946, the average cost per patient-day in voluntary hospitals was $9.39. By 1959, it had jumped to $30.19, an increase of more than 220 percent. Nor is the end of the spiral anywhere in sight. Experts are generally agreed that hospital costs will continue to rise at the rate of 5 to 10 percent a year. A spokesman for the American Hospital Association has predicted that the average cost per patient-day may reach $50 by 1968.

Of equal importance in contributing to the steady climb of the Nation's hospital bill is the striking increase in the rate of hospitalization. Thirty years ago, 37 out of every 1,000 Americans were admitted to general hospitals in the course of a year. Since then the ratio of hospital admissions has zoomed to 124. A variety of factors has figured in this upward trend. For one thing, hospitals can do much more for the sick than they could two or three decades ago. Widespread insurance coverage has removed much of the economic deterrent to hospital care for those in the middle- and low-income groups. In the Nation's population there has been a steady increase in the numbers and in the proportion of older people, who have a higher incidence of chronic diseases requiring more frequent hospitalization. Many conditions of modern city living make for significantly higher hospital use than in rural areas. The large proportion of working wives means that often there is no one at home to take care of a sick husband or child. The high price of household or nursing help to care for the sick at home and the limited size of city apartments also force up the hospitalization rate.

The net effect of higher costs of hospital care and its much greater frequency has been a tripling of expenditures for hospital services in the United States in the past 15 years. Out of a total private medical care outlay of $18.3 billion in 1959, payments to hospitals were $5.5 billion, the biggest single share, and $500 million more than the amount paid to physicians. The latest available breakdown shows that 30 cents out of every medical care dollar now goes to hospitals, 27 cents to doctors, 26 cents for drugs and appliances, 11 cents to dentists, and the remaining 6 cents for other professional services.

There are many sound reasons for the continued rise in hospital operating costs. A U.S. Public Health Service official has summed them up with the cogent observation that "when we talk about the cost of medical care today as compared to the past, we're talking about the price of an electric washer-dryer compared to a washtub."

There is no ready solution for the costliness of new and more effective medical procedures, more elaborate surgery, and more potent drugs. Such dramatic advances as open-heart surgery, artificial kidneys, heart pacemaker units, cobalt radiation treatment, and radioisotopes to pinpoint internal abnormalities are restoring patients to health sooner and more completely, and, frequently,

are saving lives which otherwise would be lost. But some of these miraculous procedures are enormously expensive, requiring dozens of physicians and technicians for a single patient.

As productivity has gone up, industry has been able to shorten its work week. But hopsitals cannot shorten their week. They must remain open 168 hours a week, 52 weeks a year. To keep pace with the standard 40-hour week in the community, hospitals have been forced to hire many new employees to fill each around-the-clock job. They also have been obliged to bring their lagging wage scales closer to those of private industry. While raising its wage level, industry has often managed to cut its labor costs through automation. But hospitals cannot substitute machines for people. On the contrary, as available life-saving services proliferate and newly developed equipment is constantly added, more rather than fewer people are required to operate them. In 1946 voluntary hospitals in the United States had, on the average, 156 employees for every 100 patients. By now the ratio of employees for each 100 patients has risen to 225. Whereas in the automobile industry wages currently account for only about one-third of production costs, payroll expenditures have shot up to 70 percent of hospital budgets.

New medical sophistication has made hospital care an accepted component of the average American's standard of living. The public learns quickly these days of new medical discoveries through the press, radio, and television. The more people learn about medical progress, the more they are likely to go to the hospital, where the latest advances can be most effectively applied. The rising standard of living also has brought a demand for more attractive hospital facilities. Hospitals are expected to match the comforts of motels by way of air conditioning, piped-in radio, perhaps television, and certainly window draperies. The new standards also call for a telephone at the bedside and some choice of menu. While the effect of these niceties on the patient's recovery is debatable, their effect on the hospital's unit costs is obvious.

Another element in the picture has been the sharp increase in new hospital construction throughout the country. This expansion has been, in general, a laudable development. Antiquated buildings have in many places been replaced, and additional bed space has been provided to keep pace with the forward march of medical science. But we have lagged in developing more economical facilities such as hospital outpatient clinics and adequate nursing and convalescent homes for chronic patients. Concentration upon the expansion of costly hospital bed capacity designed primarily for the acutely ill is wasteful. Competent opinion is that the more hospital beds are available, the greater is the tendency toward admissions for relatively trivial ailments and for longer-than-necessary stays, particularly when such abuse is encouraged by the benefit structure of hospitalization insurance.

The fact that patients now go home much sooner than they used to—the average length of hospital stay has been cut in the past 30 years from 15.3 to 7.8 days—is in itself far from an unmixed blessing.

The shorter stay means that more intensive treatment is concentrated within a shorter period of time, so that daily costs are higher. An additional cost factor in more rapid patient turnover is that chances are greater there will be vacant beds which have to be staffed but produce no income. One of the paradoxes of the hospital cost problem is that it is the result of both overuse and insufficient use of facilities. On the one hand, hospital beds are sometimes used needlessly for patients who could just as well be taken care of elsewhere at much lower cost. On the other hand, hospital facilities are not utilized as efficiently as they should be, with the result that about one bed out of four is usually empty, and in some institutions the average occupancy rate is even lower. Lower occupancy means a correspondingly heavier proportion of overhead in daily per-patient costs.

Much wider use of hospital services and their greater costliness have been reflected, inevitably, in steadily climbing hospitalization insurance rates. As Blue Cross and other plans throughout the country have repeatedly been forced to seek premium hikes, growing attention has been focused on the urgent need for eliminating hospital inefficiencies and needless use of expensive facilities. An important point to bear in mind is that hospital costs are no longer solely the concern of patients and their families. With the phenomenal spread of health insurance, which now covers more than two out of every three Americans, the hospital bill is being underwritten by the healthy as well as the sick. This means that the public is more and more looking upon hospital costs not only in terms of charges for services rendered but also in terms of the monthly cost of insurance.

Rate hearings before State insurance commissioners have increasingly provided a platform for the critics of hospital efficiency and of the effect which the present health insurance system has upon it.

Such hearings in New York, Pennsylvania, and a number of other States have produced charges that the prevailing insurance approach lays too much emphasis on hospitalization, ignoring possibilities for more economical treatment of many conditions in the doctor's office or in outpatient clinics; that Blue Cross—and Blue Shield, its companion surgical-medical insurance program—have builtin incentives for getting between hospital sheets merely to take advantage of insurance benefits; that hospitals could do considerably more than they have been doing to keep down their operating costs; that because of the general lack of overall community planning and integration in the hospital field there is duplication and overlapping of personnel, equipment, and services; that much of the present organization of hospital services, revolving around the doctor as a private entrepreneur, has become inefficient in the context of the growing complexity of medicine and must be drastically revamped to take advantage of opportunities for greater productivity and lower costs; and that the public is not adequately represented in the management of the voluntary hospitals and the insurance plans.

The adverse effect of health insurance, which now provides the greatest share of hospital income, in relaxing many of the pressures for economy in hospital operations is emphasized in the report of the commission on financing of hospital care. The commission, sponsored by the American Hospital Association and made up of a distinguished group of authorities, concluded after a lengthy study that the emergence of insurance as a major factor in medical economics has to some degree reduced, if not removed, incentives that would otherwise operate to encourage maintenance of hospital operating costs at the lowest level practicable.

The commission's report points out that prior to the extensive use of insurance, when people were required to pay the full bill directly to the hospital, there were natural economic restraints on costs and lower cost institutions providing services of equally good quality enjoyed a competitive advantage in attracting more patients. But with the introduction through insurance of a new element in the relationship between cost and use of services, the report says Blue Cross, as the intermediary between the purchaser of hospital care and the hospital, must inevitably assume some functions previously the direct responsibility of patient or hospital.

One of those holding that genuine economies can be made by hospitals without lessening quality of service, and that Blue Cross should insist on such economies instead of merely acting as a collection agency for the hospitals, is Francis R. Smith, Pennsylvania's dynamic State insurance commissioner.

Smith, who feels that his authority to pass on Blue Cross premium rates goes much further than the checking of actuarial tables and extends to the things which pyramid costs, has for several years been preaching the doctrine that neither the hospitals nor Blue Cross have done all they can and should to control such abuses as unnecessary admissions and excessively protracted stays and to put into effect other efficiency measures. And the commissioner has used his legal powers to enforce his views. In a series of trail-blazing decisions, he has ordered Blue Cross and the hospitals in Philadelphia and other cities to adopt certain economy measures before any further insurance rate boosts would be granted. Among the economy possibilities he has advocated are wider use of opportunities for outpatient diagnosis and treatment, tighter controls on the scheduling of admissions and discharges and on length of stay, better scheduling of medical procedures to avoid needless delays, more effective use of technicians and nurses, sharing of specialized equipment among hospitals, and greater standardization of supplies along with joint purchasing.

Considerable progress has been achieved in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other Pennsylvania communities under Smith's prodding during the past 2 years. Blue Cross plans have developed medical review teams to ferret out abuse of insurance contracts. They have expanded their coverage of diagnostic services and home nursing visits, in order to cut down hospitalization. Hospitals have organized medical utilization committees to check on needless admissions and excessive stays. They also are moving to achieve greater management efficiencies and to coordinate expansion through joint planning.

While hospitals are a big enterprise but not a business in the ordinary sense of that term, Smith said in a recent speech, "This does not mean that hospitals cannot be businesslike. More needs to be done in applying commonsense business practices and methods to hospitals—wherever they will apply."

Birch Society Must Be Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in the recent controversy over the John Birch Society those who oppose its noxious doctrines have split into two camps. Those who favor exposing and opposing it vigorously instead of laughing at it have support from the Madison Capital Times. I include in the RECORD their recent editorial on the subject:

SHOULD THE BIRCH CULT BE IGNORED OR EXPOSED?

Attorney General Robert Kennedy recently said of the John Birch Society:

"I don't think anybody should really pay too much attention to them. I think they make no contribution to the fight against communism here in the United States and, in fact, I think if anything they are a hindrance. It seems to me it is an organization in the area of the humorous and I don't think so much attention should be taken."

We can agree that they make no contribution to the fight against communism. But we cannot agree that they should be ignored.

These people need to be exposed because they weaken our democratic fabric when it is in mortal combat with communism and, in that respect, they serve the cause of communism. They breed distrust of democracy.

They have members who are men of great wealth and influence in the country. Three former heads of the National Association of Manufacturers are members. A former head of the Internal Revenue Service is a member. Their governing council includes prominent industrialists across the country.

Their founder, Robert Welch, is a successful businessman, whose public speaking appearances are attracting capacity audiences. The membership of this organization has grown rapidly in the few years of its existence.

Its methods of operation—anonymous telephone calls and mail to public officials—are calculated to frighten timid officeholders with being smeared with the Communist label.

They are masters at exploiting the deep-rooted fear of communism among our people. Fear-ridden people believe a lot of ridiculous things. They might even believe that our last three Presidents were part of the Communist conspiracy, particularly if the charges are ignored. Remember what Hitler said about the "big lie."

There is only one way to deal with people like this—make them prove their charges. McCarthy was finished when he went before the country to try and prove his charges against the Army.

Recent Developments in Antitrust Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the speech delivered by Lee Loevinger, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, before the American Bar Association at Washington on April 7, 1961.

I am sure that all Senators will find the speech very informative. Mr. Loevinger is considered to be an outstanding authority in the field of antitrust law.

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

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

(Speech by Lee Loevinger to Antitrust Section, American Bar Association, Washington, D.C., April 7, 1961)

One year ago I appeared before this distinguished and elite group to deliver what was then expected to be a "swan song" with relation to my active antitrust participation. The curious surprises that fate has in store for us and the verity of Bobby Burns' sage observation on the plans of men and the lower animals could not be better illustrated than by the events that have happened to me since then. Indeed, the circumstances that have thus drastically affected my own life may well be relevant to the assigned topic of this speech which is "Recent Developments in Antitrust Enforcement."

The conventional approach to this topic is to review carefully and in detail the decisions of appellate courts that have been rendered since the last such discussion. This seems unnecessary on this occasion. All of you follow the development of antitrust law in the courts; and it would be futile and foolish to attempt to improve upon either the reporting service of Law Week, C.C.H., and the advance sheets, or the analyses and discussion available to you both in publications and in your own offices. It may be more relevant and important to indicate what I consider to be the most important development in antitrust, as in other law enforcement, during the past year.

The most important development in the enforcement of the antitrust laws since your last meeting has undoubtedly been the election of John F. Kennedy as President of the United States. This has resulted in the infusion of a new spirit of energy and dedication throughout the public service. Beyond this that historic event has brought to the highest levels of Government administration and law enforcement a new understanding and a firmer faith in the principles upon which antitrust is founded than there has previously been for many years.

This may most usefully be illustrated for you by suggesting some of my own views. Perhaps these may also serve to lay at rest a few ancient shibboleths of the antitrust bar. The first is the notion that violation of the antitrust laws, whether intentional or not, is merely a normal business risk and really quite respectable. This is related to the feeling that has heretofore been tacit but pervasive that it is inappropriate to have criminal sanctions in the antitrust laws, and that, in any event, these were to be applied only to corporations and not to individuals. In this view even deliberate violations of the antitrust laws were, at worst, venial offenses of no more moral significance than a parking ticket.

It may be hoped that the Philadelphia electric cases, for which the preceding administration of the Antitrust Division is to be given all due credit, have helped to dispel this misapprehension. In any event, it should now be clear that a deliberate or conscious violation of the antitrust laws is not a mere personal pecadillo or economic eccentricity, but a serious offense against society which is as immoral as any other act that injures many in order to profit a few. Conspiracy to violate the antitrust laws is economic racketeering which gains no respectability by virtue of the fact that the loot is secured by stealth rather than by force. Those who are apprehended in such acts are, and will be treated as, criminals and will personally be subjected to as severe a punishment as we can persuade the courts to impose.

In the second place, the Antitrust Division is not receptive to pleas for exceptions, exemptions or special treatment of any company or industry. We have been told frequently and are quite well aware that every industry and situation is unique, that every company is most exceptional and that every case is quite extraordinary. We are also well aware that Congress and the courts have repeatedly and emphatically declared that competition, rather than collusion or monopoly, shall be the basic rule of commerce. This rule springs from the conviction that competition is the counterpart and corollary of economic freedom, and that a free economy is necessarily a competitive economy. Therefore, in general we will oppose exceptions to or exemptions from the antitrust laws, sought by way of departmental policy or judicial rulings. When asked for comment on a legislative proposal for antitrust exemption, we will take a long, hard look. With exceptions already covered by existing laws, we have seen no persuasive case for compromising any antitrust principles in special cases.

That the necessity for complying with high standards of business conduct required by the moral principles inherent in our legal codes may sometimes cause concern to businessmen and lawyers is inevitable. This is not a difficulty unique to the antitrust laws. The temptation to get rich quickly by dishonest means abounds in private life. Some succumb, but we do not listen sympathetically to the plea that theft or embezzlement, for example, should be legalized because it is no difficult to acquire wealth by other means. While the antitrust laws are, in some respects, complex, they are also flexible and reasonable. The burden of proof resting on those who seek exceptions or exemptions is not borne by the showing that it is more profitable or convenient to have no such inhibiting standards of conduct.

In the third place, the argument that the laws are basically sound but that they must be made more acceptable to business by modifications to make them both more flexible and more certain is either disingenuous sophistry or compounded confusion. To seek both flexibility and certainty in the same laws is a logical contradiction. It is equivalent to a demand that we simultaneously institute both higher and lower prices for a commodity. It is easy enough to write laws that are certain in their operation. In the antitrust field, the per se violations are examples of rules that provide certainty. These could well be extended by either judicial or legislative adoption of more per se rules. Conversely, it is easy enough to write principles that are flexible. In the antitrust field the rule of reason is an example. But it should be clear to any reasonable man that a rule which is certain is, by virtue of that very fact, not flexible. A rule which is flexible cannot be certain in prospective application.

As applied to the interpretation of law, the demand for certainty and flexibility involves polar concepts which must be reconciled and compromised. The difficult task is to write a law which provides a reasonable certainty and a reasonable flexibility respecting a single subject matter. No doubt judgments may differ as to the precise balance between flexibility and certainty that is desirable in a given instance. There is no objective or absolute standard that can provide a clear determination of the proper balance between these competing considerations. However, it is futile and logically absurd to demand more of both flexibility and certainty from the same law at the same time.

The antitrust laws combine both flexibility and certainty to a degree that has been thought appropriate to their subject matter by several generations of legislators and judges. Perhaps they are imperfect; true perfection is probably beyond human attainment. Improvement may be possible; but it is possible only when the demand is for consistent objectives.

In the fourth place, aside from the inevitable compromise between flexibility and certainty, the antitrust laws themselves appear to me to embody a consistent conception and system. The argument is sometimes made that while the basic mandate of the antitrust laws is for competition, other parts of the laws, such as those against price discrimination, inhibit competition.

However, there is no inherent inconsistency between demanding competition and prescribing the rules by which it may be conducted. It is true that some antitrust laws forbid the use of certain competitive weapons and techniques. This does not, however, indicate that these laws require what their detractors derisively call "soft competition," or, indeed, that they are in any degree anticompetitive. There is no sport or contest conducted in civilized society without its rules. These rules invariably permit certain forms of rivalry and prohibit certain other types of action as means of winning the sport, game, or contest. Of course, there are always those who decry any limitation on the mayhem or bloodshed that is permitted by the prevailing rules of organized sport. The Marquis of Queensbury rules, I am informed, were once regarded as wholly destroying the noble sport of manly combat in the ring. There will always be those who proclaim that any new rule takes all the fun and most of the competition out of a game. However, civilized society lives by its laws, and competition within civilized society is always inhibited by authoritative standards of acceptable social behavior. Were it otherwise, we would not have civilization but anarchy, and life would be quite intolerable.

There may well be reasonable debate as to whether or not a particular rule is desirable in organized sports, other games or contests, or in application to the economy by the antitrust laws. However, such an issue cannot be determined by the dogmatic assertion that all regulatory rules are inconsistent with the basic principle of competition. It is not necessary to hit below the belt in order to fight as hard as you can. The rules that prescribe the mode and weapons of competition are not anticompetitive, but, on the contrary, are quite consistent with free and vigorous competition in a civilized society.

Finally, let me express my profound conviction that competition is neither incompatible with nor a limitation upon efficiency. Indeed, competition is likely to be the stimulus which engenders efficiency. It is significant that the greatest industrial and economic development has taken place in those countries which have had the greatest degree of economic freedom and competition. Although there is not the time to offer the evidence now, I believe that an analysis of history suggests that the antitrust laws have not only permitted but have substantially contributed to the tremendous economic and polititcal development of the United States. However, we must now bear in mind that the future is not foreordained; and that it will be determined not by our past history but by our present character and future conduct.

The great issue of this age is whether this Nation, or any nation, can achieve full economic development, the satisfaction of all material needs, and the provision of adequate economic opportunities for all, together with political and civil liberty. We believe that these goals are compatible, and that the method by which they will be achieved is by observance of the principles embodied in the antitrust laws. The diffusion of economic power and the freedom which engenders competition are expressions in the economic realm of the basic faith of our culture that the individual human spirit represents the highest social value. Thus, we in the Antitrust Division are and will be dedicated to the faith that liberty, equality, and prosperity are consistent social objectives. We are and will be devoted to the effort to achieve these goals by a vigorous and uncompromising enforcement of the laws prescribing competition as our basic economic condition that we may protect and preserve economic freedom in this country.

Hospital Ship "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, a privately sponsored humanitarian effort of the American people that has had altogether too little publicity in relation to its accomplishments is Project Hope.

Hope means Health Opportunity for People Everywhere. Its chief instrument is a floating medical training center, the SS *Hope I*, a 15,000-ton vessel owned and loaned by the U.S. Government. Primarily a teaching program, Project Hope combines both instruction and treatment in countries visited by SS *Hope I*.

Project Hope as a mercy mission is not a governmental operation. In fact, the Government does nothing more than lend the ship. It is a free expression of a free people. It should be encouraged, and, since it is financed by contributions from private individuals and groups, it deserves general public support.

An article on this subject by Charles J. Munzinger appeared on April 6 in the Oakland Bulletin, the Pompton Bulletin, the Riverdale Bulletin, and the Lincoln Park Herald.

The story of Project Hope follows:

HOSPITAL SHIP "HOPE"

(By Charles J. Munzinger)

The following is a brief background on Project Hope.

This is a privately sponsored program of help and relief to share our country's modern medical knowledge and skills with all those in need thruout the world. It is a floating medical training center for Southeast Asia, and is on loan from the U.S. Government.

Project Hope has the most modern medical equipment and supplies, together with training aids. This ship, formerly the SS *Consolation*, is a 15,00-ton vessel, with 230 beds, constructed during World War II.

The permanent medical staff on this vessel includes 15 physicians, two dentists, 25 nurses, and 30 auxilitary personnel. Volunteer teams of up to 35 physicians will be flown to the ship on a rotating basis for tours of 4 months. The medical staff includes top specialists in the key fields of medicine.

Hope is essentially a teaching program, although necessarily there will be treatment involved. American members of the medical staff will be assigned to work in small teams with their local counterparts. This will enable the American staff to pass along modern techniques and the latest medical knowledge under working conditions.

Part of the medical staff will work on shipboard; part will be in mobile units, on duty inland. They will work with specialists, nurses, midwives, and technicians. Training will also be conducted through classroom lectures and discussions, movies and film strips.

Teaching is stressed because this will enable Hope to have a more enduring effect on local health conditions, than would attempts at widespread treatment. Concentration on training will enable Hope to help upgrade the local medical staff in their ability to diagnose and treat. In this way, these people will in turn be able to teach others. Thus, Hope's impact will grow and spread.

The SS *Hope* will visit only those countries to which it has been invited by the local medical professions. It is just completing a 6 months stay at Indonesia. Vietnam will be next, for a stay of 4 months, after which *Hope* will return to the United States. Invitations have also been received from Korea, Okinawa and Pakistan.

Hope's program is geared to the specific needs of the countries visited. Activities are worked out in advance with local doctors. This will enable *Hope* to concentrate on the most serious and pressing problems of each country.

A recent study conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shows that the construction costs of a 260-bed hospital total $5,720,000, while annual operating costs amount to $2,982,700, for a total of $8,702,700.

In comparison, the total cost of operating the 15,000-ton, 230-bed SS *Hope* as a medical training center and hospital will come to less than $3.5 million a year.

The funds to operate *Hope* are coming from private contributions, also from business, industry, labor unions, and other private groups and individual contributions. The government's only role in this endeavor is the loan of the hospital ship.

Support for Project *Hope* is widespread. It has been endorsed by the American Medical and Dental Associations, and many other medical agencies. It had the personal backing of ex-President Eisenhower and has the wholehearted support of President Kennedy.

The American President Lines are operating the SS *Hope* at cost. Drug and pharmaceutical companies of our country are supplying drugs and medicines when needed. The American petroleum industry has underwritten fuel costs to operate *Hope*. The Pure-Pak Division of Ex-Cell-O Corp. is sponsoring a major motion picture project to raise funds for *Hope*.

Poverty, disease and malnutrition are common in Southeast Asia. Millions of people there are caught up in a catastrophe—they have to produce to survive, but unhealthy men cannot produce.

Hope is an experiment in international cooperation. Hope's backers believe that better understanding among the people of the world can be achieved on a personal level, through friendship, the sharing of knowledge and helping others to help themselves.

Hope's medical staff will benefit greatly, in newfound knowledge. Information will flow both ways. The experience to be gained in diagnosis and treatment of tropical diseases couldn't be gained anywhere in the United States.

These people to people contacts can help form the basis of a lasting peace and understanding. Hope means—Health Opportunity for People Everywhere.

The need for Hope is great. In much of Southeast Asia, there just aren't enough doctors to go around. In Indonesia, there is one doctor for every 71,000 persons.

With such a condition, the medical men are so busy that they find it difficult to keep up with modern techniques and developments. This means they can't get away to the United States or Europe to gain advanced training.

Project Hope will, in effect, bring the medical school to these physicians.

Nurses aboard the good ship *Hope*, now on a training and teaching mission to the Republic of Indonesia, where the religion is chiefly Moslem, report that patients coming aboard the ship carry small compasses, to show them the direction of Mecca.

Project Hope is headed by Dr. William B. Walsh, heart specialist at Washington, D.C.

Hope is the major activity of the People to People Health Foundation, Inc., an outgrowth of ex-President Eisenhower's people to people suggestion in 1956.

The backers of Hope plan to build additional ships as funds become available.

Russia's Space Feat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, Maj. Alexander de Seversky, who for decades has been recognized as one of the world's foremost authorities on air and space power, has written a new book entitled, "America: Too Young To Die." In this excellent work he points out what we as a people must do to preserve our Republic and our way of life. He pulls no punches, as, for example:

In 1955, in an article in This Week, I wrote: "The whole military philosophy must be changed, or we shall forever trail the rest of the world not only in conventional aircraft, but in international ballistic missiles and even in manmade earth satellite development."

Two years later the Russians fired the first ballistic missile and put the world's first manmade satellite into orbit. They built the world's largest aircraft; they sent the first rocket to the moon and another around the moon.

How, to take one achievement, did Russia manage to put a satellite in space before we did? Was it because we lacked creative brans or technological know-how? Not at all. Our scientific and production capability can outperform the Soviets' any day in the week. We were beaten not so much by Russia as by the inevitable results of interservice rivalry, the refusal of the services to work together, the destructive efforts of each to prevent the others from getting ahead.

These words were written before the Russians orbited a man in space, but they are just as prophetic as if this had been accomplished prior to the writing.

Miss Doris Fleeson, writing in the Washington Evening Star, furnished the words that Major de Seversky did not use because of timing, and because I feel she so succinctly follows the major's arguments, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

RED SPACE FEAT A U.S. SCANDAL—POLITICIANS ARE HELD AT FAULT IN FAILURE TO RESOLVE PROBLEMS AND PUSH PROGRAM

(By Doris Fleeson)

It is a national scandal that the Russians have been the first to shoot a man around the world in a spaceship and bring him back alive.

Responsible officials of the United States have known for years that the same feat could be achieved by this rich and powerful country. They had every reason to believe that it also could be and would be done by the Russians.

The politicians who must make the decisions on which the survival of the United States depends ducked. They lacked the determination to put an end to Pentagon competition over which service should make the space effort. In the end, they created still a fourth agency, NASA, which has still to get off the ground in any meaningful way, much less conquer space.

The politicians of the executive branch did not have the courage to demand the necessary funds from Congress. Members of Congress did not trust the American people to understand all that was involved and accept higher taxes if need be.

Thus the United States is still dawdling and falling behind in the space race, and all the propaganda in the world cannot hide the fact from any corner of the earth. It would be ludicrous if it were not tragic that politicians are tackling the job now who must begin with a space primer before they can speak even with least lustrous technicians who know the story.

Amid fanfare, astronauts are being trained who have already sold the publication rights to a story which can only be an anticlimax to the Russian triumph. Rarely has the cart been put before the horse on such a scale.

President Kennedy and his new administration must face up to the harsh fact that Russia performed first an epic feat which was possible but forsworn by the United States. The official attitude heretofore has been that it was all very fine but not really too important, and there will be great temptation to continue it.

At the very moment the Russians were orbiting their air force major, Members of Congress were complacently telling reporters that while the voters like President Kennedy much better than on election day, they don't really care about his program. Yet they admitted that the people are thinking about the problem of peace or war and are uneasy, if not apprehensive.

The net impression, however, is that Congress will have to be pushed by the President so that the political risks will be as much as possible all his.

Despite encouraging statements, there is deep gloom in scientific circles. They had hoped against their better judgment that somehow this country would encompass a space first.

The issue is not involved with present cessation of nuclear testing, the hard choice Mr. Kennedy may soon be called upon to review. The Russian feat may lead to cries for resumption of such tests, and many experienced people believe they should be resumed, but the space fiasco is not connected with it.

It may be true that Russia will have trouble with Red China and would like to call off the costly arms race. But in space today, it's ahead, way ahead.

Proposed Junior United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the excitement generated by the creation of a pilot Peace Corps has already unleashed a flood of other suggestions for constructive and very positive steps to world peace. A nationwide mood is growing; we now realize that to have a secure peace, we must work for it in every way we can.

On March 19, Mr. Herbert Sturz addressed the American Field Service annual meeting at Princeton, N.J., on ways youth can work for peace. Mr. Sturz is executive director of the Vera Foundation, a new nonprofit group dedicated "to seek and further equal protection of the laws for the indigent by research into neglected aspects of court procedures, law enforcement, and the nature of the crime." The foundation will share the results of its research with those who seek it, and the foundation will also "develop and apply programs for the furtherance of law, justice, and civil liberties in the United States."

Mr. Sturz, who has long actively been associated with youth, told the group at Princeton about several new proposals, including a Junior United Nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, excerpts from his address.

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

You have asked me to say a few words about how youth can work for peace. I am happy to do so. But to be honest, I can't see what I can tell the American field service.

There are young people right here who have taken part in the American abroad program. In staying with families in other countries, in getting acquainted with our world neighbors, you have shown that American youth can represent America abroad. In a way this is the germ of the Peace Corps idea. In fact, the American field service is still a long jump ahead of the Peace Corps, because you are bringing young people of the world to our shores. This is very important. America, too, must learn, must be receptive. Understanding and helpfulness is a two-way street.

There is no beginning and no end to the Peace Corps idea. No one knows exactly where it originated—certainly a number of fertile minds and forward-looking organizations contributed toward its formation. It's one of those ideas that when you hear it you know it's right. You just want to drop everything and work in the Peace Corps. This is dramatized by the overwhelming response to President Kennedy's proposal. One hundred thousand volunteers are expected in the first 6 months. Personally, I believe there will be more. Nor is this enthusiasm confined to youth. And this is the heart of the matter. Young people working for peace are not really separate from adults working for peace. We are all in the same boat, we all have the same fears and hopes. The hydrogen bomb will make no discrimination as to age any more than it will single out people by race, color, religion, or nationality.

Prof. Robert MacIver has said that he would like to abolish the term "juvenile delinquency" because it suggests that youthful offenders are in their own little private stew, that their offenses and their problems have no relation to the adult world, and the implication is that youth and adults have no mutual responsibilities. Well, I agree with Professor MacIver about the term "juvenile delinquency" and just so, I would like to abolish the distinction between young people working for peace and adults working for peace. Is there any distinction? If a young man is old enough to go abroad

as a soldier, perhaps to die, then surely he is old enough to take an equal part in the attempt to create a peaceful world. He is mature enough and wise enough and certainly energetic and enthusiastic enough to demonstrate to peoples in other nations the positive, creative, traits of his fellow Americans.

Those who doubt, who call the Peace Corps "a haven for draft dodgers," or as Representative FRANCES BOLTON said last week "a terrifying thing" should study the record of Great Britain's voluntary service overseas, an organization similar to the Peace Corps. Voluntary Service Overseas has been in existence for 2 years.

Its organizer, Abe Dickson, a UNESCO social worker, saw it as a release for the energy and idealism of young Englishmen. "People want to feel needed," he said. "But it's hard to get this feeling in affluent Western societies. You can't find it in Piccadilly or Times Square." What Dickson says is true. These young Britons—men and women—serve 1 year in underdeveloped countries. Though they receive only subsistence pay and live hard, they stick. Only 2 volunteers out of 165 have quit so far. Private schools, factories, and farms have contributed young people to the voluntary service. And these young people are doing a great job—repairing bicycles, running first aid clinics, delivering babies, mending canoes, teaching English and sewing, designing hotels, vaccinating cattle.

Finally, and at last, young people feel there is something they can do about the world. This is the big breakthrough. Hopelessness and helplessness, despair and cynicism, are left behind in a cloud of dust.

The Peace Corps sounds magnificent. Most Americans are optimistic about it. The response abroad has been, by and large very encouraging. The Peace Corps can work. It must be made to work. In order to make it work we must face the fact that there are problems. Perhaps the most serious problem is the danger of unilateral effort in a multilateral world. Already Russia has offered a few unkind comments on the Peace Corps. They view it as another plot to subvert the developing areas of the world to capitalism. If we let the Peace Corps remain a purely U.S. venture, we can predict, almost certainly, that it will become another area of competition—a new playing field in the cold war. In my opinion, the hazards can be circumvented by making our eventual goal the creation of a Peace Corps of member nations from the U.N.

According to Peace Corps Chief Sargent Shriver, our Peace Corps will make men and women available to U.N. agencies upon request. And President Kennedy is sympathetic to this approach. So, we shall see what comes of it.

WORLD ACADEMIES

I would like to tell you about another idea which is being considered by the President's advisers and which I think is pretty nearly as exciting as the Peace Corps. This is the creation of a series of world academies, again under the auspices of the United Nations. These academies would be set up in Asia, South America, and Africa. Each continent would have four academies—an Academy of Public Health, an Academy of Building Crafts, an Academy for Office Workers, an Academy of Agriculture.

We plan to staff these academies by drawing upon the faculties of leading universities of every country in the world. But the instructors don't necessarily have to have an academic background. For instance, I know two carpenters, marvelous craftsmen, the finest type of Americans, who would do a wonderful job abroad. One of the finest builders in the Princeton area would welcome a chance to share his knowledge and learn something from peoples abroad. There must be many such skilled persons who would be glad to give and to receive in this fashion. By establishing these academies on the home continent, the more powerful nations would demonstrate their genuine interest in the development of emerging peoples.

Allied to the Peace Corps and the world academies is the concept of a West Point of Medicine, here in the United States. As we all know, there is a need, in America and all over the world, for doctors and nurses. This need is already acute in the underprivileged countries and our own need will be sharpened as our population continues to explode. A West Point that turns out physicians and nurses. A School of Medicine and Nursing, supported by the Government, its trainees specializing in diseases prevalent among the emerging peoples. In return for their medical education, these young professionals would put in a 3-year tour of duty—their national service—in the developing areas of the world, again under the administration of the U.N. Upon completion of their national service, these doctors and nurses will go into private practice in the United States. This happens to be a rather clear example of the way foreign and domestic needs are bound up with one another.

Another exciting idea is one which Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS launched as a trial balloon in a speech to the National Student Association at Rutgers University a couple of weeks ago. The Senator proposed a junior U.N.—a U.N. conducted solely by the youth of the world. Its home base might be in New Delhi, Montevideo, or Accra. The delegates to the junior U.N. would attend sessions the year round. They would conduct study programs and debate key issues and pass resolutions. In the process, they will acquire skills and knowledge in economics, linguistics, diplomacy, and world government—and, as Senator WILLIAMS said, "A dozen other fields essential for understanding among peoples in this tense world of tragic misunderstanding."

This is an interesting idea which should be discussed. I hope somebody here has something to say about it. By the way, Senator WILLIAMS has been one of the early proponents of the Peace Corps. He probably knows as much as anyone in Washington about the mechanics of it.

I'm sure many of you have seen "Ballad of a Soldier"—the film Russia has sent over as part of a cultural exchange with the United States. What came through was Russia's abhorrence for war and its waste of human effort and life. As I got it, the movie was a call for peace. Llewelyn Thompson, our Ambassador to Moscow, believes Russia wants peace. So do our other top advisers on Soviet policy. There is no doubt that we, here in the United States, want peace. The Peace Corps is an expression of that longing and of the practical urge to do something about it.

U.S. Policy in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the April 6 and 12, 1961, issues of the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., contain two editorials entitled "U.S. Promotes Revolution" and "U.S. Document Approving Revolution Was Written by Professor Schlesinger," respectively. I ask unanimous consent that both editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

These editorials raise some very serious questions about apparent U.S. policy to foment revolutions in Latin America. This new policy also concerns me very much and should concern every Member of this body.

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

[From the News and Courier, Apr. 6, 1961]

U.S. PROMOTES REVOLUTION

The Economic Council letter for April bears this headline: "Our State Department—Enemy of the American People." That is a grave accusation, but it is backed up by facts.

As the letter states: "Even the briefest study of events since 1934 will show that the State Department has nearly always taken a position helpful to the Soviet Union and against the interests of the United States."

One need not rehash the loss of China to the Communists or other tragic chapters in the history of the State Department. It is unnecessary to go beyond the events of the last week to find the State Department taking a position hurtful to the United States.

We refer to the State Department's most recent document on Red Cuba. The language in which the State Department promises to support revolution in Latin America will make patriotic U.S. citizens hang their heads in shame. Never before, to our knowledge, has the U.S. Government issued a state paper filled with radical cliches that have been culled from a leftist political magazine.

Yes, the State Department does support and approve revolution in Latin America, and in these words:

"It is the considered judgment of the Government of the United States of America that the Castro regime in Cuba offers a clear and present danger to the authentic and autonomous revolution of the Americas."

Who authorized unidentified policy planners in the State Department to publish a manifesto upholding revolution in this hemisphere? Who are the authors of this document? Are they the same men who supported Fidel Castro in the first place?

The document is full of false statements about how the Castro revolution started and succeeded. What's worse, it puts the United States on record as praising "positive programs initiated in the first month of the Castro regime." It specifically mentions "land reform." Congress should take note of that. Land reform in Cuba meant stealing hundreds of millions of dollars from U.S. citizens without a cent in payment.

The worst feature of the document is that it constitutes a political endorsement of Fidelistas among the Cuban exiles—Castro's old accomplices who got out of Cuba when they saw the ship was beginning to sink.

The State Department specifically lavishes praise on Jose Miro Cardona, head of the new ultraradical Revolutionary Council, as "a distinguished lawyer of Havanna." Actually he was distinguished as a political tool of Dictator Castro. The Department also praises Manuel Ray, head of the extremist People's Revolutionary Party, who wants confiscation of U.S. property to remain in force after Castro is removed.

Fantastic as it may seem to the average American, the U.S. State Department also praises Raul Chibas. Major Chibas was one of Castro's right-hand men. He presided over the firing squad executions in Havana, a bloody circus similar to Nazi and Soviet trials.

Men like this are the type the State Department hopes will gain power in Cuba. They are revolutionaries with blood on their hands. The Department sponsors revolution.

The News and Courier has received a letter from a distinguished anti-Communist Cuban patriot now in exile. Speaking of the Miro Cardona-Ray-Chibas group, he says:

"During the time they were members of the Castro government every human right was violated in Cuba. Castro stated repeatedly and in no uncertain terms that he did not intend to hold free elections and give the people the opportunity to freely and democratically choose a government. The economic measures approved were clearly Communist-inspired, and Castro's campaign of insults and vituperation against the United States was in full swing. I ask you: Can the people who shared the responsibilities of government with Castro when this was going on now lead the fight against communism and for democracy and good relations with the United States?"

That rhetorical statement is a fitting reply to the truth wisting of leftists in the State Department.

[From the News and Courier, Apr. 12, 1961]

U.S. DOCUMENT APPROVING REVOLUTION WAS WRITTEN BY PROFESSOR SCHLESINGER

Andrew Batcher, Assistant White House Press Secretary, yesterday told the News and Courier that there is great "accuracy" in a report that Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Harvard historial now on President Kennedy's staff, drafted the State Department's document on Cuba issued April 3. In Mr. Hatcher's words, Professor Schlesinger was the moving spirit behind the document. It puts the United States on record as promoting revolution in this hemisphere.

This statement is an example of what responsible Americans have warned would happen if a coterie of leftwing intellectuals gained a foothold in the White House. The palace guard is usurping the functions of regular departments of Government.

What special competency has Professor Schlesinger for drafting a new U.S. policy toward Latin America, a policy which rejects Latin evolution and hails Latin revolution? Professor Schlesinger is a former official of Americans for Democratic Action, a leftwing pressure group. He made a hurried trip through several Latin countries after Mr. Kennedy's inauguration. On the basis of this flimsy preparation, he now has ghosted a document which may set off dynamite in several countries south of the border.

For years, the United States had a policy of helping backward Latin countries evolve peacefully and in good order. To that end, the United States has supplied these countries with economic advice and assistance. Professor Schlesinger now comes along and praises authentic and autonomous revolution in Latin America. He writes an official U.S. foreign policy paper which says revolutionists should keep lands confiscated from rightful owners.

Professor Scheslinger may have wormed his way into a position of power in the President's office, but he has no special writ to give the endorsement of the people of the United States to lawless, bloody revolution in Latin America. The President would do well to disavow Professor Schlesinger's statement before it causes the death of innocent people in Latin America and disruption of already precarious economies.

Providing Home Loans for Veterans in Housing Credit Shortage Areas

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5723) to extend the veterans' guaranteed and direct home loan program and to provide additional funds for the veterans' direct loan program.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, it might be interesting to have a little survey of what has happened to the veterans' housing program since its inception.

Since Congress passed the original Veterans' Administration Housing Authority, 5½ million men and women who served their country honorably have received loans under the conventional method. That is, the local lending institutions supplied the money and the Government guaranteed a portion of the loan. The amount involved in these transactions is approximately $50 billion.

With a potential liability of $50 billion, you might wonder what the experience has been. From the interest income on the sale of acquired properties by the Veterans' Administration, from the repayment by the veterans themselves, from the assets of the properties not sold, and considering them at their value at the time of acquisition and not at the time of making the loan, the net loss in this $50 billion program as of the 28th day of February 1961 was $15 million, which is three one-hundredths of 1 percent of the original invested principal. If there is any bill or any program that has ever proven its worth, I think this program has.

When the Congress found out there were many veterans who could not get loans because either there were no facilities in their area or the banks or lending institutions of the area would not make them, Congress in its wisdom passed the direct loan program. There are, as at the end of February 1961, 180,883 loans made in that program for approximately $1½ billion.

There are on the present list of the Veterans' Administration waiting for direct loans as of the 28th of February 30,115 applications. You may wonder why this additional amount of money is necessary. As the chairman of the committee stated, in the United States there are 3,072 counties. Under the laws that exist at the present time only 332 of the counties in the United States are ineligible for direct loans; in 267 counties they are partially ineligible, but in those approximately 600 counties more than two-thirds of the veterans of the United States live. In the remaining 2,473 counties veterans will be eligible for these direct loans.

It is remarkable that in the small number of counties where the large percentage of veterans live 37 percent of the veterans who are eligible for loans have applied and received them, but in the 2,473 counties where this bill will apply only 12 percent of the eligible veterans have received their loans to acquire their homes.

Let us look what has happened to this direct loan program since its inception. By the way, so that you may understand what happens pursuant to law passed by the Congress, the Veterans' Administrator goes to the Secretary of the Treasury and gives him an obligation in writing guaranteeing to repay that amount of money to the Treasury. He borrows it, and the obligation calls for the Veterans' Administrator to pay to the Federal Government the amount of interest that the Treasurer is required to pay on loans as of the date that money is borrowed. The Veterans' Administration loans the money in accordance with the law, and those loans have varied from 4, 4½, 4¾, and 5¼ percent interest. From that interest there has been an income of $199,824,155. Of that sum the Veterans' Administration has paid to the Treasury of the United States $120,289,184 interest on this money; its property management and sales expense has been $665,926; loan closing expense has been $3,865,303; liquidation expense has been $105,667, and charges against the reserve for losses are $654,308, or a total of expense and charge for losses of $125,580,388, or a net worth of this program as of February 20, 1956, of $74,243,767. This is a profit and will go to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the programs with which this Congress can look with pride, because while it has helped the citizens of this country, the American citizens, it has more than paid its way and will continue to do so. I certainly hope that this bill will be approved and that there will be no recommittal of it to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Strengths and Weaknesses in our School Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, educators of this Nation are doing their best to analyze the many strengths and relatively few weaknesses in our schools. Their self-analysis has already helped us to recognize that major

efforts are needed to provide the skills and knowledge needed and required in a nation faced with the challenge of new growth at home to help maintain its leadership abroad.

The American Economic Association recently declared that too many students in the United States have only limited understanding of economics; the association has decided to do battle against "economic illiteracy."

An editorial in the Atlantic City Press, Atlantic City, N.J., describes this effort and issues a wise word of caution. It asks the association to avoid "the blandishments of special pleaders and interest groups who may seek to use the new program as a device to disseminate their ideas." Objectivity, of course, should be one of the ground rules for any such educational effort. We need facts and we need fresh ideas, not warmed-over slogans or outmoded concepts. The Economic Education Task Force will perform a vital service if it can help us to understand the forces that strengthen or weaken our economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Atlantic City Press, Mar. 15, 1961]

ECONOMIC ILLITERACY

Convinced that all too many students are emerging from our schools economic illiterates, the American Economic Association has appointed an economic education task force to deal with the situation.

They begin with the premise that too few students are exposed to economics, that many of those who are exposed get too little of it, and that much of the economic theory taught harks back 60 years ago or more.

There is little doubt that such shortcomings are the rule rather than the exception. A recent survey of college freshmen showed a majority held misconceptions about the simplest workings of the economic system.

In an earlier day this might not have been too important. Americans learned such economics as they needed as they rose in their occupations. But today, government decisions on economic affairs can make or break whole industries, permit or retard economic growth, and permit balance or create imbalance in the economy that affects the business cycle.

These actions are often largely in response to the notions and prejudices of the voters, and widespread economic illiteracy therefore becomes a serious factor in economic progress or the lack of it.

The task force members have vowed to gird themselves against the blandishments of special pleaders and interest groups who may seek to use the new program as a device to disseminate their ideas. They will do well to stand fast on this resolve.

A good grounding in the elements of the economy, and of the causes and effects involved in private and governmental actions is about all that can be introduced at the high school level. This by itself would represent an important forward stride in producing an intelligent work force and an informed electorate in the years to come.

In the past, voters who have believed that net profits represent 20 percent or more of the sales price of goods, that a rock-and-roll singer may legitimately earn half a million dollars a year, while a railroad president is overpaid at $50,000, and that government can guarantee full employment have had some serious effects on our progress.

A Reappraisal of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at the 13th annual institute of international relations, held at Washburn University, Topeka, Kans., April 9, 1961, Alf M. Landon, a former Governor of Kansas, a former candidate for the Presidency on the Republican ticket, and a student of international affairs, delivered an outstanding address on the United Nations.

Mr. Landon in his address discussed the importance of the United Nations in world problems, and the dangers confronting this organization.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

A REAPPRAISAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

I speak tonight to focus attention to the facts in this momentous moment of world history. My final conclusions will be neither pessimistic, nor optimistic, since it is uncertain yet whether reason will prevail.

There have been incredibly dangerous developments in world affairs in the past few weeks. There has been a failure to make clear the true import of events and their long-term consequences. If anything, I am particularly dismayed by the opposite tendency, namely, the sugar-coating of deliberate optmism. In some cases, there has been downright concealment of important and deadly significant facts.

One of my major purposes tonight is to try, as fairly and objectively as possible, to reveal what the truth is and how all the elements of crisis revolve about and ultimately center on what I believe to be the most dangerous single conclusion, the potential death of the United Nations.

Let me first clarify certain technical administrative problems which are central to an understanding of the political processes of the United Nations. The U.N. is not, and I must emphasize this point, is not, an independent entity. It has no being and no reality outside of its membership and is entirely the dependency of its membership. In the same sense that a mirror reflects the face, so the U.N. is as strong or as weak, as good or as evil, as much a success or failure as the world it reflects.

But does the U.N. in reality reflect the world? Only the naive would believe that. Member nations are not equally powerful; member nations are not totally independent of political control and manipulation. What the world really is today, and the U.N. beautifully mirrors this, is that Communist power bloc which will act predictably on crucial issues according to the dictates of the Soviet. Of course, on minor matters, there are factions and differences. But don't let that confuse us. On all matters of substance, bloc discipline is enforced.

The Secretariat of the United Nations, and in particular, its chief executive officer, the Secretary-General, is the servant of the membership. No matter his personal convictions, he is bound by the language and the substance of the instructions of the membership. He is further bound, as we are tragically learning, by the willingness of the membership to obey their own directives—on all levels—including the financial one.

At this very moment, two international problems are most revealing—Laos and the Congo.

The history of Laos is a most distressing one. From the very inception, this problem was dealt with outside the United Nations and represented the bitter conclusion of the French collapse in what was then French Indochina.

At the meeting in Geneva of the Great Powers Conference, it was agreed that Laos would be constituted as a neutral state and that all participants to the Great Powers Convention would obey the conventional terms of neutrality. As I have already stated elsewhere, the United States as well as the Soviet Union disobeyed the Convention. And no matter how we attempt to justify this in terms of Chinese, Russian, and Vietnamese intervention, we did not take this case to the United Nations, but supplied arms and military personnel to a faction in Laos in contravention of the Geneva agreement.

In the face of the deepening crisis, we did not steadfastly rely on the United Nations, but on SEATO, a rather ineffectual structure, built by the late Secretary of State Dulles, a structure which has admittedly been of little value because of Britain's and France's indifference, amounting to negative policies. Even in the face of the devastating lesson of the Baghdad Pact, we still followed a course of reliance on a jerry-built power alliance. Furthermore, for 6 years, both SEATO's military and political values were hamstrung by the Eisenhower administration's lack of any positive, definite, and consistent policy in Laos.

In the final analysis, great harm can come from dealing with Laos as an independent problem. Because of its strategic position, it is a part of the whole world's fateful issues.

Despite sugar-coated official pronouncements, Britain, France, and the United States did not present a solid front in SEATO, nor with the United Nations policies in the Congo.

I now turn to the Congo—another key country—unable to defend itself against imperial Soviet control.

Prior to the eruption of the Congo crisis, Dag Hammarskjold had been carefully, skillfully and bravely attempting to strengthen the position of the United Nations so that it would best serve the smaller nations in the face of the East-West power struggle and make possible efficient, immediate action in the face of crisis. Hammarskjold had made great progress in his efforts, so that at the beginning of the Congo crisis, it was possible to field a United Nations army with speed and precision. But here the simmering, underground dangers suddenly burst to the fore. The United Nations blundered in administering policy in the Congo—blunders partially due to the improvisation necessary in the planning and administering of new and uncharted procedures.

The Soviet Union, which felt the time ripe for a major imperialistic move, felt itself frustrated and the stakes were big enough to make major battle. The stakes were and are the Continent of Africa. The Soviet Union waged its war on many grounds, but the most important ground was the United Nations itself.

It would first destroy the Secretariat and, by so doing, create anarchy within the United Nations itself. When the initial attack failed and Dag Hammarskjold refused to resign, the Soviet Union extended its attack by creating a precedent by refusing financial support.

Without money from the Soviet Union and its satellites, United Nations effort would be seriously hampered. The arbitrary withdrawal of troops by member states created

near panic in attempting to field a force large enough to cope with the most difficult situation. And finally, the various political factions in the Congo itself, seeing dissension and disunity in the United Nations proper, were encouraged to defy the United Nations, thereby creating increased economic and political instability which always favors Communist expansion.

In the face of the impudent and cynical Soviet junking operation other member states were handed a precedent for like action. Not until April 3d did Belgium agree to withdraw its military personnel from the Congo in compliance with U.N. resolutions.

The French have refused payment of their financial commitments to the Congo operation and, with the inadequate exceptions of Australia, Ireland, and the Netherlands, who have made only partial payment—the United States alone has paid the 1960 Congo assessment in full.

There has been much talk, at times of past crises, of the capacity of the United Nations to survive. It is my considered opinion that it is this crisis now which represents the great turning point—for it is this crisis which has produced general disobedience and not disobedience merely on the part of the imperialist Soviet bloc.

The League of Nations died in the face of the Italian invasion of Ethiopia—not simply because of unilateral disobedience on the part of Germany and Italy—but of general failure throughout the membership to provide support. No single nation of power and substance elected to go to the defense of the League in clear and certain terms.

At this moment the question of survival by the United Nations relies largely on American leadership. We are compelled to act both within and outside the United Nations to have its very existence. And our actions within and without must be consistent. In terms of our allies and all those areas of the world where the United States is central for aid and survival the United States must demand compliance with the charter of the United Nations. But it can do that only when it, too, complies with the charter.

And when it acts unilaterally, as in Laos, its political position and its moral position in support of the United Nations evaporates. If we don't value the maintenance of the United Nations as the only essential organism which breeds hope for peace we must then clearly face the alternative and the certain inevitability of war. No other organism, no other structure, no other mechanism exists which can act as well to inhibit "the seeds of destruction" leading to eventual general conflict.

Having presented a general background to this momentous crisis, let me deal with those elements which bring us closer to the heart of the problem. The best way is to cite opposing viewpoints and reveal the counterarguments. We all agree on certain basic matters, namely:

(1) The policy of the Soviet Union is clearly and by its own admission imperialistic. It will use all means at its disposal to secure world dominion.

(2) Even if there be no other choice, in the last analysis, the prospect of war is too dreadful to accept with a casual shrug of the shoulders.

(3) If there is any way, any way at all, to preserve freedom, the only condition appropriate to man and that makes life positively good, every effort must be made to find that way, without war.

(4) The only way that offers hope is the existence of a third force, a force capable of channeling, focusing, concentrating the power, the idealism, the will of peoples everywhere. That third force presently exists in the form of the United Nations.

Here are some recent countering positions:

The first of March, Paul Henri Spaak, a Belgian statesman of impressive stature, said that "the idea of a general war such as those of 1914–18 and 1938–45 could now be ruled out. Competition with the Communist East now is in the economic sphere. The test is taking place in Asia, Africa, and South America rather than in Europe."

Dr. Spaak went on to say that NATO and the new Organization for Economic Collective Development are the best reliance of the free world and the United Nations is ended. That is merely one variant on a position held by many, that the United Nations has failed. And there should be a return to out-and-out power bloc alliances.

In the first place, I cannot agree with Dr. Spaak's optimistic conclusion that a general war can now be ruled out, and his optimistic reliance on an empty shell like NATO and an untried organization like the OECD. While the United Nations is facing its greatest test, neither do I agree with him that it has been ineffective and is finished.

But far more important, at the heart of what Dr. Spaak proposes, is a return to tested methods, methods predicated on the certainty of general war, and not as he says the end of the possibility of general war. Power alliances are formed for purposes of mutual defense against aggression. They do not contain within themselves the ingredients for buffering antagonists. Two armed camps facing each other with no middle ground define the logical conclusions of their existence—ultimate conflict. And if the grounds for that conflict already exist, then the greater the need for a common meeting ground. Despite his vast experience, Dr. Spaak starts with a falses premise, a premise utterly out of accord with a rational world. His conclusions are consequently false.

Another argument gaining recent support calls for a withdrawal to our own shores, the "Fortress America" theory. This would mean turning the world over to imperial communism, an act of betrayal and almost inhuman surrender of our fellowmen. It would also hasten, rather than retard, war for with massive control by the Soviet Union of the resources of the world, attack would surely follow, an attack against a weakened and demoralized America fearfully awaiting the awful day.

Against the backdrop of the need for immediate decision, I propose the following as the necessary steps for reasonable men:

I emphatically believe President Kennedy and our Congress must make up their minds soon whether we are going to emphasize the key place of the United Nations in world affairs, as our President did in his inaugural address.

I have made it plain in every address I have made on international relations, that we must keep our Armed Forces and our military strength second to none. That involves our own defense, even though, like an umbrella in a storm, it covers others.

While keeping second to none in our armed strength, I believe we must concentrate on more support of the United Nations.

We really only started that policy last September. It must be continued to a greater degree than heretofore, because, as I have said, the United Nations, as a result of that policy, was steadily growing in responsibility and strength until the member nations failed to keep even their financial commitments.

There has been much talk that the United Nations, to be effective, would have to be equipped with a permanent international army to force peace on the world.

I do not believe that is wise.

It is hard for all peoples to break away from age-old customs, and believe, that international affairs and basic major conflicts can be ultimately settled only by armed force.

However, slowly and falteringly, homo sapiens is feeling his way to new rules, new methods, for avoiding that folly. I believe there are sound grounds for optimistic conclusions that, given persistent and consistent strong support by the major powers of truly peoples' governments, the United Nations can and will grow in strength and responsibility.

That is not to say that we're not testing fate by our policies in world affairs.

The incredible danger we face is whether Khrushchev and the Soviet, Mao and his Chinese echelons, are going to make the same mistake of Kaiser Wilhelm and his war lords, of Hitler and his Nazis, of Mussolini and his black shirts, in underestimating the latent power of the undisciplined peoples of popular governments like Britain, France, and America.

The Prussians, Nazis, and Fascists relied, and the Russian Soviet imperialists are relying on, the same erroneous basic principle. The Soviet believes that disciplined peoples can conquer the undisciplined peoples of true democracies, where, as in America, local labor unions attempt to establish their own foreign policy contrary to their Government's international trade agreements.

Khrushchev cries the free press does not understand him. So did Kaiser Wilhelm II, and Hitler.

Khrushchev and Mao keep pushing here and pushing there—testing the will and the determination of truly peoples' governments to stand their ground for their principles and their freedom. So did the Kaiser, and Hitler, and Mussolini.

All three made the great mistake of believing Great Britain and France were decadent and America "too proud to fight." Well, they got their answer in two world wars. However, Mao, and the Soviet, apparently are still not convinced that governments that permit organized pacifist demonstrations, unrestrained criticism and ridicule in all phases of national life, and are devoted to the rights of the individual, can and will do a better job in war, when the incentive is there, than their disciplined masses. They confuse willing-to-live-and-let-live policy, up to a point, with faint heart. Therein lies the danger of destruction of the world by a great nuclear war.

Khrushchev, a superb actor, or a superb statesman, and possibly both, has truly said no nation can win a third general nuclear war. Therefore, the imperial Soviets' policy is a methodical process, both economically and militarily, in brush wars involving internal conflict. Questions of internal conflict anywhere can quickly become a matter of unilateral action between two major powers and thus resolve themselves into a general war.

When the United Nations charter was adopted many people vowed that was the answer to war and peace. That reminds me of a conversation I had with an old hard-boiled Republican leader in the 65th Congress that enacted national prohibition.

He told me of a visit he had with several other leaders in the Congress who liked their nip. They talked about brilliant colleagues whose opportunity for great public service had been ruined by overindulgence in intoxicating liquors. They were willing to make the sacrifice of their own tastes in order to eliminate that evil.

When I was talking to him, he was disillusioned by the results. He said, "It never occurred to us that the law would not be obeyed."

And it never occurred to people who built too high hopes on the United Nations Charter as the complete answer to settling diffi-

culties by collective process instead of unilateral actions—that the U.N. would not be obeyed forthwith.

The United Nations is going through the same period of trial and error, of growth, that our Republic has gone through, that the British Commonwealth has gone through, that France has gone through, and Germany, and free country after free country.

Take Kansas for an illustration. Its trials and tribulations in the days of horrible brutality of bitter border warfare were born of the failure of the Missouri Compromise and the Kansas-Nebraska Act, and of leadership in both the North and the South, the follies of statesmen and of generals, which resulted in approximately 600,000 casualties on both sides in the Civil War.

And yet, 100 years later, we have not yet reached the solution of the basic principles of that war, or, for that matter, in the Bill of Rights adopted almost 200 years ago. That is, civil rights for all in this great country of ours.

Two groups represent the despair theme of Washburn's Institute of International Relations:

(1) The despair of negative thinking is expressed by the tinkling cymbals of pacifists who would supinely surrender to the tyranny of communism, or reach the same end by appeasement. This very principle of nonresistance is an invitation to the Soviet and Mao.

(2) The sounding brass thinking by those who believe another world war is inevitable.

I do not agree with such extreme positions. I believe that, in the basic interest of the world's mankind, our eagle must neither fold its wings nor yield to the natural impulse in combating danger. We must abandon our presence of mind and become—as it were—a cosmic vigilante committee.

The United Nations is neither the failure some claim—nor the shining forceful success that others expected. It is now facing its greatest test. Its survival is at stake, precipitated by the failure of all the member countries to pay their share of the Congo expenses, thus playing into the hands of Khrushchev and Mao.

If the U.N. is forced to depend on the United States to pay more than its share, in order to continue the United Nations policies in the Congo, the collective position of the United Nations in world affairs is drastically altered by being heavily dependent upon one nation for the financing of its Congo policies. To that extent its collective function is weakened.

Although the possibility of the most dreadful and destructive war in the history of mankind cannot be completely ruled out, the prospects of avoiding that holocaust will improve as the free peoples' governments learn to compose their divergent views and pool their strength by and through the United Nations.

The hope, the creative theme, is expressed by such meetings as this that grasp the fact that the days of self-dependence by a nation are gone forever.

This is a new day and we must adjust ourselves to fit the new rules of the world in which we live. That calls for omniactive leadership by men of determination, of insight, whose eyes are open to the necessity and opportunity of fighting for extended cooperation by and through strengthening the United Nations as the most effective agency for peace.

If it is impossible to present a firm and united position by the United Nations, for equity and justice in the world, I fear a great calamity may be in the making, with the United Nations fading away as did the League of Nations.

Housing for the Golden Years—Problems of the Aging and the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the national effort to meet the problems of the aging and the aged is progressing on many fronts. Slowly we are achieving nationwide recognition of the fact that we must exercise long-range ingenuity to assure our elderly citizens of adequate resources for at least a minimum of security and comfort.

One of the most pressing needs is adequate, specialized housing. In the Congress last year we recognized this need in several ways. President Kennedy and Mr. Weaver of the Housing and Home Finance Agency have made it clear this year that they want to take even more effective steps this year. Their leadership is welcome and timely; the need grows more obvious every day.

It was particularly heartening, therefore, to read an article written by reporter Andre Briod for the April 2 edition of the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News. Mr. Briod, who has written often about urban development programs in New Jersey, wrote in that article that "New Jersey's cities have taken the lead in the construction of a type of housing which is of growing importance in the overall dwelling supply picture—low-cost, low-rent housing for the elderly."

His report, I believe, gives a helpful summary of the action that can be taken by thoughtful housing officials in large cities and smaller towns. I ask unanimous consent to have the article entitled "Housing for the Golden Years" be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

HOUSING FOR THE GOLDEN YEARS—NEW JERSEY LEADS NATION IN PUBLIC UNITS SPECIFICALLY FOR THE ELDERLY

(By Andre Briod)

New Jersey's cities have taken the lead in the construction of a type of housing which is of growing importance in the overall dwelling supply picture—low-cost, low-rent housing for the elderly.

Efforts in this direction have marked this State as the Nation's leader in the field, according to Charles Plotkin, information officer of the Public Housing Administration's regional office in New York.

Figures compiled last month by the regional office show there were 25 separate low-cost housing projects for the elderly either under construction or completed in 17 New Jersey communities. This record, according to PHA estimates, approaches the combined progress to date in the States of Connecticut, New York, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, Maine, and New Hampshire.

While other States, both in the East and elsewhere in the country, are following New Jersey's lead in accelerating their elderly housing programs, the Garden State continues to gather momentum in the same effort. As of last month, there were another 25 unstarted projects on the books in New Jersey, and the start of construction was expected on most of them before the end of this year.

In all, 34 New Jersey municipalities are now involved in the program, to the extent that they either have started or completed projects or have definite plans for future construction of low-cost elderly housing. Others may be expected to follow in the future.

The State now has eight completed elderly housing projects, a category in which New Jersey also is the national leader. The completed projects, some of which come within larger public housing ventures which include a portion of apartments designed especially for elderly persons, are in Newark, Asbury Park, Long Branch, West New York, Hackensack, Paterson, Bayonne, and Guttenberg.

What marks housing for the elderly as different from low-cost public housing in general is the inclusion of features and accommodations directed specifically at the requirements of senior citizens, or according to PHA regulations, a family whose household head is over 65 years old.

While the accommodations which distinguish the units for the elderly vary from city to city and project to project, three major housing developments now under construction by the Newark Housing Authority, to provide a total of 500 apartments for the elderly, offer a good example of what makes housing for the elderly something special on today's housing market.

These special features are to be included in those apartments to accommodate the special needs of elderly persons:

Slip-resistant tiles in both kitchens and bathrooms.

Oversized medicine chests in bathrooms.

Slip-proof surfaces on bathtubs. The tubs themselves are to be built lower than normal to make them easier to enter and get out of.

Grab rails around the bathtubs to enable users to steady themselves.

Silent sanitary facilities to prevent the awakening of other persons in the apartment when they are used at night.

Lower than conventional closet shelves to make them easier to reach.

Wider than normal doors to permit the passage of wheelchairs.

Pilot lights on light switches so that the switches can be more easily located in the dark.

Electric ranges, for safety reasons, rather than the gas ranges with which other public housing apartments are equipped in Newark.

Oversized elevator in each building to accommodate wheelchairs.

In addition, at least one building at each project location is to contain space for the establishment of a medical clinic to serve the elderly tenants.

There also is to be space at each location for visiting nurse service and for recreation for the elderly tenants.

Medical and visiting nurse services would be provided independently, either by social agencies, private organizations, or by a public authority other than the housing authority.

While the "extras" for the accommodation of senior citizens to be found in the Newark projects are basically the same as those which mark those included in completed or planned projects elsewhere, there are variations from community to community in the special facilities offered. The differences depend partly on the cost limitations imposed by the Public Housing Administration.

Where land costs for the projects are low, more can be provided. Where land is expensive, fewer facilities are possible.

Just as the accommodations vary, so do the building styles. Newark, Asbury Park, Guttenberg, and West New York, for example, all have employed high-rise construction in their elderly housing developments. The recently opened Long Branch project, which houses 37 elderly families, is low-rise, garden-apartment-type construction.

While most builders, whether low rise or high rise, are conventional in design, there are some unusual examples of public housing architecture in the elderly housing program, such as the hexagonal apartment tower now under construction in New Brunswick. That structure is to contain 60 apartment units for the elderly.

The factor of land cost also has a direct influence on the type of design employed in the construction of the buildings. If land costs are high, buildings must be built higher so as to keep the average cost per apartment within the limits set by the PHA. If costs of land are low, low-rise construction may be possible.

Federal housing law presently imposes a limit of $2,500 per room on expenditures for construction of low-cost housing for the elderly. That limit is about $800 higher than the limit per room for general public housing construction, but it must be set above the general limit to permit the inclusion of the facilities which distinguish elderly housing from conventional public housing.

Units built particularly for the elderly often are included within larger projects which contain a portion of general public housing. This is true of six of the eight completed projects for the elderly now finished in New Jersey.

In Newark, for example, the public housing for senior citizens now occupied consists of 28 apartments within the 1,206 apartments which comprise the Stella Windsor Wright Homes, opened for occupancy last year.

The five Newark buildings which comprise the three elderly projects now under construction here are designed for occupancy by elderly persons only. Each of the projects, however, is located at the site of existing general public housing buildings. Two buildings for aged persons are being built at the site of the Stephen Crane Village, two are being constructed alongside the Otto Kretchmer Homes, and the fifth building is under construction at the Reverend William P. Hayes Homes site.

Only Asbury Park and Hackensack, among New Jersey's municipalities, have completed elderly housing as projects separate from general public housing.

Of the 50 projects completed, under construction, or planned in this State, only 22 contemplate units for elderly persons alone. Many of those 22 developments, including the 3 in Newark, are located or are to be built on the site of an already existing public housing development.

In the case of some of the other projects, where elderly housing is to be incorporated within a larger single public housing venture, that housing portion of the development is to be located within separate buildings exclusively for the use of elderly persons. An example of this is Newark's West Kinney Street public housing undertaking, planned as the biggest single public housing project in the State, for which a site has been carved and cleared out of the city's central ward.

Overall, that project will contain 1,680 units, of which 252 are to be for elderly persons. All 252 apartments for the elderly will be located within a single building in the nine-building complex which will comprise that development.

Public housing authorities believe that a limited mixing of general and elderly public housing, such as the assignment of one or more buildings within a larger project to elderly persons only, is desirable from the standpoint of the living conditions of the older tenants.

By being placed in separate buildings they are able to keep their closest associations with persons with whom they have most in common. At the same time, they are protected from the distractions of the faster, and sometimes noisier, pace of general public housing life. On the other hand, they are given the feeling that they are still part of the overall community and not isolated from the world around them. They are in a position to establish relationships beyond those of their elderly neighbors, but not forced to accept such associations.

Today there are thousands of elderly persons living in general public housing in New Jersey. For these tenants public housing has in most cases provided better homes than they could otherwise afford. As special units for the elderly are constructed, these aged citizens will have available to them still better living conditions at approximately the same rent levels.

At the same time, as conventional public housing apartments are vacated by those moving on to the elderly units, other persons, not eligible for residence in buildings for the elderly but eligible for public housing by reason of their limited incomes, will be able to move into low-rent units from the substandard private housing they now occupy.

In this way, the benefits of the new program to house low-income elderly persons will extend beyond those for whom the new housing is designed.

The overall program in New Jersey at present will bring the eventual completion of 3,650 new apartment units for the elderly, 419 of which are already built.

In addition to the completed buildings for the elderly, these communities currently have the following number of elderly units under construction:

Bayonne, 62; Camden, 164; Guttenberg, 24; Highland Park, 6; Hightstown, 4; Hoboken, 50; Irvington, 42; Newark, 746; New Brunswick, 60; Paterson, 192; Perth Amboy, 48; Phillipsburg, 36; Plainfield, 30; West New York, 24.

Another 838 units are planned for the following municipalities: Bridgeton, Boonton, Carteret, East Orange, Edison, Garfield, Glassboro, Elizabeth, Hightstown, Irvington, Long Branch, Lakewood, Morristown, Red Bank, Trenton, West New York, and Woodbridge.

Good Works in Labor Movement Seldom Heralded by Headlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, my attention was called recently to an editorial which observed that the "majority of the labor movement, and leaders of industry are honest in their operation." I was pleased to read this editorial in the Morning News, a San Leandro, Calif., newspaper. Usually it is the sensational stories of corrupt practices that get play in the press.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

SOME HARD FACTS ABOUT GOOD UNION OPERATIONS

Good works, unfortunately, are seldom heralded by headlines.

The newspapers save the big headlines for stories about gangsters moving into unions and for articles about billion dollar price rigging conspiracy by industrial giants.

These are examples, we like to believe, of the exceptions to the rule. The majority of the labor movement, and leaders of industry are honest in their operation.

This week the East Bay Labor Journal printed some hard facts about good unions. Declared the voice of the labor movement in Alameda County: "No union corruption is right. No business corruption is right."

Russell Crowell, president of the county central labor council, declared, "We must differentiate between the union in which an isolated union officer goes bad, and one permeated by corruption."

This is not to mean that the labor movement should try to gloss over the convincing evidence which the McClelland Committee has produced—of sweetheart contracts, gangster tieins, looting of treasuries, perversion of the legitimate ends and aims of unionism, denial of union democracy and intimidation and violence. A black eye on the labor movement—whether they are AFL–CIO or not—hurts all who carry union cards.

Crowell declares that "there are some unions whose leaders have forgotten how to lead." No union member or officer should forget that the union exists for the rank-and-file membership.

Alameda County is fortunate that both Crowell and Executive Secretary Robert S. Ash stress the need for responsible labor leaders. Labor leadership in the county has been a clean, vigorous movement with an outstanding record.

American-Jewish Committee Proposes Intergroup Relations Division in Department of Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for some time I have urged the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs in the executive branch. I am hopeful, now that the Reorganization Act has been passed, that such a Department will be established in the very near future.

Most of the people who have commented on the establishment of a Cabinet-level Department in this area, have suggested subdivisions following the present structure of the agencies under the Housing and Home Finance Administration. There would be subdivisions for urban renewal, public housing, community facilities, housing, air and water pollution and covering certain aspects of highway planning and construction.

The president of the American-Jewish Committee, Mr. Herbert B. Ehrmann, in a letter to the editor of the New York Times, has made a proposal which departs importantly from this scheme. Mr. Ehrmann suggests that one of the subdivisions of this new department be charged with the responsibility of dealing with problems affecting the relations of various groups within urban areas. At present there are many such agencies at the local level which seek to iron out and resolve problems between new groups and old groups in urban areas, particularly in connection with redevelopment undertakings.

The national division on intergroup relations in the Department of Urban Affairs would—and I quote from Mr. Ehrmann's letter—"act as a national service bureau for local, State, and regional intergroup relations agencies and work as well with small communities not having their own intergroup relations committees. A principal duty would be to serve as an information clearing center for both public and voluntary agencies in this field and provide consultative services."

Mr. President, this is an interesting and exciting proposal. Up to now it has received little attention. I commend Mr. Ehrmann for his excellent and thoughtful letter to the New York Times, and I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD in order that those interested in a Department of Urban Affairs may study this proposal.

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

FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN DEALING WITH HUMAN PROBLEMS ENVISAGED TO AID URBAN AREAS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In his recent housing message President Kennedy indicated that he would propose a new Cabinet-rank Department on Housing and Urban Affairs. Since more than half of the country's population is now congregated in 168 metropolitan areas, the urgent need for such a Department is compelling clear.

However, there has long been a tendency to consider the situation of urban communities mainly in terms of such physical problems as housing, water, and air pollution, sewage disposal, urban renewal. Important as these matters are, it is hoped that the new Department will give equal consideration to the human problems which daily confront the 108 million urban dwellers of our Nation.

We are by now painfully aware of how crucial these problems can become at home and, especially sginificant these days, in terms of our high visibility to nations abroad. The range of these problems includes relations between groups of different racial and ethnic backgrounds, tensions arising from neighborhood changes, dislocation as a consequence of migration and population growth, and the general urban turmoil that is the chronic concommitant of overcrowding, deterioration, and abrasive encounters between newscomers and old residents.

GOVERNMENT'S ROLE

Many voluntary agencies such as the American Jewish Committee have long recognized the important contribution which government on all levels can make toward dealing with metropolitan human relations problems. Many States and communities, too, have given evidence of their concern for these human relations issues.

In some 70 communities, including Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, New York City, municipal committees on intergroup and human relations have been formed. Twenty States have similar bodies. Their work will be significantly encouraged and enhanced by the creation of an intergroup relations division within President Kennedy's proposed Department of Urban Affairs.

This division would act as a national service bureau for local, State and regional intergroup relations agencies and work as well with small communities not having their own intergroup relations committees. A principal duty would be to serve as an information clearing center for both public and voluntary agencies in this field and provide consultative services.

Fact-gathering and research programs would be among its important tasks, which would also include establishing training programs for professionals and volunteer workers who are urgently needed in the intergroup relations field.

CONTEMPLATED HELP

The 1960 Democratic platform, in fact, contemplated a Federal intergroup relations office "to help solve problems of discrimination in housing, education, employment, and community opportunities in general." The Republican platform pledged "the full use of the power, resources and leadership of the Federal Government" to the same end.

The tremendous prestige of the Federal Government would, of itself, give great impetus toward the effective resolution of some of these pressing problems. Further, it would be of incalculable value in communicating to the world at large our Nation's sincere and constructive interest in those human relations crises so strongly current today.

HERBERT B. EHRMANN,
President, the American-Jewish Committee.

NEW YORK, *March 22, 1961.*

The Vintage Years—Problems of Aged and Aging Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Mr. R. O. Beckman has given his readers much information about the aging and aged citizens of this Nation in his column, "The Vintage Years." He has often described new innovations worthy of great study by everyone who is working to prevent waste of human resources, which so often occurs among the elderly citizens of our society.

His column of March 20, which appeared in the Newark Evening News and other newspapers, told of community centers for senior citizens sponsored in a relatively small number of cities and towns. He gives special credit to the Auto Workers Union for leading the way in this field under the direction of Charles E. Odell.

Mr. President, Mr. Beckman's column describes a spontaneous response to a problem affecting so many of our older citizens who often find, in their later years, that their idle hours have become very lonely hours.

I ask that the attached article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

AUTO WORKERS' UNION IS ACTIVE IN AID TO RETIRED

(By R. O. Beckman)

Community centers at which retired persons may gather for companionship and leisure time are becoming an important aspect of modern social life.

Hundreds of facilities throughout the country, open to persons of all ages, but primarily youth-centered, are sponsored by city recreation departments or by welfare, religious, or other voluntary organizations. Not more than 150 such centers, however have set aside special quarters for older persons and established intensive programs for that group.

One organization in particular has blazed the trail. The auto workers union appears to have been largely responsible during the past 5 years for setting up more senior day centers in some 70 American and Canadian cities than all other agencies at work in behalf of our older citizens. These drop-in centers, sponsored in whole or in part by the union, now operate from 3 to 5 days a week, are professionally staffed, and offer a diversified recreational, educational, and social service program.

This was brought about with the leadership of energetic Charles E. Odell, recruited by the union from the U.S. Department of Labor. Odell modestly denies such credit and insists the achievement is due to the cooperative effort of other public and voluntary agencies.

Of the senior day centers, 15 are in industrial centers in Michigan, 13 in New York and New Jersey, and others largely in Midwestern and Ontario communities. Many receive primary financial support from the union, with some assistance from the community. Other centers initiated by the union are directed by other community groups.

They welcome any older person regardless of former membership in any labor union. The only charge is a voluntary contribution of perhaps a dime when a snack or cup of coffee is enjoyed. In contrast to the attendance at most other community centers and golden age clubs, a majority of participants are men.

The centers are usually open Mondays through Fridays and offer a varied program including educational and cultural activities; social affairs, games, movies, and hobbies; visitation of the homebound; referrals and counseling on health and other personal retirement problems; discussions of community problems; and participation in civic and community service.

Members have an integral part in planning programs that interest them. Monthly calendars are distributed showing each day's events. Visits to the homebound result in supplying many services and needs. Craft activity at the centers embraces such service projects as making decorated flower pots, tray favors, toys and puzzles, and candy fire crackers for a children's hospital. Dramatic and orchestral groups are popular at some centers.

For workers not yet retired, and their wives, a five-session 2-hour series of preretirement training discussions is conducted. The course was developed with aid from the universities of Michigan and Chicago. It has helped prospective retirees answer questions as to what to do to be ready for the nonworking years.

Some other labor organizations are at work for their retired members but are more largely concerned with establishing health clinics for members and retirees or setting up residential homes for older members. None has been as active in senior day center activity as the autoworkers.

Appendix

Francis E. Walter Honored by Assembly of Captive European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of the opening statement I made on Thursday, April 13, 1961, at the truly moving and most impressive ceremony of presentation of the honor scroll of the Assembly of Captive European Nations to our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the House Committee on the Judiciary. My remarks were as follows:

It is a signal achievement for an American legislator to be recognized by the international community of free men as a statesman and a great humanitarian.

FRANCIS E. WALTER was so recognized last year when, at Naples, Italy, he was unanimously elected to serve as president of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, an organization in which 30 nations of the free world banded together in the noble endeavor of providing new homes and—indeed—new lives for those who have had to flee from totalitarian persecution or from economic misery.

Today, again, the free leaders of nine countries behind the Iron Curtain—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania—united in the Assembly of Captive European Nations recognized FRANCIS E. WALTER'S work as legislator, statesman, and humanitarian in paying him an exceptional tribute.

Our friend, Congressman WALTER, has, indeed, very early witnessed the worst aspects of human misery inflicted by godless, dictatorial rulers. He was one of the first Members of Congress to enter the liberated, infamous concentration camp at Dachau, right behind General Patton's tanks. He saw Hitler's victims, and he readily recognized the need for immediate assistance, and he did not just talk about it. He did something about it.

His subsequent work in Europe, particularly his extensive investigation of the displaced persons problem undertaken in 1949, resulted not only in legislation here in the Congress, but generated an international effort culminated in the erection of the successor to the International Refugee Organization, the Intergovernmental Committee in Geneva which refers to FRANCIS WALTER as its founding father.

Throughout the years, FRANCIS WALTER has served his country with distinction, great ability, and courage. He reflects credit not only upon his congressional district which he has served so loyally, but upon our Nation as a whole.

You people, representing the nine captive nations locked behind the Iron Curtain, have a great ally in Mr. WALTER. For he is aware, like you who have fled your homelands, that the vicious forces of atheistic communism are bent on world revolution, conquest, and enslavement of people.

I do not have to tell you who have fled, of the persecution that is being carried on by Communists—the immediate successors of Hitler in your homelands. This is ever present in the minds of all of us, and we must thank God that we have men and women of the caliber, spirit and determination of FRANCIS WALTER. There is no Member of Congress who more clearly understands the intents and purposes of communism, as well as the vicious, inhuman mind of the Communist, than does the man you have come to honor, FRANCIS E. WALTER, the great American statesman and humanitarian.

Presenting the honor scroll, the chairman of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, Mr. Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, former Ambassador of Lithuania to the Court of St. James's, made the following address:

Representative WALTER, Representative McCORMACK, Mr. Attorney General, ladies and gentlemen, this is a memorable occasion for the Assembly of Captive European Nations.

We have come here to pay homage to a man, whose achievements we are singularly endowed to appreciate. As refugees from Soviet imperialism, we have always been aware of Representative WALTER'S concern for the fate of those who fled tyrannical regimes and of the actions he has initiated to support them. As spokesmen for the freedom aspirations of our captive peoples, we have followed with admiration his determined struggle against Communist totalitarianism. And we are bound to state that in combining the qualities of a humanitarian, who aids the victims of a plague, and of a fighter, who sets out to repel and to eradicate the source of that plague, Representative WALTER has set an inspiring example.

Our age is oversatiated with high-sounding words and dazzling statistics. Yet those who have tasted the bitter bread of exile will never forget that Representative WALTER is the person who introduced and piloted through the Congress all immigration, displaced persons, and refugee legislation enacted since the end of World War II. Those who have experienced homelessness will never fail to grasp the full meaning of the facts that under legislation sponsored by Representative WALTER upward of 760,000 displaced persons and refugees entered the United States; that his creation, the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, has moved to new homes over 1 million emigrants from Europe of which over 450,000 were displaced persons and refugees.

In coming to grips with Communist imperialism, Representative WALTER went to the heart of its problem and to the roots of its danger. As chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, he explored not only the American offshoots of communism, but also initiated a widespread program of research on Soviet strategy and the captive countries. Several members of the assembly, including myself, had the privilege of being called to testify, as experts on communism, before the House Un-American Activities Committee. Our first-hand experiences were recorded and disseminated to the American people, before whose gates the same totalitarian enemy now stands poised.

The freedom cause of our captive nations has always been very close to Representative WALTER'S heart. He was and remains one of the most ardent supporters of the Captive Nations Week. He has shown deep understanding of the aims of the Assembly of Captive European Nations and we have benefited from his advice and support of our activities.

Recently, Representative WALTER has offered one of the most effective rebuttals of Soviet hypocritical charges of colonialism against the United States and brilliantly exposed the Soviet slogan of "peaceful coexistence." Yet his searching mind has also looked penetratingly into the ills besetting the West. Freemen everywhere should ponder his timely warning that: "The security of the West cannot be based solely on the strength of its armed forces or the size of its potential product and on its technical skill and progress. Defense does not mean just guns and tanks and planes. Defense means the strength of dedication and the awareness that ours are the most trying times that have ever faced this Republic and this Nation."

We fully agree that at this juncture of the contest between liberty and tyranny, the will to win is as, or even more, important than the accumulation of weapons. It is the will of the West to preserve and expand the area of freedom, combined with the will of the nations of east-central Europe to become free again, that offers the best guarantee of victory and of a true peace.

Representative WALTER'S forthright views and unflinching determination was bound to make him a target of hostile criticism from various quarters. One of the most conspicuously unjust instances of such criticism was the inference that he had opposed liberal legislation in the area of immigration. We, on the contrary, are both cognizant of Representative WALTER'S past contributions to broadminded and humanitarian immigration laws, and confident that he will propose new liberal legislation which will enable the eastern European refugees from communism to enter the United States.

One day the people of east-central Europe will be able to pay due honors to the free men who stood by them in their years of bondage. As we wait for this day to dawn, we present to Representative WALTER, as a token of our deep gratitude for his contribution to the fight for freedom and human dignity, this scroll which reads:

"To the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, Representative in the Congress of the United States of America from the 15th District of Pennsylvania—fighter and humanitarian—in recognition of his undaunted courage in fighting Communist encroachments upon the freedom of man and nations, of his humanitarianism and of his generosity of heart—evidenced in legislative actions and interna-

tional achievements on behalf of refugees from totalitarian oppression."

VACLOVAS SIDZIKAUSKAS,
Chairman.
STEFAN KORBONSKI,
Vice Chairman.
BRUTUS COSTE,
Secretary General.

The presentation ceremony was attended, among others, by the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Robert F. Kennedy; chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. Celler; ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. McCulloch; members of the subcommittee of which Mr. Walter is the chairman, Messrs. Feighan, Chelf, and Poff; the Deputy Under Secretary of State, Hon. Roger W. Jones; the Assistant Secretary of State, Hon. Brooks Hays; the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Gen. Joseph M. Swing; and a large group of officials from the Department of State and the Department of Justice active in refugee and immigration affairs.

Among the exiled European leaders who honored Mr. Walter were, in addition to the chairman, Mr. Sidzikauskas, Messrs. Stefan Korbonski, Poland, the last head of the Polish underground; Vasil Germenji, Albania; George M. Dimitrow, president of Bulgarian Peasant Party; Peter Zenkl, Czechoslovakia, former deputy Prime Minister and mayor of Prague; Ilmar Raamot, Estonia, member of Parliament; Ferenc Nagy, former Prime Minister of Hungary; Vilis Masens, Latvia, former diplomat; and Constantin Visoianu, Rumania, former Foreign Minister.

Also, there were representatives of the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe, International Center of Free Trade Unions in Exile, International Peasant Union, Liberal Democratic Union of Central and Eastern Europe, and Socialist Union of Central and Eastern Europe.

Another Saginaw County Board of Education Opposes Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES HARVEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following letter I received from the Board of Education of the Frankenmuth School District. The Frankenmuth Board of Education is the second such Saginaw County board to oppose Federal aid to education. A few weeks ago the Saginaw Board of Education took a similar stand in proclaiming local school needs can best be resolved by local efforts. Here is the Frankenmuth letter, dated April 13, 1961:

Mr. JAMES HARVEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARVEY: The MEA Legislation Division has asked local school boards to express their thinking on Federal support to education.

The Board of Education of the Frankenmuth School District wishes to be on record as opposed to further support to public education in any of the forms being currently considered by Congress.

JOHN G. ZIEGLER,
President.
ARNOLD C. NUECHTERLEIN,
Secretary.

Address by Hon. Frank T. Bow Before the National Society of Daughters of Founders and Patriots of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, Washington has been honored during the past week with the 63d annual general court of the National Society of Daughters of Founders and Patriots of America. I am pleased that Mrs. Charles A. Baker of Lima, Ohio, in the Fourth Congressional District has served with distinction as president of this society, and during the recent general court our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], gave the address at the annual banquet.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his address in the RECORD:

OUR HERITAGE

There is little reason for me to come here tonight if my purpose were to tell you the nature of our heritage.

The fact that you devote your energies to this organization demonstrates that you are acutely aware of that heritage.

You know, as I do, that our forefathers handed down to us the most noble experiment in government in all of the history of mankind; that it has its foundations in religious faith; that it was conceived and has been cherished and nurtured by self-reliant, courageous men and women who were willing to give their genius, their energy, even their lives to preserve it for future generations.

All of these things we know, and so, if there is a purpose for our meeting here, it is to consider how our generation is fulfilling the obligations laid upon us by those who went before. Have we been true and loyal guardians of our heritage? Do our children understand the heavy obligations we will pass on to them? As a matter of fact, will our children inherit? Will there be anything left?

I hope it may be true that my anxiety for the future of our Nation causes me to exaggerate the perils of our situation, but nothing that I read, or hear, or witness gives me reason for either comfort or satisfaction.

The first danger, it seems to me, lies here at home where I think our people are losing the qualities of self-reliance and responsibility that are so vital a part of our heritage. Without them, all else is lost.

The second danger lies in our attitude toward the enemies of freedom in other lands, and here I fear I detect a lack of courage and a willingness to compromise that could lead swiftly to disaster.

In the inaugural address that won acclaim both here and abroad, President Kennedy spoke these words: "And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

That sentence struck a spark in the hearts of those listening. Unfortunately, the spark ignited no flame.

It is as though, for one fleeting moment, the new American President made contact with the self-reliance of our pioneer heritage. The people responded with a feeling of pride and courage as they recognized, perhaps only subconsciously, a basic statement of American faith. And then all was quiet. There was nothing to show for it. The opportunity was lost. No effort was made to build upon the moment when the President and the people shared their pride in America's heritage.

Before the day was out, the trade associations, the labor unions, the professional educators, the chambers of commerce, the unemployed in depressed areas, and pressure groups everywhere were preparing their demands upon the new Congress and the new administration.

And since that day there has come from the White House to Capitol Hill a steady stream of special messages proposing that the Government finance public schools, subsidize new industry in certain cities and States, guarantee the income of farmers by controlling their production, provide homes for millions of Americans, subsidize the States in at least a dozen new or enlarged programs of Federal aid.

In short, we have witnessed a complete reversal of the slogan of 90 days ago. We have a Federal Government eager to do things for citizens, and we have all too many citizens begging to have things done for them.

The Catholic bishops of America, in a historic statement last fall, had this to say:

"Although personal responsibility and initiative have been our national characteristics, explaining in large measure our country's progress in human welfare, yet pressures are growing for a constantly greater reliance on the collectivity rather than on the individual. An inordinate demand for benefits, most easily secured by the pressures of organization, has led an evergrowing number of our people to relinquish their rights and to abdicate their responsibilities. This concession creates a widening spiral of increasing demands and pressures, with a further infringement on personal freedom and responsibility. Intensive socialization can achieve mass benefits, but man and morality can be seriously hurt in the process."

As a Presbyterian, I wish that all of the social action committees of the various Protestant denominations could see as clearly the need for a careful balance between freedom and security, and speak as clearly against the automation of human beings and the steady loss of freedom that has characterized our recent history.

Attempts to maintain free government have failed time and again throughout history because people get tired of governing themselves.

Free governments have been tried and failed in ancient Greece and Rome, in modern Germany, in many other times and places, because the people grew tired of responsibility. They turned to government to do things for them, without pausing to consider what government might do to them. They never learned the lesson—either you run the government or the government runs you. Unable or unwilling to rely upon themselves, they sold themselves and their children's liberty to government.

The question now before us—perhaps it has already been answered—is whether we are going to follow the historic failures of other free peoples. Are we still able to make a choice?

If there are indications that we are forgetting our heritage on the domestic scene, what can we say about our conduct of foreign relations?

The first and most important obligation of our Government is to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. We can do this only if we have convictions about what is right, convictions about how we should deal with other nations, and follow these convictions regardless of whether we are admired, fawned upon, on despised by friend or foe.

I am deeply concerned by the extent to which our activities are governed by thoughts of how other nations may react.

The most crucial issue in this area today involves the People's Republic of China.

Shortly before his death, John Foster Dulles made a statement on China that reflected his firm conviction on this subject. He said:

"Internationally, the Chinese Communist regime does not conform to the practices of civilized nations; does not live up to its international obligations; has not been peaceful in the past, and gives no evidence of being peaceful in the future. Its foreign policies are hostile to us and to our Asian allies. Under these circumstances, it would be folly for us to establish relations with the Chinese Communists which would enhance their ability to hurt us and our friends."

These words are as true now as they were when Mr. Dulles spoke them.

Here is an issue on which America and Americans have been right.

We know that the Communist rulers of China are tyrants who imposed themselves on the people in bloody revolution. We know they are enemies of human dignity, human liberty. We know they are aggressors seeking to expand their dominion over other people who now are free. We know that they despise religion, and we know that it is right for us to oppose them.

In the past we have not wavered from this position; there has been no appeasement; and there has been no war.

But suddenly there are suggestions from our highest officials that our policy is unrealistic; that our allies think we should relax our opposition to Red China; that we should abandon our ally, the true Government of free China, and arrange a plebiscite on control of Formosa. We are told that recognition of Red China would increase trade, reduce world tension. We are told that admission of Red China to the United Nations is inevitable.

Are we to turn our backs on our friends, ignore right and justice, admit inevitability of something we have successfully opposed for many, many years? Is this the nature of our American heritage?

If you think about it, you know that confidence, like fear, is contagious. Our heritage teaches us courage and confidence, the courage of our convictions, confidence that others will recognize their correctness.

Our heritage does not permit wavering, appeasement, catering to foreign opinion.

Our heritage does not permit us to stand before the world as an image of dismayed indecision.

If it is true that we are losing our heritage, what must we do to regain it?

It seems to me that we should start where the Founding Fathers began.

They ascribed the origins of our Republic to divine providence.

They recognized that the inalienable right of each freeman is a gift from God, which the State can neither curtail nor destroy.

During the deliberations that produced the Declaration of Independence, Benjamin Franklin suggested that each daily session open with prayer, and this is what he said at that time:

"I have lived a long time and the longer I live, the more convincing proof I see that God governs in the affairs of men; and if a sparrow cannot fall without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it. Without His concurring aid, we shall proceed no better than the builders of Babel."

That statement can serve as our guide. The psalm shows us the way to restore our heritage, our faith.

Let us go out and tell our fellow citizens and our youngsters, that it is not the Government in Washington that gives them liberty—it is the Government that threatens liberty. Freedom is not a gift of government. Freedom is their heritage as God's children. They can enjoy it only so long as they guard it zealously, walking in the paths of righteousness, proud of their individual responsibilities, eager to discharge the obligations laid upon them by the faith of our fathers.

Writing in his epistles to the Romans, Paul said to the believers: "You know what hour it is. The night is far gone. It is full time now for you to wake from sleep."

This is our message to all Americans today. Wake from sleep. It is time. Ignore the dangers longer, and all will be lost.

Jobs for the Handicapped—A Community Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following essay "Jobs for the Handicapped—A Community Challenge," which was written by a young constituent of mine, Miss Nancy Dee Meeks, of Dickson, Tenn. Miss Meeks is a most outstanding young lady—in addition to being a writer of note, she is an accomplished musician; and, just last week, she won the poetry reading contest sponsored by the National Forensic League in Clarksville, Tenn.

The following essay has won for Miss Meeks the honor of representing Tennessee in the forthcoming national essay contest, and I, therefore, feel that her literary efforts are worthy of the attention of the entire membership of the House:

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

(By Nancy Dee Meeks, Dickson High School, Dickson, Tenn.)

Close your eyes. Yes, close your eyes for just a moment. What did you see? Nothing? Darkness? Darkness—the absence of light. For a few seconds your life was enveloped in utter obsecurity. What if that obscurity had not been altered? What if you were to spend the remainder of your life under the domination of this darkness?

Be very still for just a moment. What do you hear? A bird singing? People chattering to one another? A typewriter clicking? Perfectly common American sounds, all of these; but what if you were never to hear any of these sounds again?

Look at your legs, your arms, hands, fingers. Perfect to the tiniest detail because of God's endowment to you. Yes, of course, you are thankful. You realize what important additions these gifts are to your independence; but what if you were suddenly deprived of all or some of these vital body members or senses? What if the darkness brought about by these informities should abruptly surround your life?

"Oh, but that's impossible," you say.

If this is your attitude, will you permit your thoughts to accompany me on a short trip down the road toward light—the light of understanding one of America's weightiest problems—her handicapped populace and what can be done for them.

For the first few steps of our journey toward greater understanding, let us determine exactly what a handicapped person is. Generally, handicapped persons can be divided into four main classes—the blind, the deaf and deaf mute, the crippled, and the mentally retarded.

Until approximately three centuries ago, such people were usually doomed to lead helpless lives. Because they were unable to earn a living, they were compelled to rely on their families or friends for support and care.

Although modern scientists have discovered means of curing many of these unfortunate people, they have found ways to make them independent to a great extent. The blind are taught to read, to walk about by themselves, and to work in special fields. The deaf are taught to receive messages; deaf mutes are trained to talk. Men with missing arms and legs are given new ones and are taught to use them. The limbs of paralysis victims are restored to use. Children with subnormal intelligence are given education schooling and are trained to work and live happily with people of normal intelligence. Humanity in general benefits from talents and skills which otherwise would have been lost to the world.

You see, not everyone has been idle. These facts show that not everyone has been content to shake his head sadly and then turn away, forgetting. Not everyone has allowed himself to be convinced that this distressing situation could never occur in his own private little world.

These facts prove that someone has become aware, interested, concerned, absorbed. Someone has felt a compulsion to answer the pleading cry for help, for opportunity, for confidence. Someone has accepted the challenge, the invitation to serve.

Let us walk a little farther down this summoning road of service. How does all of this pertain to us? How are we to be the means by which handicapped persons can secure honorable and profitable occupations—positions where they can fulfill a determined responsibility to use the help of others to help themselves? How are we to be the light by which these people can again see happiness? Finally, how are we to abandon our seats in the audience and become a part of the production—the production of a solution to this perplexity?

First, we must become aware. We must grasp the enormity of the situation and realize that it can be thwarted only by organization and cooperation. As we learn more, our interest must be converted to concern to the extent that we become absorbed in a desire for service, knowing that this problem is our responsibility; the answer lies in our hands.

We, as normal individuals, can serve through industry from the largest factory under the direction of a well-organized labor union down to the smallest independent business firm. We can serve through our representation in Congress. We can serve through veterans' groups, science foundations, churches, and local community organizations. We can serve.

Our Government is responsible for much aid given the handicapped. Through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare we support the United States Employment Service and the American Printing

House for the Blind. Congress created Gallaudet College in Washington, D.C., the world's only college for the deaf. It passed the Vocational Rehabilitation Act which is carried out by various National, State, and local community committees. The Library of Congress has a special department of books for the blind, and we observe National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, October 5–11. The U.S. Army, Navy, and Veterans' Administration are active in rehabilitation efforts. The Bell Sound Laboratories have made numerous contributions through new inventions. In addition to many hospitals and sanitariums, some other helpful organizations are: The National Foundation, which raises funds for poliomyelitis, arthritis, and birth defects; The American Foundation for the Blind; and the Seeing Eye Foundation.

Our road of service isn't an easy journey, for we must lead those less fortunate than ourselves so they can avoid stumbling over the rocks along the pathway or being misled by the larger obstructions. We must work hand in hand with these national foundations and committees to apply their labor in our own communities. There are numerous tasks, common to every community in America, which could be filled so willingly and so capably by the rehabilitated and the handicapped—jobs in the field of handicraft such as ceramics, knitting, crocheting, and weaving. Blind persons with keen hearing senses are expert piano tuners. Deaf persons can work on factory assembly lines unhampered by noise. Persons with useless legs are taught skills such as watch-repairing, and victims without hands or arms can learn to paint with brushes held between their teeth or toes. Hobbies can be converted to incomes, to new ways of life, to happiness.

We must give these people the support of our thoughts and our action. They seek not pity, but understanding—not charity, but a change. They crave a chance to lead a comparatively normal life in the pleasant surroundings of people who understand and appreciate them. They deserve a chance to gain sufficient independence to become self-supporting.

We must help them achieve this notable goal. We must see that doors are opened to them—doors which will reveal to their lives the light necessary for survival. We must show them that society needs them, their special talents, and their acquired skills. We must give them jobs because of their abilities, not their disabilities.

May we have a successful journey down the road toward light. May we eagerly accept the challenge offered us. May we reach our ultimate goal of showing the world that these people are no longer handicapped, but handi-capable. They are capable of serving our communities if we will only lead the way.

Lake Geneva, Wis., Public Elementary School Board Opposed to Federal Aid to Any School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House will soon consider the Federal-aid-to-education proposals, I would like to insert in the RECORD the text of a telegram received from the Lake Geneva, Wis., Public Elementary School Board.

LAKE GENEVA, WIS., *April 13, 1961.*

Hon. HENRY SCHADEBERG,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

At a meeting of the Lake Geneva public elementary school board, held on Tuesday, April 11, 1961, a lengthy discussion was held in regard to the Federal-aid-to-education program presently before Congress.

It was decided that the school districts have the responsibility of providing educational programs. Therefore they should and are obligated to provide the necessary funds for their programs.

We feel that the Federal Government should not assume any responsibility in this field and we unanimously adopted a resolution to inform you of our decision and request that you vote against any bill that would grant Federal funds to any school, public, private, or parochial.

UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1,
LAKE GENEVA PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
FULLER BOUTELLE,
President, Board of Education.
E. A. TRAVER, *Treasurer.*
FRANK BULLOCK, *Clerk.*
W. S. HAMMERSLEY, *Director.*
Mrs. CLIFFORD GERBER,
Director.

The majority of people in the First Congressional District of Wisconsin are opposed to Federal interference in local school affairs.

Our Immigration Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the text of an address made by my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WALTER, at the "Consultation on Immigration Policy," held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C., on April 13, 1961. Mr. WALTER's address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, in looking at this fine and impressive gathering, I realize, of course, that you, ladies and gentlemen, are primarily interested in the humanitarian aspects of immigration.

I believe it to be my task, however, to propound to you a few thoughts and observations in behalf of those who, in assuming their seats in the Congress, have undertaken obligations and responsibilities toward the American Nation as a whole rather than toward specific groupings, or shadings of public opinion, as much as those segments of our citizenry may be deserving of respect for their motivations and activities.

Historically, migratory movements were prompted by the desire to find better living conditions, a desire ever present in the mind of every human being and, indeed, in the instinct of every living creature.

Migration—basically—was the search for a more suitable climate, or for more abundant food, or for a drier place upon which to erect a dwelling. Migration still is the same, allowing, of course, for some other desires generated by modern progress.

The free and unfettered stream of immigrants who founded a new nation on these shores had all of these, and one more desire—the search for freedom.

Thus, implicitly, the phenomenon of migration is a composite of economic, social, and political elements. It is the presence of these three elements in the problem of immigration that prompts sovereign nations to establish laws, rules and regulations determining the size of the foreign influx and discerning the quality of the migrant. It is the "how many" and "who" is coming that the law is concerned with. These two fundamental criteria rest at the base of immigration policies and laws of every country of the world, just as much as they constitute the two cornerstones of our laws.

It is not necessary, of course, to stress before this enlightened gathering that the economic, social and political conditions of the world are not static. They change and therefore immigration laws and policies governing the admission of immigrants must change.

If they were to remain frozen, no country would be equipped to cope with the changing aspects of the problem, the vital importance of which could probably be best illustrated by comparing it with the injection or infusion of foreign blood into the veins of a living creature.

What are the changes in the world's conditions that must fashion our judgment at this time?

It becomes gradually evident that in the second half of the 20th century immigration is no more a practical remedy for overpopulation of one country or another. Industrialization, technological progress and economic growth have made appraisals of economic conditions based on density of population completely inaccurate and as obsolete as a horse and buggy in jet age.

This conclusion is sustained by but one glance at what is occurring in the highly industrialized countries of Europe. Germany, overpopulated to a degree of actual crowding, imports hundreds of thousands of workers from Italy and Greece, in addition to providing employment to the refugees from the East, streaming in at the rate of approximately 1,000 per week.

The density of population of industrialized Belgium is the highest in the entire world but Belgium, similarly, imports additional workers. Demands for resettlement opportunities overseas, very vociferous in Holland up to about 2 years ago, have all but disappeared in that overpopulated country due to the exceedingly fast pace of its industrial development.

On the other side of the ledger, Spain could be called an almost empty country, but it strives to send great numbers of its citizens abroad due to lack of industrial progress. The differences between the economic structure of northern and southern Italy, with industries thriving in the north and modern economic development neglected in the south, further serve as a convincing illustration of the diminishing relationship between density of population and economic conditions.

Taking due notice of this development, the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration strives now to supply skilled or semiskilled manpower to the underdeveloped countries where such manpower is needed, rather than to continue the indiscriminate siphoning off of people from countries not so long ago described by the now obsolete, totally fallacious notion as overpopulated.

Another factor, a most important one, has recently entered into considerations of immigration policy: the universally growing birth rate.

Where do we, the United States, stand in this regard: Recently a Washington newspaper—not particularly friendly to me and my way of thinking—had this to say:

"If the population of the United States continues to grow at its present rate, the census takers in 2000 will count twice as many Americans as in 1960.

"In recent years we have been growing at an annual rate of 1.7 percent, faster than any industrialized country in Europe and faster than some underdeveloped nations such as India and Korea. Our rate of growth is now about the same as that of the 'exploding' world population."

It is by now agreed by everyone that the rate of our economic growth lags badly behind the rate of growth of our population. The number of unemployed attests to that, but what is more disturbing than unemployment created by temporary recessions or seasonal layoffs, is the occurrence which the economists call chronic unemployment.

Chronic unemployment stays with us even in periods of high productivity. It accompanies the population increase and it is attributed to deep-seated causes resulting from technological developments like automation, inadequate business growth rates, changes in international economic structure, and shifts in business location.

Remedies to this dangerous economic disease have been proposed, but it will take a long time before their effects become visible.

These considerations should not, I believe, serve to promote changes in the law designed to lock tight the doors to the United States. They must, however, prompt every responsible American to look at immigration problems with more caution and discernation than it was necessary some three of four decades ago. It should be obvious to anyone concerned with the national interest that our immigration policy must at this particular time be adjusted to our domestic, economic, and social problems with a considerably greater degree of precision than at any other time.

Certainly, the United States must remain a haven for the oppressed and persecuted. Certainly, the United States cannot deny its citizens and residents the right to be united with their families. Certainly, however, the United States cannot for political reasons—domestic or external—attempt to absorb into its bloodstream unmanageable and unassimilable quantities and qualities of immigrants. Nothing strikes me as more preposterous, than the proposals to increase our immigration quotas in proportion to the increase of our own population as shown by the decennial censuses.

It is my firm belief that using the existing law together with timely adjustments which, from time to time, are being incorporated into the basic statute, the United States is quite satisfactorily equipped to protect itself, and at the same time implement its responsibilities to the community of freemen.

Since the end of World War II and up to the present time, this country had continuously possessed in its hands legal instrumentality permitting the admission of a most generous fair share of refugees. Too many people overlook that fact.

Similarly, after removal by the present law of racial bars to immigration and naturalization and after the establishment of equitably determined nonquota categories of immigrants, our statutes compare most favorably with the laws of other countries; another often overlooked fact.

In further implementation of policies, which I attempted to outline to you, I introduced today in the House of Representatives a bill containing the following basic features:

1. In order to expedite and facilitate the reuniting of families, my bill establishes a "quota reserve" consisting of the annually unused quota numbers which will be allocated for the use of relatives of U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens. Every country of the world will have access to the quota reserve proportionate to the respective country's participation in the sum total of all annual quotas under 7,000.

2. Temporary laws providing for the entry of adopted children are proposed to be incorporated into the permanent code.

3. Waivers of inadmissibility, including inadmissibility due to affliction with tuberculosis, are to be made part of our permanent law and will be available to relatives of U.S. citizens and permanent residents of this country.

4. Veterans of the Korean hostilities will, under the bill, be accorded the same naturalization privileges as those enjoyed by naturalized veterans of World War I and World War II.

5. An improved procedure governing the admission of highly skilled immigrants will give the Secretaries of Defense; Agriculture; Commerce; and Health, Education, and Welfare, together with the Attorney General, the possibility to provide for the selection of the most desirable immigrants with a view toward serving the national interests in the field of defense, science, technology, public health, and cultural progress.

6. The increasing instances of abuse of our immigration laws have prompted me to propose to the Congress, in the same bill, several provisions designed to facilitate the expulsion of the racketeering elements, subversives and aliens who resort to fraud in obtaining entry and permanent residence in this country. Improved procedures and precise rules of evidence in judicial action bearing on immigration, deportation and naturalization are proposed in my bill to serve to correct laxities harmful to the national interest.

I am convinced that the country needs this legislation and I shall spare no effort to obtain its prompt enactment.

Pharmacist Writes From the Good Ship "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, of all our efforts to aid those who are less fortunate than ourselves, none has had so much success as Project Hope, a floating hospital and medical center which is truly performing medical miracles in the Far East.

The Virginia Pharmacist recently published an article about one of the men who is playing an active part in making Project Hope a success, which appears as follows:

PHARMACIST WRITES FROM THE GOOD SHIP "HOPE"

A young pharmacist has traveled halfway around the world to find the more he knows of the earth, the prouder he is to be an American.

"I have never had the values of my American heritage made so clear to me as out here working with Indonesian medical problems," says Charles Dickerson of Pontiac, Mich., one of the two pharmacists presently aboard the floating medical center SS *Hope*, currently waging the peace in the troubled waters off southeast Asia.

The *Hope*, whose initials stand for health opportunity for people everywhere, is supported by Americans in all walks of life. Members of the American Pharmaceutical Association have contributed over $7,000 in cash, reports Thomas A. Foster, chairman of the Project Hope Committee of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

Dickerson, who has been with the *Hope* since its arrival in Indonesia in October, has been responsible for the cataloging and stocking of the thousands of drug items carried aboard the vessel, in addition to his regular pharmaceutical duties.

The ship's primary mission is to teach Indonesian medical personnel to be better able to handle their own medical problems. Project Hope is not a giveaway program. It is an attempt to help the newly developing nations help themselves.

"It's been a long haul," Dickerson reported from Sumbawa, Indonesia, to Dr. William B. Walsh at Project Hope headquarters in Washington, D.C. "We're in pretty good shape now and I think we're going to lick our resupply problems."

The resupply problem of which Dickerson speaks is the staggering 8,000-mile supply line between the United States and the SS *Hope* over which pharmaceuticals and other medical supplies must travel.

A resupply system, Dickerson reports, has been set up by air between the United States and Indonesia, the first shipment by this method, a cargo of smallpox vaccine, arriving from Seattle, Wash., shortly after the *Hope* arrived in Djarkarta.

On the 15th of December the *Hope* received its next consignment of medical supplies, from the *President Taft* which left the items in Djarkarta to be transshipped to the *Hope* in eastern Indonesia.

"The next major resupply point," Dickerson added, "was Makassar in the Celebes in mid-January. Right now we're in the midst of an inventory of 2,000 expendable items—drugs, bandages, and so forth. When we finish with this we'll know exactly where we stand and can reorder stocks that are low.

"Our job in the *Hope's* pharmacy is to fill prescriptions from the doctors here for their patients on the ship," Dickerson stated. The two pharmacists are busiest at the end of each stay in a port when the *Hope* puts off sufficient drugs to insure continued treatment of the discharged patients.

American pharmaceutical companies have been generous with their donations to the hospital ship, which is supported by public contributions.

Off hours on the *Hope* have been few and far between for Dickerson, whose job keeps him on call every second night and whose working hours have probably totaled more than anyone on the ship except the captain. Nevertheless, he has been able to attend the receptions given the ship's staff by local medical authorities and take part in the tours to nearby points of interest sponsored by Indonesian civic groups.

What does he think of his work on the *Hope*? "It's terrific experience and something I wouldn't miss."

Federal Aid Fallacies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my col-

leagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial appearing in the Salinas (Calif.) Californian of April 4, 1961, entitled "Federal Aid Fallacies":

[From the Salinas Californian, April 4, 1961]

EDITORIALS AND OPINIONS—FEDERAL AID FALLACIES

It shouldn't be necessary to restate and restate the many fallacies inherent in Federal aid to education, but since it obviously and urgently is necessary, we can think of no more succinct way of restating them than by quoting a San Francisco Chamber of Commerce resolution. The chamber's directors outlined their opposition to such aid as follows:

"States and localities are in the best position to determine and meet their responsibilities for public education.

"Federal aid to education is inevitably accompanied by undesirable Federal controls.

"Federal tax revenue allocated under such a program would not be 'free' money but would consist of funds taken out of the pockets of local taxpayers and reduced in effective amount by Government bureaucracy costs.

"States which have maintained a high tax rate in support of good school programs would be penalized in favor of States which have failed to do so."

To which all we need add is "Amen" and "CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, please copy."

House Resolution 211, Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286 to 3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD:

CONNECTICUT COMMITTEE FOR FREEDOM OF CAPTIVE NATIONS,
Hartford, Conn., March 27, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD
U.S. Congress, House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are very pleased to hear that you are pressing legislation to set up a special committee to deal with the problem of the captive nations. We urge you to continue your efforts until such a committee becomes a reality.

Our organization represents local branches of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, the Latvian Association of America, the Lithuanian American Council, the Estonian Society of America, and the Byelorussian American Association. The Hartford Hungarian Club is also affiliated with us as are various Polish, Armenian, and Georgian individuals. All of us support your bill.

We shall do everything to encourage local interest in your activities. Thank you for your efforts.

Cordially,
STEVE BOYCHUK, *Chairman.*

HEADQUARTERS,
NAVAL AIR TRAINING COMMAND,
U.S. NAVAL AIR STATION,
Pensacola, Fla., March 31, 1961.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: While reviewing the proceedings and debates which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8, 1961, I read with considerable interest your very enlightening and informative remarks on the necessity of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

As you mentioned, from the viewpoint of our own national security and on the question of war or peace, the vital importance of all the captive nations should be self-evident. I wholeheartedly support your resolution and feel sure that the challenge of your remarks will bring to our citizens the realization that here we have an excellent opportunity to move from the defensive to a strong offensive against the Communist conspiracy.

I was very much aware of the enthusiasm and success with which Captive Nations Week was conducted last year. I would like to know if it will be conducted again this year and if the new administration will endorse a strong policy in favor of this urgent and significant cause of freedom.

These matters are of considerable interest to me and to many of my friends. If reprints are available, I would appreciate it very much if you would send me three or four copies of your inspiring presentation.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM E. FLY,
Captain, U.S. Navy.

SCARSDALE, N.Y., *April 4, 1961.*

DEAR MR. FLOOD: It was recently brought to my attention that your recent proposal, House Resolution 211, concerns the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. In realizing the vital importance and necessity of such a committee as a valid instrument for letting the free world truly know the deceit and perfidy of Russia, I heartly endorse this resolution.

It is gratifying to know that the Senators from New York, and my Congressman, EDWIN B. DOOLEY, are supporting you in this worthwhile endeavor. Wishing you the successful passage of House Resolution 211, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
BRIAN M. DWYER.

DENVER, COLO., *March 28, 1961.*

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: All of our members would like to congratulate you on your introduction of the resolution calling for the establishment of a special permanent Committee on Captive Nations in Congress.

We believe that such a committee will be of great help in our Nation's policy against the Soviet Union. It will serve as a source of valuable information about many nations enslaved by Soviet Russia. We believe that those enslaved nations contain a destructive power which, in many aspects, is more dangerous to the Russian empire than atomic bombs.

Proper support of those enslaved nations, which constitute a majority of the Soviet Union's population, means a win in any kind of war with Soviet Russia.

We are writing to all of the Congressmen of our State asking them to support your resolution.

Respectfully yours,
KORNEL KRUPSKY,
President, Denver, Colo., Branch, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc.

AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR THE INDEPENDENCE OF ARMENIA,
Boston, Mass., April 1, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congressman from Pennsylvania,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Recently you took the occasion before the House to offer a resolution proposing formation of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations.

In our most recent session, this committee, representing more than 300,000 patriotic Armenian Americans, resolved that this letter be sent to you commending you for the important step you have taken, and assuring you of the wholehearted support of our organization in your vitally important work on behalf of the captive nations of the U.S.S.R. whose cause has been too significantly and too long neglected.

If there is anything at all that we may do to signify our full acceptance of the establishment of such a committee, please let us know.

Sincerely,
DR. JAMES H. TASHJIAN,
Executive Secretary.

WORCESTER, MASS., *April 6, 1961.*

CONGRESSMAN DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I support your action on House Resolution 211, and commend you for it.

Very truly yours,
DAVID G. SCANNELL.

A Tribute to the X–15

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, late last month, the Nation was given the news that the X–15 rocket-powered airplane had achieved a new altitude record of 32.12 miles over the desert of southern California. The news was exciting and

inspiring to all Americans who are concerned with our position in the space race with Russia. I would like to pay tribute here to the man who piloted the X–15 on this historymaking flight, Test Pilot Joe Walker, and to the scores of men who contributed to the construction, maintenance, and preparation of the X–15.

I would also like to call the attention of this House to a forthcoming project in the motion picture industry which will graphically demonstrate the immense labor that has gone into the X–15. On April 17, Essex Productions, headed by Mr. Frank Sinatra, will begin filming at Edwards Air Force Base in California a motion picture titled "X–15." It will, I believe, show the advances made by manned-rocket aircraft in the last 15 years.

The producers of this picture have worked with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Defense, the Air Force, and North American Aviation, Inc., to assure that this picture will be accurate and will put this entire area of our defense into its proper perspective.

I hope my colleagues will join with me in wishing the men and women who will make this motion picture all the wisdom and inspiration that its subject deserves.

Salute To Maj. Gen. T. W. Parker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, as is stated in the editorial which follows, Maj. Gen. T. W. Parker, U.S. Army, is leaving his present assignment as commanding general, Fort Riley, in the 1st Infantry Division to join the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In my opinion, the editorial written by Mr. W. A. Colvin, editor of the Manhattan, Kans., Mercury, newspaper, very accurately describes the opinion of Kansans regarding the outstanding job done by Major General Parker.

I am happy to bring this editorial to the attention of my colleagues. I wholeheartedly endorse Mr. Colvin's comments.

SALUTE TO A GENERAL

Once again Fort Riley is sending a commanding general into new and higher positions of Army responsibility thus emphasizing the privilege and pleasure it is to have men of such capability in our community life.

The latest of the commanding generals to be rewarded for his years of exemplary service is Maj. Gen. T. W. Parker who has been commanding general of Fort Riley and the 1st Infantry Division for more than 2 years.

General Parker's new position which he will take in late June is one that is testimony to his outstanding ability as a general of the U.S. Army. When he leaves his command here he will join the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington in which capacity he will serve as special assistant to Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is one of the most responsible positions in the entire Army organization and in it General Parker will be assisting in many of the major—and perhaps fateful—decisions of our Nation's defense mechanisms.

In the tenure at Fort Riley, General Parker has won a host of new friends in the surrounding communities. We say new friends because General Parker was not a stranger to this area when he took over command in February 1959. He has previously served here as chief of staff to the 10th Infantry Division, returning as commanding general after service in Europe.

He and his gracious and lovely wife will be sorely missed when the time comes for their departure. But as in all such cases when a deserving man wins promotion to new responsibility there are always mixed emotions. A community to which they have endeared themselves and with which they have worked so cooperatively is always reluctant to give them up. There is always the joy, however, of seeing high-type individuals go on to new and bigger things, and we are delighted for General Parker that he is being accorded this recognition.

It is remarkable to think about how many former commanding generals of Fort Riley have gone from here to the top levels of Army administration and we congratulate General Parker for also having attained this deserved promotion.

The Army has picked exceedingly well and in the ensuing weeks before leaving Fort Riley, General Parker will find he has a host of sincere wellwishers who have no doubt of the great contributions he will make in his new assignment.

Lawrence and the Old Trails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 10, a historical marker, entitled "Lawrence and the Old Trails," was dedicated at the Kansas Turnpike service area just 5 miles east of my hometown, Lawrence, Kans. Mr. F. W. Brinkerhoff, editor-publisher of the Pittsburgh (Kans.) Headlight-Sun, delivered the dedicatory speech. He stressed the key role played by the Lawrence area and the Kaw Valley in the development of Kansas and pointed out that right now—today—the multiple advantages of adequate water supply, labor of high character and intelligence, good social and living conditions, and school facilities combine to make a powerful appeal for industrial growth in the Kaw Valley. Under unanimous consent, I include here for the benefit of my colleagues in Congress the full text of Fred Brinkerhoff's speech dedicating the "Lawrence and Old Trails" historical marker, as reported in the Lawrence Daily Journal-World of April 10, 1961:

TEXT OF BRINKERHOFF SPEECH AT TURNPIKE MARKER EVENT

Lawrence needs no marker in history. Its place there has been conspicuous and secure for a century. In Kansas the marker can serve only as a reminder. In every community of the State, men and women have carried through their lives a deep affection for the old town where they spent galmorous years as they ascended and descended Mount Oread. The magnificant campus was scarcely more impressive than the stately old homes, the great trees, the landmarks that survived war and fire. Nor was the imprint deeper than the merger of culture and courage and substance that characterized the men and the women who founded Lawrence on a frontier as a citadel of the cause of human freedom, and who erected on such foundation a city that has faithfully marched forward with the times. Over there it stands with endless pride in its past and boundless faith in its future. That strangers who pass this way may know they are in the Kansas vicinity richest in history and near the city the centennial of which has a seniority of 7 years over the centennial of our statehood which we observe this year, this marker has been erected. In forceful simplicity and eloquent brevity the gorgeous story of Lawrence is here engraved.

There is greater need for the phrases honoring the old trails. Only the ancient records and maps and a few wagon tracks here and there that have not been eradicated by man and time and markers and monuments placed along the routes by patriotic groups and an occasional landmark alongside preserve for history the paths over which pioneers passed on their way to the Pacific Northwest and to the Southwest. After a start together they separated by necessity. The Oregon trail penetrated this vicinity and for 20 miles or so westward and a route near that utilized a century later by the turnpike engineers. The shorter but more famous Santa Fe trail headed more directly toward its destination and was 15 miles south of the Kansas River at this point. But both are honored by this marker.

This marker is more than a marker honoring Lawrence and the old trails. It memorializes the Kansas River and its valley. Before there was a Kansas Territory there was a Kansas River. From it that territory took its name which, of course, remained with statehood.

Here in the Kaw Valley a vast amount of the history of Kansas has been made—territory and State. Here major projects for the settlement of Kansas were started and carried on. Here raged the main struggle for control of the territory. Here were the homes of free State men. Here was Lawrence, the inevitable headquarters of the free State cause, and equally inevitable, the objective of raiding ruffians from Missouri. From the day of its start in 1854 to the August day 9 years later when Quantrill and his bushwhackers killed nearly 150 men there, Lawrence was the object of the concentrated hatred of the Missouri slave cause leaders and the ruffian forces they did not control and did not want to control. Here in the Kaw Valley the fraudulent elections were held. Here the tide turned finally and the free State cause was triumphant.

Up the valley a few miles Lecompton, also on the bank of the river, became the territorial capital and the headquarters of the proslavery forces. There the proslavery legislators, backed by the Federal Government with troops and judges and courts, worked in vain to bring in Kansas as a slave State.

Farther up the river was Topeka where the free State cause was strong and where the Topeka movement was based—the futile effort to take over the government of the territory and have Kansas admitted as a free State.

When Andrew H. Reeder, the first territorial Governor, arrived in Kansas, his office was set up in the fort at Leavenworth. But in a few weeks he moved over to the Kaw Valley—to Shawnee Mission by orders from Washington. Shortly afterward he ordered

the legislature to convene at Pawnee. Where was Pawnee? At the other end of the Kaw Valley—near Fort Riley, one of the three principal Kansas Army posts, or forts of the day—a mile or two from the river junction which creates the Kansas River and starts the valley. A stone building had been erected as a capital. The proslave, ruffian-elected legislature did not stay in Pawnee. But it adjourned to Shawnee Mission and stayed in the valley. The Pawnee building remains today, a priceless Kansas relic—the first capital of Kansas.

Four years later, to the month, the Wyandotte Convention, meeting in the Kaw Valley, with the river flowing nearby, wrote the constitution for the free State of Kansas.

Not all the early history of Kansas was made in the Kaw Valley. Osawatomie and John Brown wrote a tolerably interesting chapter or two. Linn County's contribution certainly was lurid enough to keep historians busy half a century. Fort Scott furnished a fair share. Atchison and Leavenworth were entitled to many pages. Other scattered sections and counties demonstrated activity. But the valley dominated the territory, a habit that was continued into statehood.

An inventory of the things the Kaw Valley acquired or achieved as statehood took effect reveals the enterprise, the ingenuity, the power or the luck of the valley.

Topeka was made the State capital.

The University of Kansas was established at Lawrence.

The agricultural college was set up at Manhattan.

Haskell Institute was located at Lawrence.

The State's hospital for the insane was built at Topeka.

Wyandotte became Kansas City, Kans., and the largest city of Kansas for 75 years.

It was not by accident that the Kaw Valley was the scene of such important territorial settlement. What happened was as natural as sunshine. The newcomers looked for water. The Kansas River had the water in plentiful supply. The New Englanders chose an open space on the high bank, with a nearby hill standing like a sentinel, as the spot for their town and Lawrence entered history. The Army authorities with marvelous foresight in regard to the distant future, set up Fort Riley as far West as they could go and be assured of water—there where two rivers which gathered their contents from vast prairie areas came together and surrendered their identities to make the Kaw. To the East 130 miles, the Kaw itself gave up its own identity as it delivered its burden into the Missouri. On its whole length the Kaw enticed town founders as its valley with its rich soil beckoned to farmers. And so the Kaw Valley moved early to take its place on the Kansas scene—in all phases of life—in public affairs, or politics, in the economy, in culture, in education, and in religion.

Today, a hundred years after the Kansas star was added to the flag, Kansans are still coming to the Kaw Valley for their laws, final decisions in their lawsuits, appointments to office and for political leadership. They are coming in large numbers to the valley for higher and professional education. But they have noted a change in the valley's appearance. They are finding great industrial plants where large groups of Kansans are employed. They note the expanded and expanding borders of the cities. The returns from the 1960 Federal census disclose that more than a fourth of the population of Kansas is supplied by the Kaw Valley. Two of the three so-called big cities of Kansas are in the valley. Their borders spread across the river. Three other valley cities—Lawrence, Manhattan, and Junction City—join with Kansas City and Topeka in accounting for more than 315,000 of the State's 2,178,000 population.

From the industrial plants of the Kaw Valley come products ranging from assembled motor cars to industrial chemical items, from processed meat to greeting cards and heavy tires and dozens of other items of commerce. Along the river are great powerplants supplying public, domestic and industrial needs. Lawrence, where major attention long was devoted to the University of Kansas, with more than minor attention given to a few industrial plants, has seen its population go from a place in the teen thousands to more than 32,000 as industrialists picked sites and erected manufacturing plants. Topeka which not very many years ago was aptly described as an overgrown county seat town with a population under 60,000 now has double 60,000 on its rolls. The other cities in lesser volume have shown the same inclination to grow.

Once again water has "sold" the Kaw Valley. Industries require a water supply. This added to other advantages for which there is no substitute—labor of high character and intelligence, good social and living conditions and school facilities—makes a powerful appeal for industrial growth. The valley cities are growing. Topeka amazes the most optimistic observers and makes enthusiasts of sturdy conservatives. Lawrence is pushing its borders so far beyond the original townsite that the most progressive citizens can scarcely keep up with the expansion. Persons here today who are by no means young may well expect to see an unbroken line of industrial plants along this river for long years noted chiefly for its floods and its contribution of Kaw River sand for constructive use.

It has happened in other river valleys. It not only can happen here but it is happening.

For a long time the small by comparison industries at points along the Kaw furnished products which had a market in Kansas and nearby. But today the things that flow from the Kaw Valley factories go far from Kansas. The world is a market for the factories of the Kaw Valley. It does not require the services of a skilled economist to disclose the advantages of this situation.

This great roadway uses the valley half the length of the valley. It streaks along the Kaw on one side most of the way and then crosses to try the other side but never more than a mile or two distant until finally it curves off to the southwest. Then it rushes to another beautiful and picturesque and romantic part fo Kansas, the Flint Hills region. Finally, as it prepares to finish its course, it enters another valley of Kansas, the valley of the Arkansas, and then quits as it started, in a valley. Strangers in Kansas thus are given in a few hours a panoramic view of Kansas today—cities and factories and pastures and ranches and fields and farms. And here at this spot they may read a vital bit of Kansas history.

Wheaties Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune April 16, stresses the fact that the President of the United States should have only one sponsor—the citizens of the United States.

THE PRESIDENT LET HIS SPONSORS DOWN

Mr. Kennedy may have performed a valuable service for the sponsors of last Tuesday night's television show, "J.F.K. No. 2." But the President of the United States let his sponsors—the American people—down.

The President justified his appearance under the aegis of a toothpaste company on the ground of the need for more communication "beyond the White House." No one disputes that need. But there are many, many methods of communication open to the President that are not flavored with toothpaste. After all, Mr. Kennedy does not have to imitate Abraham Lincoln, who opened the White House doors to almost anyone wishing to speak to him. He has access to the people through time on TV and radio, through space in the press, without making any concessions to commercialism and without holding open house.

The American President does not have the outward trappings of uniform and ceremonial that were once associated with high executive position. He does not need them. But there is a dignity of conduct that should—and almost always does—distinguish the men whom the American people have chosen as their constitutional leaders.

To maintain that dignity does not require stuffiness or any fake aura. But it does demand that the President abstain from actions whose propriety can be questioned by even friendly Senators of his own party—as Senator JACKSON questioned the propriety of Mr. Kennedy's broadcast; it does demand that he refrain from doing things that bring accusations of bad taste, of cheapening his office, of setting bad precedents, all of which sprang up in the wake of that performance.

Mr. Kennedy is new to the Presidency. In his immensely difficult task, with issues that are essentially and genuinely controversial confronting him at every hand, it is vitally important that he avoid unnecessary and gratuitous squabbles. One way would be to confine the sponsorship of his public utterances to those who have a first and overriding claim on his services: The citizens of the United States.

Foreign Buying of U.S. Scrap Blamed for Rising Scrap Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Keystone Employees' News:

FOREIGN BUYING OF U.S. SCRAP BLAMED FOR RISING SCRAP PRICES

Rapidly increasing scrap prices are cutting deeply into company profits, reports R. E. Sommer, president and general manager.

Iron Age magazine, a leading trade journal, last month reported scrap prices of $44 per ton compared with $35 to $37 per ton in mid-February.

"Scrap is our second-largest manufacturing cost, and sharp increases like these in scrap prices are sure to have an impact on our already thin profit margin," the president said. He called on all employees to help reduce waste and improve production in an attempt to offset this serious increase in material costs.

A major factor causing scrap prices to advance, according to Frank Little, director of purchases, is heavy buying by foreign steel

companies. The Japanese have contracted for 103 cargoes (shiploads) of scrap since January. These shipments total more than 1 million net tons. Germany, Belgium, and Italy are also big buyers of American scrap.

"The foreign buyers of U.S. scrap not only buy huge tonnages," Mr. Little commented, "but they also skim off the top grades of scrap available."

Mr. Little also pointed out that the impact of higher scrap prices is greater on semi-integrated steel companies like Keystone because they do not have blast furnaces with which to provide a lower cost "hot metal charge." Keystone is thus forced to buy the higher priced scrap.

Feasibility of Nuclear-Powered Flight Has Been Proven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the gloomy and pessimistic picture painted by some scientists not directly connected with the project, the future of nuclear-powered flight was bright before the recent cancellation of the aircraft nuclear-propulsion program. So much so, it is difficult to understand how the Pentagon chiefs could have made the decision to make a complete break with the program.

A few days before the fateful decision to cancel the aircraft project one of the contractors engaged in the nuclear propulsion program issued an interesting news release relating to progress made in research and development work.

The press release issued Wednesday, March 29, by the News Bureau, General Electric, Schenectady, N.Y., follows:

DALLAS, March 29.—Operation of the heat transfer reactor experiment No. 3 (HTRE 3), in which two turbojet engines were powered by a single nuclear reactor, has proved the feasibility of nuclear powered flight, a General Electric nuclear flight reactor expert said today.

Ben Blumberg, Jr., of the General Electric Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion Department (ANPD), Cincinnati, Ohio, told the American Nuclear Society that the HTRE 3, which operated for some 150 hours on the ground, is the "most sophisticated gas-cooled reactor design that has operated to date."

He said that a test program completed this year, "has proved that the system operated essentially as predicted. With the application of this experience, a much greater degree of confidence and objectivity will characterize future designs."

ANPD is developing a direct-air-cycle nuclear propulsion system for aircraft under contract with the U.S. Air Force and Atomic Energy Commission. Aircraft powered by nuclear propulsion systems will have almost unlimited range, thus making them ideal craft for patrol, reconnaissance, early missile warning, and attack. Because of their nuclear power system they will be able to fly at extremely low levels over long distances and thus avoid altitudes where modern defense systems are most effective.

Chemical powered planes must fly at high altitudes to operate efficiently.

Blumberg said that ANPD now is designing an advanced flight system which will be adaptable for flight propulsion, incorporating lessons learned from HTRE 3.

He explained that "it is generally thought that the power a reactor is capable of producing is limited by the permissible operating temperature of its components, but this is not necessarily true. The power capability varies almost directly with the quantity of working fluid used and in addition can vary a large amount with the design of the various components of the reactor. One of the most important components is made up of the fuel elements. In the design of the fuel elements, if the average power of each cartridge is made identical, the longitudinal power is adjusted to produce a near isothermal temperature and the heat flux from each ring at each longitudinal location is made equal, then the power capability of the fuel elements approaches a maximum."

In the HTRE 3, the fuel elements, made up of concentric metal rings with uranium fuel enclosed in the metal, "have operated satisfactorily at temperatures up to 1,900° F. for periods in excess of 100 hours and at temperatures up to 2,050° F. for periods in excess of 25 hours," Blumberg said.

He pointed out that the average power in each fuel cartridge was controlled to $\pm 10\%$ by varying the hydrogen content of the moderator and this system has indicated what is practical to expect in future reactor designs.

Studies for advanced systems indicated that with materials used in HTRE 3, "exit air temperatures of 1,500° to 1,650° F. are possible," Blumberg reported. "The exact air temperature would depend on the operating time desired, but for this range of temperature it is expected that the operating time would vary from 1,000 hours to 25 hours, respectively."

"In summary," he said, "the performance of HTRE 3 has demonstrated that a system using the same materials can be designed which would power a modern gas turbine powerplant. The reactor would have a size, pressure drop, and power capability compatible with flight requirements. We are now applying this experience to systems using advance materials that will give us even higher levels of performance. It is a generally accepted fact that with the technology now in hand, flight with nuclear power is possible and practicable."

Dangers of Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter, written to the New York Herald Tribune, by a former very distinguished Member of this House, the Honorable Hamilton Fish, is of considerable interest.

There are many of our people who have grave misgivings about this enterprise, known as the Peace Corps. After reading this letter one cannot help but feel that this scheme may turn out to be a Pandora's box and will once again prove the truth of the old saw: "That fools rush in, where angels fear to tread."

DANGERS OF PEACE CORPS

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

The proposal of President Kennedy to establish by executive order a Peace Corps composed of young college trained volunteers to work in the undeveloped countries, instead of serving in our Armed Forces, has a humane and humanitarian appeal to the American people at first glance. It is, however, the essence of "do-goodism" or internationalism gone stark raving mad.

President Kennedy's motives, I am sure, are unselfish, idealistic and sincere and backed by the best intentions. But unfortunately he does not think the problem through or anticipate its disastrous reactions. The so-called Peace Corps has nothing to do with peace except for its camouflage name. It is an extremely dangerous project emanating from the minds of one-worlders who have completely failed to foresee its dire consequences.

The advent of young Americans into Africa or Latin America would automatically open the gates of darkest Africa and other undeveloped nations to highly trained and dedicated Communist agents. It would be playing directly into the hands of Moscow. This is what Soviet Russia has been preparing for during the past 15 years at its big propaganda universities, teaching Arabic, African dialects, Spanish, and Portuguese.

Instead of young college graduates Moscow would send skilled technicians who know the language and who would build roads, bridges, hospitals, schools and develop the natural resources and mines of the country.

The Peace Corps is part and parcel of the legacy left by Franklin Roosevelt. This interventionism has turned out to be a Frankenstein that has devoured our resources, wealth and consumed our taxes. In the beginning our financial help was necessary to contain communism in France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and England. Today these nations are prosperous and have little unemployment.

Every government in the world today is nationalistic except our own, which is internationalistic and continues to meddle and interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign nations and to hand out billions of dollars long after the emergency has passed. I am positive that if the American people, knowing the prodigious waste and misuse of these funds, could vote in a referendum the appropriations for foreign handouts would be reduced by one-half.

HAMILTON FISH.

NEW YORK.

What Really Happened?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the April 15 issue of the New York Herald Tribune indicates that the space flight of Major Gagarin could well have been fictional.

The article follows:

SPACE PUZZLES

How did Cosmonaut Yuri Gagarin come down to earth? How did he see earth during his flight? These questions have not been clarified, and reports from Soviet sources yesterday confused these points further.

RETURN TO EARTH

Soviet official announcement: "After having orbited the earth, a special brake installation was switched on and the cosmic ship started coming down in order to land in a special preset area of the Soviet Union."

The contradiction, according to Soviet reports yesterday: "Rudenko (a tractor driver) saw the landing of the spaceship. He said the cosmonaut parachuted down close to where he was." Tass also quoted scientist Gurovsky: "The astronaut came down smoothly in a glade near a field. Landing on both feet, without even tumbling, he walked up to the people who saw him first."

HOW DID HE SEE THE EARTH?

Spaceman Gagarin's own report: "From the spaceship satellite (110 to 188 miles above earth) one does not, of course, see as well as from an airplane, but very, very well all the same. The coasts of the continents, big rivers, were clearly distinguishable. It was possible to distinguish which was plowed land and which was meadow."

The contradiction: Soviet scientist A. A. Blagonravov was asked at Florence, Italy, yesterday, if Gagarin's space vehicle had windows or portholes. He said it had neither. Asked how Gagarin could "see," Blagonravov replied in English and without elaboration—"by radio." It was presumed he referred to television cameras that scanned the earth's surface, but the point was not made clear. Could it have been color television?

P.S.—MORE MYSTERIES

A book about Gagarin, published Wednesday—the day of his flight—went on sale in Moscow yesterday. It showed considerable preparation. Also ready for the festive crowds were Gagarin-pictured posters and souvenir postcards—and dishware.

Chemical Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with interest the work of Assemblyman Charles J. Conrad, of the California State Legislature. Of particular note are his efforts to bring into proper focus the importance of the work of the Chemical Corps in the defense of our Nation. I include herewith a copy of a resolution introduced by Mr. Conrad in the California Legislature, together with an article from the Sacramento Bee, of Sunday, February 26, on his work. I understand that the resolution has now passed both the House and Senate of the California Legislature and I consider this a very important development:

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE, ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 24—RELATIVE TO CHEMICAL WARFARE

Whereas the present balance of power in the world today makes the threat of localized war greater than the threat of nuclear war; and

Whereas there is a great possibility that the United States would suffer inestimable losses in such small conflicts; and

Whereas in these small conflicts it is exceedingly difficult to strike the enemy armed forces without also severely harming the civilian population, which may well include people friendly to our side; and

Whereas such conflicts may involve many of the under-developed countries of the world and as a result require the United States to feed the population and rebuild the economy of these countries; and

Whereas there is one form of warfare, known as chemical warfare, which can suppress a Communist advance without causing widespread loss of life and property; and

Whereas the scientists working in the field of chemical warfare have developed amazing chemical agents which cause temporary incapacity without causing dangerous or lasting effects; and

Whereas the United States is not a party to any major treaty which forbids the use of chemical warfare; and

Whereas the American public and many of its elected representatives know little about the science of chemical warfare and propagandists have given the false impression that chemical warfare is vicious and inhuman; and

Whereas recent world events may lead to an urgent need for utilizing this type of military operation and there is a strong possibility that the United States has not developed the science of chemical warfare to its greatest capacity; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be urged to give serious consideration to the possibility of expanding the Chemical Warfare Corps, to take such steps as may be necessary to weld the Chemical Warfare Corps into an effective operating force, especially in the use of nonlethal gases, and to inform the American people as to the true value and the humane nature of the use of chemical agents in limited warfare; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Secretary of Defense, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

[From the Sacramento Bee, Feb. 26, 1961]

STATE SOLON URGES USE OF CHEMICAL WARFARE TO HALT RED-INCITED REVOLTS

Chemical warfare to stop uprisings such as those in the Congo?

According to Assemblyman Charles J. Conrad of Los Angeles County this is not as fantastic as it sounds and he wants congress to give serious consideration to the possibility.

Conrad, who was in the chemical corps during World War II, said scientists in the field of chemical warfare have developed amazing chemical agents which cause temporary incapacity without dangerous or lasting effects.

PLANS RESOLUTION

He reported he will introduce a resolution in the legislature tomorrow asking congress to study a plan to weld the army's chemical warfare corps into an "effective operating force, especially in the use of nonlethal gases, and to inform the American people as to the true value and the humane nature of the use of chemical agents in limited warfare."

Conrad contended this may be the answer in combatting Communist inspired uprisings throughout the world.

"Most authorities believe the Soviet Union, at least for the present," Conrad stated, "will not risk all-out nuclear war, especially if they can bleed America white over a period of years by instigating civil wars, riots, and other disturbances throughout the world.

UNPLEASANTNESS AHEAD

"In such actions the United States is faced with several unpleasant situations if we put down such insurrections by usual military operations.

"For one thing, the Communists traditionally attempt to foment what they call 'popular uprisings' where they can accuse America or the United Nations of 'imperialism.'

"Secondly, in such riots it is difficult and sometimes impossible to divide combatants from civilians or pro-Communists from anti-Communists where a nation, tribe or village is divided in its allegiance. Traditional weapons may inflict death on friend and foe alike.

"Finally, such warfare always results in devastation, leaving the people unable to care for themselves, making it necessary for us to feed them and even rebuild their economy at the expense of the American taxpayer.

"In contrast, use of advanced chemical warfare techniques is both efficient and humane. It puts down the riot or insurrection by rendering the agitators temporarily helpless, without causing death. The most that can happen to friendly individuals caught in the action is temporary incapacitation, from which they will recover. There is no damage to land, crops or industry and when order has been restored normal life may be resumed.

"This revolutionary type of warfare has been handicapped by bugaboos and scare stories left over from World War I. Communist propaganda links chemical warfare with the atomic bomb as inhuman weapons even though the Soviet Union has openly threatened to use both, including the deadly variety of poison gas.

"Many years ago the United States, with great foresight, refused to ratify the Geneva Convention outlawing chemical warfare, leaving us both legally and morally free to develop the modern concept of chemical warfare, namely its use to bring the enemy under control without causing death and destruction."

While the Wild Duck Flew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond (Va.) News-Leader of Thursday, April 13, 1961. In view of our recent setback in the space race—and in view of the adroitness with which the subject is handled by the News-Leader—I think further comment by me would be superfluous.

The editorial follows:

WHILE THE WILD DUCK FLEW

When the flash came early yesterday that the Soviets had put a man in orbit, the sharp edge of surprise had been pretty well dulled. Rumors of the impending flight had swept Europe over last weekend. On Tuesday, Gen. Thomas D. Write, Air Force Chief of Staff, trotted up to the Hill to prepare a Senate committee for the blow.

Then the bells rang in newsrooms around the world, and one of the great news stories of the century came pouring out of Moscow: Yuri Alekseyevich Gagarin, the "Wild Duck," had spun around the earth in 89 minutes at a height of more than 100 miles. He was the first man in space. And who had put him there?

"In this achievement, which will pass into history, are embodied the genius of the Soviet people and the powerful force of socialism. With a feeling of great joy and legitimate pride, the central committee of the Communist Party, the presidium of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet, and the Soviet Government note that this new era in the progressive development of mankind has been opened by

our country—the country of victorious socialism.

"By the will of the working class, by the will of the people, and inspired by the party of Communists headed by Lenin, our country has turned into a most powerful Socialist state and reached unprecedented development of science and technology.

"Before the eyes of the whole world, the working class, the Soviet collective farm peasantry, and the Soviet intelligentsia—the whole Soviet people—demonstrate an unprecedented victory of science and technology."

Khrushchev's statement ran on for 1,500 words. While it was coming over the machine, a United Press International reporter began checking for reaction. He telephoned Yangley Airbase and got hold of Lt. Col. John Powers, press officer for the U.S. astronauts. The rest of the story follows:

"It's 3 o'clock in the morning, you jerk," Colonel Powers shouted into the phone.

The reporter suggested that Russia didn't put a man in space as a regular thing, and wondered whether Colonel Powers might be able to get the views of the American astronauts on the Russian success.

"If you're wanting something from us," the press officer snapped, "the answer is, We are all asleep."

O.K. Next editorial.

Aid to Soybean Farmers? "Please, No"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have expressed concern about the Department of Agriculture's unrealistic support price on soybeans.

The farmers who have been raising soybeans have been doing pretty well and they sought no Federal assistance in protecting their economy. The Department seems to have other ideas, however, and under the philosophy which now prevails in the Department, assistance is ladled out without much concern about what it might do to the market for a certain commodity.

Richard Wilson of the Cowles Publications has written an article for the Des Moines (Iowa) Register which supports the viewpoint I and many others have taken. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring this article to the attention of the Members. I am sure they will find it interesting reading:

AID TO SOYBEAN FARMERS? "PLEASE, NO"

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Government has its incomprehensible aspects sometimes when dealt with first hand. Representatives of a major economic group come to Washington. "Please," they say, "please don't help us any more. If you help us, you will hurt us," they add. And the story goes on: "We have straightened things out pretty well in our field and have done it ourselves. If you insist on helping us now you will upset everything." These are the producers of soybeans, a relatively new crop in the United States and a very important one. Henry A. Wallace was fascinated by soybeans, as he was at one time with many things indigenous to Manchuria.

As Secretary of Agriculture a generation ago he used to experiment with food products made of soybeans, gulping quantities of soybean milk at lunch. This product didn't catch on, but feeding soybean meal to livestock and using soybean oil for a variety of purposes caught on in a big way.

About 500,000 farmers raise soybeans. The estimated value of the crop at the end of 1960 was $1,115,432,000. Representatives of this billion-dollar-a-year business, the actual producers of it, pleaded with the Kennedy administration to leave them alone.

THEY REACTED WITH HORROR

They reacted with horror when Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, without consulting them, announced that the support price of soybans would be raised from $1.85 per bushel to $2.30 per bushel. This was a part of the Freeman corn reduction program. Evidently the idea was to get farmers to shift into soybeans from corn and other feed grains. Many farmers grow both corn and soybeans.

Soybean representatives grumbled that Roswell A. Garst, of Coon Rapids, Iowa, the immensely successful corn producer who has even charmed Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, worked his way with Secretary Freeman on the corn program. Garst, it appeared, was willing to encourage producers to grow less corn and more soybeans.

In 1958, the soybean producers got the Eisenhower administration to reduce the support price for their product from $2.09 per bushel to $1.85. They were happy with the deal. Soybeans moved out of Government stocks at a profit to the Government. Producers captured and held the export market they want. On the domestic market, the price went up over $3 a bushel.

Why were they worried, then, when Freeman raised the support price to only $2.30? They were worried because that froze the situation, it took out the element of risk, producers could shift into soybeans knowing they would get $2.30. Foreign producers, looking at the floor under the U.S. price, could make their plans to undercut it.

FREEMAN THINKS CONTROL ESSENTIAL

The soybean producers, doing fine in the competitive climate of risk capitalism, did not want to be woven into the Government's control fabric. A delegation headed by Charles V. Simpson, president of the American Soybean Association, came to Washington and pleaded in vain with Secretary Freeman.

They told him the corn surplus would just be augmented by a soybean surplus and piled in on top of the $9 billion in surplus commodities already held by the Government.

Freeman thought otherwise. More soybean control was an essential ingredient in trying to get a 20-percent reduction in corn production.

So there it rests, with the Government insisting on helping the soybean producers if it kills them.

Congress Should Remove the Shackles From the Nation's Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Congress should take immediate action to unshackle the railroads from burdensome ICC regulations. It is felt by many experts in the field of transportation that the unfavorable trends in railroad traffic, earnings, and employment will then reverse themselves.

At the 1960 level of economic activities, if railroads were able to regain as much as 50 percent share of intercity freight traffic, the added rail traffic at the present rate of productivity would make it possible for the roads to restore more than 90,000 railroad jobs. Still another 10,000 railroad jobs might be added if railroad participation in commercial intercity passenger traffic were increased to 35 percent of the total.

The shackles listed below constitute probably the greatest and most unjust burden ever imposed upon a major industry in the United States and represent serious handicaps to the Nation's railroads in their effort to remain solvent and maintain railroad jobs:

RAILROAD SHACKLES

1. Interest and other costs of capital for building or improving highways, inland waterways, and the Federal airways system of navigation and traffic control used by railroad competitors are borne by Government; capital costs for building and improving railroad lines are borne by railroads.

2. The publicly-owned "ways" used by railroad competitors are not subject to property or "ownership" taxes; railroad right-of-way is taxed in thousands of taxing jurisdictions throughout the United States.

3. Railroad competitors benefit from the use of signal and traffic control systems provided by Government; railroads must provide and pay taxes on their own signal and traffic control systems.

4. Hundreds of costly airports required by airlines in providing passenger service are provided, operated, and maintained by the Government; railroads must build, operate, and maintain their own stations and terminals.

5. Airports, being publicly-owned are tax-free; railroad stations and terminals not only are subject to local taxation, but in most taxing jurisdictions are taxed at a higher rate than other property subject to the same tax rates.

6. Railroad taxes are used to help build and maintain the publicly-provided "ways" of other carriers, but railroads use of public transportation facilities is either prohibited or severely restricted. Motor carriers may own and operate railroads and inland water carriers; inland water carriers may own and operate any form of transportation except airlines; and airlines may own and operate any form of transportation.

7. Besides the enormous advantage of using publicly-provided facilities, airlines have this enormous added advantage over railroads: They remain eligible for direct dollar subsidy from the Government and in fact, the smaller lines are receiving subsidy payments in ever-increasing amounts.

8. There are Government agencies for the promotion at every form of transportation, except railroads. For airlines, there is the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the aviational promotional activities of the Department of Defense; for motor carriers, the Bureau of Public Roads and State highway departments; for inland carriers, the Army Corps of Engineers. (The Interstate Commerce Commission regulates railroads, but has no promotional function or authority.)

9. Federal tax laws assign unduly long depreciable lives to railroad plant and equipment with the result that funds are not recovered in time to take advantage of technological advances as they become available.

10. Before they may abandon unprofitable lines and facilities, the railroads must obtain approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission or State regulatory commission, or both. But railroad competitors, excepting only airlines, are free to abandon unprofitable facilities as desired.

11. Persons who wish to use railroads and other for-hire carriers for travel are penalized by having to pay the Government a tax amounting to 10 percent of the fare; there is no such tax on those who travel by private automobile, which now accounts for 90 percent of all U.S. travel.

12. Although railroads are 100 percent regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, their highway competition is only 33 percent regulated and their competition on inland waterways is only 10 percent regulated.

13. All carriers, except railroads, may transport commodities which they own or in which they have an interest; a railroad may transport nothing which it owns or has an interest in except timber, timber products, and commodities used in its business as a common carrier.

14. Numerous agricultural commodities, aggregating vast tonnages, are exempt from ICC regulation when they move by truck, but are subject to ICC regulation when they move by rail.

15. Bulk commodities moving on inland waterways are exempt from regulation when not more than three such commodities are carried in a single barge or tow, and it is estimated that virtually all bulk commodity traffic on inland waterways moves under this exemption. But bulk commodities, like all others, are fully regulated when they move by rail.

16. Railroads are subject to the long-and-short-haul clause of the Interstate Commerce Act; trucks are not.

A Letter From Home Opposing Extension of the 1-Cent Temporary Federal Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Mr. Robert A. Cerwin, general manager of the Cer-tex Petroleum Co., of Burlington, Wis., has written persuasively for letting the temporary 1-cent Federal gasoline tax expire June 30, 1961. I commend his letter to the attention of the Members of this House:

CER-TEX PETROLEUM CO.,
Burlington, Wis.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: According to newspaper reports about President Kennedy's highway revenue proposal, the gasoline tax and highway-user taxes will be an important part of your job in Washington. Because this subject is of utmost importance to me, a jobber in the gasoline business, I thought I should present my views on the subject. For I believe that whatever action Congress takes will be most important to me, my customers, and to your constituents. It will be just as important to you and the Federal Government because we must sell our product to collect taxes for highways and other projects.

I am concerned about that gasoline tax which now totals 10 cents per gallon, 4 for the Federal Government and 6 for the State. I noticed that the President opposed allowing the temporary 1-cent Federal gas tax to expire on July 1, 1961, as promised by Congress back in October 1959. He said that we need the money to construct the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

Now, I object to his statement about "need." We already have plenty of money to build this national highway system if all the highway-user taxes were spent on highways and not diverted to the general fund. Too many people believe that continuation of the high gasoline tax is justified because all highway-user taxes are being spent on highways. This simply is not true. Today 40 percent of highway-user taxes are being diverted to the general fund. Therefore, it is not fair to request increases in highway-user taxes for highways when highway-user taxes are now being diverted from highway construction.

I understand that Congress in October 1959, determined to correct this situation by replacing this "temporary" 1-cent gas increase with some of the excise taxes on highway users now going into the general fund. This money would more than make up for the 1-cent gasoline tax. In other words, there would be plenty of money to continue the highway program on schedule and still allow the reduction in the Federal gasoline tax.

It is important in my business that the gasoline tax be reduced. Have you ever tried to sell a product that is being taxed 50 percent of its cost? That's what we are trying to do, and it is getting more difficult every day. Just think what our sales would be if we had no tax on our product.

That, of course, is not in the picture. We want to pay our share of the cost of building highways because motorists want good highways. But we shouldn't have to pay more than our share. We shouldn't have to pay all highway construction costs and also contribute to the general fund a sum of money based on the number of the miles we drive.

Highway user taxes hurt our business. When there is a chance to reduce them and still get the work done, we should do so. This is especially true since Congress—which included Senator Kennedy at the time—promised to do so.

Some people will ask, How shall we replace the money in the general fund? Well, it ought to be replaced by money from all taxpayers, not be just the highway user. The highway user, of course, pays all other taxes like everyone else.

I'm sure you are aware that the highway user is not the only one who benefits from the Interstate and Defense Highway System. Everyone benefits, even the millions who don't own cars. They want to be defended, too. The Defense Department which has set many of the highway construction standards so far has not paid one dime toward their construction. Remember the bridge episode? Millions of dollars had to be spent to change bridge structures for the Defense Department, yet that Department has not paid any part of the construction costs.

There are many reasons—many of them spelled out by President Kennedy in recent messages—why everyone, not only highway users, ought to contribute toward the Interstate and Defense Highway System.

In view of the above information it would appear to me that Congress ought, at least, to use all highway user taxes for highway construction before attempting to raise additional highway user taxes. Other general taxes should be paid by everyone, with no particular group singled out to pay more than his just share.

As a result of the facts set forth above, we urge you to vote to permit the 1-cent temporary gas tax to expire June 30, 1961, as promised by Congress in 1959.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. CERWIN,
General Manager.

Basic American Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, that the American people are becoming more and more concerned over the departure of Federal Government administrative policies from basic American principles is a well-known fact. We read and hear continually of the increasing interest in the conservative cause. Incidentally, this terminology is, I believe, most unfortunate. Conservatives are concerned with the fact that as individuals we are rapidly losing or willingly giving away our individual liberties. At the time this Nation was founded the so-called conservatives of today would have been liberals.

A few days ago a young farmer from North Dakota and his family were in Washington. On their way back to North Dakota, this young man sat down to write the usual thank you letter for the normal courtesies which had been extended to the family by our office. Included with his thanks were some observations which I thought would be interesting to the Members of the House and which typify the thinking of a great many people with whom I come in contact.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert my remarks, together with a copy of the letter which is attached, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BEDFORD, PA., *April 12, 1961.*

DEAR MR. SHORT: We Thompsons (all four of us) want to express again our appreciation of your kind courtesy shown us by yourself and your secretaries.

Tonight at the motel I had time to read your news releases and the copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It will come as no surprise to you that I agree 100 percent.

We know that the spiritual values and principles that founded this Nation are somehow wrapped up and included into our free-enterprise system. Destroy this system, and you have helped to destroy America.

When the free-enterprise system is functioning properly, it, of its own self, produces goods and more goods. It demands an expanding market at all times. This magic of our system, totalitarianism, socialism, communism cannot comprehend. The lack of Americans in not comprehending the magic of our system is the danger from within. We need more statements of truth like yours made in the Congress and in your news releases. And we know that the truth not only corrects the lie and the misrepresentation of facts, but it gives to us individually and collectively the spiritual strength we need to get our Nation back on the right track. America is waking up.

This struggle that is going on in Congress now domestically is as important as the cold

war. In fact if we (you and I) don't rededicate ourselves to basic American principles and fight for them and win, the other struggle is of small importance.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

WM. J. THOMPSON,
Post Office Box 41, Grafton, N. Dak.

Republican Imported Campaign Reached Such Extremes It Became an Affront to the People of St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an appraisal of the Republican National Committee's effort to high pressure voters in local communities in recent municipal elections. The appraisal follows:

GOP BIG CITY TEST FAILS BADLY IN ST. LOUIS

Democratic candidates were swept into office in State and local elections held last week in Missouri, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Texas. In all of these areas the party and its candidates continued to demonstrate their strength and appeal to the voters.

Democratic Mayor Tucker of St. Louis, who won reelection in 1957 by a record margin, easily defeated his opponent. Carrying all 28 of the city's wards, Mayor Tucker received 63 percent of the total vote with a majority of 41,428. In 14 of the 28 wards, he received more votes than in his record victory of 1957.

The victory in St. Louis is particularly noteworthy since Republican National Headquarters in Washington had sent a platoon of special workers to St. Louis as its first move in an all-out attempt to increase its strength in the large cities.

VICTORY IN MICHIGAN

In Michigan, also, Democrats continued to demonstrate widespread strength and support. Of nine statewide races, Democrats won seven and were ahead in an eighth. Support for the ticket throughout the State was evident. State Highway Commissioner John C. Mackie won a majority of the votes in both Wayne County and outstate—the first outstate majority for a Democrat in decades. His statewide victory margin was more than 200,000.

In Wisconsin's election for the Supreme Court, Circuit Judge Myron Gordon, a Democrat, defeated his Republican opponent, former Attorney General Stewart Honeck.

In the Texas primary for U.S. Senator, Democratic candidates polled 68.4 percent of the total vote. Senator WILLIAM A. BLAKLEY led the Democratic field. He will oppose Republican John G. Tower in the June 3 runoff.

Chairman Bailey analyzed the results this way:

"The Democratic victories in St. Louis and Michigan once again demonstrate that the Democratic Party has the support of the people. It also points up the fact that the Republican Party is not going to make inroads into the Democratic strength in urban areas while the Republican Party in Washington fights a fair increase in the minimum wage, opposes a House Rules Committee a chance to let Congress vote on the Kennedy program and carries on a continual battle against progressive legislation."

GOP REJECTED

"The Democratic victories in Michigan and St. Louis are the result of good candidates, good leadership, strong organization, and hard work, but they are also a rejection of the Republican Party and its negative stance.

"The vote in St. Louis is important nationally. It was supposed to be a testing ground to demonstrate that the Republican Party was losing in the cities not because its programs and candidates were rejected by the voters, but because the Republican organizational effort was weak. The Republicans said they would remedy that in St. Louis. They brought in a team of outside 'experts.' Money from outside St. Louis was poured into the Republican campaign. New 'gimmicks' were touted as the way to Republican victory. Strong efforts were made by the Republicans to inject racial issues extraneous to St. Louis into the election."

AFFRONT TO PEOPLE

"The result was accurately described by Mayor Raymond R. Tucker as a rebuke to the imported Republican campaign tactics of fear, misrepresentation, and negativism. The respected St. Louis Post-Dispatch said the Republican campaign reached 'such extremes that it has become an affront to the people of St. Louis. One reason for this, no doubt, is the participation of outsiders from Michigan and Washington who care nothing about St. Louis and are only here to seek a surprise victory which they hope would open the checkbooks of contributors to the 1962 congressional campaign. Their target is not only Mayor Tucker but President Kennedy.'

"The Republicans missed their targets and presumably they will try to find some new tactics for the next city contest. I sincerely hope they come up with a more wholesome campaign plan than they displayed in St. Louis."

Wheat Eaters Wanted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Dodge City (Kans.) Daily Globe, of March 28, 1961, regarding the new wheat product, Redi-Wheat, being promoted by the Kansas Wheat Commission with a view to increasing the consumption of wheat.

The Daily Globe editorial reveals a fine understanding of the problem and a real desire to assist the wheat farmers and the Kansas Wheat Commission in reaching a practical solution to the problem of wheat surpluses.

[From the Dodge City Daily Globe, Mar. 28, 1961]

WHEAT EATERS WANTED

Those who have eaten Redi-Wheat, the new canned product being marketed here and elsewhere say it is very good. The food can be eaten as a cereal, in place of rice as a dinner item or in various combinations such as an ingredient of meat balls.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture is making an especially intensive drive to promote sale and consumption of the product in Wichita. Results are being watched with interest.

It is to be hoped that real results are achieved with Redi-Wheat. The great human-food grain crop is rich in nourishment and is palatable in its many forms.

It is rather tragic that two World Wars cut down per-capita consumption of wheat. The food was so valuable and important in both wars, that the public was urged to "eat less wheat" thereby conserving the available supply for military and other essential purposes. The records show that the self-sacrifice of civilians in the war periods accomplished what it was designed to do, but that when peace came, new eating habits made for smaller consumption per head.

The great wheat growing section of the Nation is primarily interested in a market for its top quality wheat. One of the best ways to increase that market would be to get Kansans and others to eat more of a very valuable food.

New Russian Dogma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in the first of a series of articles based on his recent conference with Nikita Khrushchev, the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, has examined in a revealing and critical fashion some of the views and beliefs of the Russian leader.

Among other important insights, Mr. Lippmann suggests that Mr. Khrushchev now believes "that there can be international cooperation only if, in the administration as well as in the policymaking, the Soviet Union has a veto."

Such a belief certainly has great significance and far-reaching consequences for such vital areas of international relations and agreements as disarmament, nuclear testing, and the United Nations. Such a belief creates, in fact, a new dimension in our thinking concerning international cooperation.

I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Lippmann's fascinating account of his interview with Mr. Khrushchev:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—FIRST OF A SERIES

(By Walter Lippmann)

On this, our second visit, my wife and I were taken on a long journey by plane and auto to Mr. Khrushchev's country place in Sochi on the Black Sea. Before we left Moscow, accompanied by two interpreters and an official of the press department, there was much mystery about all the details of the coming visit, such as when and where we were to see the great man. In fact, as it turned out, he had no other appointments after half-past 11 in the morning when he met us in the pine woods near the entrance of his place. Eight hours later, a bit worn by much talk and two large meals, we insisted on leaving in order to go to bed.

I would not like to leave the impression that all 8 hours were devoted to great affairs of the world. Perhaps, all told, 3½ hours were spent in serious talk. The rest of the time went into the two prolonged meals at

which Mr. Khrushchev, who is on what appears to be a nonfattening diet, broke the rules, saying joyously that the doctor had gone to Moscow for a day or two. The talk was largely banter between Mr. Khrushchev and Mikoyan, who joined us for lunch, and the banter turned chiefly on Armenian food and Armenian wine and Armenian customs, which include the compulsion to drink all glasses to the end at each toast. Though we all drank a bit more than we wanted, Mikoyan chose to regard us as American ascetics who only sipped their wine. Finally Mr. Khrushchev took pity on us by providing a bowl into which we could pour the wine as fast as Mikoyan filled our glasses.

Between this heroic eating and drinking, we walked around the place, which is large, met Mr. Khrushchev's grandson and Mikoyan's granddaughter, inspected the new and very gadgety swimming pool, and, believe it or not, played badminton with Mr. Khrushchev.

In the serious talks, I might say that my wife made fairly full notes, I made a few jottings, but there was no transcript and the translation was done very ably by Mr. Victor M. Sukhodrev who is an official in the Foreign Ministry. It was understood that I was free to write what I liked when I had left Russia and to quote Mr. Khrushchev or not to quote him as seemed desirable. I shall set down my own understanding and interpretation of the most important and interesting points that he made.

For an opening I reminded him that we had last seen him in October 1958, nearly a year before his visit to the United States. Much has happened in these 2½ years and would he tell me what seemed to him the most important events for good or evil?

After a moment or two of hesitation, he replied that during this period the two main forces in the world—the capitalist and the Socialist—have concluded that it was useto "test" one another by military means. I took him to mean by "test" the backing of their politicial aims by the threat of war.

In contrast with 1958, when he professed to believe that the United States and Germany might attack him, he spoke with confidence that because of the growing strength of the Communist orbit, the threat of war from our side was dying down. As a result, the United States was abandoning the "Dulles doctrine" that the neutrality of small states is "immoral." He himself welcomed President Kennedy's proposals for a neutral Laos.

You think then, I asked him, that there has been a change in U.S. policy? To this he replied that while there were some signs of a change, as for example in Laos, it was not a radical change, as could be seen in the U.S. attitude toward disarmament. What, I asked him, is wrong with the U.S. attitude? We cannot see, he replied, that any change is imminent when the subject of disarmament is put in the hands of such a believer in armaments as Mr. McCloy. We think well of Mr. McCloy and during his time in Germany we had good relations with him. But asking him to deal with disarmament is a case of asking the goat to look after the cabbage patch.

I interjected the remark that the final decisions would be made by the President. But Mr. Khrushchev insisted that the forces behind the Kennedy administration he summed up in the one word "Rockefeller." The view that he is running the Kennedy administration will be news to Governor Rockefeller. I should add that Mr. Khrushchev considers me a Republican, which will be news to Mr. Nixon.

Then we got onto the subject of nuclear testing. He said that the Western Powers were not ready to conclude an agreement, and that this was shown, among other things, by the demand for 21 or perhaps 19 inspections a year. He had been led personally to believe that the West would be satisfied with about three symbolic inspections. Nineteen inspections, our present demand, were nothing but a demand for the right to conduct complete reconnaissance of the Soviet Union.

I asked him about his attitude toward underground testing. He replied that the U.S.S.R. has never done any underground testing and never will. I asked why? Because, he said, we do not see any value in small tactical atomic weapons. If it comes to war, we shall use only the biggest weapons. The smaller ones are very expensive and they can decide nothing. The fact that they are expensive doesn't bother you because you don't care what you spend and, what is more, many of your generals are connected with big business. But in the U.S.S.R. we have to economize, and tactical weapons are a waste.

I report this without having the technical expertise to comment on it.

Then he went on to say that the second reason why he had no great hopes of an agreement was that the French are now testing and are unlikely to sign the agreement. It is obvious, he said, that if the French are not in the agreement, they will do the testing for the Americans. To which, I said, and the Chinese will do the testing for you. He paused and then said that this was a fair remark. But, he added, while China is moving in the direction where she will be able to make tests, she is not yet able to make them. When the time comes that she can, there will be a new problem. We would like all states to sign a nuclear agreement.

Finally, he came to his third reason why an agreement may not be possible. It turns on the problem of the administrator of the agreement. Here, he was vehement and unqualified. He would never accept a single neutral administrator. Why? Because, he said, while there are neutral countries, there are no neutral men. You would not accept a Communist administrator and I cannot accept a non-Communist administrator. I will never entrust the security of the Soviet Union to any foreigner. We cannot have another Hammarskjold, no matter where he comes from among the neutral countries.

I found this enlightening. It was plain to me that here is a new dogma, that there are no neutral men. After all the Soviet Union had accepted Trygve Lie and Hammarskjold. The Soviet Government has now come to the conclusion that there can be no such thing as an impartial civil servant in this deeply divided world, and that the kind of political celibacy which the British theory of the civil service calls for is, in international affairs, a fiction. This new dogma has long consequences. It means that there can be international cooperation only if, in the administration as well as in the policymaking, the Soviet Union has a veto.

Our talk went on to Cuba, Iran, revolutionary movements in general, and finally to Germany. I shall report on these topics in subsequent articles.

What's the Story Behind OCDM?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. C. Y. Thomas, a resident of my district and chairman of the board of the Spencer Chemical Co. Mr. Thomas suggests a new look at the underlying concepts, as well as the methods of operation, of the OCDM. I call the Congress attention to his letter, because I think the situation which he mentions deserves considerable attention:

SPENCER CHEMICAL CO.,
Kansas City, Mo., April 12, 1961.

The Honorable ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: Several of us in our shop have been making a very careful and detailed study of civil defense, industrial plant protection, etc. for the past 2 months. It appears to me that OCDM is getting to be a resthome for a bunch of political hacks. In early March the new OCDM Chief, Mr. Ellis, in a story in the New York Times, stated that OCDM and its programs were completely inadequate. Two weeks later, at Louisville at an industrial civil defense conference, the same boondogglers were peddling the same old line.

This subject is so controversial that it deserves study of a committee composed of top-flight men from industry, from the sciences, and from government. I could make a speech on this subject many hours long and write you a many-page letter, but it can all be summarized by saying that there is so much boondoggling in civil defense and so much controversial thinking that the average person today thinks civil defense is for the birds. I am sure that no lawyer from New Orleans, after less than a month in office, could have any idea about the whole problem. Congress ought to investigate the whole subject and then appoint a committee of big names in whom the public has confidence to tell us what we should do about it.

Sincerely yours,

KIT.

The President's TV Appearance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the April 13, 1961, edition of the Washington Star. I include this article because it expresses my indignation better than I can myself at commercializing the White House and the Office of the President:

THE PRESIDENT'S TV APPEARANCE—DIGNITY OF THE OFFICE BELIEVED IMPAIRED BY COMMERCIAL ASPECTS OF PROGRAM

President Kennedy did Tuesday night on a television network what no other President of the United States has ever done—he participated in a program whose commercial sponsor urged the American people to buy its products. The cost of the time used was not contributed by the television company, but was paid for by a toothpaste manufacturer.

Many observers feel the dignity of the Presidency was impaired when Mr. Kennedy appeared in the role of a television performer in a prerecorded and rehearsed program.

Five times the hour-long show was interrupted for commercial advertising of a toothpaste and, in the final section of the film,

the President's picture was repeatedly used as a background for the presentation of the names of those who edited and produced the show—the television personnel of the program itself.

It will be argued that newspapers and other publications carry advertising matter alongside Presidential pronouncements, but, in rebuttal, it must be said that no story of White House news is interrupted in the middle of a news column while the reader is told in the same column about the merits of a particular toothpaste.

The show had to be rehearsed and prerecorded 2 weeks ago. The President sat at the table in the Cabinet room of the White House with a pile of photographs before him. As he held them up for the viewer to see, the broadcasting company flashed them in full length on the screen. Mr. Kennedy then discussed each of his Presidential assistants and also described the operations of his Cabinet. So the whole effect was that of a television show.

Up to now, a President's appearances on television have been confined to the showing of his unrehearsed press conferences or his public addresses or of pictures of spontaneous news events in which he happens to be participating. There has been a tacit understanding with the broadcasting companies that Presidential press conferences would not be commercially sponsored. No prearranged show has ever been put on with a President in the manner of the Tuesday night performance.

One wonders whether the other toothpaste companies are going to put on a television show in which the vast audience collected for a Presidential appearance will be made available to them to sell their wares.

Actually, the President did a good job, and the television ratings on his performance should be high. Indeed, he acted his dramatic role well, and so did Mrs. Kennedy, who followed him in the closing 15 minutes of the same program. In fact, it can be said that Mrs. Kennedy, with her calm and restrained manner, was the hit of the show.

Plainly a President and his wife have every right to appear on television or to contribute articles to printed publications, selecting those they want to favor with exclusive stories. It may sometimes be unwise politically to do so, but there's no practical argument against playing favorites, especially if it wins a plug needed perhaps for the next election. Thus, the National Broadcasting Co. commentator who narrated the program spoke of the reverses as well as the successes of the President in his first 82 days, but did insert a very nice plug for the Kennedy administration when he said:

"If you had to sum up in one word the general reaction to President Kennedy, it would have to be favorable. You could not say that Mr. Kennedy has electrified the country, but the public, from available evidence, approves of what he is doing, and appears to believe that, so far at least, he has been calm, competent and serious."

There was, to be sure, no financial compensation to President Kennedy in connection with the TV program. But would it be proper for a President to accept compensation and donate it to charity? It will be recalled that congressional hearings in 1937 revealed that Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, while in the White House, had made a contract in 1935 for 10 radio broadcasts for a total of approximately $30,000, which she had designated should go as contributions to charity. At first, the Treasury did not consider these payments to be taxable to her, but in 1942 ruled that they should be included in her personal income, subject to deductions for charitable contributions within the legally specified limits.

Back in the spring of 1933, the late Louis Howe, private secretary and press-relations officer at White House—in fact, the right-hand man of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt—appeared on a commercially sponsored radio program every Sunday night. It was said at the time that he received $1,500 weekly for his talks. The commercial sponsor was a public utility and oil company. It is estimated that Mr. Howe was paid a total of around $30,000 that year for his radio talks.

The basic question, of course, is whether a President or other high officials—whose salaries are paid by the taxpayers of the United States—should allow the prestige of their respective positions to be used to advertise any commercial product, even though they themselves receive no remuneration and do not accept any compensation whatsoever.

Advantages of the American Free Enterprise System Over Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ODIN LANGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure and privilege for me to call the attention of the House to the following outstanding essay by Mr. Curtiss L. Wikstrom, a junior in the Karlstad, Minn., high school. Mr. Wikstrom's essay, which recently was awarded first place in the 1961 Association of Physicians and Surgeon's essay contest in Minnesota, is both a tribute to himself and to many others of his generation and a testimony to the American free enterprise system. It is an example of the excellent work being done by today's young people, and bodes well for the future of this Nation.

The essay follows:

THE ADVANTAGES OF THE AMERICAN FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM OVER COMMUNISM

(By Curtiss L. Wikstrom)

Today over half of the people of the world are starving. Many top government officials in the Soviet Union are being removed from office because the supply of food does not meet the demand. Communist China is in deep famine. Refugees are pouring out from behind the Bamboo Curtain in greater numbers every day. The starvation in Africa is despairing. Men, women, and children everywhere scurry about in what is the last struggling effort of physical survival.

These are the startling effects of communism. These spots of human suffering are not being caused because of unnatural weather conditions or because of the lack of soil to grow this much needed food. The reason these areas are in distress is because the people live under a system that halts progress and industry.

The governments in all these areas illustrate communism from its most primitive form to its most up-to-date form. We can plainly see by these illustrations that planned economy has not improved the conditions of the world; it has only kept progress from advancing and taking care of the existing problems.

Communists contend that government should engage in economic planning. They believe that government should distribute the goods produced and each man should give according to his ability and receive according to his need. This principle is based on the false assumption that private saving is greed and the accumulation of wealth is selfishness.

The Communists overlook the fact that planned economy does not make a nation prosper; planned economy only has the effect of stifling a people's initiative and incentive to work, produce, and save.

The only thing communism achieves is the distribution of poverty and enslavement. To plan and control a man's life is to bind him and his potential abilities; and when he is bound mentally and physically, he is almost worthless in the advancement of progress.

Another fault of communism is its failure to recognize human value. In communistic countries a man is only part of the mass and is considered just as replaceable as a mechanical device. When a man is treated like a machine, however, he begins to act like a machine; he gives only what is required of him; he does not work to capacity because he knows he will not be benefited by it.

But while half of the world is held in bondage and starvation, the other half is experiencing a new and progressive economy led by the American system of free enterprise. Under our system of free enterprise we have amassed the greatest productive power the world has ever known. No planned economy has ever approached the achievements we have made under our system of free trade protected by a constitutional democracy.

The reason we have made such great progress is because here in America our Government has been limited. We go by the principle that though the people support the Government, the Government should not support the people. Government participation and support encourages the expectation of paternal care and weakens the character of an honest hardworking people.

Free enterprise creates a responsive, energetic, and responsible people. It gives them a quality that is not available when they cannot negotiate, bargain, plan, and construct as they believe right.

Opportunity is one of the greatest advantages of the free enterprise system. Only an individual knows his real ability; and if given the opportunity, he can put that ability to work.

Free competition is an advantage used by Americans to further progress and improvement. It draws out the best abilities of every competitor and give his customer the benefit of new and improved products.

Every American is given the chance to try, to succeed, and perhaps to fail. These things with the prospects of personal incentive drive him on to higher achievements. Success and personal incentive make him strive to do better, and the possibility of failing keeps him from slacking.

In the free enterprise system everyone receives an income proportional to the amount and kind of work he does. Each man is given the right to earn, save, trade, or sell private property, and he is protected from anyone's taking or sharing his property illegally or legally (such as is done in a communistic society where slackers can take advantage of honest laborers by sharing but not contributing). Lincoln said: "Property is desirable, is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently to build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence."

Unfortunately, Americans are up against the jujitsu tactics of those who want to destroy our strength by using that strength to destroy what is responsible for it. We must be constantly on guard against such things as welfare, Federal aid, and other socialistic measures.

Individual freedom and free enterprise have made this a modern world. Through

free enterprise people have risen from the depths of poverty and barbarism into a world where there is individual freedom and security. Now it is up to us to see that the world does not stray from the path that has been set before it and resort to the degrading policies of communism. The short period of free enterprise have given to the world more progress in the past 100 years than other systems have given the world since the beginning of time. If that powerful force is continued and spread throughout the world, we will fulfill the dream of mankind—liberty, peace, and security.

Some Facts About Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following informative article by Lyle C. Wilson appeared in the Long Island Daily Press, April 15. It sheds factual light on Federal aid to education:

[From the Long Island Daily Press, Apr. 15, 1961]

SCHOOLS AND TAXES: IS FEDERAL AID NECESSARY?

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—The religious dispute now blazing around President Kennedy's $6.5 billion school aid program diverts attention from two questions that are closer to your kids and closer to your pocketbooks: Is Federal aid necessary at all? How shall the citizen-taxpayer know whether Federal school aid, is necessary or a wasteful, pressure-group steal?

Debate in Congress should inform the citizen-taxpayer. Dr. Ernest L. Wilkinson, president of Utah's Brigham Young University, comes up with some fodder for debate. Dr. Wilkinson is against Federal aid. He believes President Kennedy's $6.5 billion plan is both unnecessary and dangerous; dangerous to education and dangerous because it would increase the inflationary rotting of the U.S. dollar.

Dr. Wilkinson argues that States and local communities have built an average of 68,000 schoolrooms annually for the past 5 years whereas the administration estimates the annual need in the next 10 years to be only 61,000 new rooms; that enrollment increases in elementary and secondary schools will begin to decline within 2 years from the 44 percent hike in 1950–60. In 1960–70 the increase will be 20 to 22 percent. He said these 1960–70 figures cannot be challenged because the children already have been born.

Here are some more Wilkinson statistics which the taxpayers should demand be proven right or wrong to their satisfaction during congressional debate on school aid. If Dr. Wilkinson's figures are right, perhaps the administration bill is wrong:

Schoolteachers' salaries have increased in constant dollars by 106 percent in the past 30 years. Other State and local employees' salaries increased 58 percent and Federal civilian employees' salaries increased 73 percent in the same period.

School teachers' average salary increased from $3,126 in 1950–51 to $5,389 in 1960–61, 72.4 percent. The number of teachers paid less than $3,500 decreased from 62 percent in 1952–53 to 9.6 percent in 1960–61. Teachers paid $4,500 or more increased from 13 percent to 63 percent in the same period.

School expenditures for 1961 are estimated at $16.4 billion, up $1.2 billion over 1960 and up $9.9 billion over 1950–51, and increase of 153 percent.

School enrollments increased 43 percent in the past 20 years while school funds were increasing 185 percent in price adjusted dollars.

Dr. Wilkinson is a hardnosed conservative. There are his figures for some soft-nosed liberal to disprove. Dr. Wilkinson had this to say:

"As a taxpayer, the [Kennedy] proposal offends my sense of fiscal responsibility. As an educator, it offends my sense of moral integrity. As a lover of my country, I very much prefer that the future of my children be premised on the American philosophy of President Kennedy as proclaimed in his inaugural address when he said:

"'Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.'"

Administration Should Consider Full-Scale Development of Atomic Powered Airplane Under Nonmilitary Auspices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the April 6 issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

I am in thorough agreement with the suggestion in the Post-Dispatch editorial that the administration consider full-scale development of the atomic powered airplane under nonmilitary auspices.

This does not mean, however, that I agree with the blind judgment of Pentagon leaders who can see no military usefulness of a nuclear plane. But I do have the feeling that if America is to get the job done the administration will have to place it in hands of people more dedicated to the New Frontier.

The Post-Dispatch editorial follows:

HARD DECISIONS ON DEFENSE

Secretary of Defense McNamara, expounding the administration's defense budget for 6 hours before the Senate Armed Services Committee, appears to have made a strong impression on men who could be his most knowledgeable critics. Chairman RUSSELL praised him highly for his grasp of the defense problem after so short a time in office. Evidently he advanced persuasive arguments to counter misgivings among the Senators over administration plans to slow down the B–70 bomber program, the Zeus antimissile missile, and development of a nuclear aircraft.

A strong case can be made for each of these weapons as extra insurance for the future Defense Establishment. But each is tremendously costly, and the administration has a point when it argues that extremely valuable returns must be in prospect to justify such expenditures on top of outlays urgently needed for other, and more immediately effective, arms.

Mr. McNamara holds that technical feasibility of the Zeus missile is so doubtful that resources can be better expended on accelerating production of Polaris and Minuteman. In other words, he would stake our defense upon retaliatory power, in the hope that this would deter attack, rather than upon the defensive power to knock down missiles once the attack has been launched. Similarly he favors cutting back the 2,000-mile-an-hour B–70 bomber program because before this plane could be put into quantity production we would already possess a missile fleet expected to be less vulnerable to attack.

These are both hard decisions, and one can only hope that those who must take the responsibility for them have used sound judgment and the best technical knowledge. But what about virtual abandonment of the nuclear plane, which Representative MELVIN PRICE calls a "tragic error"? There may be a case for dropping it as a military project, and Mr. McNamara is quite right in questioning whether defense projects should be pursued solely for prestige value. But the administration needs to ask itself what its attitude toward a nuclear plane would be if the Russians should put one in the air 2 or 3 years hence. In such event, would not the Nation berate itself for permitting the Soviets to score another scientific victory like orbiting the first satellite?

It seems to us the administration ought to consider seriously a full-scale development of the nuclear plane under nonmilitary auspices, instead of letting the project go by default because the military can't use it.

Wasted Miracles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following recent editorial from the Iola Register. It has a good moral, and I am pleased to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

WASTED MIRACLES

The Russian man-in-space episode, however thoroughly expected, hits with a lot of impact.

"Around the world in 80 days." This man went around the world in 80 minutes. And came back alive, apparently without even a bruise.

There is no question that it is a tremendous human and scientific achievement, the forerunner of many others. Who can say how long it will be before every fancy that the space-fiction writers have been able to imagine will turn into actual fact?

There is no question either that Russia's stature as a leader in science and technology has been greatly enhanced throughout the world, and that ours has been lessened in proportion.

This was bound to happen. From the very first sputnik in 1957, Russia has been so far ahead in rocket booster power that for any other nation to catch up by 1961 was unthinkable.

But it is no more palatable on that account. The Ruskies put the first man in space. All we can do is give them credit.

Incidentally, the fact that the first sputnik was in October 1957—just 3½ years ago—is a reminder of the almost unbelievable pace of scientific advance these days. Miracles happen so fast we can barely comprehend one before another is upon us.

But I noticed in the Kansas City Times this morning, by pure coincidence, that the publisher of the Saturday Review in a speech at Jefferson City described our times

as "an age of wasted miracles." And it occurs to me that there could scarcely be a better label for this strange age in which we live.

We can defy the laws of gravity. We can turn man into a living satellite, whirling around the world in free orbit, then return him to his starting point in less than an hour and a half.

Surely this is a miracle.

But of what use is it so long as man can't live in amity with his neighbor across the street or a nation live in peace with its neighbor across the ocean?

What use is the miracle of a nuclear bomb which can burn with the heat of the sun and explode with the force of a thousand bolts of lightning if its only destiny is to destroy its makers?

"Wasted miracles." That's the age we live in.

And it's the age we will continue to live in until that final miracle of peace and good will among all mankind comes about.

Federal Aid to Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of April 9, 1961, emphasizes some of the points which some of my colleagues and I have been saying about the controversy of Federal aid to education. One is on the matter of need and the other is Federal control. The editorial covers these points very well and under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring this editorial to the attention of the Members:

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS

The argument about whether the Federal Government can or should provide low-cost loans to parochial schools is tending to divert attention from the major question of Federal aid to education.

Obviously the proposal for parochial school aid raises an important constitutional issue. But the major question is whether the school system, either public or private, should receive general support from the Federal Government.

Readers of this page must know that we have long favored increased spending from both public and private sources on all levels of education. With a rapidly expanding school population, it is obvious that more money will have to be spent for both buildings and salaries. But it is not clear that this money must come from the Federal Government.

There is evidence to suggest that the need for Federal aid has been exaggerated and the dangers minimized.

Two questions need to be explored. One is the matter of need. How many States are unable to finance satisfactory school systems? There is no indication that Iowa is financially unable to handle all of its primary and secondary school needs, although Iowa is not one of the richest States in per capita income. It is true that this State will have to spend more on education in the future, but Iowa will get more buildings for its tax dollars if the taxes are collected and spent here than if the Federal Government collects the money here and sends it back to the State.

We suspect that most of the other States, although admittedly not all of them, are also able to handle their own school problems.

The second question which needs exploring, and a much more important one, is whether Federal support of the school system will also mean Federal control. Despite many well-meant arguments to the contrary, it seems inescapable that if the Federal Government contributes substantial support to the school system, there inevitably will be Federal restrictions on how the money is spent. Indeed, there should be. No governmental body should spend taxpayers' money without supervision of how it is spent.

The realistic question is whether Federal control or Federal influence over education is desirable. It can be argued that this provides a way to raise educational standards, but the danger inherent in subjecting the educational system to centralized control outweighs this possible advantage.

It may be that the Federal Government is less likely to abuse educational freedom than some State legislatures or town school boards, but Federal control would be universal. The pressure groups that want to control the schools now are scattered and relatively ineffective in a diversely operated system.

There are sound arguments in favor of Federal aid for those few States whose per capita income is sharply below the national average. But this is not the type of Federal aid proposed by the administration. President Kennedy's program would furnish assistance to all States, rich and poor, both for teachers' salaries and for buildings.

The primary question is not whether aid should be provided for private schools as well as public. The primary question is whether the Federal Government should be providing aid of this type for either.

Federal Loans to Private Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent brief regarding the constitutionality of the enactment of legislation by the Congress providing for loans to elementary and secondary private schools, including parochial schools of all religious denominations.

This brief was prepared at my request by Charles S. Sullivan, Jr., an outstanding lawyer, former trial attorney and Special Assistant to the U.S. Attorney General, Department of Justice.

The brief is both exhaustive and comprehensive and indicates that such legislation would be well within the framework of constitutional limitations.

The submission of this legal dissertation is timely due to the tremendous need for the education of all our children in this country, in view of the present world crisis.

The brief follows:

APRIL 13, 1961.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Majority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: You ask me whether or not Congress is authorized, under law, to enact legislation providing for loans to elementary and secondary private educational institutions, including parochial schools of all religious denominations.

Two issues appear involved requiring consideration, in order to ascertain an answer to the question presented: (1) Whether the term "loan" constitutes support within the meaning of the law, and (2) Whether such an act would be violative of the U.S. Constitution.

I

A loan is the delivery of money, article or property to another for temporary use, with a promise, either express or implied, to return the same. The promise to repay the money or return the object borrowed is absolute, and such obligation continues to exist so long as whatever is involved remains in the custody or possession of the borrower. In C. J. S., vol. 54, page 656, it is defined as follows: "A loan is temporary, a temporary letting for a temporary use. It is essential that it be returnable. The borrower expressly or impliedly promises to return the thing lent. A loan implies an obligation to repay."

This same definition is also restated in *Rae* v. *Cameron* (114 P. 2d 1060 at 1062); *Northern Mining Corp.* v. *Trunz* (124 F 2d 14 at 17); and *Nicholas* v. *Fearson* (32 U.S. 103 at 109).

The case of *Beard* v. *Baxter* (258 Ill. App. 340 at 347), in defining a loan, made the following comment: "A loan implies a promise to repay, and the promise to repay is absolute."

The court of appeals (2d circuit), while speaking of a loan in the case of *In re Grand Union Co., N.Y.* (219 F. 2d 353 at 356) contains the identical statement quoted above in *Beard* v. *Baxter, supra,* and further says that the promise to repay must be unconditional and free of contingency if the transaction is to be construed as a loan.

"In its popular sense, a loan of money is understood to mean a transaction creating the customary relation of borrower and lender, in which the money is borrowed for a fixed time, and the borrower promises to repay the amount borrowed at a stated time, in the future, with the interest at a fixed rate" (*Bannock County* v. *Citizens Bank and Trust Company* (32 P. 2d 674)). (See also *Bankers Mortgage Company v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue* (114 F. 2d 130 at 131); *Alworth-Washburn Company* v. *Holvering* (67 F. 2d 694 at 696).)

The most concise and inclusive definition of a loan, containing all the conditions necessary for a transaction to come within the purview of the term, is expressed in the opinion of the court in *Milana* v. *Credit Discount Company* (163 P. 2d 869 at 871): "A loan, on the other hand, is the delivery of the sum of money to another under a contract to return at some future time an equivalent amount with or without an additional amount agreed upon for its use; and if such be the intent of the parties the transaction will be deemed a loan regardless of its form."

It is therefore obvious that money delivered by one to another under an agreement, either express or implied, to return the amount involved at a future date, constitutes a loan in the legal sense of the word notwithstanding whatever attempt might be made to construe the transaction otherwise.

"Support," on the other hand, in the financial sense of the word, is to supply funds for the maintenance of something for the purpose of continuing whatever may be involved (*Board of Commissioners of Logan County* v. *State* (254 P. 71)). It is the furnishing of funds for the sustenance and the means of continuing (Opinion of Justices (13 Fla. 687 at 689)).

The term neither includes nor embraces an understanding to return the money delivered, due to the very nature of its defi-

nitions, and the interpretation of the word placed upon it by both State and Federal courts (*Great Western Power Company* v. *Industrial Accident Commission* (218 P. 1069); *NLRB* v. *Valentine Sugars* (211 F. 2d 317); *Visser* v. *Nooksack* (207 P. 2d 205); *Paquin Ltd.* v. *Nestervelt* (106 A. 766); (Opinion of Justices, supra)). "Support" is a contribution to the one to whom it is given, and the term "contribution" for support is a common phrase found in the respective opinions of our courts (see *Great Western Power Company* v. *Industrial Accident Commission, supra*). "Taxes imposed upon the people by a local, State, or Federal Government are laws for the support of the particular Government."

It appears from the discussion in this opinion that "support" is the outright furnishing of funds or means to the recipient, unaccompanied by any agreement, express or implied, to return or repay the same.

In *State* v. *Blandson* (148 P. 28), the court in defining "support" stated that the term referred to "appropriations for current expenses, maintenance, upkeep, continuation of existing functions, as well as appropriations for such new buildings and conveniences as may be necessary to meet the needs and requirements of the State in relation to its existing institutions."

The two words are so distinguishable in their legal connotations that the vast difference was recognized by the court of appeals (5th circuit), in the case of *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Valentine Sugars, supra,* when it held that the loan of money for expenses by an officer of the company to an officer of the labor organization does not constitute "support."

According to the evidence in the above case, an employer loaned his car and money for expenses to the officers of a union to make a trip to a nearby city to consult with the regional officers of the Labor Board. The petitioners sought an order directing the employers to cease contributing to the support of the labor union, contending that the foregoing loan was, in reality, support and therefore in violation of the National Labor Relations Act. The court said in answer to this argument, on the facts just recited: "In the state of the record * * * these acts alone cannot fairly and justly support a finding that the independent (union) was supported or its administration interfered with as prohibited by the act * * *."

In view of the cases cited and the definitions of the words contained in the opinions of the respective courts, it may accurately be said in the language of *Milana* v. *Credit Discount Co., supra,* if money is delivered by one to another with an agreement, either express or implied, to return the amount at some future date, the transaction will be deemed a loan regardless of its form.

II

Would such an act violate the U.S. Constitution?

The 1st and 14th amendments become relevant to this inquiry, and necessitate an examination of the pertinent judicial opinions, in order to obtain the intent of the respective provisions. The applicable clause of the 1st amendment provides "Congress shall make no law respecting establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; * * *" and that of the 14th amendment states: "* * * No State shall make * * *, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law. * * *"

At the outset of this discussion, it must be emphasized that all acts and statutes enacted by a legislative body are presumed to be lawful (*U.S.* v. *Di Re* (332 U.S. 581); *Davies Warehouse Co.* v. *Bowles* (321 U.S. 144); until held otherwise by the courts, *State* v. *Martin* (139 N.E. 282); *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U.S. 1)); and no body or tribunal has the power to decisively declare an act of Congress to be illegal except the U.S. Supreme Court (*U.S.* v. *Reynolds* (235 U.S. 133); *Gelpcke* v. *Dubuque* (1 Wall. 175); *Pennekamp* v. *Florida* (328 U.S. 331, 11 Am. Jur. 740)).

This principle is, and always has been the law of the land since the ratification of the U.S. Constitution. Article 3, section 1, of the Constitution provides that "the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

Section 2 of the same article provides, among other things, that "the judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States * * *."

The foregoing sections of article 3 leave no doubt as to which branch of Government is authorized to determine the legality of an act. The authors of the Constitution made their intentions abundantly clear, in the above clauses, that the jurisdiction for the determination of legal issues should be confined to the courts.

The U.S. Supreme Court has held, in several cases, that the 14th makes the prohibition of the 1st amendment applicable to State laws regarding the right of exercising the freedom of religion (*Cantwell* v. *Connecticut* (310 U.S. 296); *Jamison* v. *Texas* (318 U.S. 413); *Follett* v. *McCormick* (321 U.S. 573); *Marsh* v. *Alabama* (326 U.S. 501)); and in the case of *Everson* v. *Board of Education of Ewing TP et al.* (330 U.S. 1, at p. 15) said: "The broad meaning given the amendment by these earlier cases has been accepted by this Court in its decisions concerning an individual's religious freedom since the 14th amendment was interpreted to make the prohibitions of the 1st applicable to State action abridging religious freedom."

Thus the two amendments become interwoven in legal controversies such as the subject under discussion and must be considered together in order to reach an accurate conclusion.

It is well-established law that the first amendment of the Constitution had the same objective and intent to provide the same protection against governmental interference in religious liberty as the Virginia statute enacted on January 19, 1786. The relevant section of this act recites: "That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever * * *" (*Watson* v. *Jones* (13 Wall. 679); *Reynolds* v. *United States* (98 U.S. 145)).

Both Madison and Jefferson, who are the recognized leaders in the drafting and adoption of the Virginia statute of 1786, and the first amendment of the U.S. Constitution, intended the object of the statute and the amendment to be the same. It was held in the case of *Reynolds* v. *United States, supra,* that the provisions of the first amendment, in the drafting and adoption of which Madison and Jefferson played such leading roles, had the same objective and were intended to provide the same protection against governmental intrusion in religious liberty as the Virginia statute; and at page 164, the Court said: "In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect 'a wall of separation between church and State.'" What was the actual meaning of Jefferson's declaration as quoted in the above case?

Taking into consideration the prevailing circumstances of that period in which Jefferson made the statement, it seems clear from his own conduct, he could not have intended that his words be construed in a strict literal sense. There is neither legal nor historical evidence of record revealing any objection by Jefferson to the requirement of taking an oath by a President-elect as a condition precedent to assuming that office, nor to any other public office requiring an oath, nor to the motto, "In God We Trust," imprinted on U.S. coins. At the time of his declaration, almost every colony imposed some type of tax on the people for church support, due to the existence of State religions. It is a historical fact that the people of Virginia, North Carolina, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Maryland, and New Hampshire were compelled by law to contribute to the State in the form of taxes for the support of churches, clergymen and the construction of churches for the particular religious denomination favored by the respective States (see footnote 8, p. 10, *Everson* v. *Board of Education of Ewing TP et al., supra*). It was this existing condition that Jefferson and Madison so strenuously objected to, the abolition of which they desired and eventually realized by the passage of the Virginia statute and the adoption of the first amendment.

The Supreme Court has consistently sustained legislative appropriations enacted for the welfare of the people and the education of children. Even though the money derived from this particular type of legislation might pass to an institution under the operation and control of a certain religious denomination administering such service, it has been held to be within the legal confines of the taxing power of the State when imposed for a public purpose (*Bradford* v. *Roberts* (175 U.S. 291); *Cochran* v. *Louisiana Board of Education* (231 U.S. 370); *Quick Bear* v. *Leupp* (210 U.S. 50)). The Court has further ruled that a law does not have a private rather than a public purpose simply because tax money will be used to reimburse individuals for money they have spent in a manner which furthers a public program (*Everson* v. *Board of Education,* supra).

In the case of *Bradford* v. *Roberts,* supra, an attempt was made to enjoin the Federal Government from paying money to a Catholic hospital in Washington, D.C., contending that this constituted an establishment of religion in violation of the first amendment. Any person regardless of race, color or creed was admitted to the hospital who required treatment. The Court held that the hospital was a secular institution notwithstanding that all the members of the corporation were of a religious order of the Catholic faith. It was said in the course of the Court's opinion in reference to this hospital: "Although its individual members might all be members of a religious order of the Roman Catholic Church, this would not characterize the hospital as a religious or sectarian body."

Regardless of whether the policy of a legislative body meets the objections of a number of people, the courts will not interfere unless the legislation is in violation of the Constitution, and in the absence of such an offense, its policies are not reviewable by the judiciary. It was said by the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Butler* (297 U.S. 1): "The policy of a legislative body is not subject to review where an act does not violate the Constitution" (see also *Williams* v. *Baltimore* (289 U.S. 36); *Wabash Valley Electric Co.* v. *Young* (287 U.S. 488); *Buchanan* v. *Warley* (245 U.S. 60)).

The fact that a statute might create a new political concept, necessitated by conditions of the times, does not detract from the power of Congress to enact such a law as evidenced by the Court's statement in *United States* v. *Union Pacific R.R. Co.* (160 U.S. 1): "In determining the validity of a statute the courts can consider only the legislative power to enact it, and if this power exists, it is their duty to give effect to the will of the legislature."

The problem of education for children in this country has been of great concern and is more so today, due to the great expansion in population. Both legislative bodies and the courts are agreed on this matter as may be seen from the comment of the Court in

Everson v. *Board of Education, supra,* in commenting on a remedial statute enacted by the New Jersey Legislature for the benefit of parochial scchoolchildren as well as those attending public schools. It was said in this case at page 7: "It is much too late to argue that legislation intended to facilitate the opportunity of children to get a secular education serves no public purposes (*Cochran* v. *Louisiana State Board of Education* (281 U.S. 370))."

As early as 1896, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Francis E. Leupp, decided to make a contract with a Roman Catholic organization for the education of children of the Sioux Tribe. The children were to receive their education at St. Francis Mission School on the Rosebud Indian Reservation in the State of South Dakota. The money was to be paid to the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions. Action was brought by one Quick Bear, a member of the Tribe, to enjoin the execution of the contract on the ground that it was illegal (*Quick Bear* v. *Leupp,* supra). In dismissing the action, the Supreme Court made the following comment: "Some reference is made to the Constitution in respect to this contract with the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions. It is not contended that it is unconstitutional, and it could not be."

It is obvious the money was to be spent by the Government for a public purpose since it was to be used to educate the Sioux children in accordance with the treaty signed by the United States and the Sioux Nation in 1868.

In the State of Louisiana, the textbooks, excluding religious books, are supplied to both public and parochial schoolchildren at the expense of the State. The law authorizing this expenditure has been tested in the U.S. Supreme Court as to whether it violated the Federal Constitution. It was held to be well within the framework of lawful limits of legislative power in the following words of the Court: "This legislation does not segregate private schools or their pupils as its beneficiaries, * * *. Its interest is education broadly; its method comprehensive. Individual interests are aided only as the common interest is safeguarded."

Answering the question whether this action by the State of Louisiana offended the 14th amendment, the Court continued: The 14th amendment did not strip the State of the power to meet problems previously left for individual solution" (*Davidson* v. *New Orleans,* (96 U.S. 97); *Barbier* v. *Connolly,* (113 U.S. 27); *Fallbrook Irrigation District Commission* v. *Bradley* (164 U.S. 112)).

In discussing the intent of the prohibition against the establishment of a religion by Congress, as provided in the first amendment, the Supreme Court said, in the majority opinion, in the case of *Everson* v. *Board of Education,* supra: "The 'establishment of religion' clause of the first amendment means at least this: Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or nonattendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a State nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect 'a wall of separation between Church and State.'"

Again "support" of any religious activity obtained by taxes levied upon the people is stressed, as it was by Jefferson, with the admonition that everyone must remain free in the choice of a religious belief, from interference by either the Federal or State Governments.

Query. Was it ever the intention of the authors of the U.S. Constitution to erect an impenetrable wall between church and state?

If the daily convening of Congress which is commenced with prayer, the payment of chaplains in the Armed Forces with Government funds, and many other instances in which the Government participates, in addition to the foregoing cases discussed, are a criteria, the answer, obviously, is in the negative.

Although the question presented has never been determined by the Supreme Court, the cases reviewed under the first issue clearly distinguish the difference between the legal connotations of the terms "loan" and "support," rendering each of the words incompatible with the other.

In answer to the second issue, based upon the conclusion in part I, and the material disclosed under part II, it would appear that a congressional act authorizing the Federal Government to issue loans to private schools, including parochial institutions, for the advancement of a secular education for the benefit of children, would be for a public purpose and well within the confines of constitutional limitations.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES S. SULLIVAN, Jr.

A Smalltown Banker Talks About Business Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to call the attention of my colleagues a very interesting, penetrating discourse on business conditions of today by one of the best qualified men I know. Mr. Vincent E. Rossiter of Hartington, Nebr., is a banker and a businessman. He is also a close observer of the current economic scene and his thoughts along this line are therefore important.

Mr. Rossiter, perhaps more than most, speaks for the businessman whose livlihood is directly dependent upon our farmers—the smalltown businessmen who live in an agricultural area where commercial farming is the rule. His viewpoint is typically that of the Midwest where he has served his customers and the people of Hartington and surrounding area for so many years.

However, transplant Mr. Rossiter into almost any area whose economy is based, as is that of Nebraska, upon prosperous agriculture, and I think his words would be the same, his outlook identical.

Mr. Rossiter was recently interviewed by the magazine, U.S. News & World Report. I would like to include that interview at this point in the RECORD:

A SMALLTOWN BANKER LOOKS AT BUSINESS AT THE GRASSROOTS

(NOTE.—Vincent E. Rossiter is president of the Bank of Hartington, in Hartington, Nebr., a town of 1,650. Mr. Rossiter grew up in the banking business. His father kept the family bank open during depression days of the 1930's "by the skin of his teeth." Now 46, Mr. Rossiter describes himself as "just a little banker from Nebraska." He is a member of a special committee set up in 1960 by the Nebraska Legislature to look into research for new uses of farm products.)

Now that more and more economists are predicting a business recovery, how do things look to a country banker—a man who sees business at the grassroots? From his bank in Hartington, Nebr., Vincent E. Rossiter sees this picture: Farmers still cutting back, pulling their belts even tighter. Businessmen in farm neighborhoods hurt as reduced profits have to be spread thinner over their communities. In this exclusive interview, Mr. Rossiter measures the trends of the present and concludes that, unless there are basic changes in rural America, the recovery now predicted is going to run out of steam.

Question. Mr. Rossiter, how is business out in your part of the country?

Answer. It's stable and probably a little better than it was a year ago.

Question. Is there much optimism among farmers?

Answer. If there's any optimism, it's very reserved. Certainly they're feeling fairly good, because their volume and cash receipts have remained about the same compared to last year. If their net has dropped a little, most of them feel that this is only temporary.

Question. Do you mean the farmers are long-term optimists?

Answer. We're wishful by nature, I think, in the United States—always looking for that pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. Farmers are not different from the rest of us.

Question. Is the farm economy moving ahead or slipping behind in your part of the Midwest?

Answer. Our deposits have been relatively stable, and, of course, this is an indication of stability in the profit level of the community. However, on the other hand, our loans rise every year, on the average, which indicates that some people are covering their lack of income and lack of profit with borrowed money.

Question. If your deposits have made no gains in a period when the country has grown tremendously, is this a relative loss?

Answer. You're suggesting that we've got to run to stand still, if we are going to grow with the rest of the economy. Well, we haven't had any growth.

Question. Is that situation generally true of other banks in midwestern rural areas?

Answer. Yes. Theoretically, had the rural areas enjoyed the same expansion that has been enjoyed in other areas, every bank in the Middle West should be twice as big as it is—filled up with money that has been earned by its depositors. This has happened in some other areas in the United States.

Question. Are you losing farmers in your area?

Answer. Nebraska has lost fewer farmers in the past 10 years than any of the other States in the 10th Federal Reserve District, which includes Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, Wyoming, and parts of Missouri, New Mexico, and Oklahoma. We've lost about 10 percent, and Cedar County, of which Hartington is the county seat, has had the least loss of any county in Nebraska.

So I feel we have a very stable farm economy in our particular area. But, in spite of this, of the 259 farmer property statements (records of assets and liabilities) that I took from September to December of 1960, only 7 had an increase in net worth. Less than 3 percent of my customers are showing any progress or gain.

Question. What type of farming area are you in?

Answer. We're right on the western edge of the Corn Belt. Our area is diversified—principally corn, hogs, and cattle—but we also have more milk cows in Cedar County than any other Nebraska county.

Question. What happened to the remainder of the 259 farmers from whom you took property statements?

Answer. Their losses ranged from $200 to $300 to the extreme of $4,000 to $5,000.

One of the exceptions to the trend was a man who had $100,000 worth of land, $20,000 worth of farm equipment, and $40,000 worth of livestock and grain. He showed an appreciation of $7,000 in his property statement. Now, that's less than 5 percent return on his $160,000 investment.

So this man got nothing for his depreciation. He had to write that off someplace else. He received no wages for himself or his two big boys or his willing wife who quite often helps him. He received nothing for his management.

Now, he's living and he's calling this interest on his investment "income," and he's not too unhappy. But he's smart enough not to buy the new equipment that he needs and would buy now—he told me $25,000 worth—until he can see something besides interest on his investment. He owed us only $7,000, so obviously he's not in any danger of going broke. He's not a little, inefficient farmer.

Another case I had was a farmer who also had off-the-farm income amounting to $12,000 last year, and a $4,000 appreciation on his property statement, which indicated he had socked $8,000 of his outside earnings into his farming operation.

Question. When you say these farmers are living off depreciation, do you mean that they're not putting aside enough money to maintain their farms and keep their investments up?

Answer. Yes. A good example is the young man who came in last November and said, "I'm going to have a sale." I said, "You're kidding. You've been going a little contrary to the general trend. You're going to have a half section of ground—320 acres—clear the first of January; aren't you?"

"Yes; I am."

"Lord, man, what better could you ask from an industry?"

He said, "Who are you kidding? You know how I got that half section of land."

"No," I said, "I don't know."

"Well, I bought the home place, a quarter section, from the folks, and I got it cheap. I had it paid for by 1950. Then I made a little more money in the early 1950s and I bought this other quarter for $16,000. Now, I'll have that paid for by the first of the year.

"But during this 15-year period I haven't spent a penny for improvements. It'll take $5,000 just to put new boards and new nails where the old ones fell off. I've worn out a complete set of farm equipment. I'll have to go to four-row equipment, where I was getting by with two-row, because my teenage boys have grown up and moved away. That will cost around $10,000.

"Now, should I go out and mortgage my farm again to finance $15,000 for improvements and equipment, or shall I sell out now, rent my farm and go into town and get into some kind of business? That way, I could eke out a living and let the farm take care of itself until times get better."

Question. What did he do?

Answer. He had a sale in February of this year. This is a 42-year-old farmer. His reasoning was that, if he stayed on the farm, bought the machinery and made the improvements, he would depreciate the whole thing again in 10 years while he paid off the loan on the land. He would again have a clear halfsection, with a set of wornout machinery and buildings that needed repair, and he'd be 52 years old. And they're having a little trouble getting jobs at 40.

Question. Who bought this man's land?

Answer. He didn't sell the land. He kept the land, and it's supposed to pay the taxes. It's leased to a nephew who is borrowing 10 milk cows from his dad. Dad will get half the cream check for the loan of the cows. By working for his dad, he bought a tractor. He'll borrow equipment from his dad and dad-in-law.

Now, this young fellow thinks he's going to farm this halfsection without borrowing any money. But it's hard to see how he's going to make ends meet, because he doesn't have enough invested, so he can't live off interest and he can't live off depreciation.

Question. And there's a hidden cost there in the use of this borrowed equipment—

Answer. Oh, definitely. And somebody's likely to lose part of his crop because, when harvest comes, there just wont be enough machinery to go around and get the job done in time.

Question. What's the effect of all this on Main Street? Are you having any business failures?

Answer. Well, yes and no. We've had no bankruptcies. We've lost an auto dealer since the first of the year. In an adjoining town, an implement dealer just locked his door one Saturday night and said, "I'm through." He left unfinished work in his shop and told them to come and get it and drag it out, that he was tired of repairing their damned machinery and carrying it on the books.

Every time we lose 10 or 12 farmers from our community, we lose the people who would spend the income to sustain one average-size, smalltown business—roughly $100,000.

Question. But aren't the remaining farmers running bigger farms and spending more money?

Answer. Well, no. They'll spend more money for operating costs, but 10 fewer farm families means 35 fewer people to buy shoes and groceries and overalls and shirts. This hurts a community.

I suppose we should number our business houses and say, "All right, No. 10, it's your turn—you're done. We don't have the money to sustain you any longer," and then put a stick of dynamite under him and blow him up—inventory, family, and all.

This sounds kind of violent and, of course, I don't mean it literally, because the loss of a town family, by whatever means, is just as damaging to a community as the loss of a farm family. I'm only trying to illustrate that this is the only way a community could keep the remaining businesses relatively prosperous, and still not add to the unemployment situation.

But instead of that, nobody knows who is supposed to go, so everybody stays, and we spread this smaller profit over the community just a little thinner, with the consequence that everybody is operating on less profit.

Question. Your bank seems to be doing fairly well. Didn't you do an extensive remodeling job recently?

Answer. We bankers have never had it so good. We're cleaning up because the farmers are coming in to borrow everything we've got to lend. I've got 150 new borrowers coming in—driven in by the low-price level in agriculture. It's increased our loan volume to a record high. Naturally, our income has gone up. If I didn't think it through, I could be real happy.

Question. What do you see when you think it through?

Answer. Well, you can't collect bank loans from people in an orderly manner unless they are earning a profit. I know that; I'm in the banking business. Loans in my own bank have increased every year on the average since 1951. My deposits have been relatively stable for 4 or 5 years.

And I watch my customers bring in their savings bonds and deposit them to their accounts—not earned income, but income earned in other periods—to stabilize my deposits. But I know that, ultimately, my deposits are going to decline, and, as they do, I'm going to curtail my correspondent accounts with city banks. As I do that, their loan ratios are going to go up out of proportion to what they are now. And, according to one economist, they're already at historically high levels.

Now, when the credit is eliminated in our economy, and if we haven't restored the earned income, we cannot sell the goods and we're going to have another depression.

We're dangerously close, in my opinion, to a point where, one of these days, I'm going to have somebody walk in with a $60,000 property statement and say, "Vince, I need $2,000." And I'm going to have to say, "I'm sorry. We're not loaning any money because we're not getting any back."

Now, this is going to happen in metropolitan areas before it happens in the rural areas, because of the natural conservatism in the rural areas and the more liquid position of the banks there. When it happens in the metropolitan areas, it won't make any difference how much money there is out in the country. We just won't be able to bail out the Nation, because the top 300 banks in the country—about 2 percent—control more than 50 percent of the total deposits of all banks.

What we've been doing in these recession periods is liquidating manufactured goods inventory to get the money back. The day we can't liquidate manufactured goods inventory out of these industrial and rural areas, and the money doesn't come back to the banks, then we're going to be in serious trouble.

Question. Are you saying that the country is headed for a farm-led and farm-fed depression?

Answer. The fact is that, for 10 years, we've been using the agricultural segment of the economy as a tail on the kite of the whole economy to stabilize it. We've been depressing farm prices to offset inflation in other areas.

The Joint Economic Committee of Congress made a study of this in 1956, when there was kind of an abrupt jump of the wholesale prices index. An economist in the Agriculture Department testified that, yes, they knew this was going on. They knew that they were offsetting a decline in farm prices with a rise in industrial goods, which was resulting in an approximate stability in the wholesale prices index. They called in William McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, and he said, "Yes," he knew that. They asked him if it would be inflationary if farm prices should rise. He said, "It's certainly something we don't want to contemplate."

As it is now, you've got a farm price level that's down here at around 89 or 90 percent of 1947–49 at wholesale, with an industrial-goods price level at 128 percent of the same base period.

So, you're giving the farmer a 70-cent dollar and telling him to buy a dollar's worth of goods, which he cannot do.

That 70-cent dollar is not only the farmer's income, it has to flow through these small-community businesses. They are nothing but the tool of distribution. They buy things from manufacturers, set them on the floor or the shelf, and sell them to farmers and to people in the community who are making their money working for the merchants who sell goods and services to farmers. We're all farmers.

You just can't get away from the fact that your farm income provides the reciprocal market for manufactured goods.

AFFECTED: A THIRD OF UNITED STATES

Question. Aren't you giving too much weight to the farm market in our economy? Agriculture accounts for a much smaller proportion of our national income today than it did two or three decades ago.

Answer. But what the economists overlook is the fact that a large percentage of business and industry still is dependent on the farm market. In the communities of 5,000 population and under, and on the farms surrounding these communities, you have 35 percent of the Nation's population, people earning their income directly and indirectly from agriculture: either directly, in the production of agricultural commodities—or indirectly, in the business of providing goods and services for agriculture. We have permitted this rural market to lag, behind while the balance of the economy has nearly doubled its income since the 1947–49 period.

Question. What do you think should be done?

Answer. It's utterly clear to me. It's a question of whether or not we want to purchase prosperity by restoring a parity of income in the agricultural rural areas. We can go on stimulating the overall economy by needling it, by advancing payments, by doing all the things that the administration is doing now. But, unless we restore this earned income in the farm economy, there won't be anything coming along behind the temporary improvement to sustain a real recovery.

We've knocked the socks off one segment of our economy. There's no way you can create another segment of business that will restore overall health to the national economy as rapidly as just bringing the income up to a parity level in agriculture.

Question. Would you do that by raising Government price supports?

Answer. That's right. This is the quickest way, and time is running out.

Question. A number of farm economists are predicting that increases in price supports for farm products and other actions taken by the Kennedy administration will increase net farm income by around a billion dollars this year. If they are right, will this solve the farmer's problem?

Answer. It can hardly solve the problem, for the simple reason that this billion or so of additional net income is less than 10 percent of the increase that farmers would have had if their net income had been growing in proportion with other segments of the national income. It may alleviate the situation a bit, but it certainly doesn't solve anything.

Question. Will this predicted increase in net income help rural businessmen?

Answer. It's bound to have some benefit up and down Main Street—a billion dollars is going to make some difference. But it's one of these "too little, too late" propositions. We're not moving fast enough in the right direction.

A WAY TO CUT SURPLUSES

Question. With price supports where they are, farmers now are producing too much. What happens if we raised supports to a higher level?

Answer. I think we'd have less trouble with surpluses. The fact is that, when farm prices have been highest, production has been lowest. And when prices are the lowest, production is greatest. The farmer reacts just like you would. If you weren't making enough money to support your family at the job you have, you'd be out on some moonlighting job, like driving a cab at night.

Now, the farmer hasn't got this opportunity. All he can do is expand production. So he plows up the brome-grass pasture where he had his beef cows and plants the land to grain, and goes to milking dairy cows, because it gives him a weekly income. They do everything—raise more chickens, produce more eggs, more everything—trying to maintain their income with increased production.

The midwestern farmer that I know has a built-in panic button which goes off when the grass begins to get green in the spring, right about now. He works furiously and without regard for the number of hours each day or each week, from planting time in the spring until harvest time in the fall—approximately 7 months of the year. Then, not by choice but because of the nature of his business, he relaxes through the winter months.

Even during this period of relaxation he has more, or less, chores to do every day, 7 days a week, in order to process the fruits of his harvest through livestock and poultry and into the marketplace. During the rush season he easily works as many hours, in 7 months, as does the average office worker or factory worker—to say nothing of the banker—in 12 months, at 40 hours per week. And then he works half as many hours more in the 5 winter months remaining.

If you raise the prices, let them get the banker off their back, you'll see the "relaxingest" bunch of people in this world, and they'll cut back production automatically.

Question. That would be subsidizing laziness then. You increase their income by letting them work less——

Answer. I don't consider a fair profit a subsidy, to agriculture or any other industry. The midwestern farmer, the farmer that I know, is working 1½ times as long as the average 40-hour-a-week laborer in industry, for considerably less money—for 75 cents an hour. They have to in order to sustain themselves, you see.

Question. Do you really think farmers will relax, if they can afford to?

Answer. Sure, I do. Let me illustrate what I mean. They enjoy recreation just like the rest of us, and they are willing to take the time and to pay the price when they can afford it.

The other day, a farmer came in and said to my vice president, "Edgar, I've got to pay my taxes."

Ed said, "How much are they?"

"Three hundred and sixty dollars—2 years' taxes."

Ed said, "You've waited 2 years. We better wait 6 months more and see if you're going to get a crop."

"No," he said, "I've got to get them paid today."

So we fixed him up for his taxes and said, "Now, tell us, what's the big rush?"

So he told us, "You know, I can't get my boat license unless I pay my taxes." The boat license was 8 bucks, and the fishing was awful good that day, and it had been for several weeks.

Question. Wouldn't it help if there were fewer farmers? Wouldn't that give the ones who are left a better income from a larger, more efficient operation?

Answer. Well, we've been moving them off the farms at a rapid rate. Theoretically, this should leave a bigger piece of the pie for those who are left. But the facts are that the people who are remaining and who have extended themselves to increase their size, by assuming the other man's land, in many cases are extending themselves beyond the limits of their credit. These people now are in the worst condition of any segment of agriculture. So size apparently isn't the answer.

If you are producing at a loss, the more you produce, the more you lose. This is happening to some farmers. For example, corn at a dollar a bushel is a loss item on the farm unless it can be turned into pork and beef and poultry and milk. And the poor devil who is grain farming now, according to U.S. Department of Agriculture figures, earned about 2 cents an hour for his trouble last year.

SQUEEZE ON FAMILY FARMS

Question. Aren't there some cases where consolidation of farms does produce a more economical operating unit?

Answer. Up to a point—up to the limits of the family labor. The minute you start hiring help, you becouse uneconomical again.

If you hire a man and pay him $2,400 a year, and you are earning a 20-percent margin of profit on your gross, then you have to have five times his salary—or $12,000—in increased gross income just to earn his wages. So, if it takes an extra quarter section to earn his wages, then you've got to go to an extra half section before you make any headway. So, you reach a point of diminishing returns here, after you've utilized your family labor. And family labor is the most efficient farm operation, bar none—because it's so cheap and readily available.

Question. Is it the corporate farm that makes the big leap? Is that what we're heading for?

Answer. That is where we will get the big leap. The family farmer isn't capable in most cases.

Question. Do corporate farms make money?

Answer. Well, you can get some idea from income tax figures put out by the Internal Revenue Service. I got them for 1957 and 1958.

At that time, a little more than a third of the farms owned and operated by individuals were paying no income tax. By comparison, 43 percent of the corporate farms were paying no income tax. Now, whether this is a matter of bookkeeping, or whether it reflects what is really going on in agriculture, I don't know.

Question. Of course, farmers have more tax loopholes than anybody else—

Answer. Oh, they have. But, even so, unless a farmer is paying income tax, he's going broke. He's just not able to sustain himself over the long haul. I've proved this in my own business.

Question. What is the wage for a hired hand in your area?

Answer. Around a dollar an hour for labor hired by the day. A full-time hired man gets $200 a month, or approximately $6 a day.

Question. And farmers aren't even able to afford that when their boys grow up and leave the farm?

Answer. That's right. The example is that man who decided to quit farming and rent his land. His two boys could go to town and get $50 or $60 a week working in a filling station or garage, and he couldn't afford to pay them that much. His next choice was to go to four-row equipment and do the job alone, or quit. So he quit.

Question. Couldn't he have gone ahead and bought the four-row equipment?

Answer. He could have, but he couldn't have paid for it at the profit level in farming today. That kind of equipment is clear out of line with the profit farmers are getting, and it's no trouble to see why. For example, from 1943 to 1952, farmers were getting around $1.42 a bushel for corn. During that period, the average wage in the manufacturing industry was $1.28 an hour.

Now, corn is selling in my hometown for 91 cents a bushel—this is No. 2 corn, and very little of our corn will grade that high. By comparison, the farmer is paying $2.32 for an hour's labor in industry.

So, that's how one side has gone up and the other has gone down, to put the farmer in distress. Maybe I should have called this young fellow who quit a coward. I'd like to challenge him and say, "Stay here and settle this thing instead of running." But he'd have been a damn fool to stay. I've got a lot of good customers who are foolish to remain on the farm at the prevailing profit level.

Question. Where do the people go when they leave the farm and the rural community?

Answer. Sioux City, Omaha, and points beyond. I've got four youngsters who are out of high school, and two out of college. One of them is working at Memphis, Tenn., for the Phi Mu fraternity. Another one is in California going to school. The third one is working for a bank in Sioux City. The fourth one is working in my bank. So I've managed to keep one out of four. This is a good average.

Question. Isn't this a transferring of wealth from one part of the country and one segment of the economy to another?

Answer. That's what it amounts to. We sustain the cost of raising the children and educating them, and then we export them. This is part of the reason why agricultural areas are retarded. We have the burdensome expense of producing a large part of the labor force for the rest of the economy, but have no way to recover our investment.

Of course, your people create wealth, so, as you lose people, you lose potential wealth. And this is what we're doing in Nebraska. There just is no way you can replace people; there is just no substitute for people.

IF THE THIRTIES ARE REPEATED

Question. If farmers are slipping as fast as you say they are, why aren't they more agitated?

Answer. Well, they're probably the most complacent people in the world—maybe the happiest, too; I don't know. They can cut back faster, farther, deeper, and they're not going to be agitated until Mr. Banker in the local community says, "I'm sorry, this is as far as we can go with you."

When it happens on a large scale, at the same time, then they are going to get the shotguns and the pitchforks out, and in my opinion, we'll see a recurrence of all the things that happened in the thirties, including the farm holiday, when milk was dumped in the road and a county judge was strung up over in Plymouth County in Iowa. They didn't quite hang the poor devil; they cut him down before it was too late.

"Old Man Rivers"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the monthly national magazine the Officer, published by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, refers briefly, but cogently, to the outstanding service being rendered this Nation in the field of national defense by one of the Members of this body.

We all respect and admire our colleague, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina.

All of us are concerned about the state of national defense. Each of us has a constitutional obligation to provide for national defense, and to help write legislation prescribing regulations for the military services.

MENDEL RIVERS has been taking a lead in this field since he came to the House more than 20 years ago. He was a member of the former Naval Affairs Committee, and since its creation by statute, has been a senior member of the Armed Services Committee. He is one of the best informed citizens in the United States on the question of national defense.

All of us will join ROA, in its own dedicated assessment of national defense needs, in its recognition of MENDEL RIVERS.

He not only is a patriot, but a scholarly expert in the military field. He exemplifies the spirit of self-sacrifice which motivates all of the members of the Armed Services Committee in working day and night to make sure we have adequate military forces to protect this country, and thus to keep the peace.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial from the Officer magazine in the RECORD:

"OLD MAN RIVERS"

Everyone knows that MENDEL RIVERS is not an old man, but his manner of running the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Reserves is so deeply embedded in democratic processes, and so marked with his magnetic personality that we need to use the term to convey the affection in which he is held by those privileged to participate in deliberations with him.

Chairman RIVERS commended his committee's work on a stack of pending bills recently by announcing that his roundtable will be continued this year. He listened patiently to the formal presentations, and gave "all the time you want" to the freshman members who had searching questions to ask.

Then he squared away to rewrite the bills sentence by sentence. He told ROA's representatives to "come on up here and sit with the committee because we consider your views like ours when we get ready to decide these questions."

Congressman RIVERS is genuine, dedicated, and sincere. Coupled with the fact that he is one of the best informed men in the United States in his field, out of more than 20 years' service in officially dealing with the military, this makes him a great American in ROA's lexicon.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 15, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS

APRIL 15, 1961.

Two news item in the Nation's Capital this week involved my efforts to unite all forces in Congress and in the executive branch to get early approval and appropriation of funds for the Dallas Federal Center Building.

The first step was to challenge the statements attributed to the Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, in a number of publications vowing political vengeance upon the people of Dallas County because they vote for me to represent them in Congress. In an exchange of letters, I asked the Speaker to confirm or deny the statements. You will note in the copies of the correspondence as reproduced on this page, he says such statements attributed to him are wholly untrue. Never to be forgotten is the fact that political reprisals or political and legislative intimidation with the taxpayers' money can never be prmitted or condoned in our society, for if so, at that moment our form of representative government would cease to exist, a far greater loss to all than any seeming temporary and expedient gain to a few.

Once we laid to rest the stories of political retaliation, and with congressional committees in session, there seemed to be no reason for further delay on the Dallas Federal Building. Therefore, at this time I have called upon the Speaker, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings of the House Committee on Public Works, and the Administrator of the General Services Administration to join me in bringing about the speedy approval of this project. This will mean better service, not only to the people of Dallas, but to all those of the great Southwest, and will benefit all our citizens through the saving of money to the taxpayers.

Because of the interest of Dallas people in this matter, I am reproducing all the correspondence involved in this newsletter.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1961.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Recently Newsweek magazine (the Periscope, p. 17, Mar. 20 issue) quoted you as follows:

" 'If you want the House to do anything for Dallas, back someone else next time.' That's the blunt word Speaker SAM RAYBURN is sending Dallas influentials who supported BRUCE ALGER, the lone Republican in the Texas congressional delegation."

The National Review, page 5, March 4, under "At Home, Washington," says, "Speaker RAYBURN has told Dallas political leaders that unless they eliminate Mr. ALGER, not 1 cent of Federal money will go to the district."

Reprints of these articles are enclosed.

The implication of these statements goes to the heart of sound representative government, therefore, it is important that you confirm or deny these statements, at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE ALGER.

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1961.

Hon. BRUCE ALGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALGER: When your letter of March 29, 1961, arrived this morning I telephoned its contents to Speaker RAYBURN in Bonham.

He asked me to advise you that he had already told Newsweek's Capitol correspondent, Sam Shaffer, that he had never made such a statement as is contained in the March 20 issue of Newsweek.

Furthermore, he categorically denies the statement attributed to him in the March 4 issue of the National Review.

Both of these statements attributed to the Speaker are untrue.

Sincerely yours,

D. B. HARDEMAN,
Research Assistant to the Speaker.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1961.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House, the Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Thank you for your prompt and forthright answer to my letter of March 29 concerning remarks attributed to you in certain publications.

It is good to know that we can continue to disagree politically but maintain mutual respect for the honesty and integrity of one another. Such respect is the solid foundation upon which our representative form of government is built. The people of Dallas County may now be certain that, although you and I will not always be in agreement on means, we both are dedicated to serving the people of our respective districts and the country as a whole.

In this spirit I now ask you to join me in doing all possible to end further delay in securing congressional reauthorization for the Federal Center Building in Dallas. Such a center will serve, not only the people of Dallas, but all those of Texas and the Southwest and at a tremendous saving to the taxpayers. This project, of course, was not my original proposition, but I have been glad to support it on merit alone and it is only on that basis, without regard to any political implication, that I seek your aid. I have asked the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings of the Committee on Public Works for early action and I hope you will be able to support my request.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE ALGER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT JONES,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Buildings, Public Works Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In reference to my correspondence with you in August 1960 and our previous conversations regarding reauthorization of the Federal Center Building for Dallas, Tex., I sincerely hope your committee can schedule early action so that appropriations may be provided in the new budget.

This project has been thoroughly investigated by congressional committees, the General Services Administration and the General Accounting Office. Opinion has been unanimous that the project is a worthy one, will make possible better service to the people of the Southwest, and will save money for the taxpayers. I ask that the committee consider these investigations and decide to approve the project on its merits.

If there is any doubt in the minds of committee members which may delay early action, then I ask that public hearings be scheduled as soon as possible to permit me and interested citizens of Dallas to present additional facts.

Thank you for your prompt consideration of this request.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE ALGER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1961.

Hon. JOHN L. MOORE,
Administrator of General Services, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MOORE: On December 11, 1959, the General Services Administration approved construction of a Federal Building for Dallas, Tex. The project had previously been authorized by Congress after investigation proved it to be sound and in the best interest of serving the people of the Southwest at a saving to the taxpayers.

In 1960 the Budget Bureau did not include the Dallas project for completion because of limited funds and the fact that approved projects were further along in planning at that time. It was understood by GSA, the Budget Bureau, and the Congress that the building would be included in the 1961 appropriation. However, this was not possible because, for reasons unknown to this office but alleged by many to be political, reauthorization of the project was not made. The stated reason for the failure was that it was to be held up pending the outcome of the investigation of site acquisition by the Government Activities Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee.

My investigation of the subcommittee activity and a debate on the floor of the House with the subcommittee chairman resulted in establishing a clean bill of health for the site acquisition, as substantiated by a GAO investigatory report of April 1960.

In view of these developments it is expected authorization will be obtained in this session of Congress and I hope GSA will support the project because of the advantages it will offer to the people of this area and the savings which will be made in Federal operations. I would appreciate your views.

With kind regard.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE ALGER.

Why I'm a Democrat—Government for the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 21, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, recently, the San Francisco Examiner asked two leaders of each major political party to describe the reasons for their political allegiance. One of those selected to tell the Democratic story was Roger Kent, State central committee chairman. As one who has given unstintingly of his time and effort for many years, who has been a major factor in the resurgence of our party throughout the State, and one who has made an outstanding contribution to raising the standards of political activity, I am pleased to submit his statement as follows:

GOVERNMENT FOR THE PEOPLE

What does it mean to be a Democrat? It means believing that the United States is big enough, rich enough, and wise enough to assure every child a good education, every family a decent place to live, every worker a job at a fair wage (except for temporary unemployment—cushioned by insurance), every sick person good medical care, proper drugs and hospitalization, every old person a comfortable and dignified life. We won't tolerate hunger or discrimination.

In short, it means belonging to a party that cares and a party that will generate and activate new ideas and new solutions of new problems and old unsolved problems.

It means belief that the national parks, forests, and other public property of the United States must be protected for the public of this and coming generations. It means a concern for these lands, for their fish and wildlife and their natural beauty and for the people that will enjoy them that goes far beyond short-term financial profit for private individuals or the Government itself.

It means belief that when public resources are developed they should be developed for the benefit of the public and not for private profit.

It means defense of the Bill of Rights and all of it as the keystone of the greatest thing this great country has given us—our personal liberty. It means not being afraid of free speech and it means a firm stand to secure for persons accused of any crime the full measure of protection provided by the Constitution.

It means we implacably oppose the dictatorships of the right and left, but will defend the constitutional right of their misguided adherents to attempt to convert our people peacefully to their alien and objectionable philosophies. It means full confidence in the good sense of Americans.

It means devotion to competitive free enterprise and preservation and enlargement of opportunities for individuals. It means admiration for the accomplishments of big business and respect for its rights, but it also means a continuing supervision through the courts and regulatory agencies to prevent monopoly, price fixing, and exploitation of the public domain.

It means a policy that the regulatory agencies must be staffed not from the industry to be regulated, but by people who represent the public interest.

In foreign affairs, it means belonging to a party that has no strong isolationist bloc to be appeased by stupid statements for domestic consumption; a party with strong policies and soft words; a party that sees little sense in trading insults with the Russians, and much in firm but courteous negotiations.

It means appreciation of the immense difficulties of the new nations and programs to help them and to show them that they belong in the free world. It means, for instance, full approval of the Peace Corps to use the strength and idealism of our people in that effort.

In the area of national defense, it means we must have the best, even if that means we cannot meet the Russians at the border with a balanced budget.

It means that since Thomas Jefferson, we have trusted the judgment of an informed people and rejected the concept that a few know best what is good for the many.

To me, it means an enormous satisfaction in working with vigorous and intelligent people at every level of the party who believe in and support the things I believe in.

Schuylerville Woman Takes Issue With Murrow in Views on Migrant Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLETON J. KING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an answer to Mr. Murrow's "Harvest of Shame" which was written by Mrs. Adelaide Bullard who, with her husband, runs a large farm in my district in upstate New York. They have always employed migrant labor. However, conditions at Bullard camp are far different from those shown by Mr. Murrow:

SCHUYLERVILLE WOMAN TAKES ISSUE WITH MURROW IN VIEWS ON MIGRANT LABOR

(By Adelaide Bullard)

(Edward R. Murrow's "Harvest of Shame"—now that it has been seen against his wishes in Britain—continues to stir controversy. The author of the following article takes a completely opposite view to Murrow's, telling some of the problems that employers of migrant labor face. She writes from the experience gained as an employer

of migrant labor on her own farm in upstate New York.)

SCHUYLERVILLE, March 27.—"Harvest of Shame," Edward R. Murrow's exposé on migrant labor, has now been shown in Britain, too. Unfortunately, Murrow, as Director of the U.S. Information Agency, had been unable to suppress it.

Since Murrow's November telecast, there has been a barrage of stories that migrant laborers are being ruthlessly exploited by callous employers.

On March 9, for example, Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, claimed repeatedly that children of migrant workers received no schooling.

On our farm in upstate New York we have run a labor camp for 18 years, employing many of the same workers during all that time. As soon as the families arrive in the spring, the schoolbus appears for the children.

They remain in school until it closes, then play, or do work according to their age level during the summer. In the fall the bus reappears and the children, all scrubbed and starched, go to school until early November when the apple harvest is finished and the workers return to Florida.

BECOME PERMANENT RESIDENTS

The school is happy with the extra money that the State pays per child, and the parents are sometimes so pleased with our desegregated school that they obtain jobs in this area and become permanent residents.

We have plowed several thousand dollars into a State-sponsored nursery school on our property. Neither Ed Murrow nor the Senator mentioned these schools. The infants and preschoolchildren are treated as well as our own, or better.

There are cribs, formulas, clean diapers, cod liver oil, fresh orange juice, and planned diets, with college trained young women as nurses. There is a storytelling hour, play hour, nap hour, and transportation to and from the camp. All this service costs the parents 50 cents a week.

Senator WILLIAMS told the Nation that migrants receive a dollar a day, and sometimes less, and about $900 a year.

Our workers receive from $10 to $20 a day, which in 5 months adds up to a lot more than $900—and this is apart from what they earn in the winter. Of course, when a man and wife both work this income is doubled.

Neither Mr. Murrow nor Senator WILLIAMS mentioned that housing, electric stoves, space heaters, wood, transportation to and from work, hot water, rain gear, and warm clothes in the fall are provided free.

FREQUENT PAYDAYS

To prevent workers from going on spending sprees, we pay our help twice or three times a week. This creates quite a social security tangle but, theoretically, insures an entire week's wages won't be spent on something foolish; liquor, for example. Binges and brawling are common among migrant workers. These are unpleasant facts, but facts just the same.

Our labor camp has everything the State laws demand, and more. Inspections are numerous, and time consuming. We have hot showers and laundry equipment, and recreation space. We supply electricity. We have a good baseball team, transported by us to Sunday games, uniformed by merchants in the village who vie for the camp trade.

There is a community house at the camp with jukebox and piano, plus facilities for short order diner type meals. Dances are held here and sometimes weddings.

It is quite true the people are crowded. When they arrive, three families move into one unit, leaving empty apartments on all sides. They insist on being crowded.

GOOD AND BAD TYPES

Some of the people are hard working. They spend no money on whisky or gambling, and drive much better cars than ours. Others sell their daughters to the bachelors for a night at a time, bring prostitutes who refuse to do fieldwork, lend money at usurers' rates, and draw knives when drunk.

We pay the people to empty their own garbage, which most of them toss out the door though their garbage pails are 2 feet away. When they leave in the fall we clean, paint, and repair their houses, inspecting the electric stoves, which they hardly use, preferring outdoor fires.

Sometimes the employers, not the employees, are the exploited ones. Then men come to our door night after night in the summer, breathing alcohol fumes, asking for $10 to send a sick aunt, or for the price of a ticket to Florida to see a dying father.

Another gimmick is for a pregnant woman who has made good money all summer to stay over late in the fall, then ask us for money to get the baby out of the hospital, where it is retained until payment.

We parley constantly with doctors, jailers, hospitals, and State troopers, bailing laborers out of trouble.

Whether they drive north in inspected trucks or in their own cars, the migrants telephone us collect from the same spots every spring—the Carolinas, Virginia, Delaware—asking for extra money for the trip we have already financed.

We always send it.

We can no longer afford all of them, receiving, as we do, the same price for apples that we received in 1929. We are cutting down on crops, and looking to automation for an answer.

The Constitution and What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, among the many splendid essays in the contest sponsored by the American Legion of Ohio, one of the finest was the work of Miss Donna Jean Kirkland, a senior at Lake High School in Hartville.

Miss Kirkland was winner in the Legion's district 10, comprising nine counties in east central Ohio.

Under leave to extend, I include her essay with my remarks:

THE CONSTITUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS

(By Donna Jean Kirkland)

The Constitution is one of the most masterful pieces of literature that has ever been written. Its words are not fancy, but its beauty lies in its meaning and what it represents. It represents the hopes and ideals of millions of people all living together in one vast but united country—united because of these common hopes and ideals.

It also represents freedom. In the Constitution our freedoms are listed as freedom of speech, religion, the press—freedom to assemble and to petition. But its meaning goes much deeper than its words. It means freedom to live as an individual, to have the same privileges as any other individual, and to have an equal voice in one's government.

In addition, the Constitution stands for security. This means that we can live without fear—without fear of labor camps and prisons and lies and unjust punishment. This does not mean we are free from injustice, for injustice can always creep in when men sit back unconcerned and let it. It means we have the power ourselves to destroy and prevent injustice.

Because of the Constitution, Americans don't have to answer to a dictator; they only answer to the moral and civil bounds they set up for themselves. We are our own masters and are not slaves to anyone on earth. Our strength is in our common bonds and sense of oneness with our fellow Americans—the spirit preserved by our forefathers and handed down through the ages incorporated in our Constitution. This is our great heritage.

The Constitution is the core of our civilization—our way of life. It's more than the basis of a government, it's the basis of a nation—a free nation and a strong nation.

Our Constitution has stood the test of time and the threat of foreign principles. It is no longer just a written document, but it is a living symbol of justice and peaceful coexistence. It is a radiant light in a world of darkness. It is a principle for tomorrow and the tomorrows that follow.

As long as it exists there is hope for man, but without it there is no hope, for man cannot live and grow as God intended when he is not free to express himself as an individual. Our Constitution alone has provided that freedom. It is an example for the world to follow.

What does the Constitution mean? It means all of this and more.

Troubleshooter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Boston (Mass.) Herald recently published an excellent editorial in which it called attention to the splendid manner in which Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON is performing his responsibilities in behalf of the people of the United States.

Under permission heretofore granted, I include the editorial as a part of these remarks:

TROUBLESHOOTER

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, like his predecessor, is proving a handy man to have around.

His experience as Senate majority leader has given him a special touch with legislative matters. Although he ceased to be an insider when he became the Senate's presiding officer, he still knows what goes on on the Hill, and has already helped the President out of one scrape with the lawmakers (during the House rules fight).

This week the Texan is undertaking his first oversea assignment for the President. This, too, has evolved into something out of the ordinary.

The original purpose was to represent the United States at the celebration of Senegal's independence last Monday, but additional duties have been added. From Dakar the Vice President will fly to Geneva for a conference with Arthur Dean, the U.S. representative at the nuclear test ban negotiations, and then on to Paris for talks with U.S. Ambassador James M. Gavin and NATO commander, Gen. Lauris Norstad. Before coming home he will stop off in Spain to in-

spect U.S. bases on behalf of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

This is quite a schedule for a man whose office has been described as "the most insignificant * * * that ever the invention of mancontrived." And it is apparently only the beginning.

The President has provided Mr. JOHNSON with a staff and a suite of offices in the old State Department building next to the White House. The Vice President is scheduled to head the Space Council, and he will be given other permanent assignments. Mr. Kennedy's preinauguration promise to "keep LYNDON JOHNSON happy (and busy) for the next 4 years" is being carried out.

This is good for Mr. JOHNSON and good for the country. The Vice Presidency is still an awkward office, neither wholly in the executive branch nor wholly in the legislative branch, but its potential is great. Mr. Eisenhower's practice of using the Vice President as an all-purpose troubleshooter has given Mr. Kennedy a valuable lead.

Troubleshooter JOHNSON is getting off to an even faster start than troubleshooter Nixon.

Suggested Restrictions on Bank Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter written by Mr. Harry J. Harding, honorary president of the Independent Bankers Association on April 3, 1961, to the editor of American Banker. Mr. Harding's letter points out the urgent need for serious discussion of the bank merger problem. It is my hope that enough men in the banking business will concern themselves with this problem and suggest a solution to the Congress.

The letter follows:

APRIL 3, 1961.

To the EDITOR, AMERICAN BANKER,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: We read with a great deal of interest the item in the American Banker of March 28, headed "Robertson Joins Critics of Trend in Bank Mergers." This pleased us very much because our organization for many years has been advocating more stringent control of bank mergers so as to prevent the tendency to monopoly. We were able to have a number of amendments added to the bank merger bill which was enacted into law last year.

During the hearings on this legislation there were strong arguments advanced by the supervisory agencies that they needed a broad latitude in passing on applications for mergers. They outlined a number of situations where other factors might be of more importance than maintaining competition. The bill was passed giving them such broad discretionary authority.

While only the annual report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has been made available thus far, disclosing the attitude of the Department of Justice, and the basis for approval of the mergers by the Board, the report does show that the Department of Justice has in a number of situations warned of the danger of monopoly.

There is no question but that many bank mergers are designed merely for self-aggrandizement or for a quick profit, with the public need far in the background. If the tendency to follow this course is not checked we will have a concentration of control over banking that will practically mean the elimination of our American system of locally owned and controlled banks. But how can we restrict these monopolistic mergers? What criteria can we establish that will be reasonable, somewhat elastic, and yet prevent monopoly?

In a talk before the convention of the Independent Bankers Association at Miami Beach, Fla., in May 1957, I advanced for discussion an addition to the then proposed bank merger legislation that would establish some standards that could be followed by the supervisory agencies, as follows:

"No merger shall be approved under this act, in cities of 10,000 or less population, when the result will be two or less banks located in the city in which the merging bank is located; nor in cities of more than 10,000 population up to 25,000 population when the result will be three or less banks located in the city in which the merging bank is located; nor in cities of over 25,000 population to 100,000 population when the result will be four or less banks located in the city in which the merging bank is located; nor in cities of over 100,000 in population when the result will be five or less banks located in the city in which the merging bank is located. In each case, the population figures will be those of the last Federal census.

"Nor shall any merger be approved under this act when the result will be that the merging bank will hold more than 30 percent of the total banking deposits of the area in which the merging bank has offices.

"Let's kick this around for awhile. I don't want you to say you are for this or that you are opposed. I would like to have you think of the arguments both for and against such a proposal, so that we may carefully study and weigh them.

"You may feel that the criteria specified in this suggestion are not realistic, but can you think of better yardsticks than the ones suggested? Do you think that we ought to have any yardsticks other than the discretion of some Federal agency? Have you any reason to believe the Federal agencies would?

"The yardsticks I have suggested are no more arbitrary than the existing requirements as to the capital necessary for the establishment of a new bank, or of a merging bank. The prevention of undue concentration of banking control is just as much in the public interest as the limitations on the loans that a bank can make. As to the argument that mergers should be left to the discretion of a supervisory agency, this, in my opinion, could apply equally as well as to the capital requirements for a new bank.

"I know the supervisory agencies will immediately howl that the merger door must be kept open so that without hindrance they can merge a failing bank, a bank that is not properly managed, or a bank that is undercapitalized, with another good bank, regardless of its monopolistic tendencies.

"If such an emergency escape hatch needs to be kept open, that can be provided, of course, but I wonder if merging a weak bank is the one and only solution that the FDIC or any other supervisory agency can think of. If so, why do not the laws say something affirmatively giving the power to compel the merger of a bank under such circumstances, to the supervisory agencies? Or is this a method they themselves have seized upon without congressional sanction?

"You will note what we have proposed places no limitations on size, nor does it in any way hinder normal growth. It merely restricts cannibalism.

"Let's not say it can't be done, but rather ask ourselves, should this be done? I am convinced we must have a ceiling on concentration of control over banking or face destruction to our independent banking system."

Your publication at the time did editorialize on my suggestion and urged bankers to comment. However, no serious discussion ensued. We know some bankers want to absorb other banks and they would not be in favor. Others would like to keep the door open to merger in case they wanted to sell. Others just would not do anything to criticize any other banker. If we had been able to get the views of the supervisory agencies some light might have been shed on the problem, but we can hardly expect any agency to suggest restricting their powers.

I still believe the idea is worth kicking around. I wonder if your publication might not secure the views of some of the members of the Senate and the House Banking and Currency Committees. At all events something needs to be done, and quickly, either by implementing existing law or by obtaining recognition from the supervisory agencies that tendencies to monopoly should be frowned upon rather than encouraged.

Very truly yours,

HARRY J. HARDING,
Honorary President.

Personnel of Veterans Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to receive a letter commending a Government agency and its staff. I am sure my colleagues will be interested in the letter I received today from a constituent, Mr. Henry A. Hansen, of Baker, Oreg., praising the personnel of the veterans hospitals in Boise, Idaho, and in Portland, Oreg.

The letter follows:

BAKER, OREG., *April 13, 1961.*

Congressman AL ULLMAN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: I would like to inform you as to the operating conditions that I have experienced and observed at the veterans hospitals.

The general public has a misconception regarding the functions of a VA hospital. They look at it as a last resort, or a place to send their relatives or friends after they have exhausted their resources and given up hope of recovery, and are under the impression that he will be a guinea pig for the medical profession. I was included in that category before I learned my lesson.

Last April I had trouble with a tooth and had it extracted. The wound would not heal, and after doctoring with it until August, my mouth and jaw were getting worse. Having exhausted all my resources, I decided to try the VA hospital.

I went to Boise, Idaho, last August, and after 5 days of tests and examinations I was informed that I had cancer, and that part of my lower jaw and sections of my mouth would have to be removed. The shock that you get when you know you have cancer, and that some of your head has to be chopped out is something that words cannot express. I was told that Portland had better equipment for my kind of operation, and that I would be sent there.

In Portland, after more than 2 weeks of tests and examinations by many doctors, supervised by Dr. Harvey Baker and Dr. George

M. Long, I was operated on August 25. They had to remove a few more glands, etc., in the neck, throat, mouth, and half the lower jaw, as was recommended in Boise.

This was the experience I went through to get the information that I want to convey to you. I do not believe that the President of the United States or even a four-star general could get any better treatment, care, and service than was given to me at these VA hospitals. Their testing and examinations were very thorough and left very little, if any, chance for a mistake. Every test and diagnosis by any instrument or doctor had to be verified by a specialist in the particular field that it appertained to.

The personnel connected with these hospitals I found were the very finest, from the top to the bottom. All very considerate and efficient, and the most amazing of all—everyone had a full day's work to do, and did it without any griping. I never saw anyone standing around with nothing to do. And the cooperation was something to see. A doctor would not hesitate to lend a helping hand to a hospital aid or a housekeeper. Everyone just seemed to have one thing in mind—to keep the patient happy and contented. And that's some job, especially with some of the patients who think the Government owes them a new set of brains and a million dollars. Sure there are students there—lots of them—but they have a tough job. They must assist and observe many times before they are allowed to go on their own; and then they have specialists watching them very closely to see that their work is perfect. And then they are questioned no end, to be sure that they themselves knew what they did.

Now the food. I have eaten in some of the best restaurants, and I have never seen any better cooking and preparing of food than I had in the VA hospital; and variety that should please anyone.

As for supplies and material, there is very little waste. I don't mean they are miserly with things. They use as much medicine and material as necessary, but they do not throw things in the waste basket that should go back on the shelf.

The operation and maintenance of the VA hospitals are conducted much more efficiently than most private businesses and institutions, and they are a great credit to the country. And the Government is getting more for its dollar and doing more good than any money they spend. What could be better than saving a man's life and putting him back with his family and on the job again. There is only one way he can ever repay that service and that is to be a better citizen, and his own conscience will force him to do that. And God knows we can stand some good citizens.

Mr. Congressman, I wish you would take some of your time and help this VA hospital situation. Many more hospitals are badly needed. They are all overcrowded. The Government could not spend money to any greater advantage. The need is not only for the present, but the future is going to demand it. And with all the money the Government spends, nowhere does it get more out of its dollar than investing it in VA hospitals. It's not only a great help to our veterans and the country in general, but all humanity will benefit.

My gratitude and thanks to Dr. Harvey Baker, Dr. George M. Long of Portland, and Dr. Helferty, and Dr. Hastings of Boise, and all the personnel of both hospitals.

One other thing, Mr. Congressman. If you are unable to do anything about aiding the VA hospitals, please try and get President Kennedy to find time to read this letter.

Thank you very kindly for anything you are able to do, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HENRY A. HANSEN.

Soviet Claim of Man in Space Needs Further Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am including with my remarks today a letter I have sent to the chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics urging an exhaustive investigation of Soviet Russia's claim that it has placed a man into space.

It is my earnest hope that the House committee will undertake such a study because as I have stated in my letter, it is indeed lamentable that the world is so willing to accept at face value every claim of the Soviet Union, when for the past 20 years we have seen conclusive proof that the Communists are masters of deception.

In my letter to the chairman, I cite the fact that Russia's chief delegate to a space-science symposium in Italy, A. A. Blagonravov, told the press that Major Gagarin's space capsule did not have any windows or portholes through which he could have seen the spectacular description of outer space which he gave after his alleged flight.

Professor Blagonravov has since retracted that statement, and several people have asked me if this retraction in any way alters my own views on this subject. It is my belief that the contrary is true, and Professor Blagonravov's retraction only fortifies my original suspicion of the whole Soviet claim. It stands to reason that if the top space scientist of Russia does not know whether Soviet space capsules have windows and portholes, then we indeed have the right to probe this entire Soviet claim to the fullest dimension.

As an aside, I might add that it appears rather strange to me that this top Soviet space scientist would be attending a seminar in Italy at this historic moment when the Soviets claim they have placed a man into space. We have a right to ask whether or not such a flight had in fact been made when the Soviet Union's top space scientist was not around to personally help supervise the operation.

Mr. Speaker, my letter to the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics follows. I hope my colleagues will join me in the admonition that we Americans must go beyond the realm of normal assumption in accepting Soviet Russia's claims and will further join me in requesting this full-scale investigation of Russia's latest space claim:

APRIL 16, 1961.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: May I take this opportunity to suggest that the House Committee on Science and Astronautics immediately launch an exhaustive investigation into the merits of Soviet Russia's claim that it has launched a manned vehicle into space.

I make this request because as this entire story unfolds, more and more evidence begins to strongly suggest the possibility that the Soviet Union has again perpetrated a monumental hoax on the people of the world.

I should like to suggest that your committee seek the full cooperation of the executive branch of our Government, including a request to President Kennedy, that through diplomatic channels the President request the Soviet Union to permit an international team of experts to review all technical data involved in the Soviet claim before Russia's contention that it has successfully launched a manned spaceship is accepted.

There is sufficient precedence for such a request, particularly when we remember that in 1947, when the United States successfully exploded the first hydrogen bomb at Eniwetok, our country invited scientists from every nation in the world, including two from the Soviet Union, to witness this historic accomplishment.

It is not my purpose to in any way deflate the Soviet claim if it is true. But since the successful launching of a human being into space affects the future of the entire world, I believe it is the responsibility of some responsible branch of our Government to fully investigate this accomplishment before we accept it as a reality.

It is indeed lamentable that the world is so willing to accept at face value every claim of the Soviet Union, when for the past 20 years we have seen conclusive proof that the Communists are masters of deception. I, myself, during the past 20 years have made a thorough study of Communist techniques, and I am convinced that any claim made by the Soviets must be exhaustively examined before it can be given any credence.

It is my firm belief that the Soviets needed a spectacular propaganda vehicle to offset world attention from the demand made by President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan for a cease-fire in Laos. I believe the Soviets also wanted to detract world attention from the visit of Chancellor Adenauer to this country; and so the decision to announce the successful launching of a man into space by the Soviets was made at this particular time.

I believe the American press and radio, with correspondents throughout the world, are doing an excellent job in helping piece together information which strongly suggests that the Soviet Union is indeed perpetrating a hoax in its claim.

It is my earnest hope that neither your committee nor anyone else is going to be detracted from this investigation by the fact that the press in this country has given such spectacular coverage to the Soviet claim. It must be remembered that the role of the American press is not to sit in judgment upon the veracity of claims made by world leaders, but merely to report them objectively. It would be a mistake to blame the press in any way for giving this story such wide coverage because, in fact, the press is merely carrying out its traditional assignment.

However, it would be a catastrophic mistake if responsible people in Government were to accept these Soviet claims at full face value. I believe it is the duty of your committee to explore the veracity of this Soviet claim in every conceivable way possible.

I should like to point out briefly some of the reasons why there are valid grounds to question the veracity of the Soviet claim.

You will recall that the first reports that the Soviets successfully launched a man into space began trickling out of Moscow on April 7. It is extremely significant to me that only a short time earlier the Soviet Union had removed all censorship on news dis-

patches emanating from Moscow. Obviously the Soviets wanted world journalists to report these carefully planted rumors as extensively as possible.

On April 11 the London Daily Worker ran a story which gave the first official color to rumors emanating from Moscow that an astronaut had been successfully launched by the Soviets. The Daily Worker's details, published 24 hours before the Soviet Union's announcement on April 12, differed relatively little from the official announcement.

It is my firm conviction that the Soviet Union had hoped to confirm the rumors probably on April 11, but were frustrated in their carefully laid plans when the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration disclosed, following the London Daily Worker story, that American satellite tracking networks had not reported any recent space launchings by the Soviet Union. I believe this announcement by NASA threw a serious block into Russia's propaganda coup, and it is for this reason that apparently Moscow chose to ignore its official spokesman in London, the London Daily Worker, an hurriedly launched a vehicle into space Wednesday morning.

Space Pilot Gagarin's story seems to be full of significant contradictions. Major Gagarin was quoted extensively by Tass as describing what he had seen of the earth from his space vehicle, including the statement that he saw a blue rim separating the atmosphere of the earth from that of outer space. The talkative pilot told about seeing the cities and coastal boundaries, and even embellished his account with a strong plug for Russia's Sovetized collective farms.

But, according to the Associated Press reports from Florence, Italy, on April 14 Russia's chief delegate to a space-science symposium in Italy said the Soviet astronaut had no portholes or windows to look out of during his flight around the earth. A. A. Blagonravov, of the Soviet Academy of Science, was quoted by Associated Press newsmen as stating that Major Gagarin saw all these details of the earth by radio. Even assuming that by the word "radio" Blagonravov meant television, it is highly doubtful that the Soviets would place a color television camera into Gagarin's spaceship so that he could distinguish the various colors and brightness of the sun, which he so eloquently described in his interview.

The Soviet Union has released photographs of Gagarin allegedly leaving his spaceship; and in his own account, he told of how the reverse rockets went into operation to slow down the speed of his ship on his return to earth and said that he finally felt a thump which to him indicated that he was back on earth.

Yet, on April 14 the Associated Press reported from Moscow that a Soviet scientist and a tractor driver suggested that Gagarin left his space capsule at some point during his descent to earth and parachuted the rest of the way to the ground. The Associated Press, quoting a Tass News Agency story, quotes the Soviet scientist, Nikolai Gurovsky, as saying: "The astronaut came down smoothly in a glade near a field. Landing on both feet, even without tumbling, he walked up to the people who saw him first."

The AP story further quotes how a Soviet tractor driver, Ivan Rudenko, working near his field station saw the landing: "Rudenko saw well the landing of the space ship. He said the cosmonaut parachuted down close to where he was."

I do not question that Gagarin landed on the field, but he could have accomplished this sort of parachute jump from any Soviet airplane and not necessarily a space capsule.

Of particular interest in this AP dispatch is the statement that Tass admitted that the day before the landing a Soviet newsman visited the farm (where the capsule landed) and saw a field that had been plowed, presumably to soften the landing. The significance of this particular statement in suggesting further that the Soviet claims are a fraud is the fact that Western space experts have pointed out that an error of 1 yard per second in adjusting the space capsule speed as it returned to earth would have hurled the rocket 30 miles from the landing zone.

It is highly doubtful—or at least is subject to serious question—whether the Soviets or any other nation can develop a technique of premeasurement to pinpoint a landing of a space capsule within such narrow tolerances. We know that Soviet experiments with capsules in the Pacific have missed their mark by a much wider area than claimed in this latest Russian alleged accomplishment.

It is indeed most significant to me, and I trust will be sufficiently significant to you and your committee to justify this investigation, that the Soviet Union has showed the world only the most meager evidence to support its claim of placing a man into space. On the other hand, the entire world was permitted to view by television the heroic welcome given Major Gagarin in Moscow.

I believe the time has come when the free world must go beyond the scope of normal assumption in dealing with Soviet claims.

It is perfectly permissible for the Soviet Union to capitalize to the fullest on the propaganda value of such a claim, but I believe those of us in Congress, who have a responsibility to the American people, should make every effort to place these Soviet claims in their proper perspective.

In further support of my request that your committee undertake this investigation immediately, I should like to recall for you the conduct of the Soviet Union during the U–2 incident. You will recall that President Eisenhower went to Paris determined to deal firmly with the Soviet Union on the question of many problems involving world peace; and the Communists again, finding themselves in a hopeless situation of no retreat, staged a similar propaganda coup around the U–2 incident. That particular propaganda succeeded in wrecking the summit conference. I hope your committee will not permit this latest space revelation by the Soviets to wreck President Kennedy's efforts to bring a just solution to the Laotian crisis.

I am perfectly willing to give the Soviets all the recognition they deserve in scientific accomplishment, but I, as one Member of Congress, have no intention of letting the Communists deceive me, particularly when I am reminded of their long history of deception since the very founding of the Communist Party.

I trust you will order a complete investigation as quickly as possible.

Sincerely yours,

ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
Member of Congress.

Business Under Suspicion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal of April 14. It points up once more the fact that we have an Achilles heel and that it is well known and very vulnerable.

We seem to have a mania for apologizing for our successes and magnifying our failures. Of course, historically speaking, our greatest success has been in commerce and industry, so we now see an administration dedicated to making business the "whipping boy" and putting swarms of two-bit bureaucrats in charge of the whipping.

This of course is a splendid picture to hold up to the world, especially to the Soviet Union who never indulges in any such masochism, but proclaims always that everything is for the best in the Communist world:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 14, 1961]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—BUSINESS UNDER SUSPICION

The administration is losing no time making clear its attitude toward the business community—and in case anyone thought otherwise, it is not a friendly one.

Recent statements by high officials have far too freely tossed around terms like "corruption" and "economic racketeering," accompanied by assorted threats and warnings. A flock of indictments, like the new General Motors diesel locomotive one, is promised. At the same time Senator KEFAUVER, indefatigable in his efforts to discredit business, is trying to make hay out of the electrical price-fixing cases already disposed of in court after being exposed by the Eisenhower administration.

Now this newspaper happens to believe in the proper enforcement of the antitrust laws; it has no sympathy for price fixers or other business transgressors; and it certainly does not oppose congressional investigations as such. But all that is far different from a general Government attempt to cast suspicion on the whole business community. If that is what Washington is setting out to do, it is not a healthy matter for anyone, including Government.

It must be wondered what some of these people think American business is, anyway. Too often, in the past as well as in the present, they sound as though they thought that American prosperity, the envy of the world, just happened; either that or it was the creation of labor unions or of government.

But it didn't just happen. The free economic interaction of millions of individuals trying to make a living and better their living for themselves and their families is what created the prosperity. It is what has provided the capital investment for the workingman as a result of which he has no peer in the world.

Not least, it is this kind of economic activity—which is to say business—that supports and indeed makes possible the Government and its manifold projects, including the vital one of defense. What would Government be without Henry Ford's development of the assembly line?

So there is something distasteful about this sneering at business, for it amounts to sneering at the American people in general. Beyond that, Federal officials sometimes evidence no awareness of the developing and changing character of business over the years. Their conception of it seems pre-20th century if not prehistoric.

In an earlier era in this country the task of scratching a living was much tougher for everyone, at least in a physical sense. But as the economic structure developed shape and strength, a humanizing of the machine society developed with it. Today's business concerns are solicitous, to an extent unbelievable a hundred years ago, of the well-being of their employees and their communities; in a word, of the public good.

It is today's business concerns, moreover, which seek to extend the trend toward a one-class (meaning middle class) society by in-

viting employee ownership, among other ways. It is the union leaders who oppose this, who remain committed to the shibboleths of a class struggle of an outworn era.

The point is not, of course, that business should have a "friend" in the White House, as organized labor so long had. The point is that Government should understand what business is and try to foster business expansion not because it is business but because it is the national economy.

How in the world can a government talk seriously about promoting economic growth and at the same time indiscriminately attack, in word and deed, the business community which is the only source of economic growth we have?

No one reading the Democratic platform last summer would have any reason to expect a Democratic businessman's administration in Washington. But one might have expected in practice a little more realism, a little more maturity, about the facts of American economic life.

Shall We Put an End to the Nuclear Airplane?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services I have been troubled by the decision announced recently by the Department of Defense not to proceed with development of a nuclear-powered aircraft. I recognize that the technical problems in such a project are enormous. I recognize too that oftentimes our military leaders would prefer to have a weapon in the hand than one in the bush.

But can we really hope to make progress by taking counsel only of our fears? Can we really expect to move ahead in a highly technical and competitive world merely by reciting the difficulties that lie ahead? Was there any clear-cut military requirement for a nuclear submarine when Admiral Rickover was waging his uphill fight to develop that great craft, or was it only after the admiral proved that his ideas were indeed feasible that our military leaders recognized that there was not only a military requirement for a nuclear submarine but in a very real sense the nuclear submarine would actually give the Navy a new and vastly greater lease on life in a changing and up-to-date defense field?

Mr. Speaker, because of the sizable interest in nuclear aircraft in my home city of Schenectady, and because of the close connection between this project and the General Electric Co. whose home is located in Schenectady, I insert at this point an editorial which appeared in the Schenectady Gazette for April 14, 1941. The editorial follows:

NUCLEAR PLANE

Is it wise for the Defense Department to abandon the project for the nuclear-powered plane? The average citizen cannot say. On the one hand he hears the President say the project is too expensive and that the "possibility of achieving a militarily useful (nuclear) aircraft in the foreseeable future is still very remote." And there is the opinion of Defense Secretary McNamara that the military nuclear plane "would have little or no military value" because of its huge size, slow speed and radiation dangers.

On the other hand the citizen has the word of the developers of nuclear propulsion equipment, such as General Electric, that the nuclear plane is available not in the dim, distant future but in a relatively short time. In the opinion of Dr. Miles C. Leverett, president of the American Nuclear Society and manager of GE aircraft nuclear propulsion, the Russian "certainly are working" on such a plane and he believes they are "as far along as we are, or even farther."

General Electric contends that the administration is mistaken about the cost of development from this point on—provided there is no long delay. GE has offered to make the first experimental flight test of a nuclear-powered plane in 1963 for less than one-fifth of what the administration said it would cost.

If one of these days the Russians announce they have a workable nuclear-powered military or nonmilitary plane the U.S. Government perhaps will point to important differences in defense strategy between the two governments. Yet, if the lesson of sputnik has been learned, one doubts that Washington would dismiss it as of no importance, because it could be assumed that even if the Russian nuclear plane at first was huge, slow and had radiation dangers, the improvements that usually follow the development of a new craft or weapon would justify the initial effort.

The purpose of the administration seems to be to divert funds from a nuclear plane to other defense weapons, craft or methods with the idea of increasing the ability to fight limited wars. The citizen can only hope the administration's decision is wise.

In Defense of Innovators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD four items of comment related to a subject currently agitating the country. The first is an article "In Defense of Innovators," written by Bernice Harrell Chipman for the February 13, 1961, issue of the Bakersfield Californian. The second is an April 11, 1961, editorial from the same newspaper. The third is an April 3, 1961, editorial of the Hanford Sentinel. The fourth is a comment from the February 1961, edition of the Standard Oiler, a trade publication of the Standard Oil Co. of California. The articles follow:

IN DEFENSE OF INNOVATORS
(By Bernice Harrell Chipman)

That people are funny has been fully established by a not-so-funny radio personality, and one of the characteristics which seems to me most funny—peculiar and disheartening is that of the closed mind, the mind that cannot, or will not, accept ideas or art forms differing from a pattern set by personality, predilection or environment.

There is something horrifying to these persons with their feet planted firmly in the past, in modern experiments in sound, color, and thought. They turn their backs on the new art, they leave the concert when the modern music is played, they cry heresy or communism in response to ideas to which they are unaccustomed. And they use that terrible cliche—I don't know anything about art—but I know what I like. Nothing could be more fallacious. True—they don't know anything about art—but they don't know what they like either, for they like only what is familiar, and take no opportunity to know or like anything else.

It is always enlightening to note that the innovators of yesterday are the conservatives of today. At the time of the Panama-Pacific Exposition in San Francisco in 1915, there was a room devoted to the modern art of that time, including "The Nude Descending the Stairs." It became known as the "Oh, My God-Room" from the exclamations of those who met its impact for the first time, yet many of these pictures would cause not even a ripple of excitement today. To see an exhibit of the 20th century moderns which aroused such arguments in art circles in their time, Manet, Cezanne, Renoir, Van Gogh, is to enjoy their light and beauty without comprehension of the carping of their contemporaries.

So we should give some thought to understanding what is being attempted by our own moderns, the as-yet-strange art forms—or lack of form, in painting and sculpture—and in music the dissonances and discords which are, perhaps, opening new areas of listening. We don't have to like them. We don't need to accept them just because the forms are new and different and break with our preconceived ideas, but we should for our own sake make an effort to know what the artist is trying to do, and to decide by how much he has met his own requirements.

It is only by experiment in any field that further dimensions are explored, and expanded or discarded. We can't listen to Bach, Brahms, and Beethoven all our lives, but they too were innovators in their time. Wagner was hooted and hated for dissonances which we now accept and acclaim as tuneful and melodic. An art which does not attempt to open new avenues of expression is dead, indeed.

And those who think all portraits should look like Sargents even though he was much criticized in his day, or like Whistler's Mother which was a break with contemporary portraiture, that all landscapes should look like Constable or, perhaps, Keith, that all music should sound like Chopin, or maybe, "America the Beautiful," and that all poetry should sound like Longfellow—these are the people who, in the field of ideas, fear each new concept, who would like to abolish the United Nations, who would make the United States an island isolated from the world, and who would ride backward with Senator GOLDWATER into a past that will never come again.

For some strange reason individuals following this pattern have some vague idea that they are upholding the American way of life, that way which was—and is—the greatest experiment of all time. Communism is our enemy, both without and within our country, but the closed mind is not its adversary as many who pride themselves on their ultraconservatism seem to think, but, on the contrary, its able ally and assistant, shutting out in its every attitude the wonderful possibilities of advancement through freedom to find new expressions, which is the real enemy of communistic ideology.

TOP G-MAN WARNS AGAINST HYSTERIA

Sensible advice has come to the American people from J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, regarding

the proper way in which to conduct themselves in the present period of confusion and doubt and involving the appearance of movements assertedly devoted to the extermination of communism on the domestic scene. Mr. Hoover, whose position as Chief of the leading Government investigating agency, is able to speak with authority on the subject.

Although the country, he says, is engaged in "a mortal struggle with world communism, it is time for both citizens and governmental authorities to confront this threat in a calm, realistic, rational, law-abiding manner." He reminds the people of America that this land, among other things, is "historically an impregnable force against tyranny," which reminds us that there must be recognition and rejection of any movement, whatever its nature, that has within it the seeds of tyranny and authoritarianism.

Mr. Hoover, observing that the Communists find it easy going in a country convulsed by fear, hysteria and confusion, warns against what he describes as "the danger of irresponsible counteraction by citizens who lend impetus to communism through inept attempts to fight this insidious menace."

Mindful of the present discussion regarding an organization much in the news, no doubt, Mr. Hoover points out that the Communist leader Lenin urged the exploitation of every rift that appeared among those who are opposed to the extension of this doctrine, and he notes that "there exists today in our land a vital rift which the Communists are exploiting. Unfortunately, this involves certain people across the country who engage in reckless charges against one another. The label Communist is too often indiscriminately attached to those whose views differ from the majority."

This warning is particularly appropriate at this time and coming from Mr. Hoover, a dedicated opponent of all un-Americanism, it is of vital importance.

Mr. Hoover also points out that the job of curtailing and containing communism is one for legally constituted authorities with the steadfast cooperation of every loyal citizen; this is neither the time for inaction nor vigilante action. He urges the people of this Nation to unite, understand our basic American heritage under law and face the Communist menace with deliberation, quiet courage and knowledge.

We commend Mr. Hoover's counsel to all who seek to preserve the American freedoms and oppose communism and other doctrines that thrive on bigotry, intolerance, ignorance, slander, and fear.

PARANOID FASCISM

The bright glare of publicity is the most effective antidote to such an outbreak of political disease in the United States as the John Birch Society seems to be.

Newspaper stories such as the series published in the Sentinel last week show the organization for what it is, a Fascist movement, pure and simple.

It is not the first time in this country that Fascist movements have been mounted. During the dark days of the thirties, when our national economy seemed to be in serious trouble, there were many who saw in authoritarian government the only salvation for the Nation. There were also many, in those days, who saw salvation at the other extreme, in the Russian experiment. Fortunately, for the country, neither of the extreme views prevailed.

The Birch Society has the marks of fascism. Its leader openly denounces the democratic process. He attempts to repudiate our national leaders, and tries to make the American people doubt the patriotism of such irreproachable men as former President Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, Chief Justice Earl Warren, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, and others, by saying they are Communists or tools of the Communists.

The Birch Society attempts to discredit our churches and religious leaders. It attacks the integrity of newspapers.

Its methods are the opposite of democratic. By organizing into tight cells controlled rigidly from the top, discouraging free speech, and urging the members to accuse and denounce fellow citizens without proof of wrongdoing of formal charge—by these methods and others the Birchers show their colors.

The founder of the movement, Robert Welch, realizes the danger of publicity to his movement. He has attempted to keep the organization secret and have its members operate clandestinely.

But secrecy is repugnant to the American people and the secrets of the Birchers are now public knowledge.

Thus informed, the American people will know the Birch group for what it is, and the Nation will not be fooled.

[From the Standard Oiler, Feb. 1961]

DISSENT? PARTY LINE

The tendency to confuse legitimate dissent on controversial issues with the Communist Party line is an ever-present danger in these critical times.

"Communism," says FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, "feeds on social ferment. On both the local and national levels, the Communist Party, U.S.A., is continually exploiting social, economic, and political grievances for its own tactical purposes.

"For this reason, the party line will frequently coincide with the views of many non-Communists on specific issues. We must not, therefore, indiscriminately label as Communists those whose opinions on a particular question may, on occasion, parallel the official party position. We must also guard against the tendency to characterize as Communists those who merely disagree with us or who advocate unorthodox or unpopular beliefs.

"When anyone is erroneously branded a Communist, it not only constitutes an injustice to the individual but also helps communism by diffusing the strength of the anti-Communist forces."

The Constitution and What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to offer in the RECORD the essay entitled "The Constitution and What It Means," by Paul Murphy, of Alliance, Ohio, one of the 12 winners in the American Legion essay contest for our State.

Paul, a junior science seminar student at Alliance High School, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Murphy, won this award in his first attempt at essay competition.

Reading this and other entries in this fine competition gives me faith that the young people of our country do understand and appreciate our constitutional system:

THE AMERICAN LEGION OF OHIO ESSAY CONTEST—THE CONSTITUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS

What does the Constitution of the United States mean? It means, to 180 million Americans, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It means to 50 different governments a ligament of national unity. And it is to millions of freedom searching people overseas a symbol of all that they hope and die for.

What is life? Life is the right to live and let live. It is freedom from fear of death at the hands of the government for unjust reasons.

What is liberty? It is the right to do as we please so long as we harm or injure no others while doing it. Our liberty is thoroughly and emphatically protected by the first 10 amendments, the Bill of Rights. In the Bill of Rights we are irrevocably given freedom of the press, of speech, of religion, of petition, and of assembly. We are free from unjust criminal prosecution and from cruel and unusual punishment. And we have a right to a trial by a jury and the right to keep and to bear arms.

What is the pursuit of happiness? In America it is the right to seek and enjoy fun, security, and contentment in any way that is not injurious to others. In some parts of the world this simple privilege is nonexistent.

Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, each is meaningless without the other two but combined they make our American way of life the envy of the entire world.

Why is national unity as is provided by the Constitution vital to the 50 States and people living in them? Let us look to history for the answer. During the weak years under the Articles of Confederation our country almost went the way of Latin America. Our great country almost broke up into 13 constantly bickering little countries which never could have reached the pinnacle of world power and leadership. Instead of being a world power as we are today, we, without our Constitution, would be today divided, poor, and politically insignificant. As Thomas Jefferson, the drafter of the immortal Declaration of Independence and our third President, said, "The Constitution is * * * the ark of our safety."

Why is the Constitution of the United States of America a symbol of all of those who yearn for freedom—of all that they hope someday to obtain? They who yearn for freedom have not only tasted oppression but have had to swallow it whole. When they look across the sea and see Americans happily and industriously working for their country and themselves they are even more desirous of freedom. It is plain to see that if given their free and unobstructed choice, men would always choose life in a free and democratic country rather than life in a country in which each individual is just another ant on the hill.

Americans have many reasons for giving thanks to God, but they should be especially thankful that He planted wisdom and judgment in the minds of the drafters of the Constitution of the United States of America.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication from the members of the Illinois General Assembly enclosing a copy of House Joint Resolution 6, as adopted in the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, relative

to Federal aid to education, especially allowing a tax deduction for all tuition, whether paid to a public or fully accredited college or university, and, in addition, allowing parents a tax deduction of $1,500 for each child or dependent they may send to any fully accredited college or university.

The resolution follows herewith:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Springfield, April 12, 1961.

Hon. ROLAND VICTOR LIBONATI,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LIBONATI: As authorized, I am enclosing herewith a copy of House Joint Resolution 6, as adopted in the 72d General Assembly of this State.

Sincerely,
CHARLES F. CARPENTIER,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ILLINOIS, 72D GENERAL ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 6

(Offered by Messrs. Burks, Noble W. Lee, Coulson, Dolezal, Clarke, Alsup, C. A. Walker, Finfgeld, Butler, Branson, Heiple, Conti, Jack Walker, Williams, Marek, Hoffelder, Fitzgerrell, Hoover, Hachmeister, Reum, McDevitt, Robinson, Hansen, Ralph T. Smith, Casey, Erlenborn, Parkhurst, E. E. Dale, and Mrs. Dawson.)

Whereas it is undisputedly recognized that there is an urgent need to expand our schools and colleges, both public and private, to provide our exploding school-age population with the best possible education; and

Whereas private schools should be encouraged in their efforts to attract students in order to lighten the burden which will fall upon the taxpayer for the enormous expansion of State-supported schools and colleges; and

Whereas private schools and colleges should be allowed to compete on a more equal basis with tax-supported schools and colleges; and

Whereas the citizen who pays taxes to meet all or a large portion of the tuition for students who attend public schools and State universities is allowed to use such taxpayments as a deduction in reporting his Federal income tax but is denied such tax deduction for tuition paid private schools and colleges to which he may elect to send his children; and

Whereas the Federal Government is now considering some form of aid to education, and also the possibility of some tax relief to stimulate the national economy; and

Whereas by making all tuition a tax deduction, whether paid to a public or private school, the Congress would be providing an effective form of Federal aid to education without any risk of Federal control of education; without the diluting process of having such aid filtered through Washington; and would, at the same time, be providing a stimulant to the economy by this form of tax relief: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein):

(1) That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation allowing a tax deduction for all tuition, whether paid to a public, or fully accredited not-for-profit private school, or to any fully accredited college or university and, in addition, allowing parents a tax deduction of $1,500 for each child or dependent they may send to any fully accredited college or university.

(2) That this resolution does not constitute an approval of any other form of Federal aid to education.

(3) That suitable copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States and the Members of Congress from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house, March 7, 1961.
PAUL POWELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
CHAS F. KERVIN,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the senate, March 22, 1961.
SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate,
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

Address by Chief Justice Earl Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 1961, Yeshiva University bestowed upon Chief Justice Earl Warren an honorary doctor of laws degree at an academic convocation.

I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the text of the address of the Chief Justice on that occasion:

ADDRESS BY CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN AT CONVOCATION OF YESHIVA UNIVERSITY, MARCH 26, 1961

How pleasant it is in these turbulent times, when the news of the day pyramids one crisis upon another throughout the world, to join in a convocation of students and scholars who are searching for truth, and who subscribe to the principle that the welfare of our society and of the individuals in it depends upon the vigor and soundness of our moral and spiritual values. It is inspiring to celebrate the opening of still another decade of growth of a great university which is dedicated to that principle—for it is to that principle that our Nation owes its rise to greatness; and upon the preservation of that principle rest our hopes for the future.

There are far too many flaws in the pattern of our life to permit us to relax on the comfortable assumption that our progress is inevitable, without added effort or concentration of purpose on our part. Each day we are confronted with shocking evidence of departures from our moral and spiritual standards so extensive and in such responsible quarters as to undermine the respect in which we are held throughout the world. How we may rise above these deficiencies is the great present-day problem of our Nation. If we wish to stand before the world as a good nation as well as a great one, it must be accomplished through education, and education on the broadest possible base.

We have made great progress in the past, but our problem today is to continue to grow in moral and spiritual stature in a world which is increasingly blinded by cynicism and materialism and which too often makes a fetish of conformity. Our Nation has gained depth and maturity of judgment and has avoided the barrenness of conformity because we have nurtured within our society many priceless strains of thought, religion, tradition, and historical perspective. We have preserved within our national unity a rich variety of cultures—and they have given us intellectual and spiritual strength.

Our Nation is composed of many divergent ethnic groups and religious persuasions. It is our national purpose to live together in harmony and with a mutual understanding of each others aims and ambitions. And in this Nation there is no other city in which this divergence is more sympathetically preserved and its rich rewards more fully appreciated than in this great city of New York.

It is comforting to feel that the tenets of this university and the occasion of this convocation are in harmony with that purpose of our Nation and with the life of this great metropolitan area. They are in keeping, too, with the history and traditions of American education. Higher education in this country came into being very largely through the establishment of seminaries and colleges by various religious groups. The best of these religious educational institutions survived—some as small colleges, others as great universities encompassing all of the complex facets of modern higher education. In the aggregate, these colleges and universities of religious origin constitute the heart of our system of higher education—the leaven in the loaf of our intellectual bread.

State universities and colleges are latecomers in the field of higher education in this Nation. In the main public institutions of higher education are now little over a century old—and most of them were antedated by private colleges and universities by a century or even two.

Many state colleges and universities are truly great educational institutions, and perform a service which is essential to the welfare of our Nation. But these fine public institutions can only achieve their highest efficiency if they are compelled to meet the competition of private institutions, both secular and religious, where the pursuit of knowledge is wholly beyond the influence of Government.

Competition between public and private institutions of higher education does indeed exist; and it is desirable that it should. But this competition is a friendly rivalry which flows from each striving to achieve a higher level of excellence. This is a kind of competition which can never be cheapened by selfish or unworthy desires. Neither its means nor its ends can be tainted with evil. In the competition for excellence none who participate need fall by the wayside—all may take from the struggle added strength and dignity and usefulness—and these fruits will come in increasing abundance to both sides in direct proportion to the intensity of the competition between them.

The men and women who possess the vision to see the good that can come to our people from this fruitful competition, and who have the means and the generosity to make it possible by supporting our fine private colleges and universities, are entitled to our deepest thanks and to all of the personal satisfaction that flows from the performance of a truly worthy deed.

It is commonly asserted that America is on trial before the world. It is at least accurate to say that masses of men yet uncommitted are in the process of making a choice among systems of social organization, and that in every quarter of the world our system is being compared—in philosophy and in performance—with others which are antagonistic to it. If we care about the outcome of this comparison, if we are concerned with the choice which the new nations of the earth will make, then it is of the greatest importance to us that our institutions of higher education be dedicated to the unremitting pursuit of excellence.

If we are to be judged by the extent to which our Government functions effectively and in the interests of every individual in our Nation, then we must develop a degree of excellence among our political scientists and governmental leaders which will aid us in attaining that end. The present recruitment of scholars in the political science field by the National Government demonstrates

both that the need is real and that the leaders of our Government are aware of its existence.

If the unsolved social and economic problems of our country are to be considered the products of our system—as surely they will be—then nothing less than high excellence in analyzing these problems and searching out effective solutions can demonstrate the value of our institutions.

If the survival of our Nation is to depend upon the effectiveness of our defense, if national stature is to be measured by our success in the exploration of space, if we are to be judged on the basis of our accomplishments in pushing back the frontiers of knowledge in all of the fields of science vital to the comfort, health, and safety of man—surely then we must, through our schools, strive for a new excellence in all of the scientific disciplines.

If we really believe in a just and living God, then, in large part through the dedicated efforts of our educational institutions, we must achieve an excellence not yet achieved in spiritual power and in public and private morals, so that we may do worthily those things that will, in time, bring about peace through good will among the peoples of the world.

Much has been said by way of comparison of the number of engineers, the number of scientists, the number of sociologists and economists, the number of students of government, that are being educated in other nations of the world and in our own. Numbers are important—for the problem is vast. We must have enough trained men and women to solve the immediate problems and to develop the ultimate potential not only of our own Nation but also of other great areas of the earth.

Yet I wonder if it is not of far greater importance that we produce minds and hearts dedicated to the achievement of excellence—excellence in the natural and social sciences and in the realm of the spirit. If excellence becomes our preoccupation we can well afford to be optimistic about the outcome of any competition for the minds of men, for eventually the world will surely honor excellence wherever it appears.

Scores of nations even now emerging from conditions which sometimes approach the primeval are searching among the institutions and the ideals of older states for the pattern best suited to the basic needs of man. If we believe that man does have a soul which spurs him constantly to search for improvement and for truth, we can be confident that our striving after excellence will be heeded by peoples everywhere.

We will measure up to the responsibilities that history has imposed upon us only if we chart a course which makes freedom a living thing for every citizen of our land, and which gives to other nations of the world an abiding conviction of our devotion to peace with honor to all. The sure basis for success in this endeavor is the unremitting pursuit of excellence through institutions like your own. I wish you Godspeed in your efforts, and I promise you as your sufficient reward the deep satisfaction that flows from accomplishments in the interest of humankind.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

House passed bill amending Space Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held Tuesday, April 18, at 10 a.m.

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

MILITARY PROCUREMENT—ARMY

Committee on Armed Services: Committee, in executive session, received testimony in behalf of proposed authorizations for Army procurement of aircraft and missiles from Maj. Gen. L. J. Lincoln, Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, who was accompanied by his associates.

Committee recessed subject to call of the Chair.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the nominations of Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs; Phillips Talbot, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs; Teodoro Moscoso, of Puerto Rico, to be Ambassador to Venezuela; Leon B. Poullada, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Togo; James Loeb, of New York, to be Ambassador to Peru; Dr. Noah N. Langdale, Jr., of Georgia, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange; Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, to be Ambassador to Mexico; and Robert F. Woodward, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador to Chile.

Prior to this action, in open session, hearings were held on the nominations of Messrs. McConaughy, Talbot, Moscoso, Poullada, and Loeb, where the nominees testified and answered questions on their own behalf.

IDENTICAL BIDDING IN ELECTRICAL INDUSTRY

Committee on the Judiciary: The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee continued its hearings concerning identical bidding in the electrical manufacturing industry, having as its witnesses John C. Fink, manager, distribution apparatus department, Westinghouse Electric Corp., East Pittsburgh Division, Bloomington, Ind.; Alva Alexander Johnson, manager, assembled switchgear and devices department, Westinghouse Electric Corp., East Pittsburgh, Pa.; Donald Ray Jenkins, medium turbine sales manager, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Lester, Pa.; and R. J. Bunch, manager, condenser and ejector sales, Ingersoll-Rand Co., New York City.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 40 public bills, H.R. 6345–6384; 10 private bills, H.R. 6385–6394; and 6 resolutions, H.J. Res. 373–376, and H. Con. Res. 219 and 220, were introduced. Pages 5665–5666

Bill Reported: One report was filed as follows: H.R. 6345, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1962, filed on April 14 (H. Rept. 233). Page 5665

Order of Business: Agreed to dispense with the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday, also to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business of April 19. Page 5645

Consent Calendar: On the call of the Consent Calendar the House passed the following bill with amendments:

Arizona public lands: H.R. 3507, to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Departments of the Air Force and the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Luke-Williams Air Force Range, Yuma, Ariz., for defense purposes.

Passed over without prejudice: H.R. 861 and H.J. Res. 73. Pages 5646–5650

Suspension Passages: By voice votes the House suspended the rules and passed the following bills:

Vessel construction subsidy: H.R. 2457, to clarify the construction subsidy provisions with respect to recon-

Appendix

Death of John A. Willo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Slovak-Americans were saddened by the death on April 1 of John A. Willo of Youngstown, Ohio. Mr. Willo not only was a prominent and active member in the Slovenian community but had served as the law director of Youngstown. He was a founder and first president of the Slovak-American Political Federation and was named to many local, State, and national positions in Slovak organizations. All Ohio and especially our Slovenian community mourns his passing.

I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the Falcon, the official organ of the Slovak Catholic Sokol be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

JOHN A. WILLO, AMERICAN-SLOVAK FRATERNALIST, DIED

Attorney John A. Willo, 71, of 480 Wildwood Drive, Youngstown, Ohio, prominent Slovak-American fraternalist and former Youngstown law director, died April 1 at 2:25 a.m. in St. Elizabeth Hospital. He had been ill several years.

Attorney Willo, who had offices in the Union National Bank Building, had practiced law in Youngstown since graduating from Columbia Law School in 1914. He was one of the first Slovak lawyers in Youngstown and was a colorful member of Mayor William B. Spagnola's cabinet from 1940 to 1943.

Funeral services were held at 10:30 a.m. Tuesday at the Vaschak Funeral Home and 11 a.m. in SS. Cyril and Methodius Church. Members of the Mahoning County Bar Association met at 10:45 a.m. Tuesday at the church to attend services in a group.

A member of the city park and recreation commission for 2 years before his appointment as law director, Attorney Willo worked closely with the late park superintendent, Tommy Pemberton. As a youth he had played amateur baseball and basketball and helped organize one of the first Slovak teams.

At Columbia, Attorney Willo was one of the founders and first president of the Slovak-American Political Federation. In 1933 he was elected president of the Youngstown Solvak Society and later was named to various local, State, and National positions in Slovak organizations.

He was general counsel of the National Slovak Society 25 years and also president of the Ohio Fraternal Congress of the society, the Fraternal Society Law Association and the Mahoning Valley Assembly of the Slovak League of America. He served on the board of the National Fraternal Congress.

Attorney Willo was born March 25, 1890, in Youngstown, a son of Michael and Caroline Roth Willo. His father operated a Boardman Street boarding house which was a popular meeting place for immigrant Slovaks.

He attended St. Joseph School, Canisius Preparatory School, Holy Cross College, Georgetown University, and Columbia University.

At Holy Cross Attorney Willo was chosen grand marshal on "Holy Cross Night," the highest honor students could confer on one of their fellows. At Columbia, he was a founder and first dean of the Dwight Senate of Delta Theta Phi, a law fraternity.

During his early activity as a Slovak official, he traveled to many States to fight taxation planned against fraternal insurance organizations. The National Slovak Society is one of the oldest such groups in the country.

Attorney Willo also served as president of the Northeastern Ohio Chapter of Holy Cross Alumni and the Youngstown Bridge Club in the 1950's.

He was a member of Mahoning, Trumbull, State and National bar associations, the Elks Club, and SS. Cyril and Methodius Church, of which his father was a founder. He also belonged to the First Catholic Slovak Union, Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, Zivena Beneficial Society, Protected Home Circle, Croatian Fraternal Union, Ukrainian National Aid Association and Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol.

Attorney Willo leaves his wife, the former Veronica O'Brien of Boston, whom he married in 1912, and a sister, Mrs. Stephen J. Slifka of Youngstown, former supreme financial secretary of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the 10th in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

GOODLETT INTERVIEWS MISPLACED IN TIME

"They sleep around the bars, and the grass, and the packinghouses around the lake area, in the parks. Any place they can find to sleep and rest for a few hours."—Chief Goodlett in "Harvest of Shame."

Belle Glade Police Chief Charles Goodlett regrets now that he went hunting last November 25 and missed the "Harvest of Shame" broadcast.

But the chief said other residents of the community who saw the show told him his statements made during the interview were distorted.

Interviewed at his office, Goodlett obviously didn't like the manner in which the film was presented.

The chief said he told David Lowe, who questioned him for the show, about certain conditions existing in the community when he took office 13 years ago.

Because of the shortage of housing at that time, he said, many migrants had no place to sleep and used the parks, the lake area, the packing houses and other areas.

"But the film made it appear that condition still prevails," Goodlett said. "Actually, it doesn't. There has been a great improvement in housing for the migrants, in schools and recreation."

Most migrants living in the city pay $7 or $8 a week for 2-room apartments, the chief said.

Goodlett said he was interviewed for 45 minutes. But persons who saw the show made it clear to him, he said, that all of the improvements he mentioned were edited out of the film.

"I have suggested the network make a second film from the portions that were deleted from the various interviews," he said wryly.

The chief said he still gets telephone calls, letters and postcards from persons in the north who saw the show and want to help.

"One woman called me and said she was ready to send a truckload of food," he said. "She couldn't understand why I didn't jump at the chance to ask her to send it on down. She thought all of our people were starving."

The officer said he finally told the caller CBS had spent months shooting the film and that portions of it were almost a year old when shown.

"Any conditions at that time would be changed by now," he said, "and I explained to her that the film didn't show a true picture of conditions here."

Goodlett showed a postcard from a South Carolina man who offered permanent employment to a family.

"But there's more to it than making jobs available," he said. "There is a need to inspire in these people a desire for self-improvement."

The chief, a native of Alabama, said he himself in the past has found permanent jobs for some migrants.

"Many of them say they want out of the migrant stream," he said, "but I found that when June rolled around they started getting that faraway look in their eyes, and pretty soon they were gone."

Others, though, he said, have found it possible to break out of the migrant stream when given the chance.

Belle Glade has made great progress in improving the living conditions of its migrants,

the chief said, and he cited the availability of two swimming pools during warmer weather.

"In the last 13 years, the city has made 50 years of progress," he said.

Goodlett said he and Lowe became good friends while the show was being filmed. "I liked him," he said.

"After he left, he used to call me about once a week," the chief continued. "But a funny thing—he hasn't called me since the broadcast."

Stevenson Emerges as Powerful Figure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, published in the Minneapolis Tribune of April 14, 1961, entitled "Stevenson Emerges as Powerful Figure," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article describes the splendid work which is being carried out by our Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Adlai Stevenson. It points out the high regard and respect in which Ambassador Stevenson is held by the members of the United Nations and, indeed, the outstanding job he is doing in behalf of American policies.

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

STEVENSON EMERGES AS POWERFUL FIGURE—HE IS EXERTING UNUSUALLY WIDE INFLUENCE IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE WHITE HOUSE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Viewed from both Washington and the United Nations, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson is emerging as a powerful figure in the Kennedy administration.

This does not mean that the President is not making the final decisions on policy. This does not mean that Secretary of State Dean Rusk is being detoured as Mr. Kennedy's principal adviser on foreign affairs.

It does mean that, on the basis of his experience, initiative, and political prestige at home and abroad, Stevenson is exerting unusually wide influence in the State Department and the White Hoouse.

Whatever coolness there may have been in the past, Stevenson and Mr. Kennedy are now establishing a good working relationship. As a consequence, the President's U.N. Ambassador is today at the center of policy formulation.

Every delegate here is under instruction from his Government. Stevenson is, too. But to a notable extent his recommendations shape his instructions. And beyond that his views on the widest range of foreign policy carry great weight in the top councils of the administration.

It was at Ambassador Stevenson's initiative that the United States for the first time voted with the Afro-Asian nations in their anti-colonial resolution on Angola.

It was Stevenson, in part because of his long personal acquaintance with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, who was called upon to conduct the delicate and important negotiations for resuming the disarmament talks with the Russians.

When British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan was in Washington this past week to meet with President Kennedy, Stevenson took part as well as Secretary Rusk.

Mr. Kennedy needs Stevenson in his administration. The President, aware of his close election, wants to keep the support of Adlai's followers. In addition, Stevenson, through his wide travels, has gotten to know personally more world leaders than anyone in the administration, including the President. This is invaluable for his job as Ambassador at the United Nations. He also brings his gift of articulate speech to the United Nations, perhaps the best forum for Stevenson's talents.

All of these things give Stevenson a voice in cabinet deliberations and a degree of access and influence with the President which is exceptional.

Everything hasn't always gone well. Mr. Kennedy was annoyed no little when Ambassador Stevenson publicly guessed that the President would be glad to see Premier Khrushchev if he decided to come to the United Nations—this when the President did not want to give Khrushchev any encouragement to come. I am also told that Stevenson delivered two speeches, not before the United Nations, which had not been cleared by the State Department.

But these things were in the early period of the administration's takeover—and have not recurred. Rusk and Stevenson have worked together smoothly thus far.

In his job at the United Nations Stevenson is at many points doing things differently than did Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. He is initiating breakfast, luncheon and dinner sessions with the heads of all the 99 delegations, sometimes including wives. For the first time Stevenson, as U.S. representative, let it be known that he would be available to meet with the caucus of the Afro-Asian nations on a common matter. They invited him at once.

There is one intriguing thread of sameness-plus-difference between the Governor and his predecessor. As U.N. Ambassador, Lodge was, to a degree, seeking to make his political reputation while Stevenson is seeking to conserve his political reputation.

It is premature to guess what Stevenson's record will look like when it takes fuller shape. But at this point he is proving a powerful advocate of U.S. policy within the United Nations and an influential spokesman for his own views within the Kennedy administration.

No More Baubles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, confronted by another Russian successful space-spectacular, Americans once again are going through a period of reexaminations in regard to our space effort. This morning the Washington Post carried an editorial entitled "No More Baubles" that, in my opinion, is a most thoughtful, well-balanced assessment of the predicament in which we find ourselves today. Under leave to extend my remarks, I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

NO MORE BAUBLES

In the face of all the publicity and praise the Soviet Union has been receiving for its man-in-space feat, statements about the better balance of American science are bound to appear defensive. Mr. Khrushchev and his colleagues have been exploiting Major Gagarin's flight by every means available, and with devastating effect in some parts of the world.

It is unquestionably true that the United States is far more advanced than the Soviet Union in the broad range of scientific endeavor, and this is probably also true of the meaningful aspects of space exploration. As Howard Simons wrote in this newspaper on Sunday, the Russians go in for splashy projects of propaganda and prestige value. The space vehicle in which Major Gagarin circled the earth appears to have been relatively unsophisticated in many aspects. But it is unnecessary to depreciate the Soviet achievement. The plain fact is that the effort succeeded.

This was possible because the Soviet Union, starting from a vastly more primitive base, has concentrated upon certain specific objectives. Soviet science is respectable in its own right; but the Communist leaders have understood well how to make their science serve a political as well as a scientific purpose. That political purpose, of course, has been to persuade people elsewhere that communism has an irresistible momentum and is the wave of the future.

In this there is an important lesson for the United States. There is no point in either belittling or bemoaning the Soviet man in space; we shall have a man of our own in space at the right moment, and a lot more too. But the utter failure in the past to consider the political importance of being first has been very costly to American prestige.

Enough has been said of the misjudgments. We all have made them. It would be altogether foolish now to stake all our money and effort on some showy project that did not hold real promise of scientific merit and advance. But it ought to be clear that henceforth a wise national policy must inevitably comprehend the potential political reaction as well as the scientific benefit from American programs. We ought at least to be spared any more comments like those which dismissed the first Soviet sputnik as a mere bauble.

Administration Responsibility for Coming Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent article entitled "Kennedy Trying To Blame Eisenhower for Two Deficits," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, written by Mr. Joseph R. Slevin.

This article calls attention to the manner in which the Kennedy administration is trying to dodge their own responsibility for the coming deficits.

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

KENNEDY TRYING TO BLAME EISENHOWER FOR TWO DEFICITS

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—President Kennedy is trying to blame a pair of coming budget deficits on former President Eisenhower, but his own budget figures tell a different story.

The Chief Executive hammered on the Eisenhower-deficit thesis in a special message that he sent to Congress on Friday and Budget Director David E. Bell said it all over again today.

Mr. Bell flatly told the Congressional Joint Economic Committee that the budget deficit now in prospect for fiscal 1962, which begins July 1, "will be the consequence of the overestimation of revenues and underestimation of expenditures" in Mr. Eisenhower's January budget.

Mr. Kennedy repeatedly took the same position Friday. "Should there be a deficit in 1962, it will be the consequence of the overestimation of revenues and underestimation of expenditures in the January budget, and not the result of new policies or programs proposed by this administration," he declared.

The troubling thing about the President's contention is that it just isn't so and constant repetition can only serve to mislead the public.

Mr. Kennedy has been making much of the critical dangers facing the country and of the importance of telling the people the straight, unvarnished facts.

It's a good policy and it's just as applicable to the budget as to any other Government activity.

The President is trying to make a political point and the most immediate consequence has been the submission of one of the most bizarre budget messages on record.

The bulk of the message is devoted to a strained exposition of Mr. Kennedy's claim that the fiscal 1961 and 1962 deficits are Mr. Eisenhower's and the message contains very few budget facts.

The President is afraid that he will be considered "fiscally irresponsible" and that is why he is going to such strenuous lengths to convince Congress and the voters that he is a true believer in sound financial policies and an honest dollar.

The administration now is forecasting that the Federal Government will have a $2,169 million deficit this year instead of the $79 million surplus that Mr. Eisenhower predicted in his January budget message.

Similarly, it is forecasting that the Government will post a $2,126 million deficit next year instead of the $1,468 million surplus that Mr. Eisenhower had predicted. And it has painted the lily by not including defense spending increases that are expected to lift next year's deficit above the $3 billion mark.

What Mr. Kennedy's detailed budget figures disclose is that his spending programs have greatly increased the dimensions of the 1961 and 1962 deficits.

Mr. Eisenhower did overestimate the size of tax collections this year and next and the former President did underestimate the amount that the Government will spend.

But the new Kennedy calculations show that the Government would have had only an $805 million deficit this year if Mr. Kennedy had held to Mr. Eisenhower's policies. Instead, he has proposed additional spending programs that will increase the deficit to $2,169 million.

And the official Kennedy arithmetic shows that the Government would have had only a $704 million deficit next year instead of a deficit of more than $3 billion if Mr. Kennedy had continued Mr. Eisenhower's policies.

But Mr. Kennedy chose to increase civilian and defense spending by several billion dollars. Those were Mr. Kennedy's decisions—not Mr. Eisenhower's.

High National Awards Presented Applied Physics Laboratory of the Johns Hopkins University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, we of the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland have for a long time recognized the important role that the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory in Howard County has been playing in our national defense effort. We, therefore, were not surprised but were extremely gratified when the laboratory and members of the staff received three significant awards for outstanding contributions to Department of Defense research and development programs over the past few months.

In January, Dr. Frank T. McClure, chairman of the applied physich laboratory's research center, was the recipient of the first Invention Award to be made by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It was for Dr. McClure's invention of the Satellite Doppler Navigation System.

A month later, Dr. Richard B. Kershner, supervisor of the space research and development program of the laboratory, was given the Navy's Distinguished Public Service Award for organizing and directing progress evaluation in the Polaris program conducted by the laboratory. The Distinguished Public Service Award is the highest recognition the Navy can give a citizen who is not an employee of the Department of Defense.

During the same ceremony, the applied physics laboratory was awarded the Navy's Certificate of Merit for outstanding service in the field of ballistic missile systems development and analysis. The citation said: "APL contributed immeasurably in achieving the first successful firing of the Polaris missile from a submerged submarine on July 20, 1960."

Dr. Kershner's citation noted that "because of his unremitting efforts, profound professional knowledge, and astute technical direction, the program of flight test analysis yielded essential information vital to the fleet ballistic missile system program."

It was the second time that Dr. Kershner had won the Distinguished Public Service Award. In 1958, he was similarly honored for his leadership in development of the Terrier missile as a fleet weapon. He presently has responsibility for developing the Transit navigational satellite system.

It was for the basic invention leading to the Transit system that Dr. McClure was honored by NASA.

The Transit system is based upon the ability to extract extremely accurate positional information from the measured Doppler shift of a satellite's transmitter during passage of the satellite over a tracking station or a ship's receiver. The shift is the measurement of the change of frequency of a radio signal transmitted from a satellite. This change of frequency is caused by the satellite's motion relative to a receiving or tracking station. Dr. McClure recommended study of the Doppler shift as the basis of a new method of navigation. He said that if man could accurately calculate the location of an orbiting vehicle by its Doppler shift, then the reverse must be true and that the location of a point on earth could be correctly established by analysis of the Doppler signal from a satellite.

When presenting the award to Dr. McClure, Dr. T. Keith Glennan, who was then NASA Administrator said: "This award is being made to you as an individual whose initiative and keen analytical insight were responsible for the undertaking of a development program that will have far-reaching benefits, the extent of which cannot yet be properly assessed."

In March, Dr. McClure was also honored by the Washington Chemical Association, a chapter of the American Chemical Society, which presented him its Hillebrand Award for work in solid rocket fuels and other fields.

The Certificate of Merit was the fourth such award won by the applied physics laboratory. It has received two Naval Ordnance Development Awards for contributions in the field of naval ordnance and the Department of Defense Reserve Award.

The first such honor was tendered the laboratory in 1945 by the Navy for the laboratory's wartime development of the proximity (VT) fuze. In 1958, five members of the staff, including the director, Dr. R. E. Gibson, received the Distinguished Public Service Award, and four were presented the Meritorious Public Service Citation for outstanding contributions to the research and development program of the Navy.

Besides the proximity fuze the laboratory provided the first ramjet engine, the Terrier, Talos, and Tartar missiles, and is now developing the Typhon weapons system. The Typhon is a completely automated missile firing system for global fleet operation. It is designed to provide the fleet with a defensive system with greatly extended range, accuracy, and target-handling capacity, capable of intercepting and knocking down both enemy aircraft and missiles, and for long-range bombardment of surface targets.

S. 901, the Marine Sciences Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Marine Digest, an outstanding maritime publication issued weekly at Seattle, Wash., recently editorialized on the need for enactment of S. 901, the proposed Marine Sciences and Research Act of 1961. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

LET'S PASS MARINE SCIENCES BILL

The Marine Digest before has asked for support for Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON'S national program of oceanographic research. We do not hesitate to ask for support again.

Hearings on the Magnuson marine science bill will be held next week before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Because of regional interest and benefits, the University of Washington will have three of its scientists testifying in support.

The University of Washington Fisheries Instrument Laboratory was closed last year for lack of funds after 4 years of internationally recognized technological achievement. Funds in the Marine Science bill would reactivate the program, and would also authorize support at the university for marine resources studies and specialized programs including research in marine radio biology, selective fish breeding and other programs now in progress.

The bill, simply described, provides funds and direction for a 10-year program which would cut down or remove the United States dangerous lag in oceanographic and marine science research. It is substantially the same bill passed by the Senate last year, but not acted upon by the House.

In the meantime, Senator MAGNUSON reports, Russia has further increased the gap between it and the United States in oceanographic ships, oceanwide research operations, and ocean-trained marine scientists and technicians.

Last year Russia launched four new research vessels, two of them over 3,600 tons and is building three more in the 6,000-ton class. The United States let contracts last year for only two research ships of about 1,500 tons each for completion in 1962.

This is just not enough when it comes to ocean equipment. The need has been well researched and documented by many, including Navy reports which show America 15 years behind in its need to replace obsolete small vessels in the present fleet. The Navy says the need for new ships requires a construction program that will see 25 years of shipbuilding done in 10 years.

The marine sciences bill will provide funds for this and for immediate long-term research bearing on fisheries conservation, underwater routes and ocean currents, marine food supplies, and mineral capabilities. These things have a bearing on our national military and economic survival.

Let's get the marine sciences bill passed this time.

What Next in Space?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very timely editorial which appeared in the Lynn (Mass.) Daily Evening Item for April 15, 1961:

WHAT NEXT IN SPACE?

Cold second thought on the achievement of the Russians in putting a man in space is beginning to place the matter in proper perspective.

The actual flight itself was a tremendous undertaking with overtones of courage, painstaking research and resourcefulness that merit only the highest praise. The news had dramatic impact of the highest order and Major Gagarin is entitled to all the glory and plaudits lavished upon him in Moscow. It would have been more satisfying to Americans, of course, if one of our own astronauts had been the first to pierce outer space, but that does not detract from our willingness to recognize the heoric achievement of the Russian flyer.

But in appraising the actual results produced by the flight there is less reason for unbridled enthusiasm. As one commentator put it, this might be a kind of technological tour de force and not much more.

What, actually, do we know about space today that we did not know a week ago except perhaps that a blue haze surrounds the globe?

We knew before that the Soviets possessed rockets of much larger thrust than ours. The flight demonstrated their ability to control these rockets and to solve the perplexing problems of direction and re-entry. It may be that the flight will make it possible for us to know much more than we do know about certain forces in space which affect our own planet, but is there any certainty of this or will it provide any more information that we already have from our own earth-bound observations?

The Russians, of course, have scored a tremendous psychological and propaganda victory. At the moment, their prestige is riding high, particularly among those nations easily impressed by dramatic coups.

But it should be remembered that while billions of dollars were being spent on the studies and research that eventually sent the Russian major into orbit, millions of Russians were living in hovels. And while the official announcement of the success of the flight had grandiose references to enduring peace and an end to the arms race, the Soviet delegate at Geneva suddenly reversed a concession he made in principle a week ago. After agreeing to an Anglo-American proposal for research into underground nuclear explosions, with full Russian participation, he suddenly did an about-face and withdrew his assent. The Russians apparently feel at the moment that they need make no concessions to anyone, anywhere.

A New Look at Agriculture—Address by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address which was delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, before the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., yesterday.

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

A NEW LOOK AT AGRICULTURE

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman prepared for delivery at the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., April 17, 1961, 12:30 p.m.)

I especially appreciate this opportunity to urge you to take a new look at agriculture because you are leaders in the opinion field, and because I think that there is no economic problem in America today in which we find more faulty emphasis, more outmoded concepts, and less real understanding than we find in current public attitudes toward the nature, causes, and possible solution for our agricultural problem.

I believe that the achievement of an effective solution to that problem requires a much greater public understanding of the factors involved, a more widespread public recognition of the contribution farmers make to our American standard of living, and a more general realization of the implications for agriculture that are inherent in the scientific and technological progress that characterizes our times.

One of the most significant characteristics of our age is the fact that physical, scientific, and technological progress is far outrunning social, political, and economic change. No recent event has illustrated this fact more dramatically than last week's successful orbiting of a man around the earth. Scientific and technological progress made this achievement possible. But man does not yet know how to use this new power to orbit the earth. Governments of men do not yet know how to control the power that can send tons into space. They have developed no social instruments to control the scientific instruments that now boast such incredible precision that they can pinpoint targets on the other side of the earth. This social lag represents a dangerous gap, a gap that must be closed if men on earth are to have any hope for security against the destructive power that man himself has created.

But what has this to do with the price of peanuts? Or wheat, or milk, or feed grains—or the other specific problems with which the Secretary of Agriculture is immediately concerned?

Only this. There is an equally dangerous gap in agriculture. Technical and scientific progress has for outrun social and economic change in agriculture as well as in the conquest of space. The social lag represented by the gap between the abundance of food that we can produce and the extent of hunger that exists in spite of this potential for abundance may, in the long run, be far more significant than the gap in space.

True, it is less spectacular, less dramatic. But to men and women and children who are really hungry, bread and milk at hand is more important than a star in the sky. To billions of men and women throughout this world the higher standards of living that can be achieved if we properly use our capacity to produce are of more direct and personal concern than the discovery of other worlds.

It is the awesome responsibility of this generation to close the gap between scientific progress and social progress sufficiently to make our civilization secure. It is the tremendous responsibility of this Nation and this administration to exercise leadership toward closing this gap in every field—in space, in human rights, and in the task of making the abundance that we can produce available to satisfy human needs. It is the special responsibility of those of us in the field of agriculture to close the gap represented by our capacity to produce abundantly, on the one hand, and, on the other, our lack of the social and economic organization necessary to both manage and utilize that abundance.

It is in the light of this responsibility, as a part of our overall national responsibility, that this administration has developed its agricultural policies and programs and formulated the legislation that the President is today recommending to the Congress. We are now pressing forward vigorously with all our resources to achieve these programs, so that we may begin to close that gap without delay.

May I say quite frankly that I believe undue delay would be very serious—more serious than simply a postponement of the gains that we expect from the new program. In a real sense we are reaching the point of no return. Delay or postponement now could mean economic disaster. The time is running out.

We can neither ask nor expect an indefinite continuation of programs and policies under which the U.S. Government pays ever-increasing amounts for stockpiles of commodities that threaten to become ever more unmanageable. We can neither ask nor expect that the American farmer will continue to invest his capital, his labor, his skill, and his management ability for a material reward that is shockingly below the national average. Our farmers are the world's most efficient agricultural producers, and their products are the basic essentials of human life. For this efficient production of essential needs they must have an average capital investment, exclusive of the farm home, of $36,000. Yet they receive for their labor an average of about 81 cents an hour.

In achieving its prime purpose of production, American agriculture in this generation has reached a pinnacle of success. It has tripled its output per hour of labor in the past two decades, while industry's output has only doubled. Twenty years ago 1 farmer produced enough for 11 people; he now produces enough for 25.

Under our system of enterprise and initiative we expect that success will bring an appropriate reward. And this phenomenal success in agriculture has brought its reward. But the reward is to the American consumer, and not to the American farmer. The consumer in America works fewer hours to feed himself and his family than in any other country. He is able to buy a balanced and varied diet for approximately one-fifth of his take-home pay.

Contrast this with the consumer in other nations. A meal of beef, potatoes, cabbage, bread, butter, milk and fruit for four people can be bought by the average industrial worker in the United States for 1 hour's wages. In Germany and England that meal would take over 2 hours' work; in Austria, 4 hours; in France, 4½ hours; in Italy, over 5 hours.

These are facts the American public should acclaim, and for which they should pay tribute to the American farmer for his contribution to our standard of living. Let us give at least as much recognition to this as do our Communist opponents. I saw very little emphasis here on one item in last Friday's reports from Moscow that to me has real significance. In reporting on Russia's new space triumph the wire services quoted Khrushchev as saying, "The space flight must not detract the attention of the Soviet people from other targets, and these include catching up with the United States in the standard of living."

Gratifying as this is, I have already noted that the farmer has not reaped the reward of his success. Quite the contrary. Farm output was 19 percent higher in 1960 than in 1952, but realized net farm income was 19 percent lower. Incomes of farm families today are lower relative to the rest of our population than they have been at any time since the 1930's. During the years between 1952 and 1960 the cost of living exclusive of food rose 15 percent, while the cost of the typical market basket of food increased only 2 percent. During this time the marketing charges associated with that basket of food increased 17 percent, but the decline of 15 percent in farm prices accounts for the difference.

These facts illustrate that, for the farmer, productive success has paradoxically meant economic distress. And, as if to add insult to injury, the public attitude toward the farmer has come to reflect concepts of surpluses and subsidies rather than the regard we expect for ability, industry, efficiency, and successful productivity.

Such erroneous concepts and public attitudes must be changed if we are to get a farm program that meets today's needs before we reach that point of no return.

I should therefore like to note here some areas in which adequate public understanding is most essential.

I

I have already referred to the need for a recognition of the productive success of American agriculture and the extent of the contribution the farmer thereby makes to our high standards of living. Agriculture in America leads the way to a new age of abundance in mankind's most essential commodities, and as such has achieved a landmark in history more important to human health and happiness than last week's landmark in the conquest of space. This success is the direct result of amazing progress in agricultural science and technology and the farmers' ability to put that progress into practical use.

II

We need to recognize how this success, in itself, has resulted in economic distress in a society in which we have not yet learned how to live with abundance. Because we are so unaccustomed to an age of plenty, we have tried to apply economics of scarcity as we repeated the shibboleths and slogans and phrases that were a part of the "conventional wisdom" of the past, and they won't work. We need to know a little more about agricultural economics to reach a sound and constructive solution of the farm problem.

The public must understand that any realistic solution to the farm problem requires the adjustment of our agricultural abundance to current domestic and foreign needs and demands. We may, in fact we must, increase our utilization of farm products both at home and abroad, and several of the early actions of this administration have been directed toward that end. The doubling of our direct distribution of food to the needy, our pilot food stamp programs, and the expansion of our food-for-peace efforts illustrate the determination of this administration to use fully our abundance of food and fiber. But, even with an expansion of such programs to the greatest possible extent that is consistent with sound and humane ideas and policies, we will not be able, in the years immediately ahead, to expand consumption enough to absorb all of our potential agricultural productivity. Thus, we must adjust our abundance. An understanding of the problems of achieving this goal—as well as of the consequences of not achieving it—is essential to a sound approach to new legislation.

Both the problems and the consequences stem in a large measure from the inelasticity of the human stomach, and the resulting inelasticity of demand for food. A little too much in the way of food supplies leads to dramatic farm price declines—hence to a farm-income problem. And a little too little in the way of food supplies leads to skyrocketing food prices and a real income squeeze on consumers. This is the food problem so often encountered in wartime.

To cope with these problems in the past, we have imposed price ceilings in wartime, and we place floors under farm prices during periods of surplus. But neither of these measures in themselves effectively corrects the imbalance of supplies relative to the existing demand. Nor can the uncoordinated efforts of several million farm producers correct unbalanced supply situations. Farm price and income gyrations that have resulted in the past have alternately hurt both the consumer and the producer.

Chronically low farm prices in the 1950's did not induce the average farmer to contract production. On the contrary, the average producer increased his production substantially. Caught up in the technological revolution on the one hand, and rising production costs on the other, the average farmer tried to solve his income problem by increasing his output. He succeeded in increasing his output, but he did not succeed in increasing his income. Government price support operations in the great commodities of wheat, cotton, and feed grains held the prices of those commodities at support levels as the Government accumulated stocks. The new "third market," the Commodity Credit Corporation, acquired the 6 to 8 percent excess production each year, and held the farm price level some 20 to 40 percent above what it would have been with no programs.

No one liked the program of the late 1950's—the farmers, because it gave no hope for improved incomes; consumers, because it was wasteful and ineffective; and congressional leaders and taxpayers, because it was needlessly costly. It was a failure on all these counts because it did not and could not effectively adjust supplies. Supplies outran demand in the 1950's and pushed farm prices down to support levels and held them there.

Every responsible projection made for the 1960's suggests that unless we act supplies will continue to outdistance demand with the same chronic price-depressing effects.

Confronted with this prospect for the 1960's, we must now establish procedures and enact legislation to enable farmer producers to work together to adjust their production to the quantities we can use. The President is therefore proposing legislation that will provide the tools whereby they can adjust their supplies effectively whenever there is general agreement among them that such a course of action is desirable.

III

We need to recognize that all the farmer is asking for is equality of economic opportunity.

The farmer is the only basic producer in our economy who now has available to him no means by which he can adjust his production to demand, and who therefore has no effective means by which he can influence the economic rewards of his enterprise.

It is absurd, in any consideration of a farm program, to compare the farmer with the small corner merchant.

Perhaps there should be Government action for small business, but of a different nature for a different reason. But the farmer, as a basic producer and not a retailer, can be more accurately compared with other basic producers—such as, for example, the producers of steel. Government has given to such producers the instrument of incorporation, by which they can become large enough to effectively adjust their production to quantities that can be sold profitably.

Government has likewise given to labor the instrument of collective bargaining whereby millions of individual workers, who, as individuals, would be even more helpless than the farmers, can work together to achieve a fair return for their productive activity.

To achieve economic equality, therefore, we propose programs to provide farmers with the institutional machinery for coming together and developing supply adjustment programs, and with democratic methods for approving or rejecting such programs. We would specifically provide safeguards for consumers' interests in this process.

By enacting the proposed legislation the Congress would establish the ground rules

and guidelines under which supply adjustment programs would be developed and placed into operation. Then, whenever action is needed with regard to any commodity or group of related commodities, a committee of producers—including one consumer representative—would be selected to consult with the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and recommend a program of supply adjustment for that commodity. The Secretary would recommend a program based on these consultations. Only after such a program had been approved by the President, sanctioned by the Congress, and approved by a two-thirds vote of the producers themselves, would it become binding upon all farmers who choose to produce that commodity. The farmers who serve on these commodity advisory committees would be chosen from nominees designated by farmer-elected county committees and by farm organizations.

Thus, in return for the limitations to which farmers would conform only after they, themselves, had reached decisions by the accepted democratic method of voting on proposed programs—in return for these limitations the farmers would gain more real influence over the economic consequences of their farming enterprise, more real influence over their opportunity to earn fair incomes, than they have ever had, or can have, without such programs.

The new program would raise the level of the function and the responsibility of the Congress, and of the agricultural committees in Congress. As the new programs formulated under these proposals get underway, many of the powers that the Congress has now granted to the Secretary of Agriculture—powers to fix support levels, prescribe acreage allotments, establish marketing agreements and orders, and others—would require final approval by the Congress. This would add to the responsibilities of the Agriculture Committees in the Congress the function of careful review of each such program, many of which are now put into effect by order of the Secretary without any such review.

Thus, while the Congress would be relieved of the onerous burden of a detailed analysis of a multitude of separate proposals, commodity by commodity, season after season, under countless and fragmented pressures; it would have an increased responsibility for considering broad programs and policies in their entire implications, and for the continuing and final authority to determine what programs shall become the law of the land.

Under the procedures set forth in the proposed legislation programs could be developed to meet different needs and conditions by utilizing a variety of methods, many of which have already proved their usefulness. It would be the responsibility of the commodity advisory committee to adapt those methods to a program that would meet the needs of the farmers producing the commodity involved; and it would be the responsibility of the secretary of Agriculture to consider, in addition, various intercommodity relationships, potential effects on our economy as a whole, and the national welfare.

IV

For some commodities the adjustment of supply to demand could be effectively achieved by means of marketing quotas and allotments in terms of quantity as well as acreage. For some commodities programs of marketing orders and agreements could be formulated under which producers could develop research, promotion, higher standards, and quality control, as well as the effective adjustment of supply. Government cooperation in support of farm income could be by means of a variety of methods, but in all cases to be limited to instances where a supply adjustment program is in effect, after consultation with the appropriate advisory committee and after approval by the President and review by the Congress.

A final point that we need to understand to achieve a successful farm program is the extent to which the problems and performance of agriculture are inextricably interwoven with problems of domestic prosperity and economic growth and with those of achieving security and peace in the world.

I believe the American public is becoming increasingly aware of the importance of our agricultural abundance as an instrument in foreign policy. We are stepping up our programs for expanding the export of food and fiber, both for dollars and for foreign currency. We have launched a program to determine just what the world food deficit is. As we increase such efforts, and as we develop means, in cooperation with other countries, for the more effective use of greater quantities of agricultural exports, these new and increasing demands on American agriculture will have to be taken into account in the formulation of our agricultural programs at home. This is why an extension and strengthening of our food-for-peace program is an integral part of the agricultural legislation presented to the Congress today.

I have hopes that the American public is beginning to realize how essential a healthy agriculture is to the long-term soundness of our economy. Evidences of this, such as that reflected by the keen observations of the Nebraska banker interviewed in the last issue of the U.S. News & World Report, are encouraging. I am confident that when the nonfarm public fully understands how essential a healthy agricultural economy is to its own well-being we will get support from cities and towns, as well as from the farms, for the program we propose. And I am confident that, with the cooperation of American farmers, we can achieve an effective adjustment of our agricultural abundance within the framework of this legislation, and thus close the gap between our tremendous productive potential and our ability to manage and utilize it in the best interest of all. It will not be easy, but it can be done.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—XI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the 11th in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter.

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

COUNTY MIGRANT CAMPS MUST MEET STRICT CODE

"I notice there is some straw over there. What is it for?"

"Well, that was the straw they brought for the people to sleep on."

"Well, weren't mattresses supplied here?"

"No. There used to be, but there ain't now."

"Mrs. Quigley, where is the water supply over here?"

"That's it right yonder."

"For how many people?"

"This, that and yonder. All uses the same."

"Where do you use the bathrooms? Where are the facilities?"

"Don't have one."—"Harvest of Shame."

Migrant housing varies greatly in Palm Beach County, and throughout Florida.

If there is a labor camp in the county which does not have a bathroom, or has only one outside faucet for the entire camp, the county health department's chief sanitarian, Joseph Alvarez, would like to know where it is.

If one did exist, it would be closed down.

The pattern of housing in the county is quite different on the coast and in the Glades.

In the coastal area, the expense has been borne by the farmer himself. Examples may be found in the Delray Beach area. And outside the county, examples may be found at Pompano Beach, Homestead, Fort Pierce, and other communities.

In the Glades area near Lake Okeechobee, farming is more extensive. More workers are employed. This has increased the demand for housing, and it has been provided in several ways.

At Pahokee, for example, the Federal Government has financed a 115-unit housing project for which the average monthly rent in 1959 was $39.59. The cost of the project was $1,295,000. Ground was broken in June 1957. Three other camps also are located there.

Belle Glade has two huge camps for the migrants. They were built by the Federal Government, later turned over to the Belle Glade Housing Authority.

Low-cost living quarters are provided both for bachelors and family units. Nurseries for children 2 to 6 are available, and recreation and parks are convenient.

Migrants pay 75 cents per day for each child left at the nursery at the Osceola Camp. This entitles them to supervised activities, a meal, two snacks and a nap.

The cost has been increased this year from 50 cents. Juian Griggs, staff workers of the Florida Christian Ministry of Migrants at the camp, said the increase has been mandated by a deficit under which the program operated in the past.

"During the last 10 years, the Church of the Brethren has spent $5,000 to make up the deficit," he said.

The entire migrant program has cost churches $50,000, he said.

In the two Belle Glade housing projects, rents range from $4 per week for a single room to $12.50 for a two-bedroom apartment. They are funished if the renters desire it, the chamber of commerce reports.

Elsewhere in Belle Glade, migrants may rent apartments, rooms or dwellings provided by private capital. Recently, several modern concrete block multiple-unit apartment buildings have been built.

Larry Royal, member of a family that provided some of this housing, said migrants like it and occupy about 30 percent of that available.

"We rent to some on a year-round basis," he said. "When they're not here, they pay a reduced rent to make sure their apartments will be ready for them when they return."

Higher Postal Rates Are Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is it not worth a nickel to mail a letter to your old Aunt Hepsibah in California? Is it not worth 8 cents to fly a letter to Maine? These two questions have been raised and other comments have been made in an editorial supporting the Postmaster General's recommendation for postal increases in order to help reduce the annual $800 million deficit. This editorial appeared in the April 15, 1961, edition of the Cleveland, Ohio, Plain Dealer. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

HIGHER POSTAL RATES ARE NEEDED

When the total U.S. postal deficit amounts to more than $800 million a year, Postmaster General J. Edward Day has every reason to seek to reduce this deficit, and every American ought to be willing to accept the requested rate increases in good spirit. The $741 million a year increase requested of Congress will not permit the postal service to break even, but it will cut down the loss to a great extent.

After all, where can you buy so much service for your money? Isn't it worth a nickel to mail a letter to your old Aunt Hepsibah in California? Isn't it worth 8 cents to fly a letter to Maine? Isn't it worth 4 cents to send a surface postcard or 6 cents to send a postcard by airmail?

It will be noted by those who study the new rates that books and publishers' second-class matter, which includes newspapers and magazines, are in for some sort of increase, for, according to the Associated Press, the proposal would increase the rates of "all other classes of mail." This, at any rate, should preclude the receipt of letters saying, "Naturally you're for higher postal rates—you won't be affected." To what extent we shall be affected we do not know at this moment, but we have said before—and we repeat: We are perfectly willing to pay any increase in postal rates the Government thinks we should pay.

Actually, the larger the newspaper, the smaller the percentage of its mail circulation. American Newspaper Publishers Association figures show that of papers over 100,000 circulation, only 5.7 percent of this circulation uses the mails, whereas in papers under 5,000 circulation, 28.2 percent goes through the mails.

Perhaps one reason Uncle Sam has been moderate in increasing mail rates for newspapers (outside of the perfectly obvious one that he thinks it valuable to have citizens well-informed) is that the newspapers, themselves, give him a lot of help, even though paying full rates for services not rendered. Some 83.3 percent of all copies of daily newspapers in second-class mail are sorted by the newspapers, arranged in sacks or packages by the newspapers, delivered to railroad stations or post offices by the newspapers, thus eliminating sorting or other handling by postal employees.

Since we too shall be affected, we can, in good conscience, applaud the Postmaster General's wise plan to put the Post Office Department on a more businesslike basis—and we hope Congress will give him what he asks.

Moral Principles Have To Be Revived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Julius Szygowski, representative of the Polish Government in exile, has written a timely letter under the heading of "Moral Principles Have To Be Revived." I believe the cause of liberty will be strengthened by calling nationwide attention to this excellent document, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following statement by Dr. Szygowski:

The disquieting turn of events upon the international arena makes it ever more urgent to reassess western policy with regard to Russia and her ruthless methods. The truth must be faced and the admission made that so far the behavior of the Western Powers towards Russia and her political aims has ben marked by vacillation and mistakes, even by moral shortcomings. As an outcome, public opinion has the deeply rooted impression that the Western World cannot cope with Russia and is defenseless against the progressive expansion of international communism.

The process which has brought about these pernicious consequences is not of recent origin.

It cannot be denied that many lofty ideals proclaimed by the Western Powers were abandoned. Many agreements for assuring the fate of minor nations were not honored, and many war aims were jettisoned.

All this took place gradually, until the Western World's moral position offered rather gloomy perspectives before the subjugated and other countries.

There is a small wonder that in this moral and political climate, Russian affirmations that the Western World will gradually be forced by pacific means to submit to the Communist world, superior to it in every field, are beginning to acquire an air of probability especially in the eyes of various masses of Asian and African populations.

On the other hand, the memory of various accomplished facts so detrimental to different nations lives forever in the minds of people and in the pages of history, serving us a warning not to believe in the words of those who once have broken them.

The elevated and equitable principles formulated for the postwar world in the Atlantic Charter and later incorporated within the Charter of the United Nations Organization remained only upon paper.

Soviet Russia understands well this moral weakness of the West and takes proper advantage of it. And so, Khrushchev's obvious aim is to undermine the authority and prestige of the governments, systems, and ideologies of the Western democracies. He tries to destroy this not only among the Western peoples, not only among the captive nations living in hope that the West will help to liberate them, but also among the people of the newly formed African and Asian state entities.

CASE OF POLAND

Lack of broadly conceived political vision, a decline in morality with regard to other countries and in the sense of obligation to honor agreements on the part of the West are nowhere more evident than in its attitude to Poland, its most loyal ally and holder of a prime key position in Europe.

The Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement of August 1939 for a new partition of Poland should have helped the West to see through Russia, while the latter's invasion of Poland on September 17 of the same year should have opened eyes to Russia's chief purpose, i.e., to the spreading of communism westwards.

Immediately after the Germans attacked her on June 22, 1941, and she had to seek salvation in Western aid, Russia was obliged to conclude agreement (signed on July 30 and December 4, 1941) with the Polish Government, then in London. She announced in this that the German-Soviet treaties for the partition of Poland (of 1939) were considered null and void.

Yet Russia did not for a single moment hold up efforts to undermine the Polish Republic from within and from without, nor cease to lay insistent claim to Poland's eastern provinces. The Western Powers failed at the time to assess the danger facing the whole democratic world, they gave Poland no proper support against Soviet designs, thus opening the way for the Communist westward drive.

It was in October 1943 that Great Britain, the United States, Russia, and China agreed under paragraph 6 of their security declaration drawn up at a conference in Moscow that a Soviet administration would take over Polish territories in measure as war operations proceeded. Here it must be stressed that the Polish Government in London, though an ally in good standing and obviously a party most directly affected, was neither invited to the conference nor informed of this decision.

On Stalin's demand and chiefly with the support of President F. D. Roosevelt, it was definitively decided at the Teheran Conference in November 1943—again without the knowledge of the allied Polish Government in London—that in the allocation of occupation zones, i.e., future spheres of influence, Russia's share would embrace all Poland and Hungary, a large part of Germany, and part of Austria.

It was only later, at the Yalta Conference held on 4–11 February, 1945, that formal agreement was reached between Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union regarding the annexation of nearly half of Poland's territory by Russia who would also have absolute control over the rest of Poland.

It can be safely stated that most of the world perturbations and the menace to security in general undoubtedly stem from this hardly creditable transaction. It decisively helped to shift the balance of power between the two incompatible worlds in favor of the Russian communistic imperialism.

All this could have been avoided but not being so, the Western World had to pay dearly for the subsequent consequences.

KATYN WOOD MASSACRE

As mentioned before, Russia on July 30, 1941, declared the Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement of 1939 null and void and in the same time concluded the treaty with the Polish Government in London, whereby diplomatic relations were resumed. This, however, did not hinder Russia from continuing to prepare Communist administrative and military cadres which were to seize in a proper time all civil and military authority in Poland.

But after 21 months, Soviet Russia broke off (on April 26, 1943) relations with the Polish Government in London as a first step to securing a free hand. The pretext for this unusual step toward an ally in time of war was an exceedingly flimsy one: namely, Poland had requested an investigation into the massacre of several thousands of Polish officers in the Soviet Union, in Katyn Wood near Smolensk.

On April 15, 1943, the Polish Government applied to the International Committee of the Red Cross asking it to appoint a delegation to investigate the case on the spot.

Stalin thereupon wrote personal letters to President Roosevelt and to Mr. Churchill on April 21, 1943, accusing the Germans of this mass murder of Polish officers. The Western Powers ostensibly accepted the Soviet version and, judging by the documents published to date, refrained from alluding to this crime at any major international conference, at Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, or on any latter occasion.

In the U.S. House of Representatives a resolution was passed on May 18, 1951, whereby a Committee for the Investigation of the Katyn Murder was set up with Hon. RAY J. MADDEN as chairman. Detailed evidence was collected and the committee filed its final report on December 22, 1952, with the following recommendations: (1) that the U.S. President issue instructions to the U.S. Delegate at the United Nations Organization to present the Katyn case to the General Assembly; (2) that the President request that the General Assembly seek action before the International Court of Justice against the U.S.S.R. for committing the massacre; and (3) that the President instruct the U.S. delegation to seek the establishment of a temporary U.N. Commission which would investigate mass murders and crimes against humanity.

Since then, however, nothing has been done. It can be safely stated that the attitude of the Western Powers with regard to the Katyn massacre does not reflect credit upon them nor raise their prestige.

The rupture of diplomatic relations with Poland, because Polish Government requested the International Red Cross to investigate the Katyn massacre, was deemed necessary by Stalin not only for the realization of his underhand plans against that country but also for his longer designs against the whole democratic world.

FOREIGN OCCUPATION OF POLAND

This whole unfriendly attitude of Western Powers toward Poland and disregard of the international law, allowed Stalin to realize his plans. In measure as Germans evacuated Polish soil before the advancing Soviet forces, Stalin handed over the civil administration of Poland to his stooge organization, the so-called "Polish Committee of National Liberation" very soon proclaimed as the government of the country. It cannot be too strongly stressed that this alleged government could not be and was not a Polish government in the legal and constitutional sense. It was nothing but a political tool in the hands of the Kremlin.

The German administration of rump Poland during the occupation (1939–45) was directed by a German governor-general in Cracow. Craftier Communist Russia has camouflaged her occupation of Poland by ruling through "the Government of the Polish People's Republic" in Warsaw but composed for the most part of Communist graduates of the Moscow school. Both systems, of course, can be regarded merely as the administrative organs of a foreign occupation. The only difference, that the German occupation never claimed to be anything else whilst that of the Russians is more skillfully and cunningly devised. Stalin succeeded even to obtain the respectability for his administration in Poland by assuring its legal status upon the international forum. And again, this success will be found to derive from the weakness and imprudence of the representative of Anglo-American policy at the Yalta Conference. Thus, Poland has been given, against her will, the status of a Russian satellite.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT OF POLAND—IN EXILE

In virtue of the Polish constitution and, hence, of the international law, there exists the legal and constitutional Polish Government (in exile) in London, England. It works and acts abroad for the reestablishment of Poland's freedom and independence. Realizing that in our times the liberation of Poland has to be based upon a broader scheme which would help other eastern-central European nations to regain their freedom, the Polish Government (in exile) deems that the following points obviously merit an examination: (The below described plan has been repeatedly presented to the Governments of Western democracies by the Polish Government in exile since October 1955; however there has been no favorable reaction at this time.)

1. It is an essential condition for security in Europe and (owing to this continent's key position) to the whole world to establish such a state of affairs that could eliminate or at least seriously hinder any direct clash of the war potentials. This could be attained by linking together the countries of Europe within a United States of Europe. Until nations of Europe become ripe for this, it is necessary to seek some intermediate solution.

2. The solution of this problem should be sought in the creation of a neutral zone between East and West. It would embrace countries neighboring with Russia and now subjected by her: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania. The setting up of such a neutral zone on sound political, economic and military foundations would produce a favorable basis for a durable arrangement of peaceful relations in Europe.

3. This neutral zone in east-central Europe should be created on the basis of an accord concluded on the one hand by all the member-countries as sovereign states, free of any foreign military occupation and foreign-imposed governments, and on the other hand, by all the powers interested in the maintenance of world peace. The countries of the neutral zone should bind themselves not to join any warlike blocs and not to conclude any military alliances with countries outside the neutral zone. The powers not belonging to the neutral zone and interested in maintaining world peace, including a united Germany and Soviet Russia, would jointly guarantee the frontiers of the neutral zone countries so that, in case of aggression from East or West, all the guarantors would automatically become the allies of the neutral-zone lands in defense against such an aggression. Such a situation would undoubtedly become an element arresting any kind of aggressive design from whichever direction it may come.

4. The neutral zone so conceived would not act as a barrier separating East from West, but would preeminently serve as an intermediary and liaison between them in the ideological, cultural and economic fields. Those member countries of the neutral zone who have for centuries past been so wronged by both Russia and Germany, would gradually lose memory of this painful past, the bitterness felt toward these neighbors would die out little by little and could in the future become transformed into a loyal international collaboration based on sincere, natural amity.

5. The relations between the member-states of the neutral zone in east-central Europe would best be based on a sui generis confederate agreement. Such a union of independent states, adequately armed for the defense of its neutrality and guaranteed by the other powers, would provide full assurance for the maintenance of peace in Europe and hence facilitate this in the whole world. Only under such conditions would the question of disarmament acquire current significance, and only then could the huge sums now uneconomically expanded be devoted to the good of humanity.

6. The problem of the unification of Germany can really be reduced to that of liberation of East Germany from Soviet occupation. Once such a zone of neutral countries is created between Russia and Germany, with East Germany west of this zone, unification of the two German republics would probably be immediate and automatic. Hence, it can be said that the problem of the unification of Germany is a function of the general problem of security.

7. In order to accomplish this, the Western Powers should regain the political initiative at all costs. Under the present circumstances, this could be achieved solely by presenting Russia with the demand for a far-reaching revision of the situation she has brought about by dint of violence, underhand methods and the violation of international agreements. Russia's acts to the plain detriment of the weaker nations should be disavowed and denounced forthwith. It is necessary firmly to demand the immediate and unconditional liberation of the captive nations, and the righting of all the wrongs inflicted upon them. But again at this point it should be cited that the Western democracies failed (a) to guarantee the existing frontiers between Germany and Poland (b) to initiate talks about the organization of eastern-central Europe, thus giving Mr. Khrushchev an opportunity to bring up these two problems at the U.N. General Assembly in September 1960 in such a way as to further his own interests. The hypocritical and brutal ideology of the Communist world should be countered by a clearly formulated, broadly conceived ideology based upon the moral principle of the truth that equal rights are due both to strong and to weak nations.

It is worthwhile to mention that the recent "14 points accord" of Gov. N. A. Rockefeller and Vice President Richard Nixon stressed the necessity "of leading and inspiring the formation in all great regions of the free world of confederations, large enough and strong enough to meet modern problems and challenges," and suggested that "we [the United States] should promptly lead toward the formation of such confederations in the North Atlantic Community and in the Western Hemisphere."

In applauding this idea, such remarks seem to be proper: the more precise and definite are the plans of the Western democracies, the greater the determination they show in the realization of these plans, the greater their pressure toward this end and the greater their solidarity in such action, the sooner and the more certainly will it be possible to establish a system of relations that will enable mankind to enter upon the road of lasting peaceful development, and assure Europe the possibility of real unification.

And this must be done—before it is too late. A two-power world can never be at peace.

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the best editorials that has come to my attention with reference to Robert Welch and the John Birch Society is one appearing in the April 17 issue of Newsweek written by its contributing editor, Raymond Moley entitled "It Is Not Conservatism."

Mr. Moley present a powerful argument to every thinking American. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to

have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

IT IS NOT CONSERVATISM

(By Raymond Moley)

Five weeks ago I noted in this space the rapid growth of conservative groups on many college campuses. That manifestation of dissent from prevailing liberal thinking, together with the evidence that conservatism is growing among older people as well, is a wholesome sign. It offers a promise that our two-party system and our national elections will be real contests of opposing political philosophies. And the fact that so many young people are in the movement indicates that the coming generation realizes more than ever the burdens and debts which it will inherit from the altogether too spendthrift governments we have had since the war.

The perils that threaten this growth of conservatism will come, not from its liberal opposition but from those who in the name of conservatism would bring discredit by igniting passions against their neighbors, besmirching good Americans as friends and dupes of communism, and by adopting methods of organization which should be alien in this country. One such threat is the John Birch Society and the utterances and activities of its founder, Robert Welch, and some of the leaders in the group.

I have watched the growth of this society with the deepest regret and misgivings especially because so many sincere people have become members of it and risk their good names through association with its more radical spokesmen. Those who are devoted to sound conservative principles owe it to themselves and their true objectives to repudiate the John Birch Society and methods as I do here.

COMMUNISM AND CRIME

As I have noted the writings of Robert Welch over the past decade I have seen the transformation of a man who in the beginning spoke out against a certain blindness in our foreign policies to the real nature of the international Communist conspiracy and the danger embodied in the presence in our Government and society of elements of communism. Well before Welch appeared on the scene I advocated in this space and before a congressional committee the outlawing of the Communist party in the United States. That objective has substantially been accomplished although it must be recognized that elements of that conspiracy still lurk in our midst. It is the responsibility of our Government and indeed of all of us to expose and eliminate such elements by due process of law, just as we would deal with the criminally inclined elements of other sorts.

But opposition to communism as a criminal activity is not confined solely to conservatives. Individuals of all shades of ideology share the conservative's fear of communism. In fact, it was to a degree due to the warnings of American socialists that this Nation was sharply made aware of the danger. Because Norman Thomas and I agree that communism is our enemy at home and abroad does not make us ideological brothers.

UNFORTUNATE METHODS

The evidence is now before us through the enterprise of the press and the statements of Members of Congress that the John Birch Society has so concentrated its attention on communism and has become so vehement in its pursuit of that one issue that it has adopted methods and has made statements which must bring it into general disrepute. Specifically, Americans do not like the terms "monolithic" or "authoritarian" as applied to any American group or society. They resent loose and inaccurate name calling especially when applied to Presidents and other high officials who are charged by the people with responsibility for their protection. They don't like the idea of "infiltrating" various worthy organizations in our society.

I need not elaborate upon these facts. They were documented by Senator MILTON YOUNG of North Dakota in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20.

For a good many years I have specified those mistaken policies of Government under the name liberal which tend to limit the liberty of the individual, weaken the fiber of America and its institutions, and endanger national solvency. A belief in dynamic growth through individual enterprise constitutes a true conservatism. It is endangered by those who assume the livery of conservatism, but adopt radical methods.

Peace Corps Relationship With the Selective Service System Explained by Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared on page 1 of the April 1961 issue of Selective Service, the official publication of the Selective Service System:

PEACE CORPS RELATIONSHIP WITH SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM EXPLAINED

(By Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director, Selective Service System)

The Peace Corps has been established by Executive order of the President. Legislation has been requested to continue this organization. The activities of the Peace Corps have been covered rather completely by the press, radio, and television. Its relationship with the Selective Service System has been indicated but a statement of this relationship seems advisable.

The Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is flexible enough to provide deferment for members of the Peace Corps without amendment of any kind. In other words the relationship of the Selective Service System with registrants who become members of the Peace Corps can be handled administratively.

The power to defer registrants who perform functions in the national health, safety, or interest now exists. The establishment and operation of the Peace Corps is in the national interest. So the classification of registrants in the Peace Corps can be handled as any other registrant engaged in activities in the national health, safety, or interest. They will, of course, enjoy the right to appeal shared by all registrants of the Selective Service System.

These statements presuppose the continuance of the present situation of the United States in relations with other nations of the world.

The question has been raised as to the status of registrants who enroll in the Peace Corps, after their return from this assignment. This requires the assumption as to the situation of this Nation in the world, the age of the registrant when he returns, the physical condition of the registrant with reference to his acceptability for military service, his marital status, and the regulations which apply in existence at the time of his release from the Peace Corps, and whether or not the registrant on his return from service with the Peace Corps engages in an activity which permits him to be deferred in the national health, safety, or interest.

The fact that the registrant has been a member of the Peace Corps will not prevent him from qualifying for further deferment, the same as any other registrant who is engaged in activities vital to the national health, safety, or interest.

New Frontier of Freedom and Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a declaration by the American Religious Town Hall Meeting, Inc., calling on the President of the United States to proclaim a "new national frontier of freedom and equality," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

A DECLARATION BY THE AMERICAN RELIGIOUS TOWN HALL MEETING, INC., CALLING ON THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROCLAIM A "NEW FRONTIER OF FREEDOM," A NATIONAL JUBILEE COMMEMORATING THE INALIENABLE RIGHTS OF ALL MEN DURING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT LINCOLN'S EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

At this time when our liberal-democratic society is confronted by dangerous enemies abroad whose intention is to destroy our way of life and to dominate the course of human history, it well behooves America to look closely to the springs of her culture, to the sources of her liberty. Every society expresses its highest aspirations, its conception of civilized man and his destiny, and its hopes for the future, in the idealism of its founders. These goals, aspirations, hopes and ideals can be called the mystique of the society; ours has been boldly expressed in great documents, stirring orations and beautiful poetry that has warmed the hearts of millions. We all known only too well that it is difficult to realize all these social goals in actual practice; nonetheless, a society is judged by the gap that exists between the ideals of constitutional government it proclaims, and the political reality of everyday life. It is on this level that our enemies attack us in the forum of the world; they compare our lofty idealism with some of the sordid problems that mar our everyday life. It is to be noted also that they compare our problems, particularly the questions of civil equality and economic opportunity, with the idealism, that is, the mystiques of communism: They carefully avoid comparing the realities of social life in the United States of America with that of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Our liberal-democratic political idealism has been proclaimed for the world to hear by Franklin, Paine, Jefferson, Hamilton, Adams, Jackson, and a host of other statesmen and philosophers who assisted in the founding of the Republic. That mystique

was reaffirmed 100 years ago during the great crisis that threatened to destroy the Nation. On September 22, 1862, President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation freeing the slaves from the bondage that had long been a glaring gap between the lofty idealism of America as the land of the free and the actual reality of everyday life in the young Republic. It is small wonder that in the great world beyond our shores Abraham Lincoln is the best known President of the 19th century; he was the man who reaffirmed our basic American belief in the equality of mankind and man's natural right to freedom.

In our own days, 100 years after Lincoln's stirring proclamation, there still exists a glaring gap between the political idealism we profess and the reality of American society. In defiance of clear and precise orders from the highest court in the land, a large segment of our population is still denied basic civil liberties and rights, thereby creating a scandal in the world and giving our enemies ammunition to use against us. Anyone who has traveled beyond our frontiers, well knows that the first question a foreigner asks about the United States of America deals with the problem of discrimination. And we do not need to travel abroad to know that we have a desperate need to strengthen our heritage and to bolster our self-respect as a nation by closing the gap between our lofty aspirations and the political reality that so humiliates us. Our national mystique is as lofty and noble as any ever conceived by any people, but we must live up to these ideals if we are to be true to our destiny.

The American Religious Town Hall of the Air represents a program of action committed to the proposition that Americans can best be educated to fulfill their responsibilities if they can have and hear free and frank discussions of the issues before the Nation. As an interreligious institution, including within its scope all facets of religious life in our land, the Religious Town Hall of the Air has brought to the radio and television audiences discussions of all sorts of religious, political, social, and economic issues, with emphasis upon the moral problems that are involved, and with ample opportunity for all points of view to ventilate opinions. We believe that in this program we are helping to strengthen the determination of our fellow citizens to defend and protect the ideals of civil and religious freedoms of our Nation. With this in mind we would like to suggest that it would be fitting for the Nation to pause for a review of the problems of equal rights for all citizens during the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Therefore, we of the Religious Town Hall of the Air urge other Americans interested in maintaining the moral tone of our Nation to join us in an appeal to the President of the United States for the proclamation of a new national frontier of freedom and equality during the centenary of the Emancipation Proclamation. Let us join together to expel the remnants of intolerance, tyranny and oppression, and let us renew our faith in our national mystique that honors liberty, equality, and opportunity for all by declaring the period from July 4 to September 22, 1962 as a national jubilee commemorating the liberation of the inalienable rights of all men.

Bishop A. A. Leiske of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and President of the American Religious Town Hall Meeting, Inc.; Bishop T. Otto Nall, Minnesota Methodist Conference and Vice President of the American Religious Town Hall Meeting, Inc.; Donald G. Paterson, Secretary; Martin E. Kriesel, Treasurer; Jane P. Power; Violet G. Culbertson; James J. Dalglish; Doreen Wendland.

"Hope" Comes to Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I know many of my colleagues share my great personal interest in project Hope. Accordingly, I call their attention to the following article appearing in the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin on April 1, 1961:

"HOPE" COMES TO INDONESIA—NATIVES HAIL CHAPLAIN OF HOSPITAL SHIP

(By the Reverend William P. Anna, Jr., rector of Zion parish, diocese of Washington)

(The Reverend William P. Anna, Jr., an Episcopal priest, is Protestant chaplain aboard the steamship *Hope*. This San Francisco-based hospital ship, financed by public contributions and Government help, is spending a year in the South Seas. It treats native patients aboard and ashore; its staff teaches nurses and doctors. How the *Hope* has become a symbol of international hope is told in Father Anna's article.)

ABOARD SS "HOPE."—The first greeting I got in Indonesia was from a 10-year-old boy.

The *Hope* had been at sea almost 3 weeks out from Honolulu. It was Sunday. She was docking at Balikpappan in Borneo, during the 7 o'clock communion service.

After the service, I went ashore. As I stepped onto the dock, the boy came up. I greeted him in what I believed was idomatic Indonesian we had studied evenings on the voyage. "Salamat pagi," I said. "Good morning."

In very intelligible English, the lad replied: "Good morning, Pastor. Thank you very much. Welcome to Indonesia. We are glad to see you. We like to practice our American."

The language barrier, I discovered, is not at all impossible. Ours is studied in their high schools and universities, their second language.

Indonesian contains no conjugation or declensions. Man is "orang"; men, "orang-orang."

By the time we reached Djakarta, the ship's hospital was in order, ready for business.

Twenty nurses from the training center at Bandoeng were with us, and 30 other nurses are with us for 6 months. They will form the nucleus of the teaching staff for the new Ibu Sukarno Hospital in Djakarta, where a nursing academy will be established.

I went out to the theological seminary to talk with the student body. The faculty is American, Dutch, Filipino and Indonesian.

I learned quickly, I hope, never to preach to them nor lecture them. Just answer their questions. And the questions about the *Hope* and its purpose were sharp.

"Tell us about your church in America?" they asked. "Tell us about your home and family?" In the end, I told them almost every detail, even about our dogs.

"We like you," they said. "We like American people. We like America. We do not understand American policy."

I certainly learned more about Indonesia than I have been able to tell them about America.

The most unexpected call of the first half of our tour was Sumbawa, a primitive and sparsely populated island, but seemingly rich in resources.

We stopped in a well-protected anchorage to go ashore.

There is only one doctor on the whole island, a German from Stuttgart who came here after his retirement to spend the rest of his medical career working in a place that otherwise would be without a physician.

Our work was well organized. Soon the hospital was full. A clinic, set up ashore in a warehouse, operated at full capacity. Ninety-eight operations were performed by our surgeons in 2 weeks. A German surgeon aboard did a fantastic number of cataract operations, and for these he is especially well qualified.

The gratitude of one old man surpassed anything I have seen, and it was rather a symbol of what makes our medical project real.

He came on the first day. Constantly, he asked, "Am I next?" All he was praying for was to be able to see the outline of his family.

I was going down the aisle in the ward just before he was to go to the operating room. He pulled my shirt. "They say I am next," he said; and they rolled him off the cart, rejoicing.

The last day in Sumbawa they had a final reception and lunch for the staff.

There he was, standing at the edge of the crowd, and repeating again and again, "Thank you. Thank you. Thank you."

A Responsible Study To Advance Freedom Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the problem of alerting the American people to the significance of freedom and the danger of communism is far too important to be left to the crackpots.

The fact is that communism is on the march in the world. Freedom has been on the defensive. Too few Americans care deeply about freedom. The oppressive nature of communism is far too little understood.

For these reasons, it was heartening to read of a responsible and constructive attempt to meet this need. An article in a recent issue of the Milwaukee Journal reports on the efforts of a group sponsored by corporations, and several foundations, to do this. Educational and Federal Government leaders met and worked with this group.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

IMPROVED STUDY OF REDS IS URGED—EDUCATORS, MILITARY CALL INSTRUCTION ON COMMUNISM SAFETY MEASURE FOR UNITED STATES

(By Edmund B. Lambeth)

CHICAGO, ILL.—An organized effort to expand and improve instruction about communism in the Nation's schools and colleges was urged Wednesday by more than 700 participants in a national military, industrial, and educational conference.

The participants approved a resolution which, although carefully worded, expressed an urgency that has characterized the 3 days of talks here on the struggle between communism and the free world.

The conference was a project of the Institute for American Strategy, a nonpartisan, privately managed organization financed by the contributions of more than 100 corporations and several foundations. Cooperating with the institute were the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and groups and individuals from industry, education, and Government.

MAIN NEED SPELLED OUT

The resolution said that the main need was to provide authoritative, competent, and objective advice on the adequacy of existing text, reference, and source materials for courses on communism on all educational levels.

The group refrained from making specific recommendations on courses. However, it said that "an examination of existing programs shows a compelling need to strengthen school curriculums."

Instrumental in preparing the resolution were William Yandell Elliott, Harvard University professor and former consultant to the State Department and National Security Council, and Msgr. William E. McManus, superintendent of schools of the Catholic archdiocese of Chicago. Monsignor McManus headed the conference's educational advisory committee and Elliott its program development committee.

TWO DANGERS CITED

The resolution urged that two dangers be avoided.

"First we must not be frightened into using the educational and political methods of the enemy. Second, we must not lose, in our concern with communism, the balance of science, the humanities, and the cultural traditions which is the true strength of freedom," the resolution said.

Stricken from the first draft was a recommendation that a specific organization with a board of directors be set up to promote improvement of courses on communism.

It was understood that the committees, after some disagreement, decided that such a step should come from educational groups themselves.

At the closing session, Elliott said: "This must grow out of the grassroots of the educational community itself, otherwise it will not be accepted."

In urging support for "realistic teaching of the history and policies of communism," the resolution declared: "This means protecting our constitutional system against false friends as well as open or covert enemies. It means assisting our youth as well as our mature citizens to detect and to protect themselves against extremists at both ends of the spectrum."

Elliott said he did not think that the conference's action should or would "give impetus to crackpots all over the country."

There were unresolved differences of opinion among the speakers at the conference but several broad themes were common to many of their remarks. Among them were:

Many Americans, including otherwise well informed community leaders, do not understand the scope and depth of the Communist effort around the world and they do not yet have the degree of understanding needed to respond effectively.

The United States must find a way to counteract, with its own message, the Soviet propaganda and cultural offensive aimed at convincing the uncommitted nations that communism is the shortcut answer to their problems.

Communists in this country have not made deep inroads in American education but their efforts to do so are continuing.

Individual responsibility and free choice must be increasingly emphasized in an era when they are being challenged by bigness in government, business, and labor.

More Americans should be able to articulate what they believe in and why.

Housing Loans Made Under Title V of the Housing Act of 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, farm housing loans made under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 are used to finance the construction, alteration, repair, or modernization of farm homes and service buildings. Since the program started in 1949, 44,000 families have received loans totaling $300 million.

There is an extensive and continuing need for this type of credit service to farmowners who are not in a position to improve their homes and farm buildings with their own resources or with a loan from a private or cooperative credit source. The farm housing program gives such families an opportunity to acquire an adequate home and necessary farm buildings by making available loans at favorable rates and terms. Farm housing loans bear 4 percent interest and may be repaid within periods up to 33 years.

The rate at which funds are being obligated and applications being received indicates the rate of obligation will increase substantially during the coming spring months. As of February 28, 1961, 4,189 loans, totaling $31,657,671, had been obligated. New obligations currently exceed $1 million a week and are soon expected to reach several million dollars a week. Applications on hand as of February 28, 1961, were close to 10,000, which is a third more than a year ago. Almost 1,500 applications were received during February and this number was 45 percent greater than the number received during February last year.

Farm housing loans are made throughout the rural areas of the United States. The loans provide farm families with an opportunity to acquire an adequate house and efficient service buildings. The credit extended also provides job opportunities for carpenters, electricians, and masons and increases the volume of business of building supply dealers and related service industries.

Most of the farm housing funds have been used for dwelling purposes. Last year, 70 percent of the funds was spent by borrowers for new dwellings and 10 percent for dwelling modernization and repair, such as adding a bath and sewage disposal system, central heating, and kitchen modernization. The remaining 20 percent was used for construction and modernization of farm service buildings and water systems.

The average cost of a new dwelling during the 1960 fiscal year was about $9,800. This represented an increase from about $8,000 4 years ago.

Study Finds Lag in U.S. Shipbuilding Methods—Modernization Is Necessary, Facts Need To Be Determined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the New York Herald Tribune of March 18, 1961, carried an article by the financial writer, Allen M. Smythe, which refers to a recent informal study by our Navy officials of U.S. shipbuilding methods. Our Navy experts apparently concurred with the findings of an official British report on world shipbuilding which states that Germany, Japan and Sweden lead the world in shipbuilding techniques, with Holland and Norway close behind.

The writer quotes the pointed comment of Adm. Ralph K. James, Chief of the Bureau of Ships that, "plans for new war vessels require that American shipyards lead, not lag, in shipbuilding." Despite this fact, we witness a constant spiral in the cost of American warships—$109 million for a Polaris-type submarine and $285 million for an atomic aircraft carrier—due perhaps in part to the lag in shipbuilding technology.

It would not seem irrelevant to suggest, Mr. President, that the Defense Department, the Department of Commerce, and the Maritime Commission should investigate the accuracy of the official British report and determine the part that the lack of modernization of American shipyards has played in the mounting costs of our naval and commercial vessels.

In order that Members of this body may inform themselves more adequately on this problem, I ask unanimous consent that the Herald Tribune article be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

STUDY FINDS UNITED STATES LAGGING IN SHIPBUILDING METHODS

(By Allen M. Smythe)

A recent informal study just completed by high Navy officials of American shipbuilding methods has revealed "a very disturbing" lack of the latest modern techniques that are needed to construct the future nuclear surface naval vessels and deep-diving submarines.

The Navy technical experts agree with a recent British official report that Germany, Japan and Sweden lead the world in modern shipbuliding methods. Norway and Holland are close behind.

The British report did not list the United States as being ahead in any category. However, the other countries are admitted to be

well in advance in equipment for metal-shaping, in welding equipment and in modern methods of ship construction.

ADMIRAL'S COMMENT

Adm. Ralph K. James, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, said: "I dislike to learn that the shipyards of smaller and less wealthy countries are ahead in metallurgical research, marine engineering, installed facilities and productivity. Plans for new war vessels require that American shipyards lead, not lag, in shipbuilding progress."

Other Navy officials revealed that for over a year the Navy has been urging private shipyards to modernize their plants in order to reduce costs and efficiently construct the latest designs of submarines and surface vessels.

Administration and congressional leaders have been concerned about the increasing costs of naval vessels—$109 million for a Polaris-type submarine and $285 million for an atomic aircraft carrier, for example.

The British report, issued by the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, emphasized costs of commercial ship construction. It estimated the world production of ships during the next 5 years could fall to a quarter of the present level (8,300,000 tons) before it begins to recover.

LABOR COSTS CHEAPER

At a rough estimate, labor costs in 1959 were 20 percent cheaper in Germany and 45 percent cheaper in Japan, but 40 percent dearer in Sweden than in England. Sweden has been securing her share of the market because Swedish yards were able to offset higher labor and materiel costs against substantially higher productivity. The average time in months to build a ship in the period 1957 to 1959 were: Britain, 19; Germany, 10; Sweden, 9, and Japan, 8.

Against the background of excess shipbuilding capacity in the world, and the probable contraction in British shipyard production over the next few years, the report reaches these conclusions:

1. The world shipbuilding industry is facing a major and probably prolonged recession.

2. There is no indication that the United Kingdom shipbuilding industry has on balance any marked technical or economic advantage over its major foreign competitors, apart from its large home market.

3. The total effort at present devoted to research and development in the field of shipbuilding and marine propulsion is insufficient in relation to the serious problems now facing the industry.

4. In particular, almost no organized research has hitherto been applied to the industry's production and management problems with the object of increasing the productivity of labor and capital and reducing costs.

5. While adequate effort is probably being devoted to problems of hull resistance and propeller design, the development of propulsion installations is handicapped by the organizational structure of the industries producing propulsion units and auxiliaries, and in consequence by the insufficient use of available research facilities.

Many Navy officials believe these conclusions apply equally well to the U.S. shipbuilding industry.

Mexico: Our Troubled Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Newsday's Jack Altshul recently spent a month in Mexico. He has written an excellent account of his experiences and his analysis of the Mexican political scene in a series for Newsday, the Long Island publication. Sympathy for Castro is greater in Mexico than the United States likes to admit. U.S. policies have not kept up with the Mexican ambition for greater economic progress and national development. To combat the call for revolution from Moscow, the United States must press its case for peaceful evolution in vivid and forceful terms.

The program first enunciated by President Eisenhower and authorized in the act of Bogotá is an excellent beginning for a policy which I hope the present administration will practice as well as preach.

As former Ambassador to Mexico, Robert C. Hill, who distinguished himself on the football field as well as at the conference table, pointed out "We have to approach Latin America as partners not as masters." We must work out and carry out with them the programs which are necessary to raise the standards of living and literacy in Latin American nations.

Mr. President, in order that this perceptive analysis may come to the attention of a wide national audience and receive the careful study it deserves, I ask unanimous consent to have printed two articles by Jack Altshul in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

MEXICO: OUR TROUBLED NEIGHBOR

(Is Mexico ready to follow Cuba and become a trouble spot right at our border? Newsday's Jack Altshul spent a month touring our neighbor to the south, observing and speaking to people in all walks of life. Here is his report in this series of articles beginning today.)

(By Jack Altshul)

The setting might have been Moscow or Peiping or Havana. Gathered in conclave were several hundred hard core Communists and their sympathizers from farflung corners of the world. They billed themselves as a World Peace Congress, extolled Fidel Castrol and excoriated the United States. The time was 3 weeks ago. The place, Mexico City—capital of the nation that shares 1,600 miles of border with the United States.

It was no coincidence that the 5-day conference had selected Mexico as its locale. For the past year it has been the scene of anti-American demonstrations, an unusual series of leftist statements by Government leaders and a gigantic propaganda and espionage effort by the Soviet Union.

Such a conference poses the question:

Is Mexico becoming the soft underbelly of the United States in its fight against Soviet penetration of the Western Hemisphere?

A tour of the country can produce a picture as confusing as the complexities of Mexican political life, despite interviews and quiet chats with Government officials. American embassy representatives, businessmen of both countries, Communists, campesinos on agrarian reform farms, university students, and man-on-the-street types.

Their opinions ranged from forebodings that Mexico may follow Cuba into the Moscow camp to predictions that President Adolfo Lopez Mateos is leading his country on a continuing course of stability and prosperity that will make it impervious to Soviet blandishments.

MEXICANIZATION PUSHED

The most objective evaluation, shared by a number of U.S. Embassy attachés, is that most Mexicans fear and abhor Soviet-style communism but the country still remains vulnerable to its salesmen. The vulnerability exists because:

1. The private enterprise system that has sparked the last 15 years of Mexico's prosperous industrial revolution has suddenly run into roadblocks from an administration that feels it politically expedient to make concessions to the left.

2. Mexico's presently sound economic structure could collapse if the Government insists on injecting itself into the business picture.

3. Should this happen, the Soviet Union will have built up a fifth column that may be strong enough to exploit resulting chaotic conditions.

In the past year, American investments in Mexico have dropped sharply as the Government moved in to nationalize the light and power and movie industries, took over a number of businesses and pushed a program to force 'Mexicanization" (Mexican majority control) of all new companies. Three previous administrations had adopted a comparative handsoff policy toward the private enterprise system and it was during their tenure that the nation made its greatest economic advances.

The problem that will confront the still-to-be appointed U.S. Ambassador to Mexico is whether Lopez Mateos' policies signify the end of a 15-year-old mutual interest past—a pact most observers agree is largely responsible for Mexico's current prosperity.

Suspicions that this might be the case were aroused during 1960 because Lopez Mateos' veer toward increased state socialism coincided with stepped-up Soviet propaganda efforts selling the Castro revolution as the ideal for which Mexicans should strive.

There were other worrisome signs.

In August, Mexico University students staged two anti-American demonstrations in which they attempted to burn the American flag and stone the glass-fronted U.S. Embassy building on Mexico City's fashionable Paseo de la Reforma. The demonstrations capped off a long series of leftist statements from Government leaders. Congressional Leader Emilio Sanchez Piedras reaffirmed Mexico's solidarity with Cuba. President Lopez Mateos defined his administration's stand as being to the "extreme left within the constitution."

That Lopez Mateos' definition can be interpreted as a tipoff that he is ideologically sympathetic to communism is given little credence even in politically conservative quarters. Most observers believe he had to make the traditional obeisance to "izquierda" (the left) because there are powerful political leaders on that side of the fence who do not believe he is advancing fast enough the cause of Mexico's social revolution.

Chief among these is fellow-traveling Lazaro Cardenas, President of Mexico between 1934 and 1940 and the leading figure at the recently concluded "peace congress." Cardenas is retired from politics but many believe he would like to return and that he has been chafing for 20 years at the conservative direction taken by the three Presidents who succeeded him and preceded Lopez Mateos.

It was Cardenas who expropriated United States and British oil holdings in 1938, a historic move that gave him Lincolnesque stature among his people. It was also Cardenas who distributed more land among the peasants than any President before or since. And it is Cardenas, today, who sings the praises of Fidel Castro's Cuba and whose voice, observers feel, is forcing Lopez Mateos on an increasingly socialistic course. They regard, for instance, Lopez Mateos' nationalization of the light and power industry as an effort to undercut Cardenas and still his voice.

UNITED STATES IS DISTRUSTED

When the President announced on September 1 that he had purchased the foreign-owned Mexican Power & Light Co. to complete the nationalization of the electric industry, he declared a national holiday and watched schoolchildren march with yellow armbands that proclaimed "Electricity for the Mexicans."

Since then he has also nationalized the movie industry by purchasing the two leading movie chains in the country, and pushed the Mexicanization policy which makes it difficult for a foreign company to do business unless it gives up majority control to Mexican capital.

Both moves received mixed reaction. U.S. businessmen expressed nervousness and their jitters were reflected in a sharp dropoff of investments. It was rumored that one U.S. firm had canceled a $25 million industrial development. On the other hand, Mexicans generally saluted Lopez Mateos' policies if for no other reason than their president was showing his independence of the United States.

To the average Mexican, the United States presents an image of a rich, patronizing neighbor who swindled him out of most of his property and is still seeking to dominate him. There is some historical justification for the image. Through war and power politics the United States was able to acquire more than half of Mexico's territory between 1836 and 1948. It is hard for them to forget that Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California once belonged to Mexico.

The Mexican also remembers that as recently as 1910, Americans owned nearly half the total wealth of Mexico and that even as liberal a President as Woodrow Wilson ordered American troops into Vera Cruz in 1917. Only 22 years ago a group of American oil men, in effect, disputed the Mexican Government's right to rule its own country.

What most Mexicans are unwilling to accept and what Lopez Mateos feels would be political suicide to concede is that there has been change in the breed of American businessmen from circa 1910 to those of today. It is not a popular concept in Mexico to give credit to the American capitalist who crossed the border with his know-how after World War II and sparked an industrial revolution that has brought the country its present prosperity.

It took an era of mutual interest with the United States for Mexico to lift itself up from an agrarian economy in which the overwhelming majority of its people lived on bare subsistence levels. The era really began in 1943 when the late President Roosevelt came to Monterrey for a meeting with Cardenas' successor, Manuel Avila Camacho. F.D.R. needed Mexican minerals for the war effort and he got it in exchange for an agreement to help rehabilitate the nation's broken-down railway system. He also agreed to finance a program for a highly expanded electropower capacity and to accelerate the development of certain basic industries.

This opened the door for the industrial revolution which followed World War II and hundreds of American companies started Mexican branches to take advantage of the emergence of a middle class and new-found buying power. The revolution went on through the conservative administrations of Luis Miguel Aleman and Adolfo Ruiz Cortines.

Today Mexico has reached its "takeoff stage." The capital, Mexico City, is a bustling metropolis of 5 million population, second only to New York in the Western Hemisphere. Monterrey and Guadalajara, the next two industrial giants, have trebled their population since 1940. Mexico can look back on its last 15 years as the most prosperous in its history and can count among its gains an increase of 5 times its national income and 10 times its production in manufacturing, oil, steel, and iron since 1940.

AMERICAN INVEST $1 BILLION

These giant steps, of course, were accomplished under a system of private enterprise aided substantially by investments from American companies that now have a stake in Mexico totaling well over $1 billion. Of the estimated 500 American companies doing business in Mexico today, almost 80 percent have come in since 1945.

But in less than 12 months the system that has bred prosperity is undergoing refinements of a nature that prompted even Mexican businessmen last November to openly question the Government's attitude toward private enterprise.

They received President Lopez Mateos' answer a month later when he told newsmen: "Private capital has been using skates and we are traveling by motorcycle. You can see anywhere you go that the works of the official sector are much more impressive than those of the private sector."

The President's glowing assessment of Government initiative is disputed in many quarters today by knowledgeable people who have been dealing with and in Mexico for years.

An American lawyer, who has been in Mexico for 42 years and whose friends are among the most powerful in the nation, said: "The President is talking rubbish when he brags about government enterprise. Every nationalization program has ended in dismal failure. The Federal railway system loses from 200 million to 600 million pesos a year, service is bad, sabotage frequent, and wrecks an almost daily occurrence. Carelessness is rampant and the Government's authority over workers to do a good job nonexistent. It always has to worry that regulatory measures will have a bad political reaction.

"The Government makes proud statements about the success of the oil industry since it was taken over by Cardenas in 1938. The fact of the matter is that 80 percent of Mexico's oil production is dependent on one field in Poza Rica, which was developed 40 years ago by private enterprise. It is showing signs of petering out and, since it is a coastal field, engineers are convinced that drills will hit salt water any time now.

"When they purchased the light and power companies, they did it by refusing to allow them to raise their rates by as much as 6 percent, although labor and other costs had risen many times more than that. Now that the Government owns it, they find that they'll have to raise the rates 50 percent and even then they won't have enough capital to keep going. Can you imagine the howl when the Mexican people finally get the bill?"

A high-ranking official in the administration of President Luis Miguel Aleman, under whom Mexico made its greatest postwar gains, is also disenchanted with the extent of government participation in private enterprises.

"There is a difference," he said, "between Mexico building highways, dams, and other projects for the public good and getting itself in businesses which it takes experts, not political ministers to run. The Government has taken over about 350 companies, which is a far cry from its original intention of confining itself to basic industry. What is basic about the movie industry for instance?"

The former officeholder lashed out, too, at what he termed "nepotism and venality" in the present administration.

As an example he points to the position now held by Mariano Lopez Mateos, the president's brother. "For 22 years, this man was a ticket-taker for the federal railway system. Now suddenly he is on his way to becoming a millionaire because he has been put in charge of the government warehouse and storage company that imports basic foodstuffs we don't grow in our own country. And he is only one example. Every time the government takes over a business, somebody close to the president gets a big job that would amount in your country to the presidency of a corporation."

An American businessman who came to Mexico only 3 years ago and has made a fortune admitted that the reason he has been successful is: "I found out you got to have the right kind of partners if you want to do business down here. My business is selling to the government. I have 16 associates in my firm. All of them are relatives or friends of government ministers."

While they hesitate to express it publicly, most American businessmen are gravely concerned about the policy of Mexicanization Lopez Mateos has been pushing for the past year. Although there is no formal law, foreign investors seeking to begin industries in 1960 found themselves stalled in obtaining government concessions for which they had come down in the first place. Even companies in business here for years found themselves subjected to Mexicanization pressures. One firm employing about 1,500 heard bluntly from a government minister that it ought to give up its majority control.

REFUSAL BROUGHT STRIKE

The company refused and found itself in the middle of a strike in which its workers demanded a 25-percent wage increase. In the past it had been able to appeal to the government for reasonable arbitration with the knowledge it had the power of settling strikes. But in this case the government kept hands off and the strike lasted for 5 months, the company finally capitulating to a 20-percent wage increase, although holding firm in resisting Mexicanization.

A troubled U.S. Embassy official said: "The combination of nationalization and Mexicanization is just too much for foreign investors to cope with and we're just not getting nearly as many calls from people who want to start new businesses as we used to. If Lopez Mateos continues succumbing to pressures from the left to nationalize and to pressures from his own businessmen who want to get in on the profits foreigners showed them were here, I'm afraid the whole bubble can burst."

If it does, the Communists are waiting to take over.

WANTED: NEW U.S. POLICY ON MEXICO

(This is the last of a series on our shaky relations with Mexico by Jack Altshul, who recently returned from a month-long tour of the country.)

The stadium at the University of Mexico was packed to its 100,000 capacity for a game of American-style football. The opponents were Mexico University and Mexico Polytechnical Institute, traditional rivals. One of the interested spectators was an old Dartmouth lineman, Robert C. Hill, then U.S. Ambassador to Mexico. He had expressed an interest in seeing how football is played south of the border and the rector of the university had invited him to occupy the box of honor—on the 50-yard line but fortified against thrown objects by a padlocked, wire-mesh cage.

Just before the kickoff a group of students snake danced up to the box with a football and asked the Ambassador if he would be willing to throw out the first ball. Hill went them one better. He offered to kickoff on the field. Horrified officials representing the Mexican Government and the school warned him against the gesture. They could not guarantee his safety, because on that

day in 1959 Fidel Castro was the hero of the university and Uncle Sam the villain.

Hill, a husky 6-footer, came out of the cage to a mingled reception of whistled catcalls and a few cheers for his courage. He made it down to the field unmolested and proceed to show the fans an American-type place kick, booting the ball 60 yards over the goal-line, a feat never before seen in the stadium. When he returned to his box, the stadium was on its feet according him a demonstration usually reserved for a historic performance by a matador.

Bob Hill went on to become one of the most popular emissaries Washington had ever sent down to Mexico City. He won this affection during a period when anti-Americanism was manifesting itself throughout Mexico and when Soviet-Cuba propaganda efforts were building a fire under the Mexican people.

An Eisenhower appointee, Hill resigned from office last November to successfully run for the legislature in his home State of New Hampshire. His successor has yet to be picked by President Kennedy.

I interviewed him recently in New York where he was on his way to make a speech in Texas on what this Government's policy should be toward Latin America. It was a few days before the announcement from the President that he was going to ask Congress to approve a multimillion-dollar program for Latin America along the lines of the Marshall Plan.

"There is no question that we need a policy toward Mexico and the rest of Latin America," Hill declared. "And there is no question that we haven't had one in 15 years. We have been practicing crisis diplomacy instead of long-range planning all over the world and now that we have a problem with Castro, Latin America is our crisis. This is in contrast to the Soviet Union which has a planned policy and follows it."

Hill brought up the football kickoff incident as an illustration of another weak point in our dealings with Latin American nations. "They respect strength, not vacillation. If I had sat by in a protected cage at the football game, I would have given 100,000 people the image of a frightened Uncle Sam. When I was lucky enough to get off a good kick, they respected me for it. Their whistles changed to cheers. I don't expect every ambassador to Latin America to be able to kick a football 60 yards, but we will never gain their respect unless our diplomats are willing to get down to the level of the people.

"Castro is definitely a danger to our continued peaceful relations with Latin America. They have traditional reasons for hating and fearing us and when one of their own can thumb his nose at us and get away with it, he has their sympathy. It is our job to show them that he can't get away with it. But we have to go a step further. We also have to approach Latin America as partners, not masters. Our diplomats can't run their embassies at cocktail parties for the privileged few of each nation."

Hill's sentiments are echoed in many quarters in Mexico City. One Government official, whose views do not always coincide with that of President Adolfo Lopez Mateos, told me frankly:

"The sooner your Government forgets the phrase, 'Monroe Doctrine,' the sooner it will gain the respect of many nations to your south. The United States must realize that it does not speak for all of the Western Hemisphere, that every nation wants a voice in hemispheric policy."

Other influential Mexicans told me that one of the reasons anti-American resentment has manifested itself since the ascension of Castro is that the Latin American nations have felt themselves neglected for 15 years. "When your late President Roosevelt was at the head of Government," one of them said, "he took a big interest in our problems—a mutual interest. But for the last 15 years, your Government has offered financial aid to every part of the world but in your own hemisphere."

A professor at the University of Mexico, who does not subscribe to the Communist and near-Communist leanings of many of his fellow faculty members, criticized the limitations of the American student-exchange program. "Less than 20 Mexican students received scholarships to America last year despite a thousand requests," he said.

From Moscow come offers of 500 scholarships to Latin America for their Freedom University in Prague. And from Moscow, too, comes an impressive program of catering to the intellectual in Latin America through the medium of cultural fairs, appearances by leading dancers and musicians, and sponsorship of trips. It is in this field that the United States has fallen down badly.

In Latin America today the race is between evolutions and revolution. From Moscow the message is that revolution is the answer. The United States, so far, has not kept pace in selling evolution.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the 12th in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done, in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter.

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

MIGRANT INCOME VARIES

"It is the story of men and women and children who work 136 days in the year and average $900 a year."—"Harvest of Shame."

The most informed estimates available in Palm Beach County is that migrant workers who winter here average better than 100 working days and around $700 in the half year they are here.

Frequently a family unit, with father, mother, and older children working can earn a good half-year income before moving north with the harvest.

In the Glades area, migrants can count on 7 to 9 months of employment if they want it, Belle Glade Police Chief Charles Goodlett has found.

"They may arrive in September to work on corn and beans and stay for the other crops," he said.

In the coastal area, the situation is a little different, according to the Florida State Employment Service.

Bob Douglas, who's been in close contact with the migrant picture for more than 10 years, said the State figures show the average migrant in the immediate vicinity works an average 4-day week and stays 22 weeks.

His earnings may range up to $700, Douglas said, depending on the crops, the individual, and the weather.

Pieceworkers—such as pickers—average about $450 on the coast, depending on the aforementioned factors, he said, but some have been found to make $9 per day.

The wife's income can be added to this as well as money earned by older children, he said.

"There are many things which determine the earnings," he said. "I've seen workers who decide they've made enough money for the day stop and wait 4 hours for a truck to haul them from the fields."

Many like the social life in the fields, he said, and spend much time in talking, playing cards, or eating around the chuck wagons.

Basically, he said, the migrants who work on the coast arrive about the middle of November and stay until May.

Tenth Anniversary of General MacArthur's Speech to a Joint Session of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the 10th anniversary of the historic occasion of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's speech to a joint session of the Congress. For it was on April 19, 1951, that this truly remarkable and dedicated American patriot delivered his magnificent address from the rostrum in this House where we now sit. It was not my privilege then to be a Member of this great body. However, I can well remember sitting by my radio and being stirred by the power and the poignance of this great man's gifted and lofty eloquence.

The passage of 10 years of time has merely served to asseverate the truth of General MacArthur's historic pronouncement. From his tremendous breadth of experience and knowledge he delivered a warning which was so prescient that it demands repeating in this hour. I quote from his speech of 10 years ago today a single paragraph:

There are some who for varying reasons would appease Red China. They are blind to history's clear lessons for history teaches with unmistakable emphasis that appeasement but begets new and bloodier wars. It points to no single instance where this end has justified that means, where appeasement has led to more than a sham peace. Like blackmail, it lays the basis for new and successively greater demands, until, as in blackmail, violence becomes the only other alternative.

This advice is just as salient and meaningful today as when it was uttered a decade ago. Indeed world events during this intervening period have proven its wisdom beyond peradventure of a doubt.

I sincerely hope that a new President and a new administration will re-read this speech of April 19, 1951, and ponder its message. We are all sincerely motivated by a wish for peace and the twin desire to accomplish a lessening of the present international tensions.

However, this should not obscure from us the fact that we cannot compromise with evil. We cannot recognize Red China as a peaceful member of the community of nations when her actions belie such recognition. We cannot and should not seat the Red Chinese in the United Nations to obfuscate and eventually destroy the work of that body.

This was, I believe essentially the advice that General MacArthur gave us 10 years ago today.

Blueprint of Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a column of April 17 by the gifted writer Ralph McGill, which recalls the mass murders committed by the Nazis be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This column is not pleasant reading, but it is a potent reminder of the end results of a totalitarian system whether it be Fascist or Communist. It should serve to strengthen us in our determination to preserve our free and democratic society.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1961]

THE PASSING SCENE—EICHMANN TRIAL'S BIZARRE TONE

(By Ralph McGill)

To any of the reporters who covered sessions of the Nuremberg trials, the trial of Adolf Eichmann is bizarre only in the cloak-and-dagger details of the more than a decade of patient search for the man who was one of those responsible for the deaths of millions of men, women, and children.

The mind automatically rejects the word "millions." For most of us the word death conjures up a battlefield, which few have seen, or the death of a friend or one of the family in which as much of the reality of it as possible is obscured and diluted by the undertaker's arts.

BLUEPRINT OF DEATH

The blueprinted plan of death which Eichmann and others carried out as part of the Nazi philosophy of establishing a superrace is so massive an operation in murder that the mind cannot quite take it in.

"Millions? Millions? They killed millions?"

The answer is "Yes." They did. Millions.

No man who sat any time in the grim old courtroom at Nuremberg as the trial of the Nazi war criminals slowly, tediously unfolded will ever forget his experiences. Eichmann would have been there had he not escaped.

The witnesses came. Some were badly crippled from the fortunes inflicted. There were men and women who had fingers which looked like lumpy carrots. They had been broken and burned in efforts to extract information from them. Others were mutilated by experimental operations and tests of new surgical techniques which the Nazis hoped could be used on their wounded in the many military hospitals.

There were women there who had been hideously used. Some had the prison numbers tattooed on their arms. Many had been forced into soldiers' brothels.

The representatives of the super race were in the defendant's box—Goering, Hess, Speer, Schacht, Rosenberg, Streicher—22 of them. They did not look like supermen, sitting there in their prison clothing, their faces aging, the jowls of the fatter ones sagging; the faces of the thinner ones lined and masklike.

They heard the witnesses day in and out. Usually they were silent. Now and then one would whisper with another. Two managed to commit suicide—Robert Ley and Hermann Goering.

One could leave them and go to the courts trying the lesser criminals. I recall one such. He had been in charge of one of the lesser known concentration camps. He was charged with having killed more than 40,000 men, women, and children—Jews, Poles, and Balts. They put him on the stand.

"I did it," he sneered. "It was a fine life while it lasted. We had a great time. I have no remorse. We lost. Now it is over. Let us be done with this. I am guilty. Hang me."

They did. But one does not forget such a man.

There was another one. He had sent an estimated 20,000 to be executed. They had gone, of course, in daily groups. Many were marched into long ditches and made to lie face downward. Soldiers with automatic rifles walked along shooting into the bodies. The dirt was then scooped back into the ditch, and the fact that some were merely badly wounded and not dead did not concern them. It was not pleasant to hear the defendant say, "It was an order. What else was there to do?"

The stories of the larger camps are more familiar. The gas chambers went night and day—as did the crematories.

CAMPS OF DESPAIR

If one wearied of the trials one could go to the concentration camps made into rehabilitation centers. There, still skeleton-thin men, women, and children were waiting out their departure. There were children who would never know what became of their parents. There were husbands who would never know what had become of their wives or children; mothers who would never know where or how their husbands or children had died.

In the summer of 1959 those newspapermen who went to Moscow and Poland with the then Vice President Nixon went with Mr. Nixon as the Poles showed the graves of several thousands of persons taken into the forests outside Warsaw and shot down by the Nazi guards. (Eichmann was said to be one of those who planned it all.)

Anyone who had seen all that will oppose all the rest of his life any Fascist or Communist groups which seek to dilute American freedom by fanatic attacks on our courts, our Constitution, and our individual liberty.

Long Beach Federal Savings & Loan Case Bungling by Home Loan Bank Board Causes Distress to Many Innocent Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this RECORD has carried many items in the past contributed by myself and other Members of Congress respecting the inept actions of the Home Loan Bank Board against the Long Beach Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Many years ago the Board seized this institution and finally had to restore it to its management when it turned out the seizure was unfounded and improper. Last year the Board again seized the institution. An investigation followed by the House Committee on Government Operations which concluded the Board acted improperly and the negotiations should be promptly made to restore the institution to its management. These negotiations have dragged on for approximately 10 months and still they have not been concluded. The Board's so-called conservator in charge of the institution's assets has been anything but conserving them. One of these assets is a loan on a large real estate development known as the Bellehurst tract in Orange County, Calif. Because of this trouble between the Board and the association's management not only has the company developing Bellehurst been stopped in the midst of its operations, but hundreds of persons who purchased homes there have been caused to suffer anxiety and loss. The following is typical of hundreds of letters I have received from these home buyers.

APRIL 12, 1961.

Re the Bellehurst development.
The Honorable CRAIG HOSMER,
House of Representatives, House Post Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The more than 250 families residing in the Bellehurst development of Buena Park, Calif., are seriously concerned with the loss in value of our homes. Our homes are now worth at least $10,000 less than the $30,000 to $40,000 we paid for them and continue to decline in value daily.

Sales stopped in August of 1960 when title to the area was apparently clouded by lawsuits brought by the trustees under the trust deeds covering the development. There has been no construction for almost 2 years since the Federal Home Loan Bank Board took control of the development. As a result we have been living in a blighted area of partially completed premium housing with continuing deterioration in appearance and declining sales prospects. All of this is destroying the value of our homes and seriously jeopardizing the millions of dollars of financing the Government has tied up in the development as the present managers of Long Beach Federal.

We understand that an agreement for continued financing and completion of the development between the developer and the Home Loan Bank Board and/or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation was entered into early in December of 1960. Whether or not the old management of Long Beach Federal was a party we do not know, but we understand its consent may have been required in order to clear title so that financing could go forward. Apparently the agreement provided for close of escrow on March 31, but for some reason the escrow did not close and no extension of the closing date occurred. We say for "some reason" because there is apparently disagreement between the parties involved as to who is responsible for the delay.

We are not primarily concerned with who is to blame except insofar as investigation will result in concrete action to get this development underway again. Only in this way can our property values be protected and the area again made an attractive one for family living, thus assuring renewed sales potential. Certainly the Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation have a tremendous stake in protecting the millions of dollars already tied up here.

As homeowners we feel we are caught in the middle of the disputes between the Bank Board, the ousted Long Beach Federal management and the developer, in which we have no part but which have cost us individually and collectively many hundred thousands of dollars already. Unless something is done about this at once, we are faced with complete loss of our investment.

We hope you will apprise yourself of the facts of this situation and take active steps to see that the Federal agencies involved promptly proceed with a program which will reactivate the development.

Sincerely,

BELLEHURST COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION,
JOHN WALLER, *President.*

The Home Loan Bank Board was established by Congress to help people, not cause them grief and loss. It is high time the Board carried out the responsibility fixed on it by law and the obligations it owes to the people of the country which it is supposed to serve.

Scientific Successes of Soviets and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in the wake of last week's news that the Soviet Union had made the first orbit of a man in space, much was heard in this country about the urgency to catch up with the Russian achievement. I recalled the observation of Henry Kissinger that, "Our period offers no prizes for having done rather well." This is true. But at the same time we must not lose sight of our own accomplishments. Many of these achievements have lacked the element of spectacle, yet their significance is far reaching. President Kennedy, I thought, said something last week that passed with little notice, but is worth repeating as an example of what I mean.

The President said that if we could produce fresh water from salt water at a cheap rate we would score a gain "which would really dwarf any other scientific accomplishment." We are working toward that goal and there is a good chance we will push toward it more rapidly.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Post of April 16, by Howard Simons, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is a calm and clear interpretation of recent events.

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

SOVIET SURELY EXCELS US IN SHOW WINDOW—U.S. SCIENCE SUCCESSES UNSUNG

(By Howard Simons)

(Simons, a Washingtonian, has written on scientific subjects for magazines and other periodicals for several years.)

Not since the advent of John F. Kennedy, Jr., has a predictable event been so anticipated or prepublicized as the Russian man-in-space flight. Even though the Russian success came as no surprise, perhaps because of this Pavlovian conditioning, when the bell finally rang, the world drooled.

The impact of this latest Soviet space spectacular will be as great as the launching of Sputnik I was on October 4, 1957. It will reinforce Russia's apparent usurpation of world technological supremacy.

It will again raise cries in this country for review and revaluation of our own effort. It will suggest military implications, and it will heighten interest in man's step-by-step conquest of the heavens.

A PROPAGANDA BONUS

It would, of course, be a grievous error for American decisionmakers to downgrade the political and propaganda value of outer space spectaculars. The propaganda by-product of Sputnik I was not foreseen by either American or Russian planners. What began as an experiment for the recent International Geophysical Year has become a potent geopolitical weapon.

Certainly the peoples of emerging nations have been impressed with the Russian successes in outer space. These feats have been a dramatic advertisement for Russia to show that it has risen from backward agriculture to advanced technology in just a few decades.

There is no doubt that if the United States had launched the first earth satellite, the impact on the world would not have been as great as that achieved by the Russians; it would have been expected of us. Also lost on the peoples of the world are the subtleties of why the United States is lagging behind the Russians.

Few persons know or care that the United States made a decision to build smaller boosters because of its remarkable breakthrough in reducing the size of nuclear warheads, from the big fission affairs to the small fusion bombs.

At the time, it was a monetary decision. The United States could perfect intercontinental ballistic missiles cheaper than the Russians could. That was before both sides realized that outer space exploration would be a major ideological weapon.

CELESTIAL ARTILLERY

But the Russians' successful orbit of Maj. Yuri Gagarin in near-space also has heavy military implications. There can be little doubt that the Russians will soon be capable of launching a manned spaceship that can fire a rocket at a target on earth in much the same manner they launched a rocket from a satellite toward Venus February 12.

It would be an expensive weapon, however, and the Polaris nuclear submarine can do the same job with the same advantages—it is hard to detect and hard to destroy—at the proverbial half-the-price. Nonetheless, one cannot discount the psychological effects of a Russian orbiting the earth in a nuclear arsenal.

But to suggest that the Russian feat was "the greatest scientific achievement in the history of mankind," as did the British scientist Sir Bernard Lovel, is gilding the lily. President Kennedy gave it the proper emphasis when he congratulated the Russians on an "outstanding technological accomplishment."

This choice of terminology points up a continuing problem for American scientists, made sharper by space spectaculars: how to make clear in the public mind the great difference between science and its offspring, technology.

The United States has been outdone repeatedly in terms of propaganda by Russia's outer space feats. Yet it has not been second best in scientific achievement. On the contrary, it is an intriguing paradox of the so-called space race that American efforts receive less respect at home than in the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

Since Sputnik I, the boxscore reads: Soviet Union: 1 man in space, 11 Earth satellites, 2 shots around the Sun, and 1 to the Moon; United States: 37 Earth satellites, and 2 Sun orbiters. Yet, discovery for discovery, Russian achievements in outer space are no match for America's which include:

The first detection of trapped particles through the discovery and identification of the Van Allen radiation belts.

Satellite contributions to geodesy and celestial mechanics, including the theory that the earth is pear shaped.

Tiros cloud cover pictures which promise satellite weather forecasting.

Echo and Courier satellite communications experiments which will lead to a satellite-based communications system.

Transit satellite experiments for all-weather navigation.

GRANDSTANDING IS COSTLY

In fact, it has been a mystery to American space experts why the Russians have failed to exploit their capabilities scientifically. One observer says it may be that the Russians are using their dramatic space shots solely for propaganda purposes, with science as a poor hitchhiker, and then filling in the gaps with data from American findings in outer space.

For one thing, the Russians are running a very expensive program. One Pentagon official suggests that one reason why the Russians have been so sparing with their launchings is the enormous cost of sending up one of their 7-ton vehicles.

Some American scientists have expressed reservations about spending billions on outer space, particularly for a man in space. One is James R. Killian, Jr., President Eisenhower's first special assistant for science, who has said that he would rather see the huge sums spent on outer space used for earthly education instead.

Other scientists say that if the United States wants to catch the Russians purely for propaganda reasons, the terms should be spelled out just that way and the job done. But if the scientific elements of our outer space exploration are to be maintained, there is little essentially wrong with our past, present and future programs, in their view.

Of course, it would be impossible to update our own space efforts overnight. Space research and development are not the same as automobile production, where it is possible to order more cars off the assembly line within 24 hours.

Space scientists and engineers live in the future. They talk about and work on proj-

ects that will become reality 5 or 10 years hence. In the development of space hardware, time can rarely be compressed drastically even by the application of more money.

Despite the recent Russian success, there remains a strong body of opinion which shudders at the suggestion of a redirection of American efforts. These observers are convinced that over the long pull, America's scientifically oriented space effort will reap far more benefits and prestige than the Russian pyrotechnics.

The difference in what the two countries have been doing in space research tells much about a fundamentally different approach to scientific research in general.

From all available evidence, the Russians go in for massive assaults on specific scientific challenges, employing the same tactics in the laboratory that the Red Army used in World War II. American science, on the other hand, makes an across-the-board effort, seeking gains in many scientific areas, of which space exploration is only one.

It is encouraging that the promise of the American approach has not been lost on a number of scientists, Government leaders and, surprisingly perhaps, business leaders. In the fall of 1960, some 1,700 subscribers to the Harvard Business Review, mostly top management executives, were questioned about their attitudes toward the country's space program. A heavy majority favored space research over a tax cut.

Seventy-seven percent did not think we get propaganda value out of duplicating Russian research and did not think the space program should be reoriented for propaganda purposes. Sixty-six percent rejected the idea of spending several million dollars for a rapid, spectacular propaganda victory.

The United States has made significant research gains in physics, chemistry, biology and medicine. In medicine, for example, Russian contributions hardly bear comparison with America's. Here, it would seem, is a far more significant lag in prestige.

Just before he left Washington, T. Keith Glennan, the former administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, told a reporter: "I would be fearful if the worth of the United States were measured solely by our ability to put a man on the moon."

Student Unit Fights Coast Campus Bias

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, this last week I had the pleasure of meeting and making appointments for three Berkeley High School students visiting Washington as a result of winning awards for excellence in scholarship, creativity, and community service.

I would like to publicly commend the city of Berkeley and Berkeley High School for their efforts to identify and reward outstanding achievements in these fields. This is an important and exceptionally worthwhile program which is entirely consistent with our national goal of encouraging excellence.

One of the award winners, Kipp Dawson, initiated a program to overcome unofficial, but real prejudice in her high school. The Washington Post in a recent article reported on this program and I urge my colleagues to read about this encouraging and significant undertaking:

STUDENT UNIT FIGHTS COAST CAMPUS BIAS
(By Victoria Stone)

Students for Equality is the name of a small group of students in a large California high school who are trying to overcome prejudice in their midst.

The group started with the conviction of 15-year-old Kipp Dawson that "it's possible for people of different backgrounds to get together."

Kipp is one of three Berkeley High School students visiting Washington this week as a reward for excellence in scholarship, creativity and community service. The city of Berkeley paid their fares.

Kipp said the group is working to dissolve the cliques that make school segregation a fact, even if it is not the law for Berkeley High's 3,000 pupils. She calls it "self-imposed segregation."

Berkeley High, like the city itself, is a racial and national mixture of Orientals, Mexicans, Negroes, and both high and low-income whites. Until World War II, Kipp explained, the city was almost exclusively white. Kipp said she was not the first to notice that students were drawing their own color lines at school cafeteria tables, that class placement always seemed to isolate nonwhite pupils, and even that school counselors were discouraging Negro pupils from preparing for college.

A searing letter she wrote for the school newspaper last year brought her a nucleus of supporters that has grown to 50 pupils. Students for Equality concentrates on discussions, lectures and example-setting at school.

"We all went into it with deep prejudices," she confessed. A warehouse worker's daughter, Kipp said she used to be "tremendously bitter against anyone who came from the right side of the tracks."

Kipp and the other winners, Conal Boyce and David Gordan, called on District School Superintendent Carl F. Hansen yesterday for what proved a thought-provoking visit.

Hansen later told a press conference he was mildly envious of Berkeley's ability to honor its top students on public funds. "This would be a great thing to do in Washington," he said, but he doubted that the District would ever be able to afford it.

Hansen said he was impressed with young Conal's ability to compose a complete opera. He said a search for such extra-bright youngsters in city schools was worth exploring.

The District so far has not tried to single out exceptionally gifted pupils but it is "a field in which we ought to make a study," Hansen said.

What It Meant to Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article on the Battles of Concord and Lexington, as it appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on April 17, 1961:

WHAT IT MEANT TO THEM—PROPAGANDISTS OF THE DAY SAW THE BATTLES OF CONCORD AND LEXINGTON WITH DIFFERENT EYES FROM THOSE OF LATER POETS

The propagandist, 1775:

"Americans, forever bear in mind the Battle of Lexington—where British troops fired upon and killed a number of our countrymen. * * *

"Our deceased brethren, by their noble intrepid conduct, in helping to defeat the forces of an ungrateful tyrant, have endeared their memories to the present generation, who will transmit their names to posterity with the highest honor."—Massachusetts Spy.

The Poet 1836:

By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here once the embattled farmers stood,
And fired the shot heard round the world—
From "Concord Hymn," by Ralph Waldo Emerson.

THE BATTLE—APRIL 19, 1775

On the morning of April 20, 1775, a tall young man strode purposefully along the road from Boston to Worcester in His Majesty George III's Massachusetts Bay Colony. Isaiah Thomas was not alone on the road that day, for he continually met groups of men headed in the opposite direction, bearing arms.

These men were headed for Cambridge, there to join the colonial militia which was holding British forces at bay across the Charles River in Boston. Eager for news, they delayed the young stranger in his purposeful journey, seeking confirmation of the wild rumors that had spread quickly throughout the colony after the British marched on Lexington and Concord.

Isaiah Thomas unburdened his thoughts to these inland farmers, artisans, and shopkeepers, thoughts aboil over the events he had lived through during the previous day.

The sound of his name likely brought knowing grins, for though perhaps surprised at his youthfulness, they knew him as the printer of the Massachusetts Spy, a voice heard in behalf of liberty in many corners of Massachusetts and other colonies.

And after raising himself and his listeners to fighting pitch with his eyewitness report of the portentous clashes of April 19, he might have concluded, "Now I go to Worcester, whence my presses have preceded me; there to expose the iniquity of our oppressors so long as strength is left in me and paper can be procured."

PAPER INDEED SCARCE

Isaiah Thomas rode into Worcester on a horse procured for him along the way by a friend. He did indeed find that paper was hard to come by. After 2 weeks, with the help of John Hancock, he finally got some paper on which to print his first issue in Worcester of the "Massachusetts Spy"—May 3, 1775.

The issue was avidly read, passed along, reread, and reprinted, for it gave one of the most incendiary accounts to be found of the Battle of Lexington and Concord.

Propagandists like Thomas didn't see the event in poetic terms. Their accounts, in which events, names, and figures are consistent by their inconsistency, are designed to rouse, to incite, to precipitate revolt.

After an opening blast, calculated with its charge of British treachery and atrociousness to set colonists' blood boiling, Thomas picked up his account of the battles at the beginning.

REPORT REPRINTED

It is reproduced in part, here:

"A few days before the battle, the Grenadier and Light Infantry companies were all drafted from the several regiments in Bos-

ton, and put under the command of an officer, and it was observed that most of the transports and other boats were put together, and fitted for immediate service. This maneuver gave rise to a suspicion that some formidable expedition was intended by the soldiery.

"About 10 o'clock on the night of the 18th of April, the troops in Boston were discovered to be on the move in a very secret manner, and it was found they were embarking in boats at the bottom of the Common; expresses sat off immediately to alarm the country, that they might be on their guard.

"The body of the troops in the meantime, under the command of Lieutenant Colonel Smith had crossed the river, and landed at Phipp's farm: They immediately to the number of 1,000 proceeded to Lexington, 6 miles below Concord, with great silence: A company of militia, of about 80 men, mustered near the meetinghouse; the troops came in sight of them just before sunrise; the militia upon seeing the troops began to disperse; the troops then sat out upon the run, hallooing and huzzaing, and coming within a few rods of them, the commanding officer accosted the militia in words to this effect, 'Disperse you rebels.'

"SHOTS THEN FIRED

"Upon which the troops again huzzaed, and immediately one or two officers discharged their pistols, which were instantaneously followed by the firing of four or five of the soldiers, and then there seemed to be a general discharge from the whole body; it is to be noticed they fired upon our people as they were dispersing, agreeable to their command, and that we did not even return the fire: Eight of our men were killed and nine wounded.

"A little after this the troops renewed their march to Concord, where, when they arrived, they divided into parties, and went directly to several places where the province stores were deposited.

"Another party of the troops went and took possession of the Northbridge. About 150 provincials who mustered upon the alarm, coming toward the bridge, the troops fired upon them without ceremony, and killed two upon the spot.—(Thus did the troops of Britain's king fire first at 2 several times upon his loyal American subjects, and put a period to 10 lives before 1 gun was fired upon them.)—Our people then returned the fire, and obliged the troops to retreat, who were soon joined by their other parties, but finding they were still pursued, the whole body retreated back to Lexington, both provincials and troops firing as they went.

"During this time an express from the troops was sent to General Gage, who thereupon sent out a reinforcement of about 1,400 men (the British numbers are exaggerated throughout), under the command of Earle Piercy (Percy), with 2 field pieces. Upon the arrival of this reinforcement at Lexington, just as the retreating party had got there, they made a stand, picked up their dead and took all the carriages they could find and put their wounded thereon; others of them to their eternal disgrace be it spoken, were robbing and setting houses on fire, and discharging their cannon at the meetinghouse.

"The enemy having halted above an hour at Lexington, found it necessary to make a second retreat, carrying with them many of their dead and wounded. They continued their retreat from Lexington to Charlestown with great precipitation; our people continued the pursuit, firing till they got to Charlestown Neck (where they reached a little after sunset), over which the enemy passed, proceeded up Bunker's Hill, and the next day went into Boston under the protection of the Somerset man of war of 64 guns."

The Revolutionary War was begun.

THE SHOT RICOCHETS

(By Leon W. Lindsay, staff writer of the Christian Science Monitor)

Newspapers—especially Isaiah Thomas' Massachusetts Spy—played a significant role in rousing the colonists to battle pitch. But in 1775 the fastest means of communication was a good horse. And there were post riders as well as horses of proven endurance.

One of those post riders was to become known as the first man to take the news of the Battle of Lexington south—Israel Bissel.

Col. Joseph Palmer of Braintree, arriving in Watertown, April 20, the morning after the battle and grasping quickly its import, hastily scribbled a combined report and rallying cry, gave it to the veteran post rider, and told him to take it as far as Connecticut.

But Bissel went much farther than that: after shouting and showing his message through Connecticut, he rode into New York on Sunday, April 23. After throwing New Yorkers—and especially the Sons of Liberty—into a frenzy of speculation and activity, he crossed the Hudson and rode into the Jersey flats.

KEPT ON TO PHILADELPHIA

Bissel did not stop until he reached Philadelphia on April 25. He covered more than 400 furlong miles in something less than 6 days. From Philadelphia, his message was sent on south.

Charleston, S.C., received the report, say some authority, by way of the brigantine *Industry* on May 8. And in the southernmost of the English colonies, Georgia, it was sometime near the end of May before the news was heard—but it had lost none of its impact.

Dr. Joseph Warren, the famous commander in the Battle of Breed's Hill, prepared a circular on the battle on April 20 also—another report, but still in broad terms, with little detail—account was also sent hoofing down the coast.

A later, still more detailed account written by a committee of the Provincial Congress went out by special courier—with fresh men and horses waiting along the line to speed the official document all the way to Georgia.

FACTS SECONDARY

In all these accounts one purpose was paramount: arouse the colonies; the true facts of the battle were secondary.

Printers hastened to get out special broadsides on the event, and most newspapers carried accounts of the battle. These accounts contained the few facts available, bolstered by a good deal of speculation and rumor.

Though the news was, admittedly, slanted and colored—no colonist need have been ignorant or misinformed as to the essential happenings of April 19, 1775.

OPPOSING ACCOUNT RUSHED

The Boston Evening Post printed three lines on the battle the following Monday—the regular publication date. The paper was suspended after this issue and never reappeared.

Connecticut papers had accounts of the battle on Monday, too. Timothy Green of New London was so busy pursuing the cause of liberty he couldn't do justice to the clash—he got out only a half-sheet on it.

In New York, Hugh Gaine, a Tory printer, got out an account on Monday, the day after Bissel came riding in. Gaine's account was as biased in one direction as Isaiah Thomas' was in the other.

Philadelphia had a newspaper account of the battle a week after it happened, Wednesday, April 26. The Pennsylvania Packet got out a special supplement.

North Carolinians were reading of the exploits of the Minutemen, according to one authority, on May 7—a day before the *Industry* was supposed to have docked. And in Savannah, the Georgia Gazette had the story for its subscribers on May 31.

Back in Massachusetts, the Essex Gazette of Salem had one of the best accounts 5 days after the battle, and of course, there was the May 3 issue of the Massachusetts Spy.

WHO WAS ISAIAH THOMAS?

Isaiah Thomas grew with his country. In some ways his career is like that of the man he emulated, Benjamin Franklin—though Thomas started from a lower station in life.

When he was six, his widowed and impoverished mother had him apprenticed, in 1756, to a Boston printer and pamphleteer, Zechariah Fowle. He wasn't the first early American to be educated at the type case.

At 16 he, like Franklin, broke his contract and ran away to Halifax, Nova Scotia, where he was taken on by another printer. But his employer soon found he had to get rid of his ambitious helper, who was too brazen in his defiance of the Stamp Act.

After attempts to start a business in North Carolina, Thomas returned to Boston, where his former master welcomed him with no apparent ill-will, and together they began publishing the Massachusetts Spy. Soon Thomas bought out Fowle.

His first aim was to print a paper, not for the "gentle folk," but for the workingmen—an impartial journal with views of every color. Early attempts at impartiality were soon dropped. The Spy took on revolutionary tones and became one of the most important papers in America.

Though Thomas' paper has not had the historical notoriety of the Boston Gazette of Benjamin Edes and John Gill—which was the "official" mouthpiece for Samuel Adams and the Sons of Liberty, the Spy had its role, and played with at least as much histrionics, if with less adroitness.

The Spy—along with the Gazette—found Boston's British rule inhospitable, not to say dangerous, as a clash approached in 1775. With the help of friends, Thomas sent his printing equipment to Worcester a few days before the Battle of Lexington.

On the night of April 18, Thomas was one of the expresses who rode to spread the alarm that the British troops were crossing the Charles.

He was reported to have been with the militia in Lexington the next morning. As to his activities during the rest of that eventful day, no one, not even Thomas himself, seems to have left any account.

Thomas printed the Spy intermittently during the Revolution, but after the war he began to prosper. He set himself three objectives, and attained them before his passing in 1831: (1) compilation of a History of Printing in America (published first in 1810); (2) the collection of printings and artifacts having to do with America; (3) formation of a society to preserve Americana.

The American Antiquarian Society was founded by Thomas in 1812.

Yes, You Can Plant a Garden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States felt much better recently when they read in a bulletin from an office of the Department of Agriculture that it is still all right to plant a garden in the backyard.

The bulletin brought this response from Allan A. Seiler, editor of the Pike County Republican, Pittsfield, Ill., in a comment published April 5, 1961:

A clue to the degree of regimentation around the bend for the American farmer can perhaps be found in the latest news release of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

After explaining some of the current prohibitions and restrictions on production of grain and hay crops in 1961, the news release winds up with this encouraging note, "Home gardens can continue to be used to produce crops for home use."

When it comes under the heading of news to explain that the Federal Government has no objection to the planning of a home garden to produce food for home use, we have an illustration—with more clarity than might have been intended—of the degree to which we have become conditioned to governmental control.

Ambassador Pawley's Grave Revelation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which was published in the Brazil Herald on March 1. The article is in regard to one of Florida's outstanding citizens, a former Ambassador of the United States to Brazil and to Peru, and one of the most knowledgeable persons about Latin American affairs I know of—Mr. William D. Pawley.

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

AMBASSADOR PAWLEY'S GRAVE REVELATION

(By Paul Vanorden Shaw)

Of all the noncareer diplomats sent to Brazil as chief of mission, William D. Pawley stands out for notable successes in Brazil itself and for his personal and professional impact on Brazilian-American relations. He served during the Gen. Gaspar Dutra regime, the first elected President after the fall of the Vargas' dictatorship and the first under the constitution of 1946, which replaced the semitotalitarian 1937 charter. Mr. Pawley, an affluent businessman, patriotic to the core, and possessing a broad and enlightened vision of Brazil and Brazilian-American relations, gained the respect of Brazil, and its people because he could see their point of view, and their needs. And, it was a failure to meet their needs which has led him to reveal at this time the real cause for that failure. A grave and sombre revelation which comes to prove a thesis we have set forth in these columns.

Former Ambassador Pawley in hearings of the Senate Committee on Internal Security last September, published only on February 20 of this year, minces no words in laying the blame for a failure which, in his opinion, caused "a deterioration of our relations with the Brazilian Government from which we have never to this day recovered," where it belongs.

We call attention to the fact that ex-Ambassador Pawley was testifying before an Internal, not External, Security Committee showing that failures in diplomatic relations do affect the internal security of the United States as well as its security in the world. Very briefly the story he told is this. The Brazilian Army bought 40,000 tons of wheat which were sorely needed in Brazil. Bureaucratic obstacles in the United States were raised to prevent the shipment. Sizing up the sumtotal situation very accurately Ambassador Pawley came to the conclusion that that shipment of wheat should come through at all costs. With his intimate contacts great ability and drive he obtained green lights from the President of the United States down the line. Having moved Heaven and earth in the United States to meet the Brazilian need he returned to report to President Dutra that all was well and the wheat would be received. "Quacada," as the Brazilian would say, nothing came. And this led to "severe questioning" by the President of Brazil who all but impugned the honesty of the U.S. Ambassador.

The explanation, according to Mr. Pawley, was the existence of "some people in junior positions in the U.S. Government who decide "what is good and what is not good for the United States." In other words not only the U.S. Ambassador but the U.S. President and other high officials of the United States were stymied to the point of jeopardizing the relations of the United States with Brazil by junior bureaucrats who formed "a panelinha," as the Brazilians, call it, which could make a travesty of the promises and words of the representatives of the United States to Brazil. The panelinha was a self-appointed cabal of junior officers which met weekly to approve or disapprove decisions by their hierarchical superiors.

This is far from the only case on record but has particular revelance just now there are signs that Washington, after the seemingly inevitable more talk and fact-finding, is determined to do something to improve Brazilian and Latin American relations with the United States. We have been insisting that the ablest U.S. ambassadors abroad cannot carry out their missions without complete and understanding support from Washington. Especially from the high-ups in the State Department and White House responsible for foreign policies and for specific decisions affecting foreign relations.

If "panelinhas" or cabals composed of junior officers systematically meet to accept or veto decisions by their chiefs and have the power to enforce their vetos then the situation is far worse than we had imagined. Although this happened many years ago, recent events make us believe that the danger of similar occurrences is not altogether past. It is utterly illogical to maintain a first class diplomatic corps if unauthorized junior pipsqueaks can make their will prevail over the decisions of their chiefs. Ex-Ambassador Pawley has rendered a real service by bringing this episode to light.

Deplorable Conditions in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, a prominent Maine businessman, Herman D. Sahagian, of Belgrade Lakes, Maine, recently made a trip, accompanied by his wife, to the Middle East, where both he and his wife were born.

Since their return, Mr. Sahagian has been asked by many groups to relate what he found in these countries. The following talk was given before the Rumford (Maine) Rotary Club on April 10. I recommend to my colleagues that they read this firsthand account by a man who is familiar with this section of the world, speaks their languages, and sees a situation that demands immediate correction:

I have returned home to Maine from a visit to the Middle East.

I was appalled at what I saw. Appalled that after the millions our Government has appropriated and sent to the nations of that section of the free world; so much poverty, misery and want should still exist.

I saw heart-rending scenes, scenes hard (if not impossible) for any American to even imagine, especially any American who knows how genuinely concerned our people are with the plight of the underprivileged nations of the world. A concern, manifestly proved by the enormous sums under point 4 program allocated and sent to those countries.

In Beyrouth I saw a "tin city" the abominable "La Flueve." La Flueve is the name of this camp or "tin city" which is situated about 6 miles outside of the capital city of Beyrouth. Beyrouth is the capital of Lebanon. La Flueve is the city of refugees—a city of tin huts—huts made of tin beaten out from discarded American petroleum cans. Dwellings, if we can term them as such, are unheated, unsanitary, and unfit for occupancy by either man or animal.

In Athens I saw children kicking through piles of refuse in the streets trying to salvage from the offal a scrap to eat.

In old Jerusalem, I saw a community of people, fugitives from the various political upheavals of recents events in the Middle East. These people exist in crowded, oppressive rooms provided for them through the charity of hard-pressed local churchmen. This community is a veritable teaming anthill of civilization.

In Aleppo and Damascus, I say 6-year old girls consigned to domestic service with wealthy families. This contracted arrangement exists so that they would not be a burden on their defeated, destitute parents, until they reach the age of 14 when they might legally be married. These things I saw.

I talked to these people, hundreds of them, and I learned how little America is understood and appreciated by them. I thought of the enormous sums we have sent to the countries of the Middle East; I found not one soul who could admit they had benefited one iota from our enormous expenditure of money, food, clothing, and other commodities. Indeed, it was news to them that America was at all interested in their plight.

One man said to me: "We hear so much of the great wealth of America, then we look around ourselves and see this poverty. This causes us to wonder if Americans are so selfish, so unfeeling, so blind. I am an anti-Communist by nature and inclination. I hate the Soviet. Can you blame us if, in our need, some day, we accept gladly the help being offered to us by the Soviet Union?

This, of course, pinpoints the dual nature of the tragedy of the Middle East—a tragedy of unutterable consequence—not only to the United States of America, but to the future of the free way of life in this world.

Our charitable nature must be based on a foundation of self-preservation if we are not only to aid the underprivileged of the world, but save them for the cause of freedom.

Although we are annually sending huge sums of money to the nations needing aid in the Middle East, we still find these sums are somehow neither aiding the lot of the impoverished people, nor winning friends for freedom and America.

I ask, in wonderment, how is it that our generosity is not reaping rewards, rewards in uplifting human dignity in strategic areas of the free world, rewards in raising our prestige as the champion of freedom worldwide, within a section of the world where, as it may very well prove true, the coming great and decisive struggle between freedom and tyranny may take place.

Gentlemen, if we, the American people, do not take effective steps to act now, we will lose the Middle East. We will lay it open to Soviet incursion and influence, and finally Soviet captivity.

Asia will be blocked off from us, hundreds of millions of people, who are by nature champions of freedom, will find themselves standing static in this moment of great world reawakening. They will find themselves under the control of the greatest despotism the world has ever known. All because they wanted to live in dignity, to find a square meal.

For let it be known that the Arab, the generic name given to that great family of people who dwell in the Middle East, cannot by nature become a Communist. The tradition of the Arab people makes communism, collectivism, social, and thought control completely unacceptable to them. The proud, nomadic traditions of the Arab people, rebel against that which is communism.

These people we must aid to better themselves. The alternative is disaster. They want to be our friends, yet they know nothing about us.

They say that they have heard about the segregation of our Negroes, yet they do not know that nowhere else in the history of mankind has a Negro been as free as he is today in the United States.

They speak of the millions of Wall Street, yet they know nothing of the tremendous sums collected and spent by Americans and their charitable organizations.

They say that we are clannish, that we do not share our wealth.

One parent told me: "If I had but $1 a week from America, I could keep my little daughter home, give her warm clothing and food."

I am not here to tell you what is wrong with our governmental aid program in the Middle East. I don't know what is wrong, but I do know that somehow the Federal sums allotted for aid, under point 4, are not reflecting themselves in bettering the living standard of the poor in the Middle East. In that section of the world one is either very rich or very poor. There is no middle class as we know it in America.

Gentlemen, I am here rather to sound an appeal, to utter a warning. I think it is time the American people establish methods of funneling money directly into the hands of those who need help the most in the Middle East. I think we ought not at this critical time to indulge in the luxury of a national debate on the subject of, "What Is Wrong With Our Point 4 Program?" I think rather that swift action on our part as private citizens, is of essence, and I call for the establishment of an organization of Americans of good will to collect funds and send those moneys to private agencies abroad entrusted with the distribution of that aid among the people, directly, with no middlemen.

We must get our mostest to the people the fastest, to use an expression made popular by the Confederate soldier, Forrest; and if the present system of extending aid to the vital section of the world is not effective, we must render it effective with characteristic American ingenuity and drive.

The stakes in the Middle East are high. The Soviet is playing its cards expertly; we are simply trumping our aces. This is a task for all Americans. It will mean further calls on our generosity; it will mean the establishment of a new private agency; it will mean a giant public effort; but for the future of America, of the peoples of the Middle East, and for freedom, we must succeed.

The Academy of Medicine of Cincinnati

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD D. CLANCY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, while this Congress inquires into the alleged shortcomings of medical care, it behooves us to remember that American doctors exemplify all that is best in the ancient profession. They are men who are skilled, selfless, and charitable. It should not surprise us that physicians are taking a greater collective part in the health and welfare of the community in which they serve. A case in point is the Academy of Medicine of Cincinnati. This century-old medical society sponsors a popular Sunday morning TV program, "Call the Doctor." And the public does just that. People by the hundreds telephone their symptoms, their anxieties, and their grievances to the station, and a doctor panel answers them straight from the shoulder. Here is a fine example of the medical profession responding to a public interest in the facts about total medical care which serves them so well today.

This same academy also took a forward-looking step on February 23, 1961, when representatives from medical, educational, and legal agencies in Cincinnati and Hamilton County were invited to a special meeting. The subject of the meeting: "How To Protect the Community From the Menace of Intoxicated Drivers."

The audience first saw a film, "The Silent Witness," which deals with police-administered tests for intoxication. Then they heard a panel consisting of a police officer, judge, and physician discuss the legality and medical effectiveness of such tests, and how they can help reduce the drunken driving problem in Cincinnati or any other community.

"The Silent Witness" was produced by the Wm. S. Merrell Co., a drug manufacturer established over 132 years ago in Cincinnati.

Merrell, as a public and professional service, produced "The Silent Witness" as one in a series of educational films dealing with new problems of medicine and the law. The series was made with the cooperation of the American Medical Association and American Bar Association.

The meeting was sponsored by the Academy of Medicine of Cincinnati and is a laudable example of physicians taking the lead in public service at a time when both medicine and the pharmaceutical industry are under fire. Let us be reminded of the "good men do."

Reuse of Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, for years the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], has been a campaigner for a national program of water resource development. He was the able chairman of the Select Committee on National Water Resources on which I had the privilege of serving. He has become something of an educator in this field, seeking to inform the American people about the water needs of the future. This is why he was asked to be the keynote speaker at the 8th annual National Watershed Congress, which convened Monday in Tucson, Ariz.

I ask unanimous consent that an account of his speech, which appeared in the New York Times, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

REUSE OF WATER HELD IMPERATIVE—KERR CALLS ON HYDRONAUTS TO FIND WAYS TO REMOVE BOTH SALT AND POLLUTION

(By Bill Becker)

TUCSON, ARIZ., April 17.—By the year 2000 most Americans will be drinking water that is used three times or more, Senator ROBERT S. KERR said today.

The Oklahoma Democrat predicted that by then the United States would be using all its streams' flow, making reuse imperative throughout much of the Nation. He said that this would require methods of removing pollution so that water could "be used again not once, or twice, but perhaps several times."

The Senator called on "hydronauts of the New Frontier" to "crack the barriers" of stream pollution and desalting sea water. He referred to President Kennedy's statement that a breakthrough on salinity would dwarf achievements in space from the standpoint of the welfare of humanity.

Senator KERR was the keynote speaker at the eighth annual National Watershed Congress, which opend a 3-day session here today.

He predicted to newsmen that conversion of salt water into fresh water should be economically feasible within 5 to 8 years.

CITES GOVERNMENT TESTS

Preliminary tests at several Government-operated plants indicate that conversion costs can now be reduced to $1 a thousand gallons in a plant capable of treating 1 million gallons a day, the Senator said. He added the cost could be cut to 50 cents a thousand gallons at a 10-million-gallon-daily rate.

For normal drinking use, a 40-cent rate would be acceptable in most communities. For irrigation purposes, anything over 5 cents a thousand gallons would be considered too high.

Senator KERR forecast congressional passage of twin bills he is sponsoring to curb pollution and increase reservoirs for recreational use. The antipollution measure would authorize a 5-year research program to develop new methods of treating sewage.

The Nation is now using more than a third of all its streams' flow and will use two-thirds by 1980, he said. By 2000 "virtually complete storage of river flows" will be needed, as well as indefinite reuse in metropolitan areas, he said.

MORE SEWAGE IN WATER

The United States uses 300 billion gallons of water daily. New York City alone uses about 100 million gallons a day.

American cities now receive nearly twice as much sewage in their water supplies as was considered safe in 1955, a report to the Senate Committee on National Water Resources indicates. Senator KERR is chairman of the committee.

The National Watershed Congress comprises 27 organizations ranging through farm, forest, wildlife, and urban groups. Some 350 delegates from about 40 States are attending the meeting.

About 8,300 of the Nation's 12,000 watersheds are suited for multipurpose projects, Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, told the meeting. He said that the needed projects—for supply, flood control, and recreation—would affect nearly a billion acres, roughly half the Nation's land area.

Soliciting Made-Work Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN REIFEL
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when most economic indicators point to an upturn in the national economy, city officials across the country are being invited by the administration to submit lists of needed public works projects in their communities.

The inference is made clear to these officials: Here is a chance to get your hands on some more Federal money. It is an appealing prospect for the local officials, an opportunity to make civic improvements without asking the hard-pressed local citizenry for the money to pay for them.

Yet it would be the local citizenry that would end up paying the bill—only it would cost more by the time their dollars came back from Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the Federal Government participating in local projects which are vital to the welfare of the community, the State, and the Nation. But I have never heard that there is such a shortage of these projects that we have to go out looking for them.

The fallacy and dangers of soliciting made-work projects are pointed out in an editorial which appeared in the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus-Leader of April 6, 1961. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHY ROB PETER TO PAY PAUL?

City governing boards throughout the Nation have been asked to compile lists of needed projects in their communities. President Kennedy seeks this information as a basis for the consideration of various public works in the event of the desirability of an accelerated program to provide employment.

All communities, including Sioux Falls, can present a substantial list of such projects. Our city commissioners have mentioned a few. But one wouldn't have to draw hard on his imagination to develop a list representing an expenditure of $10 million to $20 million. And all of the projects would have some merit.

Similarly it might be said that all householders could present substantial lists of what they might like to acquire if funds permitted.

There is, in truth, no end to the possibilities. But certain basic questions are involved. As we take more and more money away from the people through taxes, we reduce their ability to do what they might like to do in the way of home improvement and so forth. And certainly the better way to stimulate employment is through the normal and private avenues of spending.

The made-work proposal can in a sense become a method that works against its objectives. We learned that lesson in part in the thirties. Despite made-work of many kinds, the economy was beginning to crumble in the late thirties. The picture was changed basically only when we began to prepare for World War II.

Russ Lynch of Milwaukee Cited for Excellence in Conservation Reporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article describing the national honor that has come to an outstanding Milwaukee newspaperman be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

LYNCH CITED FOR ARTICLES—CONSERVATION HONOR

Russell G. Lynch, conservation writer for the Milwaukee Journal, placed second in the 1960 Thomas L. Stokes National Award competition for conservation and natural resources writers, it was announced Tuesday. Lynch was cited for his "year long articles on State and natural resources and conservation, preservation of fish and wildlife, parks, forests, water pollution, land use and resource teaching." He will receive a citation.

The first place award of $500 and a citation went to Associate Editor John F. Huth and Reporter Robert J. Drake of the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer.

The Stokes Award is given annually for outstanding writing on the development and conservation of natural resources. It is named after the late Thomas L. Stokes, a nationally syndicated columnist who wrote in that field.

Lynch also was cited for special commendation by the Stokes Award committee last year, when only a first place award was given.

Louis M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Foundation and one of the judges, praised Lynch's "hard digging investigative articles on the problems of river development, pollution, flood protection, hazards of chemical controls, soil and water conservation—very able, factual articles and most effectively published in the Journal."

Ku Klux Klan Leader Picked Up—Warned by Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1961, the House of Representatives voted on the question of increasing the size of the Rules Committee by adding three additional members, one Republican and two Democrats. Immediately, in my district in Louisiana, the reaction to such a vote became much discussed. Within a few days, on the night of February 8, as a matter of fact, some unknown individuals burned a large, 8-foot cross on the front lawn of my home in Shreveport, La. These individuals perhaps thought I would be at home on that occasion.

On April 6, in the afternoon, the police department in Shreveport questioned at length one, R. E. Davis, of Dallas, Tex., self-styled leader of the Ku Klux Klan.

Since the cross was burned on the lawn of my home in Shreveport in obvious protest to my vote in regard to the Rules Committee in the U.S. Congress, I think it is of interest to the Members to have available the account of the questioning of this KKK official, R. E. Davis, by the police chief of the city of Shreveport, Chief Harvey D. Teasley. With this in mind, I am presenting an article giving the details of the questioning, written by Jim Leslie, and appearing in the Shreveport Times on April 7, 1961:

KLAN LEADER PICKED UP—WARNED BY POLICE HERE

(By Jim Leslie)

The self-styled leader of the Ku Klux Klan was arrested here yesterday and questioned for 2 hours about his local activities and Shreveport crossburnings.

During the extensive questioning, he was strongly criticized by Police Chief Harvey D. Teasley.

The Klan official, R. E. Davis, of Dallas, was arrested at 4:45 p.m., as he was returning home after a 2-day visit to Bossier City. During much of this time, he was under surveillance by law officers and Shreveport Times newsmen. Capt. Coles Thomas arrested the Texas man in the 1000 block of Texas.

Davis told Teasley that the charter of the local KKK chapter has been revoked. He said he took the charter away from the local group because he became suspicious that some of its members were involved in the crossburning in front of U.S. Congressman OVERTON BROOKS' home in February.

Teasley denounced both Davis personally and the clandestine group that Davis purports to head as imperial grand wizard. And he warned the man that "Shreveport does not need this subversive organization."

Teasley, in his tongue lashing of Davis, said that the crossburning "disturbed the people of Shreveport and caused considerable concern."

The police chief warned Davis that the Klan would be treated as "we do all subversive organizations that degrade and demoralize people." And he added, "our investigation so far reveals that your organization is just like this."

Teasley told Davis that his investigation revealed that the Shreveport Klan had been

made up of "irresponsible people * * * debt beaters, liars, and drunkards."

The police chief told Davis that he had a copy of his long arrest record, which, the chief said, dates back for several years. Teasley also said that he had obtained information from Dallas "where your actions and activities disrupted the citizens council." "Because of that you're very unwelcome there," said Teasley.

Davis denied the criminal record, stating that "I've made a lot of enemies and the same ones that were after me there are after me here." Davis also said that he had never been convicted of any of the criminal charges.

When questioned about the cross burning in front of Representative BROOKS' home on February 8, Davis said that he did not know where he was on the night of the incident, although he admitted being interviewed by a Times reporter the day after the cross burning.

Davis said that he has taken "drastic measures" as a result of the cross burning. He said that he has evidence that tended to indicate that the Shreveport KKK chapter was responsible for the cross burning and "I was suspicious, but couldn't prove it."

Davis said that when he was unable to discover exactly which members of the local chapter were responsible, he revoked the charter of the entire chapter some 5 weeks ago.

Teasley asked Davis if Dr. Jerry Bristol, president of the National Organization of Whites, had anything to do with the cross burning.

"I asked Dr. Bristol about it and he told me that he positively didn't do it," Davis replied.

Then Teasley asked Davis if it wasn't Dr. Bristol's group that had its charter revoked and Davis replied, "I don't know just which one of the klaverns that he claimed to have been in."

Davis denied any connection between the Klan and now.

Teasley then started questioning Davis about his activities in the Shreveport area for the past 2 days.

(Two Klan meetings have been held in this area this week. The Bossier-Webster group met Tuesday night on Lake Bistineau and the Coushatta group met Wednesday night near Coushatta. Both meetings were known to law officers.)

Davis said that he was in this area to sit for a picture that was being painted of him in his "full dress" purple robe.

Davis spent most of the day yesterday with J. D. Swenson, Bossier City drycleaning establishment owner, and two other men, according to Teasley.

Teasley asked Davis what he was doing with Swenson. Davis said Swenson is a member of the citizens council and that he went to talk to Swenson because "I understand they had great success with a meeting in Bossier City recently."

HAD RECORDS

Davis also admitted, after being asked by Teasley, that there were members of the Shreveport KKK chapter with criminal records. He said that an investigation of the local chapter revealed "that we had men in our organization that should have been in the penitentiary."

He said he based his decision to revoke the local charter on a report given to him by the State board of governors.

Teasley also questioned Davis about the finances of the Klan. At one time Davis said that all he received was "donations to help pay my expenses" from the local chapters, but when pressed he said that he receives $3 per man after the State becomes "an organized State."

Davis said that there have to be 50 chapters in the State before it becomes an "organized State" and at present there are 35 chapters in Louisiana. Then after becoming an "organized State," Davis said he receives 72 cents per member per year.

Davis said that he also publishes a newspaper for Klan members and that the subscription rate is $2 a year.

He said that the Klan is a "charitable organization" and that its moneys are spent in "charitable ways." He cited as an example the helping of a "poor church." However, he added, "it has to be done so that you don't let your left hand know what your right is doing."

Klan activities in the Shreveport area first came to light on February 10, and after criticism by Caddo Sheriff J. Howell Flournoy, Shreveport Mayor Clyde E. Fant and other officials, the Caddo group began to fall apart.

Several high-ranking officers were kicked out.

But then the movement spread to the two parishes east of Caddo—Bossier and Webster.

Davis, continuing to make trips into the Shreveport area, met with Bossier Parish Klan leaders on a number of occasions and attended several meetings.

The Bossier-Webster group, following the patterns of the Klan in most sectors, held its meetings at a camp alongside a lake.

Most of the time, these gatherings have been held on the west side of Lake Bistineau, at a camp located on the north end of the lake.

A visit by Times newsmen showed this meeting place to be a white, concrete block building situated under a grove of pine trees.

The Bossier-Webster meetings, at which persons from Minden, Bossier City and Shreveport attended, have been held on Tuesday nights.

Last Tuesday, however, the meeting place was changed to another camp, located about a quarter of a mile away.

The place of the meetings, unlike many Klan gathering spots, can be seen from a number of surrounding fishing camps.

Members driving to the meeting from Bossier and Shreveport would go east on U.S. Highway 80, turn south on the road leading to Doyline, continue through Doyline on the Doyline-Minden road 4 miles, then turn right on a gravel road. This gravel road makes a turn and curves back onto the Doyline-Minden highway.

From Minden, those attending the Klan meets would simply drive west out the Doyline-Minden road and turn on the gravel road.

Our Man in London

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD the following article which appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of April 10, 1961:

IN OUR TOWN

(By James Smart)

Our man in London: Advertisements began appearing on and off in the London Sunday Times a couple of months ago.

For a while they were a mystery to the city administration. Here's the solution: the ads were placed by Samuel Berger, Philadelphia builder who, with his brother Henry, has been responsible for several big developments and is one of the developers of the new Eastwick.

"I just thought it was a good gesture," said Berger, "and it might stimulate others to do the same.

"You know, there are two bills before Congress that are supposed to put out some loot to do this kind of thing."

Why didn't he sign his name?

"Why should I?" he said. "I'm not going to sell any houses in London, that's for sure. If I whet the appetite of a dozen people over there, I'll feel satisfied."

Sam Berger is a most patriotic, public-spirited individual who is interested in promoting good will and the virtues of America abroad. I am proud to count him among my good friends and he is to be congratulated for encouraging foreign tourists to visit the United States and particularly historic Philadelphia.

Columbus, Nebr., Looks Ahead to a U.S. Spaceman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, in case the administration is interested in what effect Russia's being first with a man in space has had on rural America, I would like to offer this news story from the April 17 issue of the Wall Street Journal. The story originates from what is one of the largest population centers in the Third Nebraska Congressional District, the city of Columbus. Columbus I might add, is well known in Nebraska as a fine progressive community that solved its problem of farm mechanization after World War II, by using its native wit, spitting on its hands and going to work.

GAGARIN AND COLUMBUS, NEBR.: VIGOROUS PRAIRIE TOWN LOOKS AHEAD TO A U.S. SPACEMAN

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

COLUMBUS, NEBR.—Almost everyone in this vigorous prairie town has heard of Yuri Gagarin, and they admire his brave voyage in orbit around the earth. But there is quiet confidence that the United States will not be far behind—a confidence born, perhaps, of the town's own orbit here on earth and of what has been accomplished by the enterprise of its free citizens.

True, there is disappointment that the United States was not first. But Columbus, anyway knows what it is to be on top, to take a tumble, and to come back stronger than ever.

The town started in 1856 as a trading post on the Platte River, some 80 miles west of Omaha. It gradually grew into a nice prosperous farming town of about 7,000. Then farm automation hit after World War II and people were being laid off right and left; population dwindled fast. Town leaders decided to encourage the people to stop crying and do something constructive—to get out of farmwork if they were working at all, and into something else.

Walt Behlen, laid off from the cornfields by mechanization, became an inventor of improved farm equipment. He started with nothing and his company now does $14 to $16 million volume annually. He is the town's most famous success story, but there are dozens of others. And now Columbus is known through the Plains States as a little hub of technology for the farm. Population has climbed to 13,000.

EXUDE CONFIDENCE

"If Columbus can catch up, so can the country's scientists," says a pipe-smoking store owner. "We're doing all right with our missiles, and it won't be long before we show the Russians something. Funny thing about Americans—once they wake up they usually go to town. Some people don't believe that, but I do."

William Floyd is 45 years old and he has been principal of Columbus Senior High School for 6 years. In those years the number of students taking advanced science courses has almost trebled, and he attributes this to the effect of the East-West space race on the popular imagination. He thinks Gagarin's flight should be kept in perspective.

"I don't lie awake nights about it. Remember Russia has really concentrated on this project to the exclusion of many other fields of inquiry. The United States is well ahead in the overall picture, and in time we'll overtake the Communists in space exploration. It would be a mistake, I think, for the country to become alarmed because the first man to orbit the earth was a Russian.

"It's overall balance that counts, don't forget. Why we've had outstanding hurdlers from time to time and still had lousy track teams."

Columbus High is a sprawling buff-colored structure situated just north of U.S. Route 30, a major transcontinental highway. The school is 3 years old and impressively equipped. In one room, a laboratory, students not entirely unhappy about an interruption in their work gave a visitor their views about Gagarin's flight.

"I don't think of it as a space race," says Bert Aerni, an 18-year-old senior, as he throws aside his rubber apron. Bert, who wants to be an electrical engineer, adds, "It's all human achievement no matter who does it. The Russians will make propaganda gains, but I don't think we're very far behind them."

After a pause Bert says softly, "Even so, I guess I am disappointed we didn't do it first."

Anita Mueller, 17, a senior who plans to be a math teacher, isn't especially impressed with the Soviet feat. "Really," she remarks with a twinkle, "what's the difference between a man and a monkey?"

Back downtown Ben B. McNair, president of the Citizens Bank, leans back in his chair and rubs his chin. Mr. McNair, at 63, has been a banker all his life, but it was only 2 years ago that he helped found Citizens. The institution has grown rapidly and now has deposits exceeding $2 million. Mr. McNair doesn't think "we should be down on ourselves."

"The Government's going about this space business in a logical way," he says. "We're not shooting a man up there just for the sake of trying.

"The sad thing is that some foreign nations are so impressionable. When I was in Italy a while ago, some people over there told me communism has more to offer than democracy. They tried to support this notion by pointing to Russia's superior athletes. What sense does this make? But undoubtedly many people will be impressed in the same way by the Soviet space man."

The idea that many of the peoples of the world use vulnerable criteria in judging ideologies was echoed heatedly by Peter Haas, a young farm-equipment salesman.

"Answer me this, will you? Why should we get in a scientific vaudeville show with the Russians? So what if all the banana countries start doing a rain dance every time somebody shoots off a rocket. Sure, putting that guy up there was a great stunt, but does anybody doubt next year at this time we'll have guys doing the same thing? I'm tired of all this moaning and wailing."

But Alice Micek, a bookkeeper, was unwilling to pass off the Soviet success so lightly. "This is a serious setback for the United States. It will provide a lot of propaganda for the Reds. I think the Russians are ahead of us because we give away too many secrets. Television and newspapers report about our missiles in such detail, it's no wonder the Communists have the advantage. Now something should be done about it."

OTHER PROBLEMS

Joe Justice, an auto mechanic, doesn't see the sense of space experiments in the first place. "The Government is having a hell of a time making ends meet on earth without going someplace else," he declares.

Mike Kincaid, owner of KJSK, the local 1,000-watt radio station, believes interservice squabbling is still holding up the U.S. missile program. He thinks it's time we got busy and got a man up there too. And he's confident we will eventually outstrip the Russians in space.

Expressing similar confidence were three workers at the Behlen Manufacturing Co., a farmer and his helper who were repairing a corn crib, two housewives browsing in the J. C. Penney store, a pharmacist, and James Preston, manager of the Columbus Chamber of Commerce.

And if a casual traveler through the pleasant streets of Columbus, Nebr., can claim a total impression it must be that confidence in America's ability to cope with this challenge in space is both strong and deep.

It could be, of course, that Columbus, which found out how to make such a strong comeback itself, could be an exception. Or it could be that the climate that permitted the ingenuity of its citizens full play is not much different from the climate in Livermore, Calif., and Waterville, Maine.

The Constitution and What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Legion of Ohio promotes as essay contest among the high school students in Ohio.

The subject assigned always has some connection with civic or governmental responsibility.

This year the subject assigned was "The Constitution and What It Means."

I am proud that the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio is represented among the 12 winners selected this year.

Miss Diana Dietrich of Laura, Ohio, is one of the ninth grade winners. Her prize winning essay is as follows:

THE CONSTITUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS

To fully develop your own character you must know your country's character. Therefore it is necessary to understand our Constitution of the United States. The Constitution of our country provides for the form of government, limits the Government's powers, and assures the rights and liberties of the citizens. First, let's consider the history of our Constitution.

The signing of the Declaration of Indepedence marked the birth of a new nation. In the period between the signing of the two documents, America had no centralized government. In 1778 the Articles of Confederation were drawn up by the Second Continental Congress. These articles left much to be desired. There was no President, Vice President, or Supreme Court. Congress could make laws, but had no means of enforcing them. In September 1786, commissioners from five States met at Annapolis. This important meeting soon led to the ratification of the Constitution by nine States on June 21, 1778. From this time on the Constitution became the supreme law of the United States. Many people agree this was the most important document made in our history.

What I like best about the Constitution is the soul and heart of it. Unless our Constitution satisfies the feelings of our heart, unless it feeds the human soul, unless it stirs our emotions, it cannot be regarded as an expression of the American spirit. The most precious expression, next to the Bible, is the Constitution. In the Bible we find our relationship to God. In the Constitution we find liberty, the next important thing in life. In studying the Constitution every American can say with pride: "When danger threatens my life and liberty neither the President nor Congress nor armies can enter and take away my life and liberty." The soul of the Constitution is in every paragraph. All the parts are mighty links that bind the people in an unbreakable chain of the Union.

You need not be a a scholar to understand the basic principle of the Constitution. Yes, it is important to know the laws and regulations, but not as much as knowing it gives the three God-given rights: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Let's consider the Preamble to the Constitution. We do not know from whose brain it came. It is a great voice of the people, giving expression to their souls' desire. Summed up, the Preamble declares that our forefathers sought union, justice, tranquallity, safety, welfare, and liberty. You should read the Preamble again and again. As you read it, the words are most ardent hopes and the holiest feelings of the human heart.

Times does not wear down nor eat away the truths of the Constitution. War cannot overturn our liberty as long as Americans are worthy of their forefathers. Instead of fading with age, the glory of the Constitution will remain through the ages. May we guard our birthright and hand it down to our future generations as the "jewel of their soul."

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, an excellent editorial concerning the John Birch Society appeared in the Pine Bluff Commercial, a rather small daily newspaper in my State. I think that this editorial hits the nail on the head

about the significance of this group, and I hope that my colleagues in the Congress will take time to read it. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Pine Bluff Commercial, Apr. 1, 1961]

THE NEW PERIL

We have been trying to work up a proper degree of concern and indignation about the John Birch Society, and have not so far made the grade.

The society may well be the menace it is being painted to be. We remember a fellow who laughed at Joe McCarthy.

But the Republic has stood off the Soviet Union since 1945 and, with considerable help, whipped two sets of Fascists plus Mussolini's legions more or less simultaneously in the period immediately preceding.

It lived through the know-nothings, the Klan, the silver shirts, and the aforementioned McCarthy, and will, from all indications, also survive the citizens councils.

We are experienced, as a Nation, with crackpots and authoritarians. If the John Birch Society is not about the nearest to impotent of the lot we are, as a newspaper, a good way wide of the mark.

It has been alleged that the John Birch Society is a hate group, hence dangerous. Certainly it is made up of people who know how to hate, and who enjoy the sport. But they are also, and more profoundly, people shaken to their being by fear.

Whether the founder (who girded for his present large responsibilities in his brother's candy factory) knows it or not, the John Birch Society is built upon the proposition that mankind is doomed, and that there is now time only for a desperate rearguard action.

The society is convinced that all forces of change are exclusively in the service of the Kremlin, and that they threaten the civilized world at every point of contact.

What we have here is a fellowship of fear. In its articles of faith, the society resembles nothing so much as one of those sects which have from time to time taken to the basement and sealed up the cracks around the door in the conviction that the world would end at 5:27 a.m. a week from Thursday.

Consider the men and things which the John Birchers or their founder have already conceded to the Communists: They include the Preisdent and his predecessor; the Supreme Court; the Nation's city managers; the urban renewal advocates; the proponents of fluoridation; the United Nations.

These people don't need condemnation. They need help.

They need, each of them, a quick course in American history, a heart-to-heart talk with a trustworthy friend and then, perhaps, a good long rest.

The evidence is that John Birchism is incurable, but we can try.

Nor does John Birchism seem to us to be contagious. The presumption on which the organization has been viewed so generally with alarm, is that it is a virus likely to infect innocent people.

All of the evidence we've seen indicates that the people already had the virus, and have simply gotten together to share its miseries.

We suppose that there may be people in meaningful numbers willing to take the oath of allegiance to an outfit which is willing to forfeit the American system of Government for something the John Birchers call, quite gratuitously, "the American way of life."

But we doubt that there are many men of sound mind willing to accept the collateral dictum that Dwight Eisenhower is a Communist.

To the extent that they have done anything, except to each other and themselves, the John Birchers seem to us to have performed a substantial public service.

They have alerted their fellow Americans to the existence on the far, far right of the political spectrum of people every bit as confused, troubled and willing to be led around by the nose as their opposite numbers on the far, far left.

The society also has provided an interesting litmus test for some of our noisier politicians.

Senator EASTLAND, for example, has just spoken well of them.

Until they move beyond their present activities, which appear to consist pretty exclusively of whipping up each others' hysteria and of occasionally slandering men so eminent as to be substantially invulnerable to such attacks, we think the John Birchers more a nuisance than a peril.

If we must have people willing to believe in the things the society stands for, we may as well have the society.

The existence of such a group is bound to cut down on the number of Birchists running around unencumbered by the label, and thus likely to be mistaken for responsible citizens.

"Wisconsin Agriculturalist" Writer Ralph Yohe Describes Vocational Training Outlook for Rural Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the outstanding farm paper, the Wisconsin Agriculturalist, has been carrying a series of fine articles on the theme "Rural Education on Trial." They have been written by a distinguished Wisconsin farm writer, Mr. Ralph S. Yohe. The most recent two articles in this series describe recent developments in vocational schools and technical training.

Mr. Yohe notes that Wisconsin has one of the better vocational training programs in the Nation, established 50 years ago. Sixty-two cities in Wisconsin offer vocational and adult education courses. As of last year, well over 5,000 students were enrolled in these programs.

Mr. Yohe asks:

How does farm youth fit into this picture? Only 20 to 30 percent of the youth growing up on farms will be able to find good farming opportunities. This means that 70 to 80 percent must eventually find jobs in factories and offices.

Yet a smaller percentage of farm youth take training in the State's vocational schools than city youth.

The writer goes on to examine the reasons for this. He suggests in conclusion that vocational training schools be expanded and upgraded, to meet the needs of both city and rural young people. To better accomplish this he recommends that area vocational schools be established in various parts of the State.

In view of the great interest in vocational training that has arisen in connection with the area redevelopment bill, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Yohe's articles and the accompanying table be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

HOW DO WE STAND WITH VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS?

(By Ralph S. Yoke)

Wisconsin has one of the better vocational training programs in the Nation. The Wisconsin Legislature established vocational and adult education in 1911—50 years ago.

The program was set up to furnish vocational and industrial training for people in the growing towns and cities of Wisconsin. At that time, there was little thought that such training might someday be desirable for rural youth.

"The growth of the schools has been correlated with the growth of the communities in which they exist; and as the communities have grown and expanded, greater demands have been placed upon the schools for broadened and more comprehensive service," says C. L. Greiber, director of the State board of vocational and adult education.

LAW ALLOWS AREAWIDE SCHOOLS

The original law set up the program as individual community activities. The courses are approved, the schools supervised and coordinated by the State board of vocational and adult education.

In 1955, the legislature passed a law to allow areawide vocational schools. Any county or area with 20,000 or more people can set up an area vocational school to meet their needs.

So far no such area schools have been established. Why?

Such schools must be built and run largely through local tax money. The areas that need them most are the least able to build and support them.

Most of the areas that are able to run and support vocational schools already have vocational schools in one or more of the cities.

Wisconsin's present vocational schools get most of their support from the local towns and cities where they are located. The State's vocational schools' income in 1960 came from: 75 percent, local property tax base; 4 percent, State funds; 3 percent, Federal Government; 7 percent, fees and tuition; 11 percent, other sources.

Last year the State's part of the $10 million for running vocational schools in Wisconsin amounted to $420,000. This year it will be upped to $1,785,000.

The Wisconsin program is quite in contrast to States like Connecticut, where vocational schools get nearly 100 percent of their help from the State.

The 62 vocational schools scattered over the State offer a variety of training—trade and business extension education, general adult education, training for apprentices, and instruction for high school age youth.

Wisconsin laws require youngsters to go to school until they are 16 or have graduated from high school. Where vocational training is available, youngsters under 16 who have graduated from grade school can take full-time vocational work instead of high school.

The law also requires that town and city youth from 16 to 18 who are not enrolled or have not graduated from high school must attend vocational school 1 day a week.

That is if there's a vocational school in the town or city where they live.

A very important part of the vocational school educational program is technical courses offered to young people who have graduated from high school. It is important because the Nation will need 40 percent more trained technical and professional workers in the next 10 years.

An impressive number of people are enrolled in the States vocational and adult schools. This includes apprentices, adults, continuation school students, and high school graduates—in night, part-time and full-time courses. Here's the total enrollment for the State:

1957–58, 132,746; 1957–59, 142,986.

The number is far less impressive, however, when we look at the number of high school graduates enrolled in vocational-technical training.

On February 15, 1959, 5,267 students were enrolled in full-time vocational /technical courses designed for high school graduates.

On February 15, 1960, 5,319 students were enrolled in these courses. Most of them—4,323—were high school graduates.

In addition, some young people were enrolled in private or other public schools offering technical training.

Even so, the total is only a fraction of the number of students enrolled in various colleges and universities in the State.

ENOUGH PEOPLE AREN'T BEING TRAINED

Only a small percentage of the States high school graduates take full-time courses in vocational training. Yet it is one of the fields where our need for trained people is growing the most rapidly.

We have no figures on the percentage of rural youth enrolled in these full-time vocational technical training courses. But certainly it is only a small percentage of the total farm youth who will eventually seek jobs in factories and offices.

On February 15, 168 high school graduates, or those 18 years of age or older, were taking vocational courses half- to full-time at the Wausau Vocational School. Of this group, 102 were from the city, 66 from the surrounding county.

At Superior 209 were from town, 19 from the surrounding county. At Milwaukee 1,109 were from the city, 209 from the county.

At Madison 139 were from the city, 94 from the county. At Green Bay 166 were from the city, 75 from the county. And at Eau Claire 124 were from the city, 44 from the county.

Why don't more rural and urban youth take advantage of the technical vocational courses offered in vocational schools?

We'll try to answer this question in the next article.

YOUTH PASSING UP TECHNICAL TRAINING

(By Ralph S. Yohe)

Sixty-two cities throughout Wisconsin offer vocational and adult education. Twenty-eight of these schools offer full-time vocational technical courses at the high school graduate level.

Many of these schools are very good and well attended. The largest—Milwaukee—reports an attendance of more than 700, with a comprehensive vocational technical program carried on in 58 shops.

The chart below shows that the Nation's needs are greatest and most training is needed for professional and technical jobs.

On February 15, 1960, there were 5,319 students enrolled in vocational technical programs in the State's vocational schools.

This is an impressive number, but it is small compared to the large number of Wisconsin high school graduates who do not go on to college or other advanced training.

How does farm youth fit into this picture? Only 20 to 30 percent of the youth growing up on farms will be able to find good farming opportunities. This means that 70 to 80 percent must eventually find jobs in factories and offices.

The most opportunities are in fields requiring the most training

Occupation	Change in the Nation's needs 1955–65	Number of years of school completed by those in field, 1959 (years)
Professional and technical	37 percent more	16.2
Proprietors and managers	22 percent more	12.4
Clerical and sales	27 percent more	12.5
Skilled craftsmen	24 percent more	11.0
Semiskilled	22 percent more	9.9
Service workers	13 percent more	9.7
Unskilled laborers	3 percent less	8.6

ONLY A FEW FROM THE COUNTRY

Yet a smaller percentage of farm youth take training in the State's vocational schools than city youth. The map of Wisconsin shows the number of students attending the Madison vocational school from the various counties throughout the State (not shown here).

By far most vocational school students come from the city where the school is located. Only a small percentage comes from outside the county.

In view of the Nation's growing needs for technically trained people, why do not more farm youth in Wisconsin go to vocational schools for technical training? Fees are very low and many of the schools offer fine instruction.

There are probably many reasons, but some of the important ones are:

The vocational schools are run and are largely supported by taxes from the cities in which they are located. While students outside the city are welcomed, there is no great effort made to promote the school's program outside the city.

Most of the schools, with the largest variety of courses, are located in the more highly urbanized eastern part of the State. In northern and southwestern Wisconsin where there is great need among rural youth for such training, there are no vocational schools offering extensive courses.

Farm youth who wish to attend such courses must either travel long distances or live away from home.

Many student advisers in high schools fail to encourage or point out the advantages of taking additional training in vocational schools. Even excellent agricultural technical training is available in some of the vocational schools.

A general feeling that vocational technical training—"going to a trade school"—is a pretty poor second choice to going to college. We have an attitude that it's "college or nothing" in spite of the Nation's growing need for technically trained people and the fact that many technicians earn as good a living as many college graduates.

Area schools need to be established in those parts of the State where vocational education is not available at present.

If we are to get well-equipped and well-staffed vocational schools in these areas, it will mean that the State must bear a much heavier proportion of the cost of vocational training. The areas where new schools are needed are the least able to raise the taxes to support them.

The schools should be given more prestige by adopting a name more in line with the job they have to do. The term "vocational school" or "trade school" is hardly in keeping for the training needed for today's technician.

California calls its vocational training centers "technical junior colleges."

It is time that we get along with the serious job of expanding and upgrading our technical programs in our vocational school system. They must be designed to meet the needs of all our youth—both city and country.

This is not apt to come about so long as each community—regardless of its size or tax base—is forced to build and support its own vocational school.

What Kind of Revolution Are We Supposed To Be For?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a timely article from the editorial section of the April 15 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, an article which establishes that there is an urgent need for the development of a proper perspective before we, as a country, can hope to go forward with a purposeful foreign policy:

WHAT KIND OF REVOLUTION ARE WE SUPPOSED TO BE FOR?

One way to gain unqualified approval with almost any group of Americans is to say, with a tolerant smile, "The United States must no longer be allied to the reactionary forces in the world but must participate in the revolution which is springing up everywhere, convincing the new elements that we share their hopes and aspirations." Recently Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles joined this chorus. He said that we must not be "linked with the forces of reaction and stagnation," but must participate in the effort to reform the world.

The only trouble with remarks like these is that, despite their acceptance in the best circles, they lack definition. They are loaded with emotion, but light on facts. For one thing, what are the forces of reaction and stagnation to which we are supposed to have been tied? For another, what are the forces of reform with which we are asked to identify ourselves? For a third, what are we supposed to do to be saved?

Well, we have had and, unless we are crazy, will continue to have relations with our European and Asiatic friends with whom we can hardly dispense in critical times like these. Just why countries like Great Britain, France, Nationalist China, Belgium, West Germany, Japan or Italy are supposed to be reactionary and stagnant is beyond us. Yes, some of them have, or have had, colonies in which, despite conflicts and errors, the people are generally better off than they were before the arrival of the imperialists. Would it be wise to become so outraged at discrimination at the white-imperialist country club that we throw over our friends and make our political bed with people who eat one another?

In respect to Cuba we tried to get right with the revolution and detach ourselves from the brutal tyrant Batista. Our reward is a Red satellite under Castro, who assures us that the "so-called free world will soon go down in defeat before the rising power of the Soviet Union."

Mr. Bowles agreed that "our international interests are incompatible with the global, long-range objectives of Soviet strategy." Unfortunately Soviet strategy is making good use of elements which describe themselves

as the forces of reform and revolution. They have made it appear to timed Americans that our "image" is so bad that, unless we get into the swing of things and picket our own embassies in revolutionary areas, we will lose the cold war.

Obviously we cannot hope to compete with the Communist conspirators in stirring up ruckuses. What we ought to do instead is look about a little, at least until we find out just what the genuine forces of reform are after. In many cases it will appear that all they want is to be as much like us as possible, to share our freedom and our economic progress. When the rioters and the bearded upstarts have shot their bolt—in Cuba, Japan or the Congo—it usually turns out that the Communist hell raisers did not have the box office which Moscow and its minions had claimed for them.

Thus in the case of Cuba thousands of exiles are now urging this country to "do something"—not to "ride, with the Castro revolution" but to get rid of it. In the Congo responsible elements form a confederation to deal with the Communist threat—but, instead of riding with their successful revolution against colonialism, we lend our planes to the United Nations to harass it. The effort to renew the outstanding charges of Soviet aggression in Hungary and to initiate proceedings against Communist genocide in Tibet did not rate so much as a debate in the United Nations, but the U.S. delegation voted to tell Portugal off for the way its African colony is administered. In Japan, after serious Red-inspired riots, the Diet ratified the treaty with the United States as if nothing had happened, and several student rioters, inspired by the Moral Rearmament movement, apologized to Jim Hagerty for mobbing him during his disastrous visit to Tokyo last year. What revolution should we have joined there?

What all this comes down to is the suggestion that, before talking about forces of stagnation and reaction versus the bright banners of progress and reform, it is important to decide which is which and where American interest in the struggle really lies.

Equality Claim Is Called Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a newspaper article in the Memphis Commercial Appeal which really touches at the core of the racial situation in the South. Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to place a copy of this article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

NORTHERN BORN BUSINESSS FIGURE AND FORMER MEMPHIAN LAUNCHES NEW BROADSIDE AGAINST DESEGREGATION

(By Paul Flowers)

On the thesis that there is "no such thing as equality even between two leaves on the same bush—that this was not just a matter of difference, but of inferiority and superiority in terms of the value judgments of persons, communities, nations, and cultures, and that the heart of the matter as regards race lay in the area of heredity," Carlton Putnam has launched a new broadside against desegregation.

Mr. Putnam, well known in business circles in Memphis and the South through his service as president of Chicago & Southern Air Lines, and as chairman of the board of Delta Air Lines, is a self-admitted Yankee. In fact, his book's subtitle, "A Yankee View," spots his geographical origin. It is "Race and Reason," and comes from the Public Affairs Press, Washington, at $3.25.

In a biographical introduction, he mentions his New England heritage, with Israel Putnam, Washington's first major general, and Rufus Putnam, founder of the Ohio Colony, admittedly to establish his position as observer and commentator not influenced by Southern birth and environment.

To produce his argument, an admirably organized and competently documented piece of special pleading, he fell back on a liberal arts-scientific education at Princeton University, and a law degree from Columbia. With acceptable scholarship in gathering his materials, and creditable legalistic skill in marshalling his arguments, he presents a case that will be convincing to many.

HOPES TO STRENGTHEN THE SOUTHERN STAND

Moreover, it is his expressed hope frequently in the book, that his evidence and arguments may first strengthen the position of southerners who do not accept the doctrine of racial equality, and that, despite calculated censorship in the North, his conclusions may penetrate into areas where many already regard with misgivings the consequences of the Supreme Court's rulings.

Basically, Mr. Putnam's case rests on these points:

1. That the theory of equality of all races, as advanced by Franz Boaz and his successors in modern anthropology, is a hoax imposed often by force on scientists, both natural and social.

2. That the Supreme Court went far beyond the Constitution to arrive at the edict handed down in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*.

3. That to lift up the Negro race by law necessarily means that the white man will be pulled down, in the same proportion, in the scale of civilization and culture.

4. That social status has to be earned.

5. That the Negro race has not demonstrated, either in its homelands or in the New World, the initiative, aggressiveness, and resourcefulness which Mr. Putnam submits are the qualities which brought Northern European peoples from savagery to civilization.

ARTICLE IN MAGAZINE INSPIRED REBUTTAL

Soon after the Supreme Court's desegregation decision, Mr. Putnam read, in Life magazine, an article by Virginus Dabney, editor of the Richmond Times-Dispatch. Mr. Dabney had stated the southern viewpoint, and Life had replied to Mr. Dabney with "an editorial wholly lacking in perception and full of inept analogies, and abandoned principles."

This inspired Mr. Putnam to compose a letter to Life, and he sent a copy of the letter to Frank R. Ahlgren, editor of the Commercial Appeal, with whom he had associated in Memphis. The Commercial Appeal reprinted Mr. Putnam's letter and Mr. Dabney followed by reprinting it in the Richmond paper.

Followed then Mr. Putnam's letter to President Eisenhower, in which he said, in part:

"Throughout this controversy there has been frequent mention of the equality of man as a broad social objective. No proposition of recent years has been clouded by more loose thinking.

"The whole idea contradicts the basic tenet of the Christian and Jewish religions that status is earned through righteousness and is not an automatic matter. What is true of religion and righteousness is just as true of achievement in other fields. And what is true among individuals is just as true of averages among races."

Mr. Putnam concluded his letter to President Eisenhower with:

"What evolution was slowly and wisely achieving, revolution has now arrested, and the trail of bitterness will lead far."

LETTER TO PRESIDENT WIDELY REPRINTED

The letter was reprinted in many southern newspapers; a Birmingham committee, stimulated by Columnist John Temple Graves, raised money to reprint it as an advertisement in 18 northern and western papers, with total circulation of 7 millions. Eight newspapers, the Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times and Examiner, the Pittsburgh Press, the Indianapolis Star-News, the Newark Star-News, and the Buffalo News, refused to carry it even in an advertisement.

Five months later, in March 1959, Mr. Putnam wrote to Attorney General Rogers, as "nonadversary party to the proceedings (one presumed) to have represented the people of the United States." Herein, he wrote:

"It is my considered opinion that two generations of Americans have been victimized by a pseudo-scientific hoax in this field (anthropology), that this hoax is part of an equalitarian propaganda typical of the left-wing overdrift of our times, and that it will not stand an informed judicial test."

QUESTION HAS FLOURISHES OF ORATORICAL RHETORIC

Mr. Putnam, with a flourish of eloquence, repeated a question he had put to Clyde Kluckhorn, a Harvard anthropologist, concerning Negroes' contributions to culture:

"I was curious as to one poem equal to Milton's 'Paradise Lost,' one history equal to Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall,' one novel equal to Dickens' 'David Copperfield,' one playwright equal to Shakespeare, one philosopher equal to Aristotle, one medical discovery equal to Salk's polio vaccine, one military leader equal to Napoleon, one inventor equal to Edison, one physicist equal to Einstein, one pioneer equal to Columbus, one composer equal to Beethoven, one painter equal to Rembrandt."

The potential for adaptation to a culture is one of Mr. Putnam's points for argument. On this theme, he writes:

"The Negro race has various and valuable qualities. In those great attributes of the heart—sympathy and kindness—and in a sense of humor—the average Negro, taken as an individual, is fully on par with the average white. In certain skills the Negro ranks above the white. If I were lost in an African jungle my life might depend on the talents of a Negro. In other qualities of mind and character, qualities specially involved in our Western civilization, the full-blooded Negro is congenitally only partially adaptable. Hereafter, when I use such words as 'inferior,' 'backward' and 'unequal,' I use them in this limited sense only."

NEW BOOK CLAIMS EQUALITY A HOAX

Follows then a long chapter of questions, put by correspondents, and answers provided by the author, along the entire spectrum of the segregation-integration controversy. Mr. Putnam repeats his conviction that races are not equal, that the anthropological doctrine of equality is a hoax and a fraud, that the 14th amendment to the Constitution is unconstitutional, and that the South's best hope is to enlist support, against odds, in other parts of the country wherever observers, faced with harsh realities, may be more receptive to the southern, and Mr. Putnam's point of view, and all implications.

In his reply to one question, Mr. Putnam wrote:

"In forcing integration upon the South, the North is demanding that the South do what the North itself in similar circumstances would not do. It is an established fact that white people favor integration throughout the United States exactly in proportion as they do not need to practice it."

He concludes:

"Minority groups, coming to us for asylum out of centuries of failure in the struggle for freedom, clamored to dilute those values, but their voices only made more necessary our own recommitment. I could repeat: To alter the foundations upon which a house is built is a doubtful way of preserving it. Let us continue building, let us extend the foundations, but let us not change rock to sand."

California Meets Educational Challenges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to offer my colleagues excerpts from a speech delivered to the California Teachers Association and State Council of Education by the distinguished Governor of the State of California, Hon. Edmund G. Brown.

Governor Brown commends the teaching force of California for their great contribution to education, citing, for example, that California students led the Nation in scholarship awards and at the same time the State experienced a zooming population growth of school-age citizens.

For a few minutes I want to talk to you about what your State government is doing to meet our great challenges in education. By this, I don't mean the details of some of the controversial measures now before the legislature. I have been gone for about 10 days, and so much has been happening that I won't know what form many of them are taking until I return. There is so much flux and change in the legislative process, that I cannot properly give you a reading on the situation here today.

But I do want to tell you what the general philosophy of my administration has been in the field of education, and what we are trying to accomplish. For more than 2 years, we have insisted that our school programs move forward on all fronts.

We are proud of our unique chain of public schools. The elementary and high schools, and the junior colleges. Fourteen State colleges, with two more on the drawing boards. Our great university, with five campuses in being and three in the planning stages.

No part of the program has been neglected.

We must, first, supply the money, and we are doing so. Out of the total general fund budget of $1.7 billion, 60 percent is provided for education.

Let us put it another way. California spends more than $1 billion annually for education—more than the total budget in 43 of the other 49 States.

This is not a static thing. Over the last 2 years, we have provided a $50.3 million increase in State aid to local school districts—the first such increase since 1952.

During the current session of the legislature, we released nearly $30 million in State funds for school construction and site purchases; in excess of the increased monthly allocation of $12 million. This action is meant to help cut down double sessions in California, a steadily growing problem.

No one knows better than you how great are the problems posed by California's zooming growth. One measure of that problem is the number of students on half-day sessions. Here we have made real strides.

In the past year we have built more than 6,500 new classrooms and have reduced the number of elementary school pupils on half-day sessions by 20 percent. This record was achieved while our total public school enrollment was increasing by more than 170,000 pupils.

There can be no relaxing of effort. We have more than 3 million students in public school today and we will add another 2 million in the current decade alone.

The same challenge faces us in higher education, and we are meeting it head on. Last fall, we enrolled 203,000 full-time students in our public junior colleges, State colleges and the university. By 1970, we must provide space and equipment for more than 450,000 students.

During the coming fiscal year, we will provide for full-year operations of the Coordinating Council and the State College Board—a 44 percent increase in State scholarships—and nearly three-quarters of a million dollars for the new State colleges and university campuses, as well as a new medical school at San Diego.

In short, we are focusing the attention of State government on education in a manner without precedent in civilized history.

I emphasize that no licenses to luxury are being issued. If we are to justify new programs and new fiscal commitments, we must make certain that education and economy are not natural enemies.

This is the right time for me to pay tribute to the California Teachers Association, and the sense of responsibility you have consistently shown toward State government.

Of course, you recognize our pressing need to keep school programs abreast of growth. At the same time, you do not come to us and say: "Give us money—but don't worry about where it comes from."

We appreciate your responsible programs and the constructive way in which you help us find the answers to hard fiscal questions.

Our great schools are monuments to your wisdom. And every time a California taxpayer sees a new elementary or high school, a new State college, or a new university campus, he can feel proud that he has chosen to spend his money for this most worthy purpose.

At the same time, false economies have no place in a great system of public education.

I firmly believe that they are completely out of joint when they are made at your expense.

No other profession is asked to give so much for so little recompense.

I understand that the average teacher is 41 years old, has had 14 years of teaching experience, and 4½ years of college preparation.

In no other field will you find people with that experience and training making salaries at the teacher's level.

Great skills are demanded of you. The teacher must be a scholar, a specialist in people, and a decisionmaker as much as any corporation head or scientist.

Beyond this, you are asked to handle paperwork and clerical chores, collect money for various causes, take attendance, do stenographic work, and be constantly at the beck and call of your community.

Little time is given to advance your own knowledge, to prepare materials, to consult outside experts, to visit local resources for improving your preparation.

Gifted teachers receive no special recognition. And all teachers are asked to labor hard in the vineyard, sacrifice most current symbols of advancement, and teach our children the nonmaterial values of the spirit.

Somehow, you do the job. The record proves it. Last year, for example, California students led the Nation in scholarship awards following the National Merit Contest.

I believe all parts of our society must change the conditions which now prevail. We must do this out of simple justice—and out of our great need to attract more young people to the profession.

We must cut down on your petty tasks, pay the salaries you deserve, and seek other means of lightening your burden.

My new budget, for example, provides a small sum to expand the use of educational television. We expect further help through the Magnuson bill, now being considered by the Congress.

Certainly, educational television is no cure-all for our ills. But I believe you can use it to help lessen your teaching loads, and to increase the diversity and richness of education.

Turning to another projected program, I am asking for funds to help conserve human resources among our students.

Public education is no less a function of our society than public health.

If anyone proposed cutting down on public health expenditures, on the theory that a little typhus or polio wouldn't hurt our children much, we would react in shock.

We need the same sense of shock at the idea that we can't afford to educate our gifted children.

An estimated 68,000 California children have gifts and potential skills far above the average. If we allow them to lose interest in school and in themselves, priceless human resources go down the drain.

I have, therefore, asked for extra funds to a maximum of $250 a year for each of these children. The money would be used for special classes, facilities, and teachers to help develop their full potential.

We aren't trying to develop freaks. We plan no classes in third-grade Sanskrit. But we do want to foster a school atmosphere in which the high IQ is as valued as athletic skill, and where the general feeling is, "It's smart around here to do your schoolwork."

I also have asked consideration of a new program to assist children who are emotionally handicapped.

Steady progress is being made in other fields.

Curriculum improvements are going forward in ways you have recommended for many years. Science and mathematics enrollments are up. At the same time, you are successfully emphasizing the enduring values of the liberal arts.

So we can note accomplishment.

Yet the progress we are making would still be inadequate, without the new Federal leadership we have in Washington.

Everyone who believs in education must respond to the President's twin goals: a new standard of excellence in education, and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it.

For public school construction and teachers' salaries, the President has recommended Federal grants of $2.2 billion over a 3-year period. The States would decide whether to use the grants for school construction, teachers' salaries, or both.

This recognition of national responsibility has long been lacking. Its absence has generated many of the problems we now face.

I want to emphasize this. No State and no nation in history has ever poured the money into public education that California is furnishing today.

Yet without Federal cooperation, the staggering future costs cannot be met.

Already we have the greatest school population in the Nation, and it is rising at a rapid rate.

Already we are pressing our resources to the limit. I, therefore, ask you to ponder this:

Under present building terms, the department of education estimates that more than $3.2 billion will be needed to house the increase in public school enrollment just during the current decade.

You are all knowledgeable men and women. You know it is right that education should have first priority on our public funds.

You know, too, that a dynamic State like California has other unmet needs. Without water development, our State would in great part revert to desert. Without essential programs of social welfare, social insurance and public health, we cannot keep our economy strong.

We must therefore establish the priorities, recognize that the State treasury is not a bottomless well, and support active programs of educational responsibility at all levels of government.

Now, I am not here to give you a partisan address. And I recognize that your own role is, very properly, nonpartisan.

But I emphasize this. The State and Federal administrations you now have are deeply concerned with meeting the needs of education and are acting on that concern.

I hope that you will seek and support administrations which reject the status quo, which do not bury their heads in the sand, and which insist on progress.

The spirit of regard for education now being shown in Washington is one which I have fostered for the past 2 years in Sacramento.

I am proud that this is an honest, progressive State—as I am proud of the foresight you have shown in your most important field.

Not for 1 minute do I forget that government's responsibility may be great, but yours is greater.

The President and the Governor can push your cause. The school board can set the salaries. The districts can levy the taxes. But in the final analysis, you exert the vigorous, lonely discipline. You do the job.

Without your leadership, the great halls of learning are hollow shells. And that is why General Garfield once said: "A pine bench with Mark Hopkins at one end of it and me at the other is a good enough college for me."

I pledge to you my continued recognition of your problems.

I know you will continue to instill regard for learning in California youth.

Continue, too, to discourage dropouts—the children caught in a terrible vacuum without a function, and with fewer jobs available to them every year. Remind them that three out of four unemployed have failed to finish high school. Remind them that after every recession, unemployment has still edged up—because jobs are increasingly scarce for those who lack skill and training in our complex age.

Certainly we ask a great deal of you.

From diverse materials, we ask you to fashion superior products. We ask you to tame the rebellious, embolden the timid, spur the laggard, sharpen the dull, and burnish the bright.

But we should also remind the public that schools can go only just so far.

Parents, and other parts of our society, have their own heavy obligation.

They must not make the teachers and schools the dumping ground for their worries about the H-bomb, and all other insecurities of our times.

I reject the fad for blaming teachers and schools for everything that goes wrong—from a misguided child to a misguided missile. This tendency is a sign of escapism and foolish immaturity.

As Governor, I will continue to do all in my power to help you fulfill great responsibilities—and meet great opportunities—in our times.

And meanwhile, let's not make a scapegoat out of education.

I congratulate you on what you are doing to build our State.

Yet I know that in your own handiwork, in the fruits of your labor, you find the deepest satisfaction.

In the words of Henry Adams, a teacher affects eternity, for he can never tell where his influence stops. Thank you.

Land Retirement Payment Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a telegram from one of my constituents advising me of a wire which he had sent to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, protesting what appeared to be a rather flagrant inconsistency in county yield figures established in different counties immediately adjoining, for the purpose of arriving at land retirement payment rates under the provisions of the recently enacted feed grain bill. This party advised me that, in general, there seemed to be a differential of as much as 33⅓ percent between adjacent counties located in North Dakota and Minnesota and lying within the area of the Red River Valley of the North. Since the productivity of land and climatic conditions in the Red River Valley is identical, for all practical purposes, I could see no justification for any such differential between the adjoining counties. To verify the general information furnished me, I secured a report of the county yields which had been established in adjoining counties located on opposite sides of the Red River, and consequently being within the States of North Dakota or Minnesota. Here are the figures which I find the county agricultural stabilization committees intend to use in arriving at the rate of payment for corn land that is to be retired from production:

Grand Forks County in North Dakota, 32 bushels per acre; Polk County, immediately across the river in Minnesota, 41 bushels per acre; Traill County in North Dakota, 29.3 bushels per acre; Norman County, immediately across the river in Minnesota, 40 bushels per acre; Cass County in North Dakota, 29 bushels per acre; Clay County, immediately across the river in Minnesota, 39.2 bushels per acre; Richlands County in North Dakota, 32.7 bushels per acre; Wilkins County, immediately across the river in Minnesota, 36 bushels per acre.

To carry this a little further, since Richland County, N. Dak., is the corner county in our State adjoining both Minnesota and South Dakota, to find what the comparative yield figures in the adjoining South Dakota county would be, I checked and found that in Roberts County, S. Dak., which immediately adjoins Richland County, a yield figure of 40 bushels per acre had been established as compared to the 32.7 bushel yield for Richland County mentioned above.

Mr. Speaker, there seems no rhyme nor reason to this very substantial differentiation in yield figures being used in adjoining counties where the soil and climatic conditions are practically identical just because the counties happen to be located in different States. I have done my best to get in touch with somebody in the Department of Agriculture who would be in a position to explain or adjust this apparent discrepancy, but so far I have not been successful. I am inclined to believe that the Department of Agriculture has every intention of treating farmers equally insofar as it is possible under the provisions of any farm legislation with which the Department is charged with the responsibility of administration. I sincerely hope that the question that has apparently risen in the minds of the North Dakota farmers that this is administrative retribution being leveled against a State which did not support the present dministration in the last election, is not justified.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the telegram received by me yesterday from Mr. Mark Andrews, a farmer of Mapleton, N. Dak.:

APRIL 17, 1961.

CONGRESSMAN DON SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Have just sent the following wire to Orville Freeman: "Urgently request you take immediate action correcting grossly inadequate corn yield figures set for many North Dakota counties under your Federal feed-grain program. If such restrictive legislation must be enacted it is extremely important to our farmers and our State's economy that these yield potentials be fairly set. As just one example of the gross inequity of your yield assumptions: the Minnesota counties of Polk, Norman, and Clay have been set 33 percent higher than our adjacent counties of Grand Forks, Traill, and Cass. These six counties are all in the heart of the Red River Valley with land values and climate virtually identical. Any person with a farm background would know that a political boundary cannot change soils and growing seasons. Comments are being made that this is a retribution given North Dakota for voting against Kennedy. If this were true, it would be the shabbiest, most vindictive political trick ever pulled on the people of North Dakota and one they will not easily forget."

Regards,

MARK ANDREWS.

The 1960 Oscar Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, since I represent in this body much of the area which contains the American motion picture industry, Hollywood, it is with some pride and affection that I call attention to the annual Oscar Award ceremony. I am sure that many of my col-

leagues, along with the rest of the Nation, watched last night's telecast of the program staged for the 33d year by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences.

This event represents one night each year when the American motion picture industry honors its artists and its craftsmen for their outstanding contributions.

It, too, is a night when the moviegoers of America pause to recognize the unique qualities of the motion picture—a medium that over the years has brought entertainment and enlightenment to countless millions at home and abroad.

I compliment the 1960 winners on their well-deserved awards. I salute Hollywood for demonstrating once again that true artistry in all its many forms—acting, directing, producing, writing—is prized above all else in the American motion picture. I should like, therefore, to enter the 1960 Oscar winners in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are:

Best motion picture: "The Apartment" (Mirisch Co.)

Best leading actor: Bert Lancaster.

Best leading actress: Elizabeth Taylor.

Best supporting actor: Peter Ustinov.

Best supporting actress: Shirley Jones.

Best documentary features: The Horse With the Flying Tail," Walt Disney. Short Subjects, "Guiseppina," Lester A. Schoenfeld Films (British).

Best special effects: "The Time Machine," Metro Goldwyn Mayer, Gene Warren and Tim Baer.

Best costume design: black and white production—"The Facts of Life," United Artists, Edith Head and Edward Stevenson.

Best costume design, color production: "Sparticus," Universal-International, Valles and Bill Thomas.

Best score, musical picture: "Song Without End," Goetz-Vidor Pictures, Morris Stoloff, and Harry Sukman.

Best score, drama or comedy: "Exodus," Carlyle-Alpina S.A. Production, Ernest Gold.

Best song first used in an eligible picture: "Never on Sunday," from "Never on Sunday," Melinafilm Production, Lopert Pictures Corp. (Greek). Music and lyrics by Manos Hadjidakis.

Best directing: "The Apartment," Mirisch Co., Billy Wilder.

Best screenplay, based on material from another medium: "Elmer Gantry," Burt Lancaster-Richard Brooks Production, screenplay by Richard Brooks.

Best story and screenplay, written directly for the screen: "The Apartment," Mirisch Co., story and screenplay by Billy Wilder and I. A. L. Diamond.

Special honorary award: Gary Cooper.

Best film editing: "The Apartment," Mirisch Co., Daniel Mandell.

Special honorary juvenile award: Hayley Mills.

Best art direction, black and white: "The Apartment," Mirisch Co., Alexander Trauner. Set decoration: Edward G. Boyle.

Best art direction, color: "Spartacus," Byrna Productions, Alexander Golitzen and Eric Orbom. Set decorations: Russell A. Gausman and Julia Heron.

Best cinematography, black and white: "Sons and Lovers," Company of Artists, Freddie Francis.

Best cinematography, color: "Spartacus," Byrna Productions, Russell Metty.

Special Jean Hersholt Humanitarian Award: Producer Sol Lesser.

Best sound achievement: "The Alamo," Samuel Goldwyn sound department, Gordon E. Sawyer.

Special honorary award: Comedian Stan Laurel.

Best short subjects: cartoons, "Munro," Rembrandt Films, William L. Snyder, producer. Live action subjects, "Day of the Painter," Little Movies, Kingsley-Union Films, Ezra R. Baker, producer.

Best foreign language film: "The Virgin Spring," A. B. Svensk Filmindustri (Sweden).

Affection and Regard Accent a Homecoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, a brilliant sun in cloudless skies, and thousands of enthusiastic Pennsylvanians welcomed Dwight and Mamie Eisenhower home yesterday.

Men and women from every walk of life lined the streets as the motorcade proceeded from the railroad station to the capitol in Harrisburg. The familiar "I like Ike" shouts were repeated over and over as the procession traveled along the route. The general must have realized he was not the entire center of attraction as he stood in his car and recognized the friendly welcome with his customary outstretched arms gesture. Riding in a closed car directly in back of him was Mrs. Eisenhower. When she was not immediately recognized the "Where's Mamie" chant was heard along the entire way.

Upon their arrival at the capitol the distinguished couple was greeted by a vast throng who came, not out of curiosity, but to show sincere appreciation and pay well deserved respect to a great American. Leaders from both political parties joined in praising this outstanding couple for a lifetime of unselfish devotion to, not only their own country, but to the entire world.

As the brief ceremonies ended and they departed for Gettysburg, the first place they could actually call home, the best wishes of all present went with them. If two people ever deserved to live their own lives after a half century of loyal and devoted service, Ike and Mamie are those people. Welcome home, and may the dreams you have had of this day become a pleasant reality and continue for many years.

A copy of Governor Lawrence's remarks on this occasion, and an editorial from Monday's Harrisburg Patriot, follow:

REMARKS OF GOV. DAVID L. LAWRENCE WELCOMING FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER ON THE OCCASION OF THE PENNSYLVANIA HOMECOMING OF THE PRESIDENT AND MRS. EISENHOWER, CAPITOL PLAZA, HARRISBURG, PA., MONDAY, APRIL 17, 1961, 8:30 A.M.

There has never been any doubt in anyone's mind of the deep and abiding affection the American people feel for the patriot we honor here this morning.

Pennsylvanians were among the first to make that affection obvious. When the chant that America liked Ike began to roll across the land, Pennsylvania's citizens were in the frontline of the chorus.

Because of the great respect we have felt for him for so many years, we were delighted when President Eisenhower chose the gentle, rolling, pastoral beauty of central Pennsylvania's farm country for his home. Somehow it seem supremely fitting to us that the Cradle of Democracy should become the home of one of democracy's greatest defenders.

Pennsylvania has given roots to America's richest traditions of freedom and equality. The voice of liberty was first proclaimed to the world from the streets of Philadelphia. The terrible grandeur of our great struggle between the brothers of our own Nation found its supreme climax not far from the spot where President and Mrs. Eisenhower make their home today.

I know that General Eisenhower will find the people of Pennsylvania grateful for his presence here; their high regard for him has not diminished.

I speak for all the people of this State when I say that this welcome today here in Harrisburg is only a symbol of the great and overwhelming friendship which reaches out to the Eisenhower family from Pennsylvanians everywhere.

Now that the tragic consequences of war are laid aside; now that the bearer of arms has, at long last, come to a time of relative peace in his own life and his time; now that the grave responsibilities of the world's greatest office have been turned over to new hands and a new generation, he has earned the right to come home.

If I may interject one other thought, it is to reemphasize the importance to our Nation of the ease of transition between the administration headed by our fellow Pennsylvanian and that guided by President Kennedy. It was not only indicative to the world of democracy's ability to provide continuity of government but was a great tribute to the wisdom and the character of General Eisenhower and his associates.

I was talking to President Kennedy last Thursday and told him of this occasion today, and he asked me to convey his warmest respects to the Eisenhowers and to express once again his deep appreciation for the support which the general has given in the Laotian crisis.

Now all of us can look forward to many years of warm friendship with our respected neighbors who will be able to spend more time among us and this is precisely the way in which Pennsylvania thinks of Dwight Eisenhower and his gracious wife. They are neighbors; they are friends.

We cannot possibly pay a higher tribute to either of them than this.

It is one of the most pleasant duties I have ever had, to say to them, this morning—welcome home to Pennsylvania.

AFFECTION AND REGARD ACCENT A HOMECOMING

It was a full century ago when the last man came home to Pennsylvania from the Presidency of the United States. In those unhappy times James Buchanan's homecoming was not what it should have been. Neither was Mr. Buchanan's reputation. "Old Buck" was on the receiving end of far more brickbats than bouquets.

Today another man comes back to his home in Pennsylvania from the Presidency after a brief rest and vacation in sunnier climes. He returns home in far different circumstances than prevailed for "Old Buck" with his reputation enhanced.

The times are not what he and all of us wish they were. Crisis and turmoil prevail in so much of our unhappy and divided world. But so does freedom. And not the least of the reasons it does is because of what

this man did during the eight rough and rugged years he had to live with and had to cope with crisis, chaos, and never-ending challenge.

Now he can look out upon his people and the world from the peaceful and quiet vantage point of retirement. The massive responsibility that he knew for so long has been handed on to another American who, not too many days ago signed a bill restoring five-star general rank to Dwight David Eisenhower, speaking of the action as a reaffirmation in behalf of the American people of the "affection and regard" for him.

In the same spirit this morning Pennsylvanians—from the Governor to the most obscure of citizens—are welcoming Ike and Mamie Eisenhower home in the hope they will know the bright sunshine of happiness and peace throughout the years of retirement.

Today's little "welcome home" by their central Pennsylvania neighbors stands as but a symbolic token of the great affection and regard in which they are held by all people, everywhere in the world, who love freedom.

House Resolution 211, Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee, pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD:

SPACETRONICS ASSOCIATES,
New York, N.Y., April 4, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: It has just been brought to my attention that you have introduced a House resolution for the formation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

I am in complete accord with this resolution, and feel that it is a good step to implement the Captive Nations Week resolution of 1959. Moscow knows that the truth hurts. Therefore I also feel that the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics should be exposed to the world as nothing but a conglomeration of captive nations. Once this becomes known on a worldwide basis I am sure the people of these captive nations and people outside them will be inclined to take various actions that will eventually contribute to the freedom of these captive Soviet Republics.

You have my full support for House Resolution 211. I am sure the Members of the House will not fail to accept so powerful a propaganda weapon as this resolution provides.

Sincerely,

RICHARD T. HANLEY,
Executive Director.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA,
Hammond, Ind., March 28, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, branch in Hammond, Ind., takes this opportunity to congratulate you for introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee of Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This committee is needed badly. Soviet Union's goal is to rule the world, and we all know it, for we too live in the same world. Our enemy has weaknesses, and by knowing these weaknesses, lesser will be our battle.

A Committee on Captive Nations is a big step in the right direction. It would serve as an information center on the enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R. Our Government needs this information in making proper policies with respect to the captive nations. The committee's main function, however, would be to give the world and especially the American people the timely true picture of the inside of the Iron Curtain.

At this time we are also writing our Congressmen RAY J. MADDEN and C. A. HALLECK asking them to give their full support on this matter.

Sincerely,

ALEX ZALUCKYJ,
Secretary.

MARCH 29, 1961.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I would like to express my approval of your recent bill dealing with the captive nations. I think the resolution for a permanent committee is an excellent idea.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the Representative from Florida, hoping that he will give it great support.

Sincerely,

Mrs. KATHRYN TALBERT.

ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA.

(Member St. Johns County Chapter of the Florida Coalition of Patriotic Societies.)

CHEVY CHASE, MD., *April 7, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Recently, House Resolution 211, which you submitted to the House of Representatives on March 8, 1961, was brought to my attention. After studying the contents and meaning of the proposed bill, I am thoroughly convinced that a Special Committee on the Captive Nations is a vital necessity.

The establishment of a Captive Nations Week was a true advancement for the preservation and extension of free nations. The observance of Captive Nations Week in 1960 had very favorable results. The eyes of the people of the free nations were open, probably for the first time, with regard to their enslaved neighbors. It was clearly noticeable that Moscow feared that there might be even a greater awakening; but the results of this observance were insignificant when compared to those results which might be attained.

We are in what we call a cold war and the only way to fight it is with the plain, simple truth. If it is uncovered, truth can win the victory for us. Why prolong the war, when its duration can be brought to an abrupt end? Thus far our Nation has slept while Moscow has slandered us. Our biggest defense against this slander is to let the people of the world see the true Russia and her destructive goals.

The Captive Nations Week observance is the first step toward the freeing of the nations enslaved by Soviet imperialists. But why not make full use of this great weapon? The only way to do so is to set up a special committee on the captive nations. Only by such a commmittee could the full picture be represented; unless we fully open the eyes of the people of the world to this situation, the number of captive nations will be progressive instead of regressive, and we will take a further retreat in our position in the war in place of a victory.

In conclusion, I want to say once again that I am in complete favor of the proposed bill, House Resolution 211, and urge its passage.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS EDWARD DOLAN.

COSSACK REPRESENTATION IN EXILE,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 20, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Our organization wishes to express sincere congratulations on your introduction of the resolution for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

The establishment of such a committee is of greatest importance. The problem of our times is the Soviet Union, where many nations and peoples are being held in slavery and despotism. These nations represent a constant weakness in the Soviet Union, due to their desire and eagerness to escape the Soviet Russian tyranny. We should take advantage of the knowledge of this weakness and work to augment it.

The Committee on Captive Nations would supply information and data on the various enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R. to the U.S. Government and its agencies, as well as to the world and mainly to the American people regarding the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain. It would provide assistance to the Government in forming its policies with reference to the captive nations.

In writing to our Congressmen, Hon. GORDON MCDONOUGH and Hon. GLENNARD P.

LIPSCOMB, we hope for their full support of your resolution.

Respectfully,

VICTOR KARPUSCHKIN,
Chairman, Cossack Representation in Exile.

MANHASSET, N.Y., *April 3, 1961.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I was indeed pleased to learn that you had introduced House Resolution 211 in the Congress recenty. I have long been interested in the cause of the Captive Nations Committee and of Captive Nations Week. I hope to see the cause given permanent committee status within the framework of the legislature.

Mr. Lev Dobriansky has done a marvelous job in promoting the cause but so much more can be done under the new proposal. The State Department simply and obviously does not have the time to handle this great task as is should be handled. It is up to you, the representatives and voice of the people, to insure that every possible step is taken to overcome false Communist propaganda within these areas and replace fear with hope.

If something is not done now the already too long list of captive nations will expand.

I wish you the best of luck in making this proposed committee a reality. I speak for all of my associates who keep a close watch on the work of the Captive Nations Committee in congratulating you on your initiative thus far. I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM T. DAILEY, Jr.

ST. MICHAEL'S
UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 28, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our parish, St. Michael's Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Minneapolis, Minn.—a church organization with over 1,000 people—wishes to congratulate you on your bold and farsighted move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

Needless to say, such a committee is long overdue. One of the greatest problems confronting our Nation today is the Soviet Union, a prison house of many nations and peoples. These nations, ever eager and wanting to escape Soviet Russian slavery and despotism, constitute a perennial weakness of the Soviet Union. Therefore, it is to our advantage to know these weaknesses, and work to multiply them.

A Committee on the Captive Nations would serve as a reservoir of information and data on the various enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R., which information could be made available to the U.S. Government and its various agencies. Its main function, however, would be to inform the American people and the world at large on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain and assist the Government in formulating its policies with respect to the captive nations.

We are writing to our Congressmen: A. H. QUIE, A. NELSEN, CLARK MACGREGOR, J. E. KARTH, W. H. JUDD, FRED MARSHALL, H. C. ANDERSEN, J. A. BLATNIK, and O. LANGEN, asking them to support your resolution.

Sincerely yours,

PARISH COMMITTEE,
KATHERINE SPASYK,
Recording Secretary.
Rt. Rev. Dr. WOLODYMYR LEWYTZKYJ,
Rector of the Parish.

SHARON HILL, PA., *April 3, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It is my understanding that you have sponsored a resolution to establish a special committee on the captive nations. May I as an American citizen encourage you to keep on with this work. Prosecute it diligently and fully. It is most important to learn about the desire for freedom in the captive countries and to realize that many millions could use the proper kind of help and encouragement to gain the blessings of liberty for themselves.

A friend of mine, Mr. Isakjan I. Narzikul, formed a Turkestanian-American Association to help political refugees from Turkestan and other nearby countries of Turkish origin which are now under Soviet domination. I was one of some interested Americans who aided Mr. Narzikul to incorporate this association and we would be glad to cooperate with you in any way that you may see fit in this endeavor.

Please send us any information which you may judge helpful to keep us informed about your committee.

Very truly yours,

JOHN K. BROWN.

COSSACK AMERICAN
NATIONAL ALLIANCE, INC.,
Queens Village, N.Y., April 4, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Our organization takes the liberty of congratulating you on your valorous proposal for the introduction of the resolution for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

The necessity for such a committee is extremely great. The Soviet Union, holding many nations and peoples in captivity, presents today the greatest problem for our Nation. Those enslaved nations, eager to escape the Soviet Russian tyranny and despotism, form eternal weak spots of the Soviet Union. It is of vital importance to us to know these weak spots and work to increase them.

A Committee on the Captive Nations would be the source of information and data on the enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R., information which would be made available to the U.S. Government. Its main purpose, however, would be to inform the American people, as well as other parts of the world regarding the situation behind the Iron Curtain, thus assisting the Government in expressing its policies with regard to the captive nations.

Hoping sincerely for a full support of your resolution, we are writing in this respect to our Congressman, Hon. LEONARD FARBSTEIN.

Respectfully,

COSSACK AMERICAN NATIONAL ALLIANCE, INC.,
G. L. JEREMENKO, *President.*

ASTORIA, N.Y., *April 5, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: As an international affairs major, I am keenly interested in America's affairs of state. I am especially interested in the nations under the domination of Russia and would like to relate to you that your House Resolution 211 is the best thing that has come up in Congress, regarding the dominated nations, in a long time.

I think that this bill will impress upon the American people the importance of Captive Nations Week and will also impress upon them the fact that we must take some action for the subjugated nations.

I sincerely hope that you will do all you possibly can to make sure that this bill will pass through Congress.

Sincerely yours,

BEVERLY A. YURASHUS.

TRENTON, N.J., *March 26, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Congratulations for introducing the resolution for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations.

At the same time we shall ask our Congressman, Mr. THOMPSON, to support your resolution.

Very truly yours,

D. KUZYK, *Chairman.*

Young Americans for Freedom Speak Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the Young Americans for Freedom is a comparatively new organization of young people who have interested themselves in the problems of government. This fine organization is doing much to promote sound, stable, and responsible Government in the United States at all levels.

I commend to the Members of the House the publication of this organization entitled "The New Guard." In its recent issue, it carries an article by William M. Schulze, a young man just 21 years of age and a senior at Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio. The article, entitled "HUAC and Its Enemies," follows:

HUAC AND ITS ENEMIES

(By William M. Schulz)

On the morning of January 2, 1961, as a sleepy Nation welcomed in the second day of a new year, some 200 bright-eyed college students arrived in Washington after a 5-hour bus ride from New York. Their purpose was simple: to demonstrate against the "witch hunting" House Un-American Activities Committee and to publicize Representative JIMMY ROOSEVELT'S move to abolish the congressional body.

The "students"—ranging in age from 16 to 50 plus—searched for Congressmen and swarmed over Capitol Hill. They picketed the White House and held a well-publicized rally at Washington's All Souls Unitarian Church. Student leaders held a smooth running press conference for reporters representing Washington's three dailies, the Nation's two wire services and a half-dozen news magazines. The reporters' questions were not unusual, neither were the answers.

DENY CP CONTROL

One student was asked about a report that the anti-HUAC group was Communist-con-

trolled. Jacob Rosen, 22, of New York, answered by terming the query absurd. The mustached youth declared the movement spontaneous and unrehearsed. It was merely a coincidence, he continued, if his position happened also to be held by the Communist Party, U.S.A.

What Rosen didn't bother to announce was that he is one of the Nation's leading young Communists, a ranking party member in the New York Metropolitan area. He did not bother to admit that his participation in "Operation Abolition" was ordered by the Communist Party hierarchy, that destruction of the House Un-American Activities Committee was considered the party's No. 1 aim.

Rosen's background is all the more interesting because of liberal assertions that the anticommittee drive is spearheaded by sincere young students with no partisan political axe to grind. Rosen was sucked into the party apparatus while still in his mid-teens. At the age of eighteen he had been chosen to hold a key role in the party-controlled American delegation to the 1957 Moscow Youth Festival. The New York Times reported:

"Jacob Rosen, of 636 West 174th Street, Manhattan, a junior at City College, went without sleep to keep things moving. He carried a U.S. flag at yesterday's opening, dipping it in salute to Nikita Khrushchev and other Soviet dignitaries at the Lenin Stadium."

It came as no surprise to the Nation's security agencies when Rosen was identified under oath last spring as one of the top young Communists on the Eastern coast. And it came as no surprise when the young New Yorker took the fifth amendment on his party activities.

Although he remained tight-lipped about his Communist ties, it is known that Rosen has been charged with organizing party activities among the young. He is vice president of the new Communist youth group, "Advance," and a leader in the New York chapter of "Youth Against the Un-American Committees."

Working closely with Rosen in the party is Joanne Grant, an attractive young Negro who doubles as correspondent for the red-lining National Guardian. She, too, was active in directing the Washington demonstrations.

Despite her youthful years, Miss Grant is an experienced party functionary. In 1959 Communist top brass gave her the all-important job of raising funds to send an American delegation to the Seventh World Youth Festival in Vienna. In that capacity she worked closely with Nicolai Burov, secretary of the Soviet mission to the United Nations.

VISITS RED CHINA

Miss Grant herself attended the Sixth World Youth Festival in Moscow 4 years ago. Following that visit she slipped behind the Bamboo Curtain in defiance of State Department orders and conferred with top-ranking Chinese leaders including Chou En-lai. She is one of the few Americans ever to have an audience with Mao Tse-tung.

Testimony before a congressional committee that Miss Grant was one of the leading young comrades in the United States. Given an opportunity to refute the allegations, Miss Grant repeatedly found refuge behind the fifth amendment. Both Jake Rosen and Joanne Grant took instructions at Washington from a tall distinguished looking gentleman by the name of Frank Wilkenson. Agitating against the committee was nothing new to Wilkenson. For the past several years he has crisscrossed the country directing what the Communist Party calls "Operation Abolition." Wilkenson just happened to be in San Francisco last spring when the committee scheduled hearings, and Director J. Edgar Hoover has singled him out as one of those responsible for the student riots that followed.

EXPERIENCED ORGANIZER

Like Rosen and Grant, Wilkenson is an identified Communist. Fingered under oath by FBI Undercover Agent Anita Schneider in 1956, Wilkenson has never bothered to deny the charge. He has refused to testify about his Communist activities on three separate occasions, and in 1958 won a contempt of Congress citation for his silence. Convicted, Wilkenson has managed thus far to evade a 1-year sentence to Federal prison by appealing the verdict all the way to the Supreme Court.

Wilkenson was field representative for a group which called itself the Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms when the national Communist leadership decided to intensify its drive against the committee.

Perhaps because the Citizens Committee had been officially cited as a red front, a new group was founded with Wilkenson again field representative. The National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee was formed last fall. Seven of its fifteen directors were identified Communists. Operating out of the old Citizens Committee headquarters at 617 Larchmont Boulevard in Los Angeles, Wilkenson traveled from coast to coast setting up new fronts, collecting funds, and instructing party members in anti-HUAC agitation.

Two months before the Washington demonstrations, Wilkenson met with Communist functionaries in a top secret New York rendezvous to map overall strategy. At that meeting, it was agreed that Wilkenson would have complete control over the Washington protests.

Wilkenson organized New York rallies, arranged for busses to transport students to Washington, coordinated the efforts of Red agents throughout the metropolitan area. He arrived in Washington early, setting up headquarters in the offices of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, a group labeled by Senate investigators as a red front.

The move to abolish HUAC, as expected, failed. It did not surprise Wilkenson and company. But Party chieftains considered the Washington demonstrations a complete success. Reams of anti-HUAC publicity had been won. Lagging party morale was given a shot in the arm.

Immediately after the defeat, comrade Wilkenson announced that his group would continue to agitate against the Committee. He declared full support for Congressman Roosevelt's new move to "slash to the bone" the HUAC appropriation. He then embarked on a tour of the Nation's college campuses. Despite a momentary setback, the Communist-directed drive to destroy the Nation's security apparatus continues on schedule.

Students may be duped into working with the Wilkensons and the Grants and the Rosens unless they avoid euphemisms and call a Communist a Communist and recognize a conspiracy as a conspiracy.

Just How Guilty Are the Electric Companies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Philip Salisbury in Sales Management magazine of April 7, 1961:

JUST HOW GUILTY ARE THE ELECTRIC COMPANIES?

When one of the indicted General Electric officials said the other day that the trial and subsequent jail term had ended his usefulness to the company and that, accordingly, he was resigning, I was reminded it was about time to file a minority report on the trial.

There has been much editorial moralizing about the case of the identical bids. I am just as much in love with motherhood, just as strongly against sin, as the next one, but I feel strongly that justice may not have been served in the Philadelphia decision.

Let's face the facts. There are in many industries giant corporations that could destroy most or all of their competitors. Do you think for a moment that General Motors couldn't destroy every other auto manufacturer, with the possible exception of Ford, if it used its superior facilities and huge surplus to undercut the field? Does GM control only half of the production because that's all it could get? Certainly not. General Motors, United States Steel, General Electric are examples of companies that hold a price umbrella over their marginal competitors, not because they are humane, but because enlightened selfishness tells them that the Government surely would move in if they became larger in a relative sense and therefore more monopolistic. Isn't it ironic that they should be indicted for noncompetitive pricing when they most surely would be indicted if they used their power to slash prices?

The truth is that for generations the ordinary law of supply and demand has been shoved aside in this country. No matter how great the surplus of labor, under law an employer is compelled to pay the minimum wage. No matter how great the surplus of food, the farmer's wage is underwritten. So, as the Value Line Investment Survey points out, there is a large body of law and a long political and economic tradition that not only permits, but even requires, control over price fluctuations. Besides that, facts show that during the period of controlled prices in the electrical industry, prices went up considerably less than in comparable high-ticket metalworking or construction equipment fields. For these and other reasons too numerous to detail in this limited space, I think the electrical companies received sentences and tongue lashings they do not deserve. They did break a law, but the law should be updated.

United States Is Ahead in Most Sciences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of April 3, 1961:

UNITED STATES IS AHEAD IN MOST SCIENCES

(By Dr. John Turkevich)

The role of science is dominant in the future of nations and social and economic systems. That form of society will prevail that best integrates science into its structure, that makes science a vital part of its

defensive might, economic productivity, social well-being, intellectual activity, and spiritual aspirations.

The United States is superior to the Soviet Union in all major fields of science and technology but that of space.

For every excellent Soviet scientist, and they do have a number of outstanding ones, we in the United States have 10 as good or better.

Since 1941, 15 Americans received Nobel Prizes in physics. On the other hand only three Soviet physicists received the Nobel Prize. Only one has been honored in the Soviet Union for his work by election to the Soviet Academy. In chemistry we have nine awards in the last 20 years compared to one for the Soviets. In medicine the number is 18 Americans and no Russians in the last 20 years.

In the field of mathematics the Soviet contribution has been significant during the last half century. It has been along the lines of classical mathematics and has neglected such modern applied mathematics as information theory, operational research, theory of games, linear programing, cybernetics. In recent years many prominent Soviet mathematicians have started work in these fields.

In solid state physics, the work of the Bell Telephone Laboratories, the General Electric, Westinghouse, RCA Laboratories, and such university centers as California, Harvard, Illinois, and MIT have dominated the field that produced a revolution in electronics with transistors, photosurfaces, phosphors. The only field of excellence in the Soviet Union is that of thermoelectric devices which convert heat into electricity and electricity into cold.

In nuclear science the results of American scientists have been no less spectacular. It can be safely said that at the two Conferences on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy at Geneva in 1955 and 1958 nothing basically important in nuclear science was learned from the Soviet contributions. We did learn that they had many fine scientists following diligently and ably the leads indicated by the West.

The structure of organic compounds and the mechanisms of their reactions are widely studied. The scientific activity of the Soviet Union in this field is not on as high a level as in the United States. However, in the field of physical chemistry, Soviet scientists have shown strength for three decades.

Biology and biochemistry is in a said state in the Soviet Union. Before World War II Soviet scientists were outstanding in the important field of genetics. Both the influence of Lysenko, and the injection of Communist Party dogma into a scientific discussion killed genetics as a science in the Soviet Union and raised havoc with the whole field of biology.

Yet biology is one of the most exciting branches of modern science. This is the science of proteins, vitamins, hormones, drugs, viruses, physiology, molecular anatomy, genetics, radiation damage. American scientists have been awarded Nobel Prize after Nobel Prize for this work, scientific journals are filled with elegant and decisive experiments, the physician's bag with disease-curing drugs.

In exploration we have reached the North Pole from the air, over the ice cover, and with our atomic submarines, below the ice. We thus realized one of Jules Verne's scientific fantasies. We have reached the bottom of the oceans. Soviet activity in exploration is significant but pales with respect to the American accomplishment.

On the other hand, one must grant a glorious paragraph in the history of scientific achievements to the Soviet space scientists. The first earth satellite, the first cosmic satellite, the first hit on the moon, the first photograph of the back side of the moon, the first launching of a cosmic satellite from a space station, the heaviest mass of satellite—these are the impressive Soviet attainments.

The greatest achievement of Soviet science is its integration within the totalitarian socialistic society. The challenge that faces the United States and the Western World is how to integrate modern science into our domestic capitalistic society.

Israel's "Bar Mitzvah"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure many of our fellows in this Congress know, the State of Israel is celebrating the 13th year of its independence, its "Bar Mitzvah." It is my pleasure to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the New York Journal-American of April 14, 1961.

It is refreshing to be reminded that the beginnings of democracy are very often the same in our world, no matter where freemen come together in a community. It is new evidence of the advantages of a free society when we read of the fruits that Israel is reaping from the former desert. The article follows:

ISRAEL'S "BAR MITZVAH" RECALLS BIRTH OF UNITED STATES

(By Morris Morgenstern)

JERUSALEM, April 14.—The bitter iciness of Valley Forge and the scorching sands of the Negev Desert are more than 170 years and 6,000 miles apart. But the characteristics of the people who fashioned two luminous chapters in history—the birth of the United States and the establishment of Israel—are virtually identical.

A tenacious spirit a resolute belief in the dignity and equality of man and an unquenchable desire to live in freedom these were the qualities which helped mold a new nation in a new world, and a vibrant new state in the land of the ancients.

In the past 2 weeks I have marveled at the astounding progress the State of Israel has made in 13 short years.

The resourcefulness of its people its firm dedication to remain alive leave the beholder with a feeling of genuine exhilaration and a profound respect for these gallant Israelis.

SURROUNDED BY FOES

Israel's fierce resolve to sustain its independence—and its every existence—are brought into sharp focus when one considers that this tiny nation—approximately the size of New Jersey—is literally surrounded by antagonists.

The war-like leaders of Israel's enemies snort in outrage at the very mention of democracy's oasis in the Middle East, and have repeatedly vowed its destruction. But despite their terrifying pronouncements, I am certain that they, too, realize that Israel is here to stay.

The year 1961 marks Israel's "Bar mitzvah" its 13th anniversary. In Jewish tradition, a young man who attains his 13th birthday stands on the threshold of manhood. He is ready to assume the responsibilities which accompany adulthood, and self-reliance.

The carefree days of youth are supposedly at an end.

The analogy, however, is only superficial. Since its birth in 1948, Israel has recorded monumental achievements, and its plans for the future are breathtaking in scope.

During my travels here, I have met with a number of government officials and leaders in industry and commerce. The stark figures hardly indicate the enormous advances Israel has made in a number of vital areas.

Nevertheless, to give you an idea of Israel's progress, I would like to cite a few statistics, to help underline the accomplishments of this young country.

PRODUCE OWN FOOD

From 1951 to 1959, industrial production in Israel more than doubled, from $400 million to $950 million, and is expected to soar even higher within the next few years. In keeping with Israel's belief in self-reliance, the country now supplies more than 75 percent of its own food, and has increased the number of agricultural settlements from 290 in 1951 to nearly 800 today.

Through the years, as the nation has become more industrialized, exports have soared from $45 million in 1949, to an astonishing $350 million in 1960. From the Sea of Galilee in the north, to the city of Elath at its southernmost point, Israel continues to harvest miracles of productivity with the apparent ease of plucking a fig from a tree.

In recent weeks, the city of Jerusalem has become the focal point of international interest, as the trial of Adolf Eichmann has reawakened the horrible memories of the plague that was nazism. Outwardly the people are calm. They realize that the fate of one man—no matter how despicable his crimes—can never bring 6 million Jews back to life.

It is my feeling that the Israeli people fervently hope that Eichmann's trial will be a stern warning to the entire world that the barbaric spirit of Hitlerism must not rise again to menace freedom-loving people anywhere on the face of the earth.

Railroads Need Help Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as one who depends entirely on the railroads for distant travel, and to some extent for intermediate journeys as well, I am becoming increasingly concerned over the plight of our railroads. The storms of last winter and the interruption of rail transit due to strikes have revealed how completely dependent we are on our railroads, particularly in the matter of suburban commuter service. And it serves no purpose to point out that when the railroads were riding high with little competition from any quarter they did little to develop and retain passenger good will.

In undertaking to create a healthier climate for the operation of the Nation's rail lines it must be strongly emphasized that the solution will not be found in imposing restrictive regulations on the other modes of transportation such as the airlines, river barges, and long-haul trucks. The railroads do have a legitimate complaint, however, when they

point to the extent to which their competitors have been subsidized and that distinguished columnist, Ray Tucker, in pointing out that the Union Station here in Washington was built by the railroads with their own funds and on which they pay almost $2 million in taxes each year, has this to say in his column on April 14, 1961:

A few miles away across the Potomac River is the National Airport. It was built by the Government at a cost of $32 million, and it pays no taxes at all. Southward, on the edge of Civil War battlefields in Virginia, the Dulles Airport is under construction at a cost to Uncle Sam of $101 million. It will pay no taxes. The airlines serving both fields compete with the railroads for cargo and passenger traffic.

The discrimination, together with other subsidized forms of competition—trucks, passenger cars and waterways like the St. Lawrence canal—helps to explain why the railroads face their most serious crisis in history, possibly wholesale bankruptcy or millions in Federal and State subsidies.

Indeed, there has been talk that nationalization is the only solution, despite its utter failure in England.

The railroads might also complain to Congress and the White House that they have been "overinvestigated," but with no remedy for their problems. Several agencies are now trying to diagnose and arrive at a cure—a Presidential Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and two congressional committees.

The crying need of the railroads today is relief from punitive taxes and restrictive regulations that serve no useful purpose other than to extend unearned competitive advantage to other forms of transportation. The elimination of the iniquitous transportation tax and a reduction in the real estate levies imposed at the local level would go a long way toward bringing needed relief. From there it should be a simple matter to allow the railroads to compete with other carriers at their levels and not to be bound by antiquated and archaic regulations, even though such regulations may have once been justified when there were no other adequate alternate means for the movement of materials and personnel.

Mr. Speaker, this matter is of vital urgency. We simply cannot survive as a nation without a healthy rail system. In time of national emergency there simply are not enough trucks, barges and airplanes to move the goods necessary to meet the demands such a situation would present. And we must be prepared to protect the railroads from the threat of misguided union leaders who are trying to outlaw the so-called piggybacking of trucks. Let us continue to control all forms of transportation since it is in the public interest to do so. But let us also see that the controls are uniform in their application to all carriers and that some relief is found for our primary transportation system which seems presently headed for a disaster that could prove comparable to that of losing a war.

San Francisco's Midtown Terrace Home Owners Association Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to your attention, and to the attention of my other distinguished colleagues two newspaper articles appearing in the San Francisco press summarizing an alarming incident that occurred in San Francisco when several young men discharged shots into the home of a Negro family living in the Twin Peaks district.

Shortly thereafter the neighbors of this family met, and through their homeowners association, the Midtown Terrace Home Owners Association, unanimously passed a resolution reaffirming the belief of the members of the neighborhood in the right of all persons to live there or anywhere without regard to race, color, or creed.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, I reflect the feeling of the overwhelming majority of San Franciscans in commending the members of the Midtown Terrace Association for their prompt and vigorous reaction to this vicious shooting by the passage of this heartening resolution.

The above-mentioned articles follow:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Apr. 12, 1961]

NEIGHBORS PROTEST SHOTS AT NEGRO HOME

The Midtown Terrace Home Owners Association last night unanimously adopted a resolution expressing shock at the "cowardly and vicious" shooting into the home of a Negro family there Saturday night.

Ten shots were fired into the home of Elmo Ollison, a city maintenance worker, at 129 Marview Way. None of the five members of the family was injured.

The association, 160 strong, meeting at St. John's Armenian Church, 175 Olympia Street, resolved:

"By law, by San Francisco's tradition of tolerance, and by simple human decency, Mr. and Mrs. Ollison have the same right to live here and to raise their children here as anyone else.

"We welcome the Ollison as neighbors and we will support their rights to the fullest."

The association's board of directors had earlier passed the resolution for presentation to the full membership.

The association, the resolution added, "unequivocally affirms the right of all persons regardless of race, creed, or color to live in Midtown Terrace. We are shocked at the cowardly and vicious shooting into the home of Mr. and Mrs. Ollison."

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 12, 1961]

TWIN PEAKS HOME—NEIGHBORS BACK "BLASTED" NEGRO

Neighbors of the Negro family whose home on Twin Peaks was shot up last Saturday came to their defense yesterday as police continued to check into the case.

Last night, directors of the Midtown Terrace Home Owners' Association passed a unanimous resolution defending the family's rights and expressing shock at the incident. Some 160 persons attended the meeting and word of the vote was greeted with applause.

The shooting occurred in the early morning hours at the home of Elmo Ollison, 35-year-old laborer who works at the department of electricity.

Meanwhile, police said yesterday they have got some names of people who may have been involved.

"We think it was probably two people and we're checking leads. That's all I can say now," said Inspector Nathaniel Pedrini.

Ten .22-caliber slugs were fired at Ollison's garage, car and house at 129 Marview Way, located in a predominantly white neighborhood. A blast which police believe came from a shotgun and a .22-caliber rifle tore into the garage floor.

Neither Ollison, his wife, nor their children, aged 13, 10 and 3½, was injured.

In its resolution last night, the association said: "The Midtown Terrace Home Owners' Association affirms the right of all persons, regardless of race, color or creed to live in Midtown Terrace.

"We are shocked at the cowardly and vicious shooting into the home of Mr. and Mrs. Ollison. By law, by San Francisco's tradition of tolerance and by simple human decency, Mr. and Mrs. Ollison have the same right to live here as any one else.

"We welcome the Ollisons as neighbors and we will support their rights to the fullest."

Ollison, a mild-mannered man, took yesterday off to answer newsmen's questions and received expressions of sympathy from his white neighbors.

"Six or eight of them have dropped by and let us know we're welcome here," he said.

Ollison explained that he and his family had expected trouble when they moved into the mainly white Midtown Terrace 4 months ago.

There was none, he said, and after 2 months or so they thought they'd passed the hurdle.

"When this happened we were completely relaxed. We hadn't even considered the possibility of it."

Postage Stamp in Memory of Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, under date of February 27, 1961, I introduced H.R. 4487, to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in memory of the late Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley.

The great sacrifices made by Dr. Dooley received worldwide acclaim, and it seems such a little gesture on our part to carry out the provisions of H.R. 4887.

I am including herewith a letter from the Post Office Department in reply to my letter written to the Postmaster Gen-

eral on April 6, wherein I requested that he take this action. However, in light of his answer, the need of legislation is apparent. I can see little good in the issuance of such a stamp 25 years from now when the people of that day will perhaps have little interest in this matter. Therefore, I am once again asking the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the Honorable TOM MURRAY, to hold a hearing so that his committee can act upon and report the bill I have introduced, or any bill of a like nature.

I sincerely hope that action will be taken at this session.

The letter follows:

APRIL 12, 1961.

Hon. FRANK J. BECKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKER: The Postmaster General has asked me to thank you for your letter of April 6 concerning the issuance of a commemorative stamp in memory of the late Dr. Thomas Dooley.

We recognize the many services rendered by Dr. Dooley but consideration cannot be given to the issuance of a commemorative stamp in his honor at this time. As you may be aware, it has been the policy of the Department not to honor an American citizen until at least 25 years after his death. Postmaster General Day is in accord with this stipulation, which is a provision of the Hall of Fame in New York, and is believed a proper one since there are many people whose "greatness" diminishes over the years.

The Department infrequently issues memorial stamps in honor of American officials who died in office, and it is in this category that the memorial stamps for the late Secretary of State Dulles and Senators Taft and George were issued in 1960.

We appreciate your interest in our philatelic program.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. KELLEHER,
Special Assistant to the Postmaster General.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, as debate nears on Federal aid to education legislation, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an excellent statement in support of the administration's proposal by Mrs. Fred L. Bull, a distinguished Marylander and chairman of legislation for the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. Mrs. Bull's statement follows:

PTA POLICIES FOR EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Although it is understandable that we find a wide variety of opinions in an organization as large and as democratic as ours, we do have certain basic legislation policies, each of which must be approved by at least 30 of the 52 State PTA Congresses before it can be added to, or removed from, our national program. These previously adopted policies determine, at all times, our legislation action as a national organization. We can support only those specific bills that conform to these policies.

I shall mention only a few of these basic policies which relate to some of the proposed bills under discussion. We believe:

1. That our public school system should be maintained and strengthened to meet the ever-increasing demands of today's world.

2. That public education is a responsibility of government and requires action and financial support at all levels: local, State, and National.

3. That Federal support for education should go to publicly controlled tax-supported schools only.

4. That all Federal legislation for the support of education should include provisions to insure maximum local control.

5. That Federal funds be appropriated for the purpose of increasing educational opportunity among the States, with encouragement to the States to put forth their best efforts to equalize opportunities within their own boundaries.

6. That Federal funds be provided to augment State and local support for schools in federally impacted areas.

The policies were developed over a period of many years as problems in education became more acute and the need for Federal support become more apparent. In past years our national organization has supported many proposed education bills, such as those for emergency school construction which were rejected in previous years, and those which passed the House and Senate last year only to be held by the House Rules Committee. Our interest and concern continue as we note the many inadequacies in our school systems which rob children of the opportunity to develop their individual talents to the fullest. Each year's delay in the enactment of a good Federal support bill has compounded the problem and added greatly to the educational handicaps of countless boys and girls.

THE NEED GROWS

We parents who are so close to the schools are well aware of the mounting shortage of classrooms, the staggering number of teachers who do not meet the qualifications for certification, as well as many other urgent educational needs. According to the U.S. Office of Education there was a shortage of 142,000 classrooms last fall, almost 7,000 more than the shortage in the previous year. Some 685,000 children are on curtailed or half-day sessions. The National Education Association reports 93,917 teachers on emergency certificates; if we multiply that by 30 children (which is most conservative) it means that at least 2,817,510 children are being taught by such teachers. Think of it, and what this means to them and to the country, even when we recognize that some teachers on emergency certificates are very good teachers. It is equally shocking that there are still more than 25,000 one-teacher schools in the United States.

WE PROMISE SUPPORT

Among the proposals in certain Federal-support-for-education bills which have particular appeal to us are the following:

1. That assurance against Federal interference in schools is provided.

2. That Federal support be based on average daily attendance in public schools and personal income per public school pupil.

3. That a general program of aid be provided for all public schools, with additional aid to low income States, in order to equalize opportunity.

4. That State and local governments be required to maintain or increase their present support.

5. That Federal funds may be used for construction, salaries, additional teachers, or other purposes to improve education as each State might determine.

6. That a portion of each State's allotment would be available for special pilot, demonstration, and experimental projects in education.

We are very much interested in amendments to Public Laws 875 and 815, as proposed in H.R. 4970. A careful comparison of what this would mean to all the various States makes us wonder why the proposed reductions cannot be made more gradually. Such reductions seem a bit too sudden and too drastic especially for those States which have already compiled their budgets or will have done so before enactment. This would require them to call special budget sessions for readjustments or new levies. It would be most helpful to a great many States if these proposals could be adjusted upward.

Despite greater effort at the local and State levels, education needs have been accumulating for 3 decades and are at present greater than ever, and costs are higher. Like Alice in Wonderland, we have had to run faster and faster just to stay in the same place. Our members, as taxpayers, are willing to pay their fair share for quality education for their children. We are concerned not so much about the cost of providing a program of excellence as of the tremendously greater cost of not providing it.

Mr. Chairman, we recognize the outstanding ability and the sincerity of your committee. We are confident you will report out a good bill to which we can give our full support.

I thank you for the privilege of appearing before you today.

Improving Our Regulatory Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the problems of improving our regulatory agencies is a continuing one and a matter in which the Members of Congress are increasingly concerned. In this connection, Dean James M. Landis, the President's counsel and adviser on improvement of the regulatory agencies and administrative process, recently made an address at my alma mater, Vanderbilt University, in Nashville. I desire to have reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials following the address of Dean Landis' discussion of our regulatory agencies. The editorials are from the Nashville Tennessean, of April 14, last and the Nashville Banner, of April 15, last.

The editorials follow:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Apr. 14, 1961]

PRESIDENT CALLS FOR REFORM WHERE NEED LONG EXISTED

In his message to Congress calling for a streamlining of regulatory agencies, Mr. Kennedy singled out the Federal Power Commission for the biggest overhaul—and with plenty of reason.

His adviser on the regulatory agencies, Mr. James M. Landis, charged in his report to the President some time ago that the Federal Power Commission was the "outstanding example of the breakdown of the administrative process."

In terms of foot dragging, solicitude for the natural gas industry, and a heavy case backlog, the Federal Power Commission represents much that has been wrong with all the regulatory agencies.

Mr. Kennedy noted the Federal Power Commission still hasn't ruled on 4,000 rate increases proposed by gas producers, and that 193 applications for pipeline construction were pending before it at the end of February 1961. Some $850 million in construction is involved here and the President is right when he says more prompt handling of these matters would help the employment picture. Neither industry nor the Nation is benefited by such delays.

This particular agency is something of a thorn in the side of the administration since its holdover Chairman, Mr. Jerome Kuykendall, refuses to resign. Mr. Kennedy wanted a Nashvillian, Mr. Joseph Swidler, to be Chairman, and we agree he should be.

By midyear, however the Commission will have a Democratic majority, and if Congress will—as there is pressing need for it to do—whip the regulatory agency setup into better shape, the Federal Power Commission should still be able to do its work despite the obstructionist Chairman Kuykendall.

President Kennedy views the regulatory agencies in their proper perspective when he says they "permeate every sphere and almost every activity of our national life * * * they are not merely regulatory but are designed to further the expansion of certain facets of our economy." And he is very much aware of their responsibility to the consuming public as his message indicated. The latter has often been the forgotten factor in regulation.

No facet of government is more in need of reform than these agencies, to which both the executive branch and Congress has paid too little attention.

It is safe to assume there will no longer be lacking any executive attention toward this headless "fourth branch of government." And if Congress will now level its sights on the problems of delay, of inadequate personnel, of lacking coordination among agencies, and other flaws, there will be re-created some of the high purpose for which these agencies were created in the first place.

[From the Nashville Banner, Apr. 15, 1961]

NEW DEALISH THICKET: NEEDED AGENCY OVERHAUL IS CONGRESS RESPONSIBILITY

On the matter of regulatory agencies—subject of President Kennedy's message to Congress Thursday—there will be general public agreement with the fact that an overhaul is needed. But more than that, and prior to it, a comprehensive study is essential, looking not only to efficiency, but to curtailment where excesses of bureaucracy inflict injury on Americans to whom all too many of these agencies accord "subject" status.

There are departmental operations that are valid and vital. There are subsidiary units created for useful functions. There are subalterns added through the years into a vast accumulation, some of them temporary in original designation, but perpetuated, and comprising a thicket of undergrowth which Government reorganizations to date have failed to weed out.

The mere replacement of top hands by the patronage turnover attending a change of administration will impart no cure.

In addressing himself to this big subject, Mr. Kennedy will do well to remember that the correction sought, if it is to be effective, entails a reversal of the direction his own element of political sponsorship has pursued since 1933. These were the exponents of big government under whose aegis the agencies mushroomed. By formal enactment, or by Executive order—usually in the name of "emergency"—they were brought into being.

Dr. James M. Landis, no stranger to Government during that mass incubation process, find fault with some of them—and, after a one-man task force look, supplied the surface fact sheet on which Mr. Kennedy bases his program for reform.

The Landis summary confined its criticism to a 10-year period involving two administrations, though, significantly, it was these same two Presidents (Truman and Eisenhower) who assigned the Hoover Commission to the task of study and recommendation. Point by point most of its recommendations have been submitted to Congress.

The Nation wants efficiency in the proper operations at all levels of government. It needs no reminder that the ponderous bureaucracy and many of the agencies in question had their beginning in the New Deal. It was in the orgy of that tenure that many of them arrogated to themselves the roles of judge, jury, prosecutor, and executioner.

Most lawmakers—excepting those who are of the big government persuasion—will agree in substance with the need for a new look at some of these operations. But they will recognize, too, that the responsibility for any revamping undertaken belongs to Congress. That is the lawmaking body; the agencies for the most part are created by law, and statutory changes will have to be by that process.

The thorough study proposed is in order. The overhaul it anticipates is mandatory.

The Dichotomy of Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, many manufacturing firms in my district are suffering from the competitive effect of imported goods. Some companies seek relief by moving their operations out of the country. In other cases they import parts, and so forth, to use in finished goods. The results are equally discouraging for the American worker. Mr. Arthur Tisch, president of the Special Wire Nail Manufacturers of America has called my attention to a recent column of George Sokolsky, which points out some of the dangers involved in this situation. This article merits the careful study of all who are concerned with adverse effect of increased imports on our American industries.

The letter and article follow:

HON. HASTINGS KEITH,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEITH: Although there may be no manufacturer of dry-cell batteries in your district, I feel sure that the subject matter covered in this column is pertinent to many of us. I wonder if you could have this column reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and call the Congress' attention to the closing paragraphs which I think are the most important in the entire column. As I have said many times, management is finding a way out of the dilemma by importing. It is the laborer who must suffer. The laborers' name are removed from two very important lists. One, the list of employed Americans and two, the list of customers.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR S. TISCH,
Director, Technical Sales President, Special Wire Nail Manufacturers of America.

BRIDGEWATER, MASS.

THESE DAYS: THE DICHOTOMY OF TRADE

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Every week, mail comes from some industry or some press agents dealing with the subject of imports. The concern is very profound. Certain American industries are convinced that they are being squeezed out of the American market by cheaper imported products. American workers are frightened.

Before World War I, when a free market existed, it was possible to fight unfair competition. Today, when governments determine the wages, hours of work, taxes, indirectly the prices of raw materials, when they subsidize enterprises by various devices, the markets of the world are no longer free and the danger to labor in a high-wage country is that jobs will be wiped out.

The storage battery manufacturers, who are in direct competition with Japanese, find that some Japanese batteries are sold at a lower price in the United States than in Japan.

The dry battery section of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association consists of seven companies which employ 8,000 Americans, and have an annual payroll of $35 million. This is not a very large number of workers, but they are widely scattered over the United States and their loss of employment would seriously affect many communities.

The transistor radio set has grown increasingly popular in the United States. Young people carry transistor radios with them to sports, games, and even to musical events. Having come into the market importantly in 1957, 3 years later, in 1960, the transistor portable radios sold against tube radios at the ratio of seven to one. Japanese manufacturers entered the American market immediately and can afford to underbid American manufacturers because of cheaper wages, lower taxes, and government subsidies in Japan.

The radio battery industry figures show this production (in millions):

	1959	1960	1961 (*estimate*)
United States	5.8	12.0	12.0
Japan	3.3	7.4	16.1

The basis for competition between American and Japanese radios is that the average American worker in this industry receives $2 an hour whereas a Japanese worker receives the equivalent of 30 cents an hour. Japanese No. 216 batteries cost in New York about 15 cents; American No. 216 batteries sell to distributors for about 70 cents. The argument that the American battery is superior and will last longer is not particularly pertinent as this is a price rather than a quality market.

The Japanese have to import not only raw materials but food. Their country being only about 20 percent arable, they have no alternative but to manufacture for export and they must have a market where there is no political opposition to them.

This then is the dilemma that faces both Japan and the United States. Japan's principal market is the United States, but everything that Japan exports to the United States in any quantity is manufactured in the United States.

The pressure of American labor for protection is becoming increasingly great. Instead of the industrialists demanding protection, they solve their problem by moving their plants abroad where wages and taxes are low. They, in effect, export jobs.

On the other hand, the labor unions are beginning to demand protection. The pressure can become a major political issue and therefore requires more than casual thought.

Jobs for the Handicapped—A Community Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a great deal of justifiable concern has been attached to our national problem of unemployment and underemployment. Essentially, the problem is one of making full use of the skills and capacities of every American who wants to work. In this category are many men and women who have suffered physical impairments, who through special training and a determination to be productive are capable of holding down a gainful job.

The President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, and similar committees in the States, have spotlighted the need for employers to consider the value of the handicapped worker to their firms and to the community.

As a device for educating the public to the potential of many of our handicapped citizens, the President's Committee, in cooperation with Governor's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, recently sponsored essay contests, State and National, among young people. New Mexico is proud that its State winner won second place in the national competition. She is Miss Claire Marek, of 2429 Wisconsin, Northeast, Albuquerque. Claire is a student at Albuquerque High School.

I ask unanimous consent that her winning essay "Jobs for the Handicapped—A Community Challenge" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

(By Claire Marek)

"Pencils for sale," a feeble voice comes from the weatherbeaten face of the old man sitting against the store wall. His shabby clothes and dilapidated shoes and hat present a sharp contrast to the fashions on the models in the store window above him. Dark glasses over his eyes, an old tin cup in his hand, and a white cane lying beside him complete the picture. A shopper, dropping a few pennies in the tin cup, so few that it hardly makes a rattle, passes by and remarks, "Why can't they do something about that?" "They," an easy way of passing the responsibility onto that vague group into whose care "we" place all the problems and mistakes of the world. The "they" should be you, I and all of us in the community where the pencil man exists.

The pencil man is of the older generation. Much has been done for younger people with the same handicap. One seldom sees a middle-aged person in the pencil man's plight. Still—

A young man wheels himself into the huge room furnished with benches and tables on which various electronic equipment is placed. His eyes are bright and his excitement is quite evident, for this is his second day on the job. A man stops to say hello and chat a moment, but at another table, another man speaks to his boss, "Why can't that crippled guy work somewhere else? Why does he have to be near me? I can't do my job right 'cause he makes me nervous."

The Government and the State have done their part of the job well. The man is efficient because the Government has trained him. He has a job. However, the community has failed to complete the work started by the Government. The community must educate the average person about the ability and efficiency of the handicapped. Some prejudice has been torn down. Young children in school stand a better chance than ever of obtaining jobs; but.

A 5-year-old boy pauses as his instructor shapes her lips to form a vowel and places his chubby hand on her throat. She utters the sound again and again. Then she turns the boy to the mirror and places his hand on his own throat. He tries. The process is repeated until a satisfied smile appears on the face of the young woman. Then one appears on the face of the boy. Watching through a one-way window, a society matron comments: "This education is fine, and we expect to raise quite a sum in our fund drive, but what good will it all do? Will he ever really amount to anything?"

Progress has definitely been made with the handicapped. Each succeeding generation has a better chance, but these questions—"Why can't they do something about that?" "Why can't he work somewhere else?" "Will he ever really amount to anything?"—are asked frequently throughout the United States, and they reflect a broad area of Americans' opinions.

The Federal Government has done much to remedy such situations as that of the blind man selling pencils, in the form of special education programs and facilities for medical treatment. But this rehabilitation and education of the handicapped is worthless unless the community is educated to accept the rehabilitated as truly rehabilitated. Pamphlets can be sent out showing how everyone benefits when the handicapped are hired, for they may serve as contributing members of the community. This information acquaints the community with the efficiency of disabled persons, but does not erase the prejudice entirely. The old adage that "experience is the best teacher" holds true in this respect. The community must experiment with their handicapped by trying them and trusting them. It must be a community effort, for the people of a Minnesota town are not going to help a blind man in an Indiana town; the people of a small Texas city are not going to see that a crippled factory worker makes a "go" of his job, nor that his neighbors accept him; and the people of a Tennessee town are not going to arrange that a little deaf boy in Arizona has a job in 20 years. But, the people of each community can help the handicapped in their own town, and only by this "teamwork" can successful placement of the handicapped be attained.

Moreover, a job involves more than mere placement or position. A job for a handicapped person means being accepted by his fellow workers to the extent that they are able to concentrate on his abilities rather than his disabilities. Americans did not understand it when the Japanese rioters made Eisenhower cancel his trip to Japan. The handicapped person is in the same way puzzled when a job is refused him because of his disability. He wants a job and acceptance, not a job and avoidance.

The little boy working diligently trying to learn to speak, wants acceptance also. Right now, funds from the Government and some from the community are paying for his education. He appreciates this, and will appreciate it even more in 20 years, for it will mean his bread. But now and in the future, he will need more than bread. The friendliness of his community will mean the difference between a drab, lonely, and embittered life and a life of contentment and sharing in the community's privileges and responsibilities. Modern equipment and experienced teachers can fit him for meeting the outside world, but is the outside world a fit place for him?

This question and all the others that have been asked by pitying donators and charitable clubwomen can be answered only by the community. These questions are the challenge that faces each community today. The answer is community cooperation to do something about that blind man on the corner. The community must educate its members against prejudice so that the crippled factory worker is sought after and accepted for his abilities. Finally, the community can prepare its future citizens so that the deaf boy in the special school will some day "amount to something."

This, then, is the complete challenge—the hiring of the handicapped devoid of any prejudice. When this challenge is met, each community, each State, and finally the Nation will be a better place for everyone—able and disabled alike—to live.

The Family Farm: Definition Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the New Castle (Ind.) Courier-Times, Mar. 30, 1961]

THE FAMILY FARM: DEFINITION NEEDED AT THE OUTSET—95 PERCENT OF U.S. FARMS OPERATED BY SINGLE FAMILY

In President Kennedy's recent farm message to Congress, he reaffirmed the proposition that "the family farm should be protected and preserved as a basic American institution." The Wall Street Journal probably echoed the thoughts of many urbanites when it commented: "Now the reality is that time has outmoded the family farm, but it is nonetheless to be wrapped in the flag and, like Mount Vernon, to be preserved at all cost."

Depending on definition, the "family farm" may or may not be outmoded and inefficient. Some detractors might want to revise their opinions of the family farm if they studied one set of criteria—now widely accepted among agricultural economists—as to what constitutes such a unit.

If by "family farm" one is talking about 4 acres of submarginal land on which a family scratches out a mean existence, little justification can be found for its continued survival through Government handout. In actual practice, this kind of farm produces so little that Government price supports can add only a few dollars to its receipts, usually not enough to keep it in business.

But the modern definition of "family farm"—and the one substantially applied by the Farmers Home Administration in granting loans—is of a farm on which most of the management (not ownership) and most of the labor comes from the resident family. In actual percentage terms, the country's family farm, so defined, comprise about 95 percent of all farm units, and may be gaining slightly even as the total number of farms decline.

This seeming paradox is explained by an Agriculture Department economist in this way: Even though the actual number of farm units in the United States has dropped steadily since the end of World War II, greater mechanization has enabled farms which previously had to hire substantial outside labor to operate within the accepted definition of a "family farm." Moreover, reliable studies indicate that the cost per unit of production on a mechanized family farm of reasonable size compares favorably with costs on the larger and presumably more efficient "factory farm." Agricultural economists complain that "family farm" has become an emotive term which, lacking proper definition, sheds more heat than light on the issue of the Federal role in agriculture.

Howard Coughlin Speaks of Office Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the statement on office automation presented by Howard Coughlin, president of the Office Employees International Union, AFL–CIO, before the Subcommittee on Unemployment-Automation.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON OFFICE AUTOMATION PRESENTED BY HOWARD COUGHLIN, PRESIDENT OF THE OFFICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION, AFL–CIO, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON UNEMPLOYMENT-AUTOMATION, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, MARCH 29, 1961

On October 18, 1955, I appeared before the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and discussed the effects of office automation at some length.

In again reading my testimony, I find that we were right in many of the things that we predicted but came to a conclusion which I now feel is no longer a solution to the problems resulting from the introduction of automative devices in offices.

In 1955, I stated that "computers in an office are going to be like bulldozers in the construction industry." I also said, "I do not subscribe to the point of view that dire things lie ahead. We have had automation in our factories for some years without disastrous results. I do believe, however, that there will be serious problems caused by the introduction of automation in offices. Many individuals who have spent their lives acquiring certain skills and have come to believe implicity in their own indispensability are in for a rude shock. They will see machines do in seconds, work that takes them days and weeks to accomplish. They will see machines replace the jobs they and their fellow workers have come to feel are their permanent niches in the office world. A lot of people will lose their jobs. A lot of individuals will be forced to acquire new skills. There will be many new responsibilities placed on the employers of our country."

In conclusion, I stated, "we call upon the employers in the United States to conform to the practices instituted in our organization for the protection of persons displaced from office positions as a result of the introduction of automation. We feel that responsible employers should, as a matter of policy, insure the transition to automation without hardship to the officeworkers of America. We further urge employers to share with labor the gain in productivity resulting from automation."

Our prediction of things to come in the statement I presented to that committee was correct. My conclusion, however, which indicated that employers might insure the transition to automation without hardship to the officeworkers of America was incorrect.

In 1955 office and clerical employment was rising steadily. In fact clerical employment has been on the rise since the year 1900. There are approximately 24 million white-collar workers in our Nation today.

In 1955 we thought in terms of giant vacuum tube-type computers which required thousands of square feet of space to house. These machines also required air-conditioned, moistureproof surroundings. We felt that it would require several years for a company to change over from a manual-type clerical operation to the giant computers. The time involved, therefore, would give companies the opportunity to cut their clerical staffs through attrition rather than through layoffs.

We did not take into consideration the startling improvements that have already evolved in electronic data-processing machines. Solid state transistor-generated computers no larger than an office desk are already in process. These newer computers require little space, are much more reasonable in price and are available for medium and smaller businesses.

Computer centers are springing up throughout the Nation. These centers are eliminating small office staffs overnight. It is a simple matter for a small company to use the computer centers and, at the same time, guarantee secrecy of confidential company information. Automation magazine, in its March 1961 issue, announced that self-service computer centers are now a reality. A do-it-yourself computer center has been opened in Los Angeles by Computermat, Inc. It operates along the same lines as a laundromat. The client solves his own engineering and scientific problems with a minimum of instruction. If assistance is needed, there is an experienced staff to help the client in the preparation of programs and in machine operation. An extensive library of programs and subroutines is also available. An IBM 1620 system which uses decimal arithmetic was selected for use in the center.

The New York Times, in its March 15, 1961, edition, illustrated the use of two computer service centers in the financial district of the city. These two computer centers, maintained by IBM and RCA offer for a few all of the advantages of electronic data processing without requiring users to buy or rent computers or their related equipment.

While the giant security concerns have their own computer systems, an increasing number of smaller brokerage houses are using the facilities of service centers. All of the back office accounting for three brokerage concerns is accomplished at the IBM unit, known as the Service Bureau Corp. Each day at the close of trading, all information dealing with customer stock trades, commissions due, and other important data are forwarded to the center. The centers work all night and deliver to the users, before 8 a.m. the next day, complete records for all customers. Complete monthly statements for each customer are also prepared and sent to the brokerage concerns.

RCA's Electronics Systems Center at 45 Wall Street provides daily individual processing of trades, including calculations of commissions, transfer taxes, and net amounts in customers' accounts.

Fees for this work vary, depending upon the amount of work accomplished. Obviously, however, the firms using these centers find it more economical to operate in this way rather than to pay regular salaries, taxes, and fringe benefits for permanent employees.

A solid state digital computer has been designed for small- and medium-sized firms by Autonetics Division of North American Aviation, Inc. The machine called Recomp III has a 4,096-word magnetic disk memory and can handle more than 8,000 instructions. It has a list of 32 standard commands plus five optional floating point commands. Standard input and output is 10 characters per second by typewriter or paper tape punch. The computer's potential can be extended in accordance with the needs of the purchasing firm.

New companies geared to build smaller computers are springing up all over the Nation. All one has to do is check the day-by-day activities of the New York Stock Exchange to find that electronic companies are getting the greatest amount of attention from investors.

There are varied estimates as to the number of computers which will be in operation in the coming years. The Bureau of Labor Statistics stated that in 1959 an estimated 2,000 electronic computers of all sizes were being used for a variety of business, scientific, and engineering purposes by private companies and Government agencies. It has been conservatively estimated that electronic data processing machine sales have reached $500 million as compared to only $10 million in 1950. Conservative estimates bring this total to $2 billion in 1970.

Computer Sciences, Inc., estimates that 10,000 computer installations will be made in the year 1961. Based on studies made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), it is estimated that each computer will affect 140 jobs. It is, therefore, easily seen that in the year 1961, 1,400,000 workers will be affected by these new installations.

BLS has also indicated that 25 percent of the jobs affected will be eliminated. We, therefore, can anticipate that 350,000 white collar positions will be permanently abolished by virtue of computer installations in the year 1961.

We can reasonably expect that the number of computer installations will multiply at a rate in excess of 10,000 installations per year. If, for example, the increasing number of firms entering this field were able to double the number of installations in the year 1962, a minimum of 700,000 jobs would be abolished in that year in addition to the 350,000 which we estimate will be lost this year. This number will increase to gigantic proportions as additional installations are made.

We do not have any estimates of the effects of computer centers. In view of the fact that these centers can do the work of multiple firms at rates running from $25 per hour and up, I am sure that we can all agree that many additional hundreds of thousands of positions now held by white collar workers in small and medium sized firms will vanish from the American scene.

We have noted that some of the manufacturers of electronic data processing machines took issue with Congressman ELMER HOLLAND when he published an estimate which indicated that 4 million office and clerical jobs will be eliminated within the next 5 years through automation. While we can understand that some people may find it difficult to believe that 4 million clerical jobs can be eliminated within 5 years through automation, we do not believe that the manufacturers of computers are unaware of the serious results of large scale installations of computers.

Computers, however, are only a part of the problem of automation in the office. There are numerous automative devices other than computers which, over the next few years,

will eliminate many additional jobs. Some of these machines include the atuomatic sales clerk which can dispense as many as 36 varieties of merchandise and accept payment in return. These machines manufactured by Universal Match and Universal Controls will accept payment up to $5 and will give the customer the exact change due.

A major firm announced last fall that it has created, in effect, an automatic law clerk. This machine recently demonstrated to members of the American Bar Association performs 7 man-hours of legal research in a matter of minutes. In order to get the answers to a question involving tax exemptions, this brain analyzed 400 laws from 50 States and the District of Columbia. In less than 10 minutes, it had typed out all of the statutes and case citations and was beginning the full text of the material. While this machine is expensive and would cost $12,000 monthly if rented, it is also true that we can expect smaller and less expensive machines of similar capability in the foreseeable future.

Addressograph-Multigraph has a machine known as the optical code reader which electronically reads, punches, verifies, and totals numerical information imprinted on tabulating cards with Addressograph data recorders. Cards are punched at the rate of 180 per minute. This machine will eliminate the need for manual key punching.

IBM announced the development of a reading machine which scans entire typewritten pages at the rate of 1,800 words a minute and can automatically operate a teleprinter machine for long-distance transmission of messages. An electronic scanner is presently being used at the Atlantic City Electric Co. in New Jersey. It would take 24 keypunch clerks to do the work of this scanner.

Positions which were created by the giant computers have been eliminated by the smaller models. The use of magnetized tape is eliminating the need for key-punch operators. The use of microwaves will eliminate the need for those who punch magnetized tapes. In other words, the newer electronic machines are already doing away with jobs previously created by predecessor computers.

For example, most utilities use meter readers who forward information read from the commerical and private meters to the memory drum of the computer. It is now possible to eliminate the meter readers and have this information forwarded directly and automatically from the meter to the memory drum of the computer without use of humans.

It is also possible to have retail stores, through the use of electronic equipment, automatically notify their wholesalers or suppliers of depletion of items for sale through proper use of their cash registers, adapted to the particular electronic installations. This could eliminate salesmen, telephone order clerks and those regulating inventories.

Recently, we have learned that the David Sarnoff Research Center of RCA was working on a phonetic typewriter. This typewriter will automatically transcribe from the spoken word. At the present time, it uses a type of sound language similar to speedwriting. This machine puts down exactly what it hears and, therefore, is not orthodox in spelling. In accordance with an article published recently in the New York Times, the machine will transcribe the word "ultimate" as "ultimit" and the word "typewriter" as "tipriter." Just as in speedwriting, it is not difficult to understand the language used by the phonetic typewriter.

Two possibilities present themselves: (1) that through the use of such a machine, a new type of business language will result; or (2) the machine will be perfected to the extent that it will transcribe perfectly.

In commenting on RCA's request for a patent for the phonetic typewriter, the New York Times correspondent stated that the human secretary is safe in her job because the machine can't make coffee. We could add many other substantial reasons for the retention of the human secretary as opposed to the machine. However, we are sure that RCA is not spending its money in the development of this machine without purpose.

There is also experimentation in Kyoto University in Japan with the phonetic typewriter. It would appear from the translation of the material that we have received that the Japanese may well be ahead of RCA in the development of this educated typewriter. This machine, known as Sonotype is being perfected at Kyoto University in cooperation with the Ministry of Education and the Japan Electronics Co.

The Japanese stated that it eventually will be used for any language or dialect. While we are told that the phonetic typewriter has imperfections and is not ready for production, we believe that the committee should be aware that this machine, when perfected, can eliminate the jobs of 1,500,000 secretaries, stenographers, and typists.

I believe some of these examples can well indicate to you that we are facing something more than technological displacement of clerical workers.

We are facing a revolution in the office.

It is not possible for labor or industry to resolve the problems of wholesale displacement of office and clerical workers either unilaterally or bilaterally. This problem requires the active participation of the U.S. Government if we are going to avoid the possibility of millions of unemployed white-collar workers whose jobs have been permanently abolished.

Some optimists prefer to pass over this problem lightly, and point to the continuing increase in the numbers of clerical and kindred workers. They fail to point out, however, that the Bureau of Labor Statistics has found that the rate of increase in clerical and kindred workers in companies where electronic data processing existed is only 7 percent as compared to 15 percent in companies where such systems have not been installed.

These optimists also refuse to recognize the fact that the Bureau of Labor Statistics has found that 25 percent of the jobs affected by the installation of electronic data processing systems have been permanently abolished.

Our labor force is continuing to increase. High school and college graduates available for office and clerical work are also on the increase. The figures indicate that automation will soon curtail, if not eliminate, the positions sought by these newcomers to the labor market.

Worse still, our high schools and business colleges are continuing to prepare students for occupations in the business world which will cease to exist in the next few years.

It is easily seen, therefore, that the problem of displacement of office and clerical employees requires the study, planning and recommendations of organized labor, industry, and the Federal Government working together.

A Federal commission representing organized labor, industry and the Federal Government, after a complete study of the problems resulting from automation of the office, should have the power to make certain recommendations. These recommendations, along with others, should include:

1. Training and retraining centers through the unemployment insurance program.

2. Rehabilitation centers for those office and clerical employees advanced in age and not readily adaptable to the operation of automative devices.

3. Increased unemployment insurance payments and extended duration of time for receipt of such payments for those displaced by automation. We must recognize the difference between those temporarily laid off because of lack of work and those whose jobs have been permanently eliminated through automation.

Those office and clerical workers whose jobs have been permanently abolished due to automation represent a special problem and should receive special consideration. These people have not received secondary training for positions of a manual nature. It may be necessary to offer these people relocation in other cities in positions found by a Government agency. It may also be possible to have such individuals and their families moved from the city in which they are residing to the location of the new position; such expense to be paid through the unemployment insurance system.

Admittedly, it is better for the national economy to undertake payment of these expenses than to continue unemployment insurance payments or community relief subsidies indefinitely. This plan is in operation in Sweden and has proven successful.

4. Earlier retirement for women. Women now make up two-thirds of the white collar force. It is far more difficult for a woman in her forties or fifties to gain new employment than is true of a man.

5. Establishment of a shorter workweek. We believe this is inevitable, particularly in view of the greater productivity and increased profits resulting from the installation of automative equipment. We believe that a radical cut is inevitable in the working hours of office and clerical employees.

The House Committee on Education and Labor must concern itself with the fact that high schools, business schools, and colleges are continuing to train potential office and clerical employees in skills which are in the process of disappearing from the labor market.

Unless this is accomplished, we will find ourselves continuing to prepare people for long periods of unemployment rather than for the creative employment they seek.

In conclusion, I feel that a special tripartite Federal commission, representative of organized labor, industry, and the Government, should be appointed immediately to make a complete study of the problems resulting from the introduction of automative devices in the office.

This commission should report back to the House Committee on Education and Labor at the earliest possible date. Delay in taking action can be costly to the economy of the United States.

Freedom Shall Prevail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Grace Van Atta sponsored and conducted an Americanism essay contest in the Cincinnati public schools. Three outstanding Cincinnatians were judges of this contest; namely, Brady Black, executive editor of the Cincinnati Enquirer; Thomas Gephardt, editor of the editorial page of that paper; and Mr. Peter Grant, director of news for station WLW, the Crosley Broadcasting Co.

Mary Lyons Temple, of Cincinnati, Ohio, a student at our Western Hills High School, was adjudged the winner.

The purpose of the contest was to stimulate a greater interest and feeling of pride and appreciation for the American way of life; the ideals, customs and responsibilities of the American citizen.

Miss Temple's essay, "American Citizenship: What It Means to Me," is so outstanding that I feel it should be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The essay follows:

AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME FREEDOM SHALL PREVAIL

(By Mary Lyons Temple)

Allow me to introduce myself. My name is George Washington. I served as Commander in Chief of the Continental Army during the Revolutionary War, and later, I became the first President of the United States. Now, I am here in America as a spectator to see what has become of the Nation which I helped to found.

I see all of the wondrous advances that have been made in industry and agriculture. Everywhere there are machines that run by themselves, lamps that shine without fire, and pictures that move and talk. I am greatly amazed by all of these things. I am shocked by the new language I find the people speaking—so like, and yet so unlike, that of my day. The clothes, too, are different from anything I could have imagined. Gigantic buildings loom everywhere, and people fly through the air above them like birds. Yet, I am able to understand these changes, for such progress is inevitable and, from what I can see, good. I would not want the people of America to stand still and not search for better things. No, it is not these material changes which frightens me and bewilders me; it is the change in the people themselves, in the way they feel toward their country.

There are now more than 180 million U.S. citizens, yet there seem to be no more, or perhaps not as many, true Americans as there were in my day. I hear the word "American" used as a synonym for "citizen of the United States." This is not right, for an American is someone who lives up to the demands of his citizenship. He takes an active interest in the affairs of his Government; he is proud of his country, and thankful to be a citizen of it.

He is eager to protect his rights and those of other citizens. He appreciates his great heritage as an American citizen. I have found few citizens of the United States today who could really be called Americans. The people of the United States, although they call themselves "Americans," have actually forgotten what it means to be a citizen. They have abandoned their sacred duties as citizens, and they have left their many privileges unguarded in a world where there is much danger of losing them.

The most tragic part of the lack of Americanism among "Americans" is that the people do not realize what is happening today. They think that they are good Americans because they say the "Pledge of Allegiance" at the opening of public gatherings, buy U.S. bonds, and can sing the first verse of "America." Undoubtedly, there are moments in every citizen's life when he feels pride and joy in being part of so great a Nation, but this is not enough. American citizens of the 20th century must be, as those of the 18th century were, true Americans every day.

I observe that on July the Fourth Americans celebrate with parties and firecrackers, but this is not really done in honor of, or in celebration of, American independence. It is done because the people of the United States want to have a good time. To be sure, there were many, many firecrackers on the Fourth of July in 1776, but they were a display of true rejoicing over the newly proclaimed independence of America. In 1776, the people knew what it meant to be free, for they had long been oppressed by British rule. On that first Fourth of July, Americans had good reason to celebrate, and they still do today. Citizens of the United States still have the same rights and responsibilities which they had in my day. They still have those rights given every citizen by the Constitution of the United States: to manage their own affairs; worship as they see fit; speak out on whatever they please; criticize the government; read and write freely; have a fair trial by an impartial jury; and, perhaps the most important, they have the right to govern themselves.

In 1787, I attended the Constitutional Convention where I helped to set down in writing these rights of the citizens. It never occurred to me then that in years to come these hard-won rights would simply be taken for granted. In my day, they were the most cherished possessions of the people; and they should be today. If the present attitude of American citizens toward their rights continues much longer, there will be tragic results. The rights, the very freedom, of the people will be lost gradually. Then these rights and freedoms will finally be appreciated, but it will be too late. The American people must learn now what it really means to be a citizen of the United States. They must know what their rights are so that they may protect them, and they must recognize their responsibilities so that they may carry them out. Then they will be true Americans.

Help Wheel Needy Ill of World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of transmittal from Mrs. Paul Bedford, of Wilkes-Barre, with which she forwards a feature article on the international humanitarian work done by the Wheel Chair Club of Wilkes-Barre, of which she is the founder. The aforementioned article was written by Mr. Sheldon Wintermute, a staff writer, Sunday Independent, Wilkes-Barre, and appeared in that newspaper on December 11, 1960. It gives me great pleasure to include this material as part of my remarks today which is in addition to previous remarks that I had made in the RECORD on this truly outstanding and humanitarian enterprise. Mrs. Bedford is to be warmly congratulated on the success of the Wheel Chair Club which she founded 25 years ago. I am sure I reflect the wishes of many thousands when I say that we all fervently hope that her good works will be continued and sustained for many more wonderful years.

The letter and article follow:

THE WHEEL CHAIR CLUB, INC.,
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Thank you for putting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article about our sending 300 wheelchairs around the world in 3 years.

We wish instead of that you had put the enclosed one in which CARE sent to the Sunday Independent, without our knowledge. It shows our work in action. We appreciate greatly what you did.

Sincerely,

GERTRUDE BEDFORD
Mrs. Paul Bedford.

HELP WHEEL NEEDY ILL OF WORLD—BEDFORD RESIDENCE HEADQUARTERS FOR UNIQUE PROJECT

(By Sheldon Wintermute)

It was 25 years ago and Christmas was just as close when a Wilkes-Barre woman, who 4 years ago rightfully was honored as a Distinguished Daughter of Pennsylvania, founded the Wheel Chair Club of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., which now is known to handicapped children throughout the world.

The founder, Mrs. Paul Bedford, of 96 West South Street, city, had only a small group to help her plot the course for this international humanitarian project.

It was only last week that five wheelchairs were delivered to the Franklin Delano Institute for Crippled Children at Bogotá Colombia, as a gift of the Wheel Chair Club of Wilkes-Barre, the headquarters of which is the study in Mrs. Bedford's West South Street residence where she resides with her husband, one of the most distinguished members of the Pennsylvania Bar Association.

The official presentation at the institute in the capital city of the South American republic was made by Richard W. Reuter of New York, executive director of CARE (Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere), who was visiting Bogotá as part of a tour of CARE missions in Latin America.

TRIED FOR SIZE

Mr. Reuter reported to Mrs. Bedford that the chairs immediately were tried for size by five little Colombian girls being treated at the institute for polio.

Another chair earlier this year was delivered to the Physical-Social Rehabilitation Organization in Bogotá, which serves the crippled and blind poor.

Colombia brings to nine the number of countries to which CARE has delivered wheelchairs on behalf of the Wilkes-Barre club.

The others are Hong Kong, India, Italy, Panama, Philippines, Turkey and Vietnam.

Mrs. Bedford and her tireless aids are working on reports that chairs are urgently needed for a children's hospital in Israel and a school for the disabled earthquake-stricken Chile.

The former Gertrude Vaughn, Mrs. Bedford was cited as a Distinguished Daughter of Pennsylvania in 1956 for outstanding contributions through personal service, effort and humanitarian work in the field of welfare.

When it started 25 years ago, the Wheel Chair Club was merely an outgrowth of the Friends of Shut-Ins Club. Today there are 27 active units around the country helping to provide wheelchairs and walkers to the needy ill in this country and abroad.

Nature and the Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD

an article entitled "Nature and Man: The Two Faces of Management," which appeared in the Audubon magazine May–June 1960:

NATURE AND MAN: THE TWO FACES OF MANAGEMENT

(By Daniel McKinley)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dan McKinley is a teacher of biology at Salem College, Winston-Salem, N.C. In the summer of 1959, he was on the staff of the Audubon Camp of Connecticut, and for 2 years was a teaching fellow in biology at Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine. In a recent letter to us, he wrote: "I grew up in the Ozark area of southern Missouri, where I learned certain Thoreauvian truths about dolomite glades, sandstone barrens, and other wastelands. They were places of great charm and interest * * * not real wildernesses but without them life would have been different." Dan McKinley has worked as a naturalist in Missouri State parks, studied wildlife management under William H. Elder, a disciple of Aldo Leopold at the University of Missouri, and has worked on ecological problems in Alaska.)

The dourest prophet has at least a despairing hope that human nature can be changed enough to make man's life compatible with the order in nature. Something of the sort, without a resort to quackeries, has to be done.

The common question goes: Where is science taking us? Can it be that science is taking us, as the question implies, to some end that we have not elected? The two most frequent replies are not reassuring—the hell of nuclear war; or the dubious utopia of a manmade world powered by atomic energy.

Today's shoddy promise of utopia is not a pretty one, even if it works; and we do not yet know what to do with the leftovers from peaceful atomic fission. Inevitably we shall see nature molded more and more by the cankering stresses of overpopulation and undreamed-of increases in material demands. Individual freedom will perish in the totalitarianism necessary for the running of such a factory of human protoplasm.

I think it conceivable there is no solution to the looming catastrophe of too many people in so frail a world. Like the dragon's brood we threaten our world with hydrogen bombs, atomic fallout, earth movers, and simple overuse by billions of men whose blindness prevents them from recognizing the earth's fragility. Municipal airports, superhighways, and suburbias weigh heavily upon land that ought to lie exposed to rain and light and life. Earthly life may soon consist only of that in managed man and his tanks of algae stewing in the solar gardens of the future. Farming as a way of life, wildernesses, arctic tundra, national parks, wild animals, and plants—all of these things may be dreams before we know it.

Maybe, as I say, we cannot do anything. But how justified is this view for the managers and technicians who do alter the world? Are we an ignorant society so mobilized by taboos that we act, but cannot guide our actions? What do we know about the tangled web of effects woven by the changes we initiate? So far, perhaps because of "science," it has not mattered much to us. We are utopia bound. What are esthetics and ethics, or even the practicalities of soil poisoning, pollution, and the extinction of species? But the web tightens. Bacteria, green plants, and molds are among mankind's greatest friends. They are the result of an almost eternally long balance in nature that man can never duplicate, and one in which he was never remotely involved until quite recently. Yet aside from whooping cranes, platypuses, and moccasin flowers, all beneath contempt because they have no market value, we may also be endangering the willingness of just such impersonal facets of life as chlorophyll, penicillin, and nitrification to support us. We know little enough about the kind of world required for their fruitfulness. Man, an ignorant parasite, sucks up their bounty, and without them he is lost.

I am the sheepish owner of a hope that a world fit for unmanaged men may yet come out of it all. It is an agonizing hope. Coupled with that hope is the belief that in completely managed landscapes only a managed man can fit without going mad. For, as much as politics, religions, schools, and automobiles, freedom consists of spaciousness, natural beauty, and complexity, and the familiar challenge of the unknown. If we lose these things, how can they be legislated back into a world spilling over with people?

Yet, suburban developments, tomorrow's slums, sprawl listlessly over once lovely hills. A living topsoil is bulldozed away and its basement cemented over. People spew outward from decrepit metropolises, into which are driven ever more displaced people from the farm. Gadget-filled lives have been invested with so false a halo that one wonders if the gadgets are not the proffered carrot that precedes the slipping on of the halter.

Where does the emphasis on material social creations put a naturalist? This skeptic yet remembers country summers in Missouri: grasshopper symphonies not confined to a Saturday afternoon. Although strayed from Ozark hillsides of oak and hickory, he yearns not for lost youth but for the lonely call of a blue jay in the emptiness of an oak forest in midwinter; for katydids rasping out their lives in gleaming summer evenings; for the cyclic drone of a cicada in a locust year; for nighthawks booming their own delights over a limestone glade; or, above the comforts of fellow creatures, sunset silhouetting neither skyscraper, power pole, nor jet trail.

What I describe is not the antithesis of human society, but its proper setting.

I am told to ogle the progress of mankind. Join. Socialize. Have faith. Faith in what? Faith in man—man possessed of the Midas touch; man the remover—not the maker—of mountains. Man so in love with his own image that he cannot see or reflect or weigh; so open to the faults in his faiths and practices that he now endangers the future of his species. Will he—can he—continue to love his fellow men when men fall over each other's feet, as will probably happen unless some infinitely terrible disaster prevents that horrible end?

Wisdom, management, education are the echoes I hear, encapsulated in American thinking in the word "conservation." Conservation is at best a focal point of deep and creative thought; at worst, a brain-stopping little slogan beginning and ending with "Wise use." Smog, alpine meadows, moorland sheep, Chesapeake oysters, almost everything you can name, may any day begin to poison us with radioactivity very appreciably more than at present; soils whose fire ants have been eradicated may soon become our savings account with death; the whole African continent may lose its elemental charms to make way for a teeming society that will in its turn starve—the ultimate in drab memorials to our political vacuity. Are we so very wise?

So we manage. We become professional, steeped in techniques that override our philosophies, silenced by Government subsidy, smug from the conventionally measurable services we provide the public. In wildlife management, for instance, any fool who can legally carry a gun can now pay to have a coturnix quail turned loose in front of his gun, a sick trout dangled from his prebated hook, or for a shot at a goose from a blind that he did not build within the territory that was recently sanctuary to the goose. This is no nightmare of our overpopulated future. This is management—but considerably strayed from the philosophy of its great founders.

In a day when American population pressures are still modest enough, we find game management plying the techniques rather wildly in its efforts to provide more heads of shootable game for the increasing baggers of game. This usually means chopping down the beech trees, shooting off the horned owls, mountain lions, and wolves, and introducing exotic animals to fill nooks where native animals can no longer live. It means cultivation, fertilizers, poisons; it means the intercession of more and more grades of expertness between producers and consumers; it means the channeling of the sun's energy through a few manageable species of animals rather than through a bright array of wonderful forms as nature has always done it.

And then, education. Not the slow and costly provisioning of human minds with perceptiveness. That might accomplish something. But we must be dynamic and progressive: great buildings, to shut out the sunlight; expensive equipment, to magnify the cell and lose the organism that makes it meaningful; and eminent measureableness, so that we can point with pride; an out-doing of the Russians, that Government funds may flow. Application: technicans, salaries, degrees, departments, politics, rottenness.

Our knowledge is backfiring into our faces, and yet the pressure to accentuate the practical can hardly have begun. More than mere wise use is required. Technology's balm will not touch the source of our infection, part of which is technology itself. Yet obviously we do need wisdom, management, and education. But humility before the facts of nature—before the marvels of nature—must be our point of departure. This is no grovelling before what we do not understand, but a loving caution in using facts that we think we are thoroughly familiar with.

We are surely lost if all sciences cannot become more a conviction that we are "the wiser * * * for knowing that there is a minnow in the brook" (Thoreau). So wisdom begins with luck—in having the brook in the first place; and ends with human restraint in preserving the brook and in keeping it unpolluted enough that minnows can live in it. Without some feeling for the precedence of nature, we shall soon have neither brook nor minnow nor wisdom.

And the minnow's service to mankind is in its own being—maybe even in the number of scales in its lateral line—more than in any arbitrary scheme of values assigned to its use as food, as object of bounty, as destroyer of agricultural pests, as eliminator of weak or sick prey animals, as pet to be caged, or specimen to be idly maimed in a freshman biology class.

People have to get into the open air, have a look at life, and see how fare the neat laws that the laboratory gives them. Man today needs badly to cultivate his qualities of seer and thinker. Human life is potentially richer where all of life is richer. Without that richness, all our education will be vanity. Life has the roots of its richness in areas that man has left alone, often those areas that in the past have been economically useless. We are no longer a people with hoes nibbling at the landscape; useless bits of land are being remodeled nearer and nearer our own image, and lost to nature so long as our age of concrete endures.

Civilizations destroy the useless and the harmful in nature (with increasing success), put the rest under the halter, and place more and more of the individual man into the icebox. Nature, on the other hand, is liberating, elementally and not merely legally, freeing the eye with its multitude of forms and saving the mind by its offering of

alternatives to dictatorships of fad and fashion and decree. If we look deeply into relatively undisturbed nature, we have used the most precious gift of science; if we understand even superficially we have had science's greatest blessing. True science does not consist of quarterly reports and sure-fire returns.

But man is not merely a thinker. He is a biological organism. He requires appropriate natural surroundings for the play of his activities. One function of a spacious world where natural beauty and complexity have full sway would be not only in its food for man's thought, but also in its being food and a place of refuge for his body. People are hardly justified in having bodies, they derive so little good from them.

Perspective cannot altogether be taught; it has to be "discovered" by the individual. If men, in their leisure time are lured away from the social and intellectual opiates of cities, something has been accomplished. If, during that harried truancy, they gain a glimmer of understanding, a minor miracle has occurred. There is real danger that a whole generation of people will one day be reared away from contacts with wild nature. Something compulsive is needed to make at least a few people into a part of the country: Not for fresh air merely, but for benefits that the country nurse can never measure.

It is indeed hard to see how man can long maintain contact with nature in the years that face us. A kind of human management is needed. We must do the managing, with nature and man's place in it clearly in view. No kind of self-management is so much needed as population control. Without that, any appreciable amount of "nature" of any kind is out of the question. Consider the bad names, the crooked statistics, and the hoots of derision with which Thomas Robert Malthus is proved wrong these days, and you will see the task that looms ahead.

Society worship lies deep among our roots. Abstractions of nature in still life, in formal gardens, or regimented agriculture, are held up as not only substitutes for but even improvements upon nature. The sense of husbandry fostered by forestry, game management, or outdoor recreation means for some people that they are not liable to the same ethical strictures that ought to govern human activity in any field of nature. The feeling is deep that more basic laws of nature can be discovered in the laboratory than in the field or at the observational level, and that the resulting control over nature is the chief glory of man.

Many persons also insist that a peculiarly mystical and durable essence of humanity gets entombed in bronze, cast into marble, molded onto canvas, or enshrined in great buildings. They belittle the role of environment, not only in its symbolical function, but also its vital role in providing the largeness of bounty that makes leisure possible. Such people desire—or in practice, encourage, and make inevitable—a world smothered into humanized stability. Some of them desire—or overlook—the stabilization of humanity that must follow as man, cut off from distances, rain, and natural life, revolves in ever smaller orbits around allegedly precious bronzes, marbles, books, committees, laws, canvases, and services. What began as opportunities for masterly individual achievements will end in mass strangulation of the individual.

What I have tried to say in suggesting a reorientation of man in nature is that where money and man are put immoderately before the whole of nature, the margin of safety for man himself is narrowed. One day, he will be caught short. Due to the taint of folly in our wisdom, a rot of our own making will surely undermine the foundations of man's termite civilization.

Natural history is a point of view, not a science. That is its salvation, and the source of its services to man. Human social life is no mere substitute for it. It is not a matter of money. Here is something that we cannot apply. It receives few subsidies from government, and hardly gets lip-service from many biology departments in colleges and universities. Yet, its prerequisites are those that any inspired amateur can bring to it. One may just see and appreciate, although few persons operate on so exalted a plane.

The lessons of natural history for mankind are not negative. The festering homocentrism that now leads us to commit devastation toward both man and earth might possibly be alleviated by a love for nature that places man in perspective.

Love of nature is the supreme aim. The study of natural history, in the interest of that love, must be encouraged. Neither natural history nor naturalists, however, can be particularly dictated, legislated, or financed into existence. Uncontrolled nature is the mother of both of them.

The creation of naturalists, of individualists, is more difficult than the training of technicians. And less measurable. Perhaps colleges, geared to run on money from self-satisfied tycoons, and State universities, pacing in the dignified steps of politicians, are both poor places to expect any such impalpable, immaterially good thing to be fostered.

Natural history in some way needs to remain in a state of perpetual amateurishness. The living world we see has to be, in a way not now clear, kept natural and rich; the individual man, in a manner yet to be discovered and practiced, must be left to explore, learn, and experience, as with a compelling passion. Naturalists only grow in such remarkable surroundings; I suspect that in this peculiar independence from extreme social coddling, they reflect a quality that is basic to healthy human beings.

Rugged Individualism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Lake Wales News, April 13, 1961, entitled "Rugged Individualism."

I call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues because the thoughts expressed therein are so typical of those often expressed by the so-called rugged individualist. This is a man who has taken advantage of practically every Federal program available to him and has benefited from them. Now he has reached the security in life where he can demand that other people should stand on their own feet "without expecting handouts from the Government and, in turn, us taxpayers."

The editorial follows:

RUGGED INDIVIDUALISM

A young man lived with his parents in a public housing development; attended public school, and participated in the free lunch program. He entered military service and upon discharge, retained his national service life insurance. He attended the State university and worked part-time at the State capitol to supplement funds provided by his GI education check. Upon graduation he married a public health nurse, bought a home with an FHA loan, and obtained an RFC loan to go into business.

Their baby was born in the city hospital. Wanting some farmland and a home for his parents, he bought a small ranch with the aid of the veterans land program. For his livestock he obtained emergency feed from the Government. Later he put part of his land in the soil bank and the payments he received soon paid for the ranch. His father and mother lived comfortably on the ranch with the help of their social security and old age assistance checks. REA lines supplied electricity; the government helped him clear his land; the County Agent showed him how to terrace it; and the government built him a fishpond.

He read books from the public library, and his banked money was insured by an agency of the Government. His child grew up; entered public school; ate free lunches; rode in a school bus; played in the municipal park, and swam in a public pool. The man owned an automobile, so he favored the Federal highway program. He signed a petition, seeking federal assistance in developing an industrial project to help the economy of his area; was the leader in a move to get a new Federal building and went to Washington with a group who asked the Government to build a great power dam costing millions, so the area could get cheaper electricity.

Then, one day, after hearing that the per capita income tax bill in 1959 averaged $251.49, for every man, woman and child in the Nation (over 177 million persons), he wrote his Congressman:

"I wish to protest these excesive governmental expenditures and attendant high taxes. I believe in rugged individualism. I think people should stand on their own feet without expecting handouts from the government and, in turn, us taxpayers. I am opposed to all socialistic trends, and I demand a return to the principles of our Constitution."

Protest by Polish-American Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD the protest of the executive committee of the Polish Peasant Party against the new act of violation of the Polish nation's will. The Honorable Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, chairman of the committee, is the former Prime Minister of Poland and is President of the International Peasant Union.

The above-mentioned protest follows:

PROTEST OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE POLISH PEASANT PARTY AGAINST THE NEW ACT OF VIOLATION OF THE POLISH NATION'S WILL

April 16, 1961, will go down as the day on which the Communists committed a new infamous act of violation of the Polish people's will by holding the so-called elections. The Polish nation was the first to take up arms, in 1939, against Hitler, who, after concluding an agreement with Stalin, started World War II by attacking Poland. Through a great loss of blood and property

the Poles confirmed their will and their right to national sovereignty, to civic freedom, and to a free choice of a system of government and national economy.

This was reaffirmed at the end of the war by representatives of the three Big Powers, the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, who declared that Poland had the right to full independence, its own government, and determining its own political system through free and unhampered elections.

The nation's will and its right to self-determination were brutally violated by the Soviet Union and its agents during the 1946 referendum and the election of January 1947. Two memoranda and thick volumes quoting facts of various violations, beginning with arrests, obstructions, burning of whole villages by the Red Army and Secret Police, and ending with the murder of candidates of the only independent list of the Polish Peasant Party—were not only submitted to representatives of the Big Powers concerned, but they also constitute till this day, in the records of the United Nations and of all its democratic members, an indictment of the Soviet Union for the violation of the Polish nation's will in 1946–47 (84 percent of the Polish people voted in January 1947 for the independent list of the Polish Peasant Party) and remain a lasting evidence of the violation of international pledges by the Soviet Union.

The so-called election in 1952, along with the change of the constitution patterned after the Soviet model, was held in the Bolshevik style with only one list of candidates. The same kind of election, Soviet style, was held in February 1957, although in 1956, after the Poznan events, it was announced that the will of the people would be respected and the whole system liberalized. The worst of it is that, in 1957, on the eve of the election, Gomulka, who was afraid that the Polish people might boycott the election, threatened them with obliteration of Poland from the map of Europe, should they dare, when going to the polls, to strike off the names of the leading Communist candidates from the list.

In April 1961, when new nations in Africa and Asia are being granted the right to self-determination, which is recognized by the whole world, a new act of violation of the Polish people's right to determine their own system of government is taking place. There are no free elections for Poland. A nation with an over-1,000-year-long history of culture and statehood has been denied the right to determine its own system of government, national economy, and policy; and instead of an election a tragicomedy is being staged.

The tragedy is still greater when we consider the fact that the Polish people has not only been deprived of the right of self-determination, but that Polish citizens who do not belong to the Communist Party or its affiliations cannot nominate candidates they trust. In addition, they have been ordered to go to the polls and cast their vote for their enemies and for a system which destroys them and which they abhor.

Just like before Communist courts an innocent citizen has to confess uncommitted sins before receiving a death sentence, so in political life the citizen is ordered to vote for his enemy who is as hostile to him as to the majority of the nation; he must vote for the Communist system and the dictatorial rule of Moscow, which, having deprived Poland and other Iron Curtain countries of independence, is now planning to extend Communist dictatorship the world over.

The farce of the situation lies in the fact that in 1952 and 1957 the Polish citizens, who were forced to vote, cast into the ballot boxes ordinary pieces of paper with such shocking words that the Communist press said after the election that it was simply unbelievable that a citizen could write such obscenities on the ballot.

Under the new electoral system, scribbling on official ballots does not affect their validity. In other words one can write under the candidate's name on the official ballot the most insulting words and the ballot is still valid and is counted in favor of the Communist candidate.

As the Communists recognize only the dictatorial rule and treat the so-called elections as an instrument of forcing the citizens to cast their readymade ballots for the single Communist list of their oppressors—it is worthwhile to recall at this point their attitude toward elections in other countries.

A secret pamphlet written by a Czech Communist, which has been recently made public, says that the Communists in Western democracies must go to the polls and seek seats in their parliaments in order to destroy them subsequently from within.

An election was held recently in South Vietnam. There were three candidates for the Presidency and three for Vice President. The Communists staged attacks against individual leaders of the non-Communist parties and murdered them. Last year over 2,000 non-Communist leaders were killed. Most of them were peasants. They had been given land under the land reform and had no intention of joining the Communists. A few weeks before the election Communist bands attacked villages, murdered local leaders, and took away personal documents from the villagers to prevent them from going to the polls.

In this case the Communists not only conducted an open campaign against the elections, but also tried to prevent holding them by terrorist activities.

It is the general rule in the entire Soviet camp and also in Poland that an election is invalidated if less than 50 percent of those entitled to vote in an electoral district have cast their vote.

Last March, an election to national councils in U.S.S.R. was held. Instead of the usual 99.8 percent of the voters going to the polls, the voters abstained from voting in 18 districts in the Ukraine, in 6 districts in Kazakhstan, in 11 districts in Lithuania; thus, the required 50 percent of voters did not show up at the polls. These are the figures the Soviets admitted; but we do not really know how the things really were. But everyone who can read knows that the citizens availed themselves of this first opportunity to declare themselves against the Communist system by boycotting the election.

In 1946 Stalin told the Polish Communists in Moscow: we have determined the outcome of the 1947 election in Poland here, today. But what I want is that you do not rest content with merely adding votes. I want you to break the Polish people before the election, so that they go to the polls to vote for you.

The same thing has been done in Poland now. When the central committee of the Polish Workers Party discussed the question of election in Poland in October 1960, Gomulka ordered that the Polish people be broken before the election; in particular the opposition of the peasants and of the church should be overcome. This started the Communist campaign in Poland against the church and the peasantry. Hence the fear that the elections might be boycotted by the Poles and the linking of the elections to the parliament with those to regional councils.

Poles at home are mature enough and politically minded—so they do not need our advice from abroad in matters bearing on elections. After the past election, the Communists, enraged by the existence of the Mikolajczyk "remnants," quoted so many examples of national resistance against the so-called Communist election that no better methods of a bloodless opposition could ever be invented abroad.

There are some possibilities in the new electoral system, such as, for instance, of a mass boycott, so that the aforesaid 51 percent of the voters do not go to the polls; or to apply article 61, if one is forced to vote, and go to the voting booth and tear up the ballot into pieces so that the vote is counted against all the candidates on the list.

In the entire democratic world, an election in which a citizen has no right to nominate his own candidate and is obliged to vote for his enemy, is not considered a real election.

And that is why the most important thing is not the outcome of these Communist elections in Poland, since it is known that deputies or councilmen have been chosen by the Communists well in advance.

True, the Communist election system says that nominations can be made only by political, professional, and cooperative organizations, as well as by other societies of the working people. However, we know that no other party except the Communist Party, with its agencies, the United People's Party and the Democratic Party, can exist in Poland and have the right to nominate its candidates.

The same is true about other organizations. Already in 1957 and 1958, initial attempts by the peasant, socialist and boy-scout youth associations as well as by labor unions and agricultural associations to make themselves independent were thwarted by Communist terrorism.

The fact that Piasecki from the PAX had to pay larger taxes for a larger number of seats, or that Zawiejski-Kisielewski and Stoma—vestiges of the ZNAK, proclam the duty to vote—does not change the situation in the least. The fact is that the voters in Poland have only one Communist list to vote for and that they must go to the polls because the Communists fraudulently tell them that it is their civic duty to do so.

The citizen's duty is to vote only when he also has the right to nominate his own candidates. He has no duty to vote for his enemies.

The Polish Peasant Party published its independent lists in 1947, because, under the election law, 500 voters could submit their own list. The Communists arrested the Polish Peasant Party members and tortured them, even the women, by keeping them outdoors, behind barbed wires, in the winter cold, barefoot in icy water, and demanded that they withdraw their signatures, which they refused to do.

In 1952 and in 1957 there was no such rule, nor is there such a rule in 1961. Citizens have no right to submit their lists of candidates and therefore they are not obliged to vote for their enemies. The executive committee of the Polish Peasant Party, protesting against this new act of violation perpetrated by the Communists against the Polish people—will continue to insist that the international pledge be carried out in Poland, and that after the releasing of the Poles who have been deported to Russia and following the withdrawal of the Soviet forces from Poland, the freedom of the press and association be restored in Poland and that a truly democratic election under international control be held.

March Monthly Change Indexes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the attached predictions by Dr. John H. Hoagland result from his compilation of reports from purchasing agents.

It is interesting to note that the most recent statistics support Dr. Hoagland's prediction made in February that the recession had reached bottom and that the trend from there on in 1961 would be on the favorable side:

MARCH MONTHLY CHANGE INDEXES

(By Dr. John H. Hoagland)

The latest recession ended in February and the business upturn began in March. Order backlogs were bigger; new orders were larger; production was greater; employment declines were less; and, inventory liquidations were smaller in March than during many recent months.

These important business trends for March are shown in the accompanying charts of monthly change indexes developed from purchasing business surveys. Again, purchasing executives are providing early and accurate evidence of a turning point in the business cycle, as they have successfully done so many times in the past.

In March 1961, as in May 1958, many of these key indexes shifted from negative to positive, signifying a cessation in the business decline and the beginning of the business recovery.

The purchasing business surveys showed March business trends improving throughout the Nation, as well as in important industrial areas—such as New England, Detroit, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and Chicago. Monthly change indexes for these areas all moved upward during March. The majority of these indexes now have turned positive, signifying increases over the preceding month. Those indexes which continue to be negative, indicating declines, all showed a March rate of decline less than that of February.

The late 1960–61 recession did prove to be one of the shortest and mildest in history. Inventory liquidation, caused by the imbalances of the 1959 steel strike, was a major factor in this latest recession. Purchasing executives, however, readjusted inventories sooner than in previous recessions, and this helped keep the recession short and mild.

A FORECAST

Forecasting business trends is always hazardous, but perhaps now is an appropriate time to discuss some probable developments of the coming months. The current business recovery should continue at least through the first half of 1962. The present low level of inventories should increase in the coming months due to increased demand for final products, lengthening leadtimes caused by slower vendor deliveries, and anticipated price increases. By the fourth quarter of 1961, a strong inventory accumulation stimulus will be provided by the threat of a steel strike in the summer of 1962. Inventory accumulations and other stimuli should raise business activities to new high levels in 1961 and 1962. Inflation will probably be a major problem in 1961 and 1962.

The next danger period for a business recession will be 1963. It is more casual than coincidental that each of the last three recessions occurred within a year after a major steel strike. The steel strike threat of 1962 is thus likely to cause a business recession in 1963. Although not generally recognized in business forecasting, the threats of major strikes exert considerable influence upon purchasing decisions which, in turn, determine many business trends. Purchasing executives exert an important influence on their firms' profits, and their combined actions produce a major impact on the business cycle. Fortunately, the business surveys of purchasing executives have provided some of the very best monthly data for analyzing and forecasting business cycles.

NATIONAL

For March, the National Business Survey Committee of NAPA reported increases occurring in both new orders and production. The March new order increase was greater than any month since January 1960; and, the production increase was larger than any month since February 1960. In 7 out of the 8 preceding months new orders had shown declines, and production cutbacks had been registered for 6 of the 8 preceding months.

Employment in the industries of the National Business Survey declined for the 13th consecutive month; but there was definite indication in March that a turning point in the rate of decline was reached in February 1961.

Inventory liquidations continued in March. In this last recession, however, the inventory monthly change index was one of the first to pass a turning point, for its low point was August 1960. In most previous recessions, inventory liquidations continued to increase until after reductions were made in other rates of decline. Thus, it is indicated that purchasing executives made inventory adjustments earlier in the 1960–61 recession than they had in many previous recessions.

Prices during March remained relatively stable for the third consecutive month, according to the National Business Survey.

With the business upturn now started, these monthly change indexes will undoubtedly show further rises in the coming months. A pattern quite similar to that of 1958 and 1959 may be the result.

NEW ENGLAND

New orders in the New England area showed a greater rate of improvement in March than during any month since January 1960. March was a sharp change from the preceding 6 months, during which time there were 5 months of declines.

Production improved at the greatest rate since July 1960. During the first 3 months of 1961, improvements were shown for 2 of these 3 months.

Employment increased somewhat in the New England area, showing a better performance than any time during the preceding 9 months.

Inventories of raw material were liquidated only slightly. The rate of liquidation was less than any month since April 1960. For the third consecutive month, work-in-process inventories showed an accumulation. Turning points in both of these indexes were reached in December 1960.

Prices increased slightly for the third consecutive month.

DETROIT

The business conditions index for Detroit rose sharply in March, similar to the rise in May 1958, at the end of the 1957–58 recession. This index was higher in March 1961 than during any month since February 1960. Improved automobile sales and pre-automobile strike activity have stimulated business activity in the Detroit area.

Employment declines in March were relatively minor and much less than they had been in late 1960.

Inventories continued to be liquidated by industries, as they have been for the past year.

Prices increased slightly.

CLEVELAND

New orders and production in the Cleveland area increased in March, after having declined somewhat in February and risen in January. Peak rates of decline occurred in both of these indexes in December.

Employment continued to decline, but the rate of decline was less than any of the preceding 6 months.

Inventories were liquidated further, but the rates of liquidation in 1961 were much less than those of late 1960.

Prices increased more than any month since August 1960.

Order backlogs, volume of business, and production all increased in March. This was the first month since January 1960, that any of these indexes registered noticeable strength.

Employment decline was less than any time time during the preceding 6 months.

Inventory liquidation continued, but at a lower rate than during the latter half of 1960. Vendors provided somewhat faster deliveries, with the rate of improvement being the lowest since November 1959.

CHICAGO

Order backlogs were increased in the Chicago area for the first time since December 1959. Production increased, after having declined for the 8 previous months. The employment and inventory declines were less than any month since June 1960. Most of these indexes reached their turning point in October 1960.

Vendor performance improved, with the rate of improvement being less than any month since January 1960.

Prices rose slightly.

PURCHASE POLICY INDEXES

The purchase policy indexes show purchasing executives were making some extensions in their forward commitments. The national indexes for capital expenditures, production materials, and M.R.O. supplies all turned up in March. Each of these indexes reached a turning point in November or December 1960. The regional purchase policy indexes show very little change in the New England and Detroit areas; but, some reductions were made in the Chicago area.

Jazz: A Potent Force for American Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, from the triumphs which have been scored by the jazz tours of Louis Armstrong, Dave Brubeck, and others, it is obvious that this native, American musical form has a valid and important role to play in our cultural exchange programs.

Russ Wilson has been writing a regular jazz column in the Oakland Tribune for the last 5 years. This last year he was honored by a California young men's club for his "invaluable service in promoting jazz in California."

In a recent article, Mr. Wilson points out that Russia has made a bid to hear American jazz. I certainly agree with Mr. Wilson that we should test this invitation thoroughly and make full use of this potent force for American diplomacy. Under leave granted, I include the article, as follows:

REDS' BID FOR JAZZ SHOULD BE TESTED

(By Russ Wilson)

That outright appeal for jazz voiced in Moscow the other day by a distinguished Soviet musician gives our new administration its first opportunity to offer Russia a

chance to hear some of the greatest artists in this field—American jazzmen.

The bid for jazz was made by Leonid Utyosov, 65, whose popularity as an orchestra leader and singer has gained him the award, People's Artists of the Russian Federation. Even though this might equate with second lieutenant, it shows he's a man of some note.

Significantly, Utyosov's statement appeared in the official magazine of the Soviet Ministry of Culture. From all past evidence it seems sure the remarks were printed only after they'd been OK's by the Kremlin; that's the way things work in a dictatorship.

It might therefore be assumed that when Utyosov writes, "We need jazz; there is a demand for it; to make it a forbidden fruit is dangerous and interferes with the education of young people in musical taste" he is indicating a change in government policy which heretofore has opposed this musical form.

If this were not so one wonders why an official publication permitted Utyosov to assert: "Jazz is not a synonym for imperialism and the saxophone wasn't born of colonialism. * * * Good jazz is art and a bad symphony is not art," true though this is.

This Russian is no square; he cites a jazz historian as saying improvisation is the cornerstone of jazz and adds, "A man who has no talent can not improvise." He also discerningly points out that the roots of jazz "go not to bankers' safes but to poor Negro quarters." His ridiculous claim "that so-called Dixieland existed in Odessa before New Orleans" can be written off as party-line boasting—or as a sop that got his other remarks into print.

The important fact about the incident is that the United States has been given a wide open chance to offer jazz-hungry Russians a feast. As was reported here last November, President Kennedy is aware of the popularity of American jazz overseas and its high propaganda value.

Let's hope the wheels start turning. At the least we'll show up the Moscow bid as a phony. And if it should work out that we can send a first-rate jazz unit to Russia—say for example a big band led by Dizzy Gillespie—it will take care of business.

A Welcome Visitor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased and honored to be among the guests at the reception given by the Greek Ambassador for Prime Minister Caramanlis and his lovely wife this week.

As Representative of Lowell, Mass., the Athens of America, the experience was both rewarding and meaningful.

This distinguished visitor to our shores was given an open-armed editorial greeting by the Boston Globe, one which sums up the outstanding job Prime Minister Caramanlis has done for his country. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert this editorial:

A WELCOME VISITOR

At the invitation of President Kennedy, Premier Constantine Caramanlis, of Greece, will come to the United States Monday. It will be the first visit to these shores by a prime minister of the great maritime nation whose civilization is one of the oldest in the world. It will be a happy visit; Greece today represents one of the clearest triumphs of U.S. foreign policy, so much under fire in recent years.

Greek recovery in the past decade is amazing. Threatened by economic anemia in the postwar years, the country was put on its feet by the Marshall plan. Chewed at by Communist guerrillas supplied by Iron Curtain neighbors, the nation was saved by the Truman doctrine, the heroism of the Government forces, and public pressure applied on the Communist countries through the United Nations. The U.N. denounced the rebel abduction of 20,000 Greek children; and condemned Bulgaria and Albania for assisting the Greek Communists.

With the defeat of the rebels Greece was able to contribute to the cause of freedom. She was one of 16 nations that sent military forces to the U.N. command in Korea. With the death of Stalin and the relaxation of cold war tensions, she was able to reestablish relations with once hostile neighbors. In 1951, with adjacent Turkey, Greece joined NATO.

From 1950 to 1955 the country built its fences at home and abroad. The domestic economy strengthened; the national income grew; merchant shipping increased. During these years, under the premiership of Marshal Alexander Papagos, a youthful Athenian lawyer, married to the niece of a former prime minister, began to distinguish himself. He was Constantine Caramanlis.

The new highways of Greece, familiar to the multiplying number of tourist, are a tribute to his industry. After serving as minister of labor, of transport, of social welfare and national defense, he became minister of public works in 1952. He still held the post when the marshal died, and King Paul turned to him to form the government. He assumed office October 6, 1955.

Since then, he has achieved a balanced budget, a stable currency, a sturdy credit, increased bank deposits, a 50 percent increase in the national economy, and has meanwhile held the cost of living to a 10-percent rise. In Norway in the same time, the cost of living has mounted 15 percent, and in France 30 percent. His 5-year development program is transforming the face of Greece; his foreign trade program is recovering and extending the markets lost in World War II.

Staunch ally of the United States, Greece stands today on a peak of economic achievement that may find the ancient country shaking off historic poverty and raising its living standard under free government to enviable levels. The prime minister is a welcome figure in the United States.

Four-Year House Terms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune reveals facts which, if followed through, would greatly improve the efficiency and functioning of our House of Representatives.

A House Member should have a breathing time between elections to devote to legislation and the many added duties saddled on congressional duties during the last 30 years.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the editorial, as follows:

FOUR-YEAR HOUSE TERMS

A Gallup poll shows a majority of the American voters would approve lengthening the term of U.S. Representatives from 2 to 4 years.

The majority is rather substantial, 51 percent in favor of the 4-year term as against only 34 percent opposed, with 15 percent expressing no opinion.

A good many students of government believe the change would be of benefit to the country. Its personal benefit to the legislators themselves of course would be considerable.

The 2-year term presumably makes Representatives more responsive to the will of the voters. Senators serve 6-year terms and thus will act primarily on the basis of their own judgment as issues develop. But House Members must go back to the people every 2 years for a fresh mandate.

Objection is made, however, that the House Members must give so much time to campaigning that they do not have enough to put in on their duties in Washington. In a sense, a Representative must start preparing for the next election just as soon as the ballots are counted on the last one.

This doesn't hold true for legislators in many southern districts, or for some in the North, where one of the major parties is in overwhelming strength. The result is to give such House Members greater authority in its deliberations.

Modern methods of travel should be easing the situation for many legislators. By jet plane, they can give considerable time to affairs back home, and yet not lose many days from their duties in Washington. Yet the result may be that they are expected to give more attention to their home districts, by reason of easier travel conditions, and thus really get no relief from the planes.

In many States, there is a trend toward reducing the number of 2-year offices. That has been done with county government in Indiana, for example. Only 16 of the 50 State Governors now serve 2-year terms; the others all get 4 years.

On the whole, Government probably would be better served if the House membership was elected every 4 years. It would mean a long wait to get rid of a bad Congressman, but it might make us more careful about getting good ones in the first place.

Will Peace Corps Be Too Young?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Clark Mollenhoff, of Cowles Publications, who is well known for this Washington coverage, has been traveling abroad during the past year and has been submitting some interesting articles for the Des Moines (Iowa) Register and the Des Moines Tribune.

Recently he had some observations about the Peace Corps in which he raised the question about the age of the group to which this program is having its greatest appeal. I found some food for thought in these observations and I would like to share them with the Mem-

bers. We will be called upon one of these days to evaluate this program and we will find some guidelines for doing this in the article by Mr. Mollenhoff.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article on the Peace Corps in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WILL PEACE CORPS BE TOO YOUNG

(By Clark R. Mollenhoff)

VIENNA AUSTRIA.—The recent return from the Congo of 10 members of an Austrian medical team demonstrates some of the problems the Kennedy Peace Corps may face in helping the primitive people of Africa.

The returning medics reported that the 60-member U.N. medical team that went to the Congo last fall has lost nearly all of its enthusiasm for Africa and that all but 5 members of the team are eager to come home. The group found it could not cope with the problem of protecting itself from malaria and other diseases.

TOO YOUNG TO SEND

The Austrian trade union supporters of the team have not lost their enthusiasm for helping Africans. But at least one of them, Kurt Prokop, is skeptical about sending people in their early twenties into Africa or other underdeveloped countries.

"Africa needs help but it must be from experienced people," Prokop said. "I would say they should be between the ages of 35 and 45—old enough to have had considerable experience but not too old to be able to withstand the physical work involved."

In the last several months this reporter has discussed the Kennedy Peace Corps with dozens of persons in the Middle East, Africa, and Europe, most of them people who have been on the scene trying to help Africans help themselves.

A NOBLE IDEA BUT—

Invariably they started their comments with praise of the noble idea of the Peace Corps. But the skepticism started when questions were asked about the age group that could be used most effectively.

Israel's Minister of Labor, Giora Josephthal, who has had years of experience in sending Israeli teams to Africa, is skeptical about sending pure idealists with no practical experience.

"They must have more than the theoretic experience they would get in college and they must be people who have worked long enough to develop the patience necessary to deal with Africans who tend to be extremely sensitive and even unreasonable," he said.

WHAT MISFIT COULD DO

"The Peace Corps is a fine idea but 1 bad selection can destroy the work of 10 good people," Austrian Minister of Social Administration Anton Praksch said.

"Absolutely not," was his reply when asked if it would be advisable to send people just out of college in the age range from 20 to 25.

These views were echoed by Government officials, trade-union officials, U.S. diplomatic officials and educators with experience in the areas involved. They were not conservatives with built-in reservations about such projects, but in many cases were people of a definite Socialist background.

All agree that there is need for thoughtful work in Africa to offset wel-financed Communist propaganda. But if the warnings of these experienced people were heeded, the whole concept of the Peace Corps work would be changed from a program made up of people in their twenties to one made up of men in their thirties or forties.

HOW WILL THEY LIVE?

In addition, there are a number of practical problems involving food and housing.

The initial idea was to require that the Americans live the day-to-day life of the African. This was to include eating African food and living in African housing.

"It would be impossible for Europeans or Americans to live in the African housing," commented Prokop. "But the program would be defeated before it started if the Americans were to live in a European housing area or off away from the Africans."

Cheaper hotels in the African sections would provide the most practical housing, but such hotels are available only in larger cities.

It would be possible to construct housing of a modest but modern type, but this would not be regarded as roughing it with the natives.

Even if the Peace Corps members get over all of the practical hurdles of age, housing, and health, how long will they be able to endure the hardships of primitive living without complaint when they see the pleasant accommodations provided for Americans attached to embassies in the European sections of African cities?

A Passion for Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Irving J. Fain, chairman of the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism, as it appeared in the April 1961 issue of American Judaism, which is the official publication of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations:

A PASSION FOR JUSTICE—ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FIRST JEWISH RELIGIOUS SOCIAL ACTION CENTER IN WASHINGTON REFLECTS THE CONCERN OF REFORM JUDAISM WITH APPLIED MORALITY

(The Emily R. and Kivie Kaplan Center for Religious Action will open this fall in Washington, D.C. The building will house the first social action center in that city established under the auspices of any branch of Judaism. The Washington office will strengthen the programs of the Commission on Social Action, joint body of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis, in response to an overwhelming mandate from the 1,000 reform Jewish leaders who attended the 45th General Assembly of the UAHC in Miami Beach, Fla., in November 1959. The Social Action Center will fight injustice by giving voice to the sentiments and translating into action the resolutions taken by the general assemblies of the UAHC and the conventions of the CCAR. The Commission on Social Action comprises, in addition to the UAHC and the CCAR, the following affiliated bodies in Reform Judaism: National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, National Federal of Temple Brotherhoods, National Federation of Temple Youth, National Association of Temple Administrators, and National Association of Temple Educators. The Center for Religious Action also will serve as the headquarters for the Mid-Atlantic Council of the UAHC, serving Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. In the following article, the chairman of the Social Action Commission of Reform Judaism tells why the center is being set up and what may be accomplished thereby:)

The passion for social justice, which had fired the prophets of ancient Israel, was rekindled by the founders of Reform Judaism. They cherished the faith that Judaism, as a way of life, must help to build a better world here on earth. They dared to believe—and to act on the belief—that Judaism had something vital to say to the great moral problems of society. They insisted that man is the copartner with God in ushering in His Kingdom of Justice here on earth. This divine discontent has helped to make American Judaism dynamic, modern, and relevant to the realities of a changing society. It has helped to make Reform Judaism a potent moral force in American life.

Historians of the future, in charting the dynamic growth of Reform Judaism in America, will list 1961 as a year of decision—a milestone in the life of the movement. For in 1961, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations established the Emily R. and Kivie Kaplan Center for Religious Action in the Nation's Capital to extend the social action program of Reform Judaism.

Concern for social ethics was expressed by the UAHC at every biennial from the beginning in 1873. Similarly, the CCAR spoke out repeatedly against racial, economic, social, and every other kind of injustice. In 1949, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis joined together to create a Joint Commission on Social Action to apply the ethical principles of Judaism to the urgent moral issues of the day. That commission has subsequently been enlarged to include the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, Brotherhoods, and Youth, as well as the National Association of Temple Educators and the National Assoication of Temple Administrators. Through intensive efforts, the Commisison on Social Action has stimulated the development of social committees in some 300 reform temples to translate the ethical principle of equality, justice, and peace into practice in the life of the community, the Nation, and the world. Such problems as housing, racial equality, interfaith relations, and juvenile delinquency have been dealt with by such committees.

And now this work has been enlarged and a long-nurtured vision has been realized. Made possible by a generous gift of Mr. Kivie Kaplan of Boston, the Washington center was authorized by the overwhelming decision of the delegates of the 1959 biennial assembly of the UAHC in Miami Beach after a long and comprehensive debate. The center will serve as the Washington arm of the national commission on social action, operating within the policies adopted by biennial assemblies of the UAHC and the conventions of the CCAR.

But historians of the future will also note that this major step—as with most milestones in the life of any living movement—was not taken without a measure of opposition and controversy.

Despite the overwhelming approval of the delegates at the UAHC biennial, a few congregations are vigorously exercising their legitimate right of dissent and are seeking to rally opposition to the Washington social action center.

Two congregations have appealed to other Reform synagogues to join them in protesting the acquisition of the center. They have contended that the UAHC is violating the autonomy of member congregations, in presuming to become the voice of Reform Judaism on public issues, and that the center may become a kind of religious lobby in Washington.

At this writing, the protesting congregations are seeking to win support for a special

biennial assembly of the UAHC to reconsider the Washington Center for Religious Action.

Inevitably, the Washington center has become a dramatic symbol of social action. Just as it has evoked enthusiastic commendations from most rabbis and lay leaders, it has also elicited the long-simmering opposition of those who feel that Judaism should not be concerned with social problems, that Reform Judaism should not take stands on such matters as racial segregation or war and peace, and that controversial issues should be avoided by religious institutions. Eyebrows were raised by the statements of the dissenting congregations in view of the obvious fact that the UAHC and the CCAR have historically adopted resolutions on social issues since the founding of these organizations. It was clear that many deeper questions of policy and personality must underlie the opposition to the Washington center, but one question at issue remains: Is it right to adopt a resolution on a social evil at a national convention—but wrong to implement that resolution through a Washington center?

At the same time, enthusiastic commendations have poured in to Judge Emil Baar, chairman of the UAHC board of trustees, from distinguished leaders of all faiths. Christian social action agencies with offices in Washington—including the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the (Protestant) Council of Churches and the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice—have welcomed the forthcoming cooperation of the Center as a "significant contribution to the national welfare" which will "strengthen the efforts of all denominations and faiths as they join together for a finer nation and a more just and peaceful world." Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Governor Price Daniel of Texas, Rt. Rev. James A. Pike of California, and Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg are among the many prominent Americans who have warmly hailed the center as a "fine achievement" for Reform Judaism.

The center will serve the social action committee of UAHC congregations, federations, and regional councils, along with their sisterhoods, brotherhoods, youth groups, educators, and administrators. This service will range from informational materials about subjects best researched in Washington to suggestions regarding education which might be taken by local and regional social action committees. It will work closely and harmoniously with other Jewish bodies as well as with Christian social action agencies in the Nation's Capital.

Only a sterile movement, mired in its own platitudes, can avoid the clash of varied views. The price of progress in a healthy movement is honest controversy. It is so with the Union of American Hebrew Congregations—and has been so since Isaac Mayer Wise fashioned the UAHC out of 28 congregations in 1873. The years have rung with passionate controversy about ritual ceremonies, Palestine, the move of the UAHC from Cincinnati to New York, the American Jewish Conference, the 10-percent plan of dues payment and a host of other issues. These issues are fought out—sometimes painfully and stormily—and they are resolved in accordance with the democratic process.

And the Reform Jewish movement has gone from strength to strength.

Historians will thus judge the establishment of Reform Judaism's Center for Religious Action. They will also judge that, by that decision, Reform Judaism gave muscle to the ancient but timeless Jewish dream of a just and peaceful world. "It is not incumbent upon us to complete the task. But neither are we free to desist from it."

Burns Creek Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a few supporters of the Burns Creek project in Idaho would have the Congress believe that everybody in Idaho is in favor of this power project, which is being called a reclamation project.

The following editorial from the North Side News of Jerome, Idaho, is a refreshing revelation that many in Idaho who believe in reclamation do not want this project.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the North Side News, Apr. 13, 1961]

IDAHO CAN MOVE AHEAD WITH RECLAMATION

As viewed from this corner, it is a pity that Idaho's reclamation goals have been placed in such an indefensible position as the Burns Creek project which is designed about 1½ percent for irrigation and 97 percent for public power. In the long run, pushing for such a government handout in the name of reclamation can only injure Idaho which has been developed under the exclusive and preferential privileges of the Reclamation Act.

Representative HALEY, of Florida, emphasized this very point in remarks on the floor last week with these words:

"Congress in its wisdom has put the 17 Western States in a very favored position at great cost to the other taxpayers of the Nation. There is going to come a time if you abuse this privilege which I think you are doing in this project (Burns Creek) when you will lose the preferential status. Do not forget that you are receiving huge subsidies in every respect and if you abuse this privilege, you are going to lose your favored position. You will bring it on yourselves by presenting to Congress projects that are not justified under the irrigation and reclamation laws of this Nation."

Other eastern Representatives attacked Burns Creek from similar viewpoints which should awaken the people of Idaho to a situation. Senator CHURCH admitted that unless this modest project is built cooperatives and municipalities might be forced to purchase supplementary power from private utilities. What a crime that would be. Some preferred customers exerting all the pressure for Burns Creek would have to pay for private power like the rest of us do. They want tax-free power at the expense of the U.S. taxpayer. A nice advantage if you can get it.

The Utah Power & Light has plans for two new coal-fed electrical plants. One in eastern Utah and another near Kemmerer, Wyo., both depressed economic areas. Approximately 500 coal miners at both plants would be employed. Eventually, 5,000 more consumers for Idaho farm produce just a hundred miles away. Without a Government handout to these depressed areas, Congress could stimulate industrial development on a legitimate, taxpaying basis. Does that make sense? Can you name a better method for the Kennedy administration to aid depressed areas without using a single tax dollar?

And then, maybe Idaho and its reclamation leaders could get back on the track. Build the simple $5 million reregulating dam below Palisades as originally planned instead of this $50 million power project. Let's survey our State for genuine reclamation. You do not see the people of the Colorado Basin holding back on account of the farm surpluses. They are going ahead as fast as Congress will let them in the development of new dams that will bring in more land for irrigation in spite of the farm situation. One reason is that by the time these projects are completed over a four-State area, there will be the need for more irrigated farmland.

What are we doing in Idaho for reclamation? Well, we have Burns Creek which won't even qualify. We have old, established tracts such as Richfield without enough water to get through a dry year. Wouldn't a supplementary reservoir on the upper Wood have saved carryover water for such a season? It was only a short time ago that Magic Reservoir spillways were overflowing for a month or more in the spring due to too much water.

What about the Guffy project on the lower Snake? We have literally hundreds of thousands of acres of the finest topsoil on the American Continent south, east, and west of Mountain Home. What is being done to develop it? The replenishment flow of the Snake River alone would take care of thousands of acres of new land if reclamation leaders would tie into such a project as that. The Fremont Dam in the upper Snake Basin has long been declared feasible and practical, but has anyone ever heard of this project?

The longer the Burns Creek project stands in its present form, the more wrath will Idaho stir in the Halls of Congress. We should not build dams to peg the prestige level of some of our politicians or a handful of preferred power users. We should build dams for Idaho that will develop new land and nurture the position this State by geography, climate and soil is best adapted—that of a breadbasket for the booming coastal States and the eastern consumer. That is the historical and basic southern Idaho story. We cannot change it.

A Journey to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include another in a series of highly interesting and informative articles on Ireland written by the editor and publisher of the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent, Mr. Thomas Heffernan, this article having appeared in that newspaper on April 9, 1961. Mr. Heffernan wrote this series of articles following an extensive tour through Ireland last fall.

The indicated article follows:

A JOURNEY TO IRELAND

(By Tom Heffernan)

How would is seem if, about halfway down the first block of Wilkes-Barre's South Main Street there was a wide gate which opened into a courtyard in the midst of the South Main Street stores and about this courtyard were gathered the buildings which provide offices for the city government and perhaps the county government as well?

That's the way it is in Dublin—and in other towns on the other side of the water—and it groups things more conveniently.

Furthermore, since governmental buildings like city hall just about "kills a large segment of a central city block, this disadvantage also is avoided.

In the Irish capital, of course, some of the government buildings have been there for many, many centuries, with Chapel Royal, a feature of the section, having been built right into and made practically a part of famous Dublin Castle, which was built in the year 1100.

There is an incident in connection with Chapel Royal which appeals mightily to Irishmen, too.

Hung within are the portraits of all the Englishmen who served as viceroys to Ireland while the Emerald Isle was under British domination.

There was space for just so many, too.

And, as it happens, when the last space was filed the man who posed for the portrait turned out to be the last British viceroy to Ireland.

You can draw a moral or work up a bit of superstition as you desire.

SUPERMARKET PROVES IRISH HONESTY

Whether it means the average Irishman is more honest, we will not try to presume.

However, nearest thing we saw to a supermarket was in Dunne's store on Grafton Street in Dublin.

It had several big, double doors open to the sidewalk and most of the interior was occupied by a quite conventional type of store.

However, the full length of the lefthand wall was made up of canned goods and such on display in supermarket style, so no clerks were necessary and as in our American markets, you picked up what you wanted.

But where do you think were located the cashiers to whom you took the stuff to be checked and to be paid for? Right by the front door? No. At the extreme rear of the store.

With no one watching to make sure people weren't picking up stuff and walking right out the gaping front doors and hidden on the way by the crowds who filled the place.

Bet you could get away with nothing like that in the land of the free and the home of those who think that condition applies to everything that isn't nailed down.

RANDOM NOTES

The pub at the end of Lord Edward Street is named quite handsomely as Farrelly's Select Lounge. And instead of a sign out front announcing that there is TV inside the card announced "Telephone." Down a couple of blocks, in that baffling European manner, Lord Edward Street was Dame Street. The mailmen must have to be memory experts.

Irish girls are almost 100 percent modest but one and all will hike up their skirts to climb on a motorcycle. The name we know as Walsh was so often spelled "Walshe" and Eagen was "Egan" and Coughlin was "Coughlan." A mighty common name, on Irish business houses at least, was "Campion."

There are mighty few TV aerials in Dublin, none at all in Adare and one between Adare and Limerick. In answer to a question, "Lovely Adare" is about 45 minutes ride from Shannon Airport and it is impossible to imagine a better inn than Adare's Dunraven Arms.

A lot of advertising of coal is to be seen and one brightly lit one, showing a couple sitting before an open fire, read: "Donnelly's Cozyglo Coal." You can have a pocket full of British or Irish coins and still have little if they are those huge pennies, big as a half dollar. Towering Brigitte Bardot hairdos were common in Dublin and most of the girls wearing them were extremely short.

The fat sorrel we rode with the County Meath Hunt outside Dublin was the only hore we rode in Ireland that we coulld get on unassisted. It belonged to a chap named McGee and it was 15 hands 3 inches. Maybe we are prejudiced, but the school kids we saw—most carrying their books in bags which they wore on their backs like knapsacks—seemed as handsome a bunch as we ever had seen anyplace.

The waiter in the fine dining room of the Royal Hibernian did a fast turn by the headwaiter and, as he passed, smiled and said: "The All-America boy." But Donnybrook, where once the fairs were held that became famous for Irish fights, is now, we are assured, a most respectable neighborhood. It is, in fact, a pleasant residential suburb of Dublin. And the airline pilot seated on a stool at the Buttery bar in the hotel sought to interest two girls passing through by assuring them he was Irish as he said, "My name is Higgins." Actually, he was a most pleasant Dutchman.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE GIVES US PROBLEMS

Our stupidity with the various accents used by others who also speak the English language often becomes embarrassing—since we seem almost completely unable to understand any brand of English aside from that used in Luzerne County.

As a result, one day while we were out with the County Meath Hunt—over the beautiful County Meath country which was once "the seat of the Irish kings and the finest land in Ireland—the horse we rode had come in the same trailer as that of a lady member of the group.

To help us, she reminded us that we should look out for her at the end of the day and she would help us get to the proper place.

Some hours later, still trying to help, she came up to us at a moment when the hunt had checked to say what we understood to be that "The horse doctor would be at" a certain crossroad.

We were puzzled, asked her to repeat, understood her to say the same thing and then, trying not to be rude, asked why she was telling us about that.

After her next words we realized that what she was talking about was the "horse tractoh," not "horse doctoh" and by horse tractor she meant what we would call a horse trailer, hitched behind a car or truck.

It's a good thing we don't embarrass easily.

ZEBRA CROSSINGS IN IRELAND, TOO

Just as do England and Scotland, Ireland has its "zebra crossing" at which the pedestrian, crossing the street has the unquestioned right-of-way.

If a person on foot is hit using one of the zebra crossings to get across a street the motorist can only be wrong, no matter what the circumstances.

They are called zebra crossings because they are marked by stripes of white paint.

Kingston also has painted zebra crossings at points near Kingston Corners on Wyoming Avenue.

However, there is a great difference because, in Kingston, there are no provisions whatsoever for the safety of those using these crossing places so that they seem mostly to lull the users into an extremely false sense of security.

Would Award Scholarships for Ability, Financial Need Only

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure to discuss college scholarships and scholarship programs with Dr. Edward Sandberg, of the faculty of Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa.

Dr. Sandberg's views are worthy of note and I hasten to call them to the attention of the Members, by including his statement on scholarships in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The statement follows:

[From the Waterloo Courier, July 8, 1960]

WOULD AWARD SCHOLARSHIPS FOR ABILITY, FINANCIAL NEED ONLY

(By Dr. Edwin Sandberg)

Of serious concern to parents and educators alike is the need for many more college scholarships for capable students who might not otherwise be able to attend college. Yet before more scholarships are made available, the gross abuses in the awarding of many of the scholarships now available must be eliminated. If such an attempt is successful, the study involved can help to establish a clear pattern for the endowment of future scholarships.

First in this study should be a careful consideration of the legitimacy of granting any scholarships at State institutions if these scholarships involve a remission of undergraduate fees at such schools.

It must be remembered that every citizen pays taxes to support such institutions in order to keep tuition and fees low, and that this in a sense means that every student at a State institution is on a scholarship. Further remission of fees hardly seems justified on the undergraduate level. Private scholarships are an entirely different matter as are scholarships on the graduate level where these institutions are often the exclusive ones offering advanced programs.

Second should be the decision to award scholarships only to those students who have a demonstrated financial need for such aid. Many scholarships today go to students who come from financially secure families certainly not in need of financial help. It must be remembered that every time such a scholarship is awarded the chances are that a student who may not have scored quite so high, but is of superior mental caliber, is denied the opportunity to attend a particular institution and must look elsewhere or not attend college at all.

There is something grossly dishonest about the practice of parents with adequate finances even encouraging their children to apply for scholarships, and it is absolutely immoral for such people to accept them if offered. Some institutions thrive on the practice of buying students through scholarships—a deceitful use of funds leading to the perversion of the independent spirit of youth and compounding the belief of conformist Americans that the world owes them everything. There is a clear design for a scholarship program which avoids this evil—

the national merit scholarships—for these honor outstanding students but base an award on the need of the individual.

Third, no scholarship should be awarded for other than academic reasons, for this is a very repudiation of the meaning of the word. Athletic scholarships, accordingly, should be given to athletes only when their academic abilities indicate that they can do successful work in college and can make a real contribution to society after graduation. The function of a college is to educate, not to provide entertainment for rabid fans and alumni.

A final consideration is that scholarship programs should not carry so many restrictions as to regions from which students come, areas in which they specialize, lodge affiliations of their fathers, church affiliation, and other narrow requirements. The United States desperately needs leaders in all fields today, and there is only one way in which scholarships can do an effective job in providing such leaders in larger numbers: the awarding of scholarships exclusively on the basis of academic ability and recognized financial need.

California Attorney General Warns of Subversion From Fanatics of the Radical Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Enterprise, Friday, April 7, 1961, in which Attorney General Stanley Mosk expresses views on subversion from the radical right:

ATTORNEY GENERAL MOSK WARNS OF SUBVERSION FROM FANATICS OF THE RADICAL RIGHT

Subversion from the radical right is as dangerous as subversion from the radical left, according to Attorney General Stanley Mosk.

"With Communist activity under close scrutiny by Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, a number of fanatical groups on the extreme right have been springing up in California and other parts of the Nation," the attorney general said. "They must be as closely checked as the Communists, for they are equally dangerous to orderly democracy.

"One of these groups has labeled the last three Presidents of the United States as willing tools of the Communist conspiracy. Others have impugned the integrity of churches, schools, and other agencies in our society. These scatter-gun attacks achieve no purpose other than to destroy confidence in traditional American institutions."

Attorney General Mosk suggested six tests to ascertain whether an organization is extremist and should be suspect by loyal Americans:

1. Does it attack schools and churches with blanket accusations?

2. Does it attack other traditional American institutions with wild, unsupported charges?

3. Does it label everyone un-American or subversive with whom it disagrees politically?

4. Does it try to rewrite modern history by blaming American statesmen for wars, communism, depressions, and all the other ills of the world?

5. Does it resort to crude pressure tactics by such means as anonymous phone-calling and letterwriting campaigns?

6. Do the spokesmen for the group appear more interested in the size of their money collections than in the principles they purport to espouse?

"Apply those six tests, and you will avoid entangling memberships with and contributions to, such groups as the American Nazi Party, the Communists, the Ku Klux Klan, the John Birch Society, the Cinema Educational Guild, the Moslems, and others of that type," the attorney general advised.

Stock Options: Unfair Tax Advantage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by Mr. J. A. Livingston which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on April 12, 1961. Mr. Livingston has here taken a jocular approach to what is a very serious problem. It is unfortunate that more publicity has not been centered on this situation. With direct reference to it I intend—within a short time—to introduce a bill which will eliminate the tax advantage which is now unfairly enjoyed by those corporate executives who have access to these options. The bill would make the profits received as a result of the options taxable as income rather than capital gains. The article follows:

HOW TO BUILD UTOPIA WITH STOCK OPTIONS

(By J. A. Livingston)

Contrite, unmitigated, unrepressed confession is ennobling medicine. You feel so superior to your fellow man afterward. That's why I herewith openly and self-consolably acknowledge error in churlishly opposing stock options.

Insistently have I clamored that they were a special form of largesse for executives to escape the burden of high-income taxes. Corporate commanders could get capital gains profits at virtually no risk and pay only 25 percent to the Federal Government.

I even went so far as to remonstrate with corporations which permitted fairy godmother committees to reduce the price of options when stocks declined. How wrong can you get?

On the golf course, if you miss a putt, it counts a stroke against you. Brashly and unsympathetically, I wanted to apply the same rule to executives. A broadminded, far-seeing person is responsible for my conversion—Troy M. Rodlun, a sales promotion man of Washington, D.C.

Give options to stockholders, he suggested to Transamerica Corp. He reasoned: If a company holds on to executives with options, the same sauce can be used on investors, too. The more I thought of this the more I felt it deserved extrapolation.

POLICEMAN'S INCENTIVE

Take the traffic policeman at the plant gate. He's a valued company helper. In the course of a year, he can save thousands of delivery minutes. At Christmas, maybe he gets a present. Every once in a while, someone will hand him tickets to a ball game.

Why not, instead, slip him a stock option? Think of the incentive to move those trucks into and out of the plant faster, and to hell with traffic that doesn't help the company.

But tie a string to the policeman's option. It can be exercised only while he's on the beat. Then he'll grant a suboption to the sergeant, who'll sub-sub it to the captain. Soon incentive will trickle up the whole police force. The company will own the commissioner.

Or, take the stockholder. No holder of a stock option likes to see a stock go down in price. And why do stocks go down? Because some impatient stockholder wants cash. By taking long faithful stockholders into the stock-option club, executives would reduce the floating supply of shares and help themselves to quicker profits on their own stock options.

FOR SUPPLIERS TOO

And let's reverse what happened at Chrysler. There, an executive owned stock in a company that sold door hinges to Chrysler. Why not, instead, give stock options to the door-hinge executives? To cash in on their options, they'd try to keep door-hinge prices down and quality up. In that way, they'd make more money on Chrysler than off Chrysler.

Options to customers would work far more persuasively than trading stamps. In a trice, quality control problems would vanish. Even if the product were a stinker, customers would continue to buy it rather than lose their options.

Options can be used as an incentive on Government officials. As an illustration, so long as stocks kept going up (never down) the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers could get his pick of stock options out of a hat held by Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange.

And a group of major companies—United States Steel, Pennsylvania Railroad, the Ford Motor Co., and Consolidation Coal—would extend stock option privileges to the Secretary of Labor so long as wages didn't rise.

CUTTING THE TAX RATE

Options to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee would depend on a decrease in the corporate tax rate. This is a sure winner, based on the time-tested Chinese laundry principle of no tickee, no washee.

Finally, a special stock option would be meted out to Lewis D. Gilbert, the self-dedicated stockholder, who upsets corporate presidents at annual meetings, to stay away.

I am so ardently converted to stock options that I want to make them as multitudinous as assignats in 18th century France. As I see it, what's good enough for executives of the Generals—Electric, Motors, and Dynamics—is good enough for stockholders, vendors, customers, policemen, et cetera. Adroitly used, Livingston's economic law can become the modern Gresham's law: stock options will drive out stock options.

Man-in-Space Stunt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Russian man-in-space announcement is shrouded in mystery and has evoked

many questions, so far unanswered. David Lawrence, in his article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on April 17, brings out some of the discrepancies in the reports that have come from the U.S.S.R.:

DID GAGARIN REALLY ORBIT EARTH?—SEVERAL DISCREPANCIES IN RED REPORTS LEAD TO DOUBTS BY WESTERN OBSERVERS

(By David Lawrence)

Was the Soviet man-in-space stunt, as announced officially from Moscow, a hoax? Granted that something went around the earth, was a man really in it, or did the astronaut merely make a separate flight similar to that which an American airman, Joseph Albert Walker, recently made in an X–15 rocket plane at an altitude of 32 miles?

These questions are being asked by scientists because there are some obvious discrepancies in the boastful account of his trip given by Major Gagarin.

First of all, Gagarin says he was over South America 11 minutes after he started. This couldn't be right, and the tracking data collected by Americans tells the story of his gross exaggeration.

Second, Gagarin says he came down by parachute. It is now being implied by a Russian scientist that the satellite may actually have glided to the earth.

Major Gagarin, in his interview, said:

"While flying over Soviet territory, I saw perfectly great squares of collective farms. It was possible to distinguish between plowed land and grassland."

The Russian major declared he saw all this through portholes, but it isn't clear whether this vehicle had portholes. In fact, Dr. Anatoli A. Blagonravov, a noted Russian scientist, interviewed at Rome at an international space symposium, said at first that there were no portholes in the ship but later declared there were "slits."

Can the human eye really see 200 miles away through portholes or "slits"? It might distinguish large formations such as the lines on the moon, but it seems incredible that Major Gagarin could have seen anything as relatively small as meadows or fields such as he described.

Christopher Shawcross, chairman of the British section of the International Institute of Space Law, is quoted in a Reuters dispatch from London as saying a protest had been launched with the International Aeronautical Federation in Paris against an attempt by the Moscow government to seek registration of the space flight as an altitude record for man. He said the published evidence of the flight was not credible.

Walter Sullivan, a science writer for the New York Times, says in an article published over the weekend:

"Three days after man's first space flight there are still several puzzles concerning the circumstances of the trip. They pertained to its timing, the presence or absence of portholes in the manned capsule and the manner in which the occupant returned to earth.

"The timetable issued in Moscow said the vehicle had reached the sky over South America within 15 minutes. However, there is no point in Soviet territory from which an orbiting vehicle could come close to South America in so short a time."

There's another mysterious aspect. The Daily Worker, a Communist newspaper in London, published an article on the flight before it was officially announced as having happened. The article spoke on April 7 of the flight as having already occurred when it wasn't announced or tracked by American observing stations as in orbit until 5 days later. The Communist newspaper revealed that the astronaut, son of a Soviet plane designer, was under medical care. Later on, Russian scientists in Moscow denied that the earlier flight had occurred.

The Soviets are past masters at deception. It could be that they did have a man in flight and that the stunt failed. Not to be denied their laurels, the Communists may have substituted the experience of one of their highflying airmen, who may have simulated the kind of altitude venture which the American Joseph Albert Walker, achieved with his X–15 rocket plane. The sensations experienced might well have been identical with those encountered by a man in orbit. After all, to go 32 miles into the air might bring exactly the same sensations and perhaps the same view of the earth, and even, perhaps, the same observation of meadows and fields, similar to those exultantly described by Major Gagarin.

It probably is true that the Russians sent a satellite around the earth in 90 minutes. America has done this too. It is also probably true that Major Gagarin went high into the air. But whether he traveled around the earth as claimed, or merely achieved a high altitude in the air remains an unsolved mystery.

Just why would the Russians concoct the story if it isn't entirely true? One answer is that the Communists have no morals—they regard lying as a legitimate device in national and international policies.

Just now it is important for Nikita Khrushchev to divert the attention of the Russian people from their hardships with an appeal to their national pride. History records that the Czars of another era also engaged in huge spectacles, parades and displays to impress the people and cause them to forget or put aside their woes.

The Communists have much to explain. Scientists throughout the world will remain curious. Science has a way of probing into such things. Already the Soviet Government has declined to make its data public. Secrecy is always the refuge of totalitarian governments which do not hesitate to try to fool not only their own people, but the whole world.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

The Polaris Fleet Ballistic Missile Weapon System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, a week ago last Sunday and Monday at the invitation of the Secretary of the Navy I had the pleasure to accompany several Members of this and the other body on a cruise aboard one of our new fleet ballistic missile submarines.

We boarded the U.S.S. *Theodore Roosevelt* at Cape Canaveral, Fla. and continued several miles out into the Atlantic. There we had demonstrated to us the amazing capability of this weapon system. We are indeed fortunate to have this fine submarine and crew on our side. Cmdr. O. H. Perry, the commanding officer, and his crew are outstanding in every respect.

At my request, the Navy liaison has furnished the following unclassified information, which has been cleared for release:

THE POLARIS FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE WEAPON SYSTEM

The U.S. Navy's fleet ballistic missile (FBM) weapon system, became an operational reality on November 15, 1960, when the nuclear-powered submarine U.S.S. *George Washington* (SSBN 598) left Charleston, S.C., to go on patrol with a full load of tactical Polaris missiles. On December 30, 1960, she was joined in her silent domain by the U.S.S. *Patrick Henry* (SSBN 599) also fully loaded with Polaris ballistic missiles. Four more Polaris-firing submarines will join the fleet during 1961: *Robert E. Lee* (SSBN 601), *Theodore Roosevelt* (SSBN 600), U.S.S. *Abraham Lincoln* (SSBN 602), and U.S.S. *Ethan Allen* (SSBN 608). The *Ethan Allen* will be the first of a larger and heavier class of FBM submarines.

THE SYSTEM

Besides the missile itself, the fleet ballistic missile weapon system includes nuclear-powered missile launching submarines, support facilities, and personnel. The system became operational more than 2 years ahead of the original schedule. All phases of the program were brought along in parallel and through interlocking channels designed to have each component ready at the target date.

The first launching of a Polaris test vehicle from a submerged submarine took place on July 20, 1960, about 30 miles at sea off Cape Canaveral, Fla., at 12:39 p.m. e.s.t. Less than 3 hours later, at 3:32 p.m. e.s.t., *George Washington* fired a second Polaris.

The Polaris weapon system development is being managed for the Navy by the Director of the Special Projects Office, Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr. Assisting him is an imposing team of Navy missile experts, major industrial firms, and scientific leaders.

Operational ballistic missile submarines are under the control of the Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Command who exercises his authority through the commander in chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet and commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet.

The Special Projects Office will continue to manage the research and development programs for longer range versions of Polaris missiles, advanced versions of Polaris firing submarines and associated equipment.

THE CONCEPT

With almost unlimited cruising range and with endurance limited only by the crew, the FBM nuclear submarine is capable of extended submerged operation in the international waters of the world which comprise about 70 percent of the earth's surface. Free of the need to surface or extend a snorkel above the surface for continuous operation, FBM nuclear submarines will remain hidden by an oceanic curtain, their locations unknown to any potential enemy. The FBM submarines will at all times be under U.S. control. The Polaris missiles, powered by solid propellant, will be ready for launch within minutes of receiving the command without the need for long countdown. Mobile, hidden, ready for instant action (or carefully considered delayed action), the FBM system will provide the United States a powerful deterrent to those who might start a global war.

THE MISSILE

Polaris, named for the North Star, is a two-stage ballistic missile powered by solid fuel rocket motors and guided by a self-contained inerital guidance system independent of external commands or control. Propellant is basically a polyeurethane compound with light metal additives for higher specific impulse.

The 1,200 nautical (1,380 statute) mile range operational missile is designated Polaris A–1. It is about 28 feet long, about 4½ feet in diameter, and weighs about 30,000 pounds. Each motor exerts thrust through four nozzles in the motor base. Thrust vector (direction control) is exercised by devices called jetavators. Both motor cases are made of steel.

Flight tests of the second generation Polaris A–2 missile began on November 10, 1960. Polaris A–2 will have a range of 1,500 nautical (1,740 statute) miles. The second-stage motor is made of wound fiberglass, and the first stage motor is about 30 inches longer than on Polaris A–1. The solid propellant used in the longer range missile has a higher specific impulse than its predecessor. Polaris A–2 is expected to be operational by early 1962.

Future development of a Polaris A–3 will give the missile a 2,500 nautical mile range.

MISSILE GUIDANCE

The inertial guidance system used in Polaris is a refinement of earlier inertial systems and is the smallest in use in U.S. ballistic missiles. Using extremely precise gyroscopes, accelerometers and its own electronic computer, the guidance system puts the missile on correct course at the time of launch. Should the missile be moved off course by high winds or other effects, the guidance system automatically computes a new correct course and puts the missile on it. The guidance system also maintains the stability of the missile in pitch, yaw, and roll planes. At the precise instant required, the guidance system shuts off the rocket motors and triggers separation of the reentry body from the missile. The reentry body then follows a ballistic trajectory to the target.

THE FBM SUBMARINE

FBM submarines of the *George Washington* class are about 380 feet long with a beam of about 33 feet and displacement of about 5,900 tons. *Ethan Allen* class submarines will be about 410 feet long and displace about 6,900 tons. Both classes are driven by steam turbines powered by water-cooled nuclear reactors. Both classes carry 16 Polaris missiles stowed in 8 pairs of vertical launching tubes in the space immediately behind the sail. Each submarine has a 300-ton capacity air-conditioning plant. FBM submarines are also equipped with air scrubbers and precipitators to remove irritants from the air and maintain the proper balance of oxygen, nitrogen, and other atmospheric elements. Electrolytic oxygen generators under development will permit the submarine to manufacture its own oxygen from sea water.

NAVIGATION

Two positions must be known for success in missile launching: target and launcher. In the FBM system this puts great importance on navigation since the position of the launcher is the position of the ship and is continuously changing. Several methods complement each other in the FBM submarine to provide a very high order of accuracy in determining ship's position. Heart of the system is the ship's inertial navigation system (SINS), a complex system of gyroscopes and accelerometers which relates movement of the ship in all directions, ship speed through the water and over the ground, and true north to give a continuous report of ship position.

Each submarine has three SINS, each checking on the other. Systems similar to the SINS used in FBM submarines guided the *Nautilus* and *Skate* on their historic voyages beneath the polar ice in 1958 and, more recently, *Triton* on her 84-day underwater cruise around the world. The converted Mariner class cargo ship, U.S.S. *Compass Island* (EAG 153), serving as navigation test ship has steamed well over 100,000 miles in development tests of the submarine navigation system. A number of equipments are included in the submarine navigation system to provide an all weather capability of checking on the accuracy of SINS. These include both optical and electronic devices. All are highly automated.

FIRE CONTROL

The fire control system feeds coordinated information to the missile guidance system as to ship location, local vertical, true north, target location, and trajectory to be flown. Corrections are supplied until the instant of fire. The fire control mechanism can prepare missiles for launch at the rate of about one per minute.

COMMUNICATIONS

Radio communication with submerged submarines has been possible for a number of years. The systems used have been devised with special care to protect the locations of the submarine and leave the advantage of concealment unimpaired. Recent tests have again demonstrated that the Navy's worldwide communication system has the power and coverage necessary to exercise command of the always-submerged FBM submarines.

LAUNCHING

Polaris missiles are launched by an air ejection system which forces the missile from its launching tube and propels it up through the water to a point above the surface. At that point the rocket motor ignites and sends the missile on its way. The system takes advantage of the reliability and instantaneous ignition characteristics of solid propellant fuel used in Polaris. The result is increased safety for submarine and crew. Each launching tube has its own air supply and is independent of the other 15 tubes. Vital parts of each missile are accessible for inspection and maintenance even when loaded in the launching tubes and while the submarine is underway at sea.

PERSONNEL

Each FBM submarine has two crews, called Blue and Gold, of about 100 men and officers. The crews will alternate on the long patrols with the off-duty crew employed in training ashore at specially designed team training simulators.

TRAINING

The average precommissioning training period for FBM personnel is about 8 to 12 months. Initially training was conducted by the factories supplying the equipment, but the Navy now has its own training facilities. After pretraining in transistor theory, digital computing theory, Boolean logic, and electronic circuitry, FBM personnel get an intensive and extensive equipment training course. Maintenance instruction culminates in a course devoted to the functioning of the entire weapon system.

SUPPORTING FACILITIES

Support facilities include missile testing sites, naval shipyards, submarine tenders, an experimental test firing ship and a navigational test ship.

Chief testing site is the Atlantic Missile Range, Cape Canaveral, Fla. The Navy complex includes three launching pads, a missile assembly building, missile checkout building, engineering building, and associated supply and maintenance buildings and shops. Two of the launching pads are conventional flat pads and the third is the unique ship motion simulator which mounts a submarine-type launching tube in a 200-ton hydraulic device which can simulate all the motions of a ship at sea.

U.S.S. *Observation Island* (EAG 154) experimental missile test firing ship is based at Port Canaveral. The ship, a post-World War II Mariner class cargo ship modified extensively to serve as a firing test ship, has a complete submarine-type fire control, navigation, and launching system. The ship serves as both a floating launch complex for missile flight testing and as a working example of the kind of installation which could be placed aboard surface ships. *Observation Island* has served the additional role as floating school for training FBM submarine crews and will be the seagoing link between the Atlantic Missile Range and FBM submarines when they visit the cape for training with live test vehicles.

Flight tests of Polaris are conducted at Cape Canaveral. Other tests on various parts of the missile have been conducted at Point Mugu, Sacramento, San Francisco, and China Lake in California, at San Clemente Island off the California coast, and in Carderock and Cumberland, Md.

Among naval shipyards being equipped to meet the special requirements of the FBM submarines are Portsmouth, N.H., and Charleston, S.C.

A Naval Weapons Annex at the Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, has been commissioned to serve as a missile assembly and loading point. Here completed sections and subsystems of the missile, including motors, controls, guidance, etc., are being received from contractor plants, assembled, checked out and stored or loaded aboard FBM submarines.

The submarine tender U.S.S. *Proteus* (AS 19) has been commissioned and will be able to provide supplies, service, and all but major repairs to the FBM submarines. This includes supplying missiles and loading them into submarines. A second tender, yet unnamed, is under construction.

American Policy in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an editorial entitled "The Blank Check." This editorial appeared in the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, April 15, 1961.

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

THE BLANK CHECK

Not since the unlamented days of Dean Acheson have the Communists been given a blank check such as that written for them this week by President Kennedy.

The precise words from the President were, "There will not be under any conditions an intervention in Cuba by the U.S. Armed Forces."

There can be no higher U.S. authority to which Fidel Castro or Nikita Khrushchev might look for an explanation, or a softening, of this statement. Even Acheson spoke as Secretary of State when he committed the blunder which brought the Red invasion of Korea.

Try as we might, we could find no other comment by the President in his latest news conference which qualifies this bald statement. His words are plain, clear, and easily understandable. They were reported exactly and in the same context by reliable newsmen and news services who were at that conference.

Perhaps the full implication of what he said was not realized by the President, and has not yet been fully appreciated in official Washington. He said the United States will take no action with its Armed Forces in Cuba "under any conditions." Without changing the meaning or the context, the President's statement can be rephrased, "Regardless of what Castro, the Communists, or any other nation does in Cuba, the United States will not act to protect its interests."

Does the President mean that U.S. Marines will not defend the base at Guantanamo, even if the Castro-led Reds attack that American installation? Can Castro's air force, furnished with aircraft and weapons from behind the Communist Iron Curtain, attack U.S. Navy ships and planes without fear of attack?

Can Russia proceed to erect rocket bases in Cuba, unhindered by any action on our part? Will bland disregard of Cuban affairs be the official policy of this country henceforward in the Caribbean?

These are not idle or speculative questions. These are matters of direct concern to the United States in its relationship with Cuba, and with the allies Castro has chosen for the Cuban people. These questions do not deal with remote possibilities, but with pressing probabilities which can be turned into ugly realities on the shortest kind of notice.

Again, we must reemphasize what the President said. The United States will not intervene in Cuba "under any conditions." While he followed this statement with an involved commentary on various Cuban affairs, the heart of his position is that Cuba and its Red allies can do anything they like with impunity. The Armed Forces of the United States will not be used to check them, or to protect this country should action be required in Cuba.

This is the strangest kind of position for the President to take. Less than 3 weeks ago, he was discussing use of American Armed Forces in Laos, halfway around the globe from this country. Suddenly, he pledges the Reds immunity to the use of force "under any conditions" regardless of what they may choose to do only 90 scant miles away from the continental United States.

Is this the new Kennedy peace program? Is this unilateral disarmament in a specific area? What, pray tell, did the President really have in mind?

There was triumph in the councils of Fidel Castro and his Red conspirators when this statement was heard. Here is proof from the President that the Yanquis do not dare set foot in Cuba "under any conditions." This is what Fidel boasted of before, and will gloat about in the future.

It must be pointed out that the American people had to pay in blood, tears, and treasure when the Reds filled in the blank check handed them in Korea by Dean Acheson. Must we make the same kind of payment in Cuba?

Mounting Taxes in Pennsylvania Together With the Recent Proposal To Tax the Proceeds of Life Insurance Policies Are Regarded as Detrimental in Attracting New Industries and a Callous Disregard for Widows, Children, and Elderly Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-established fact that many Northern States and especially Pennsylvania have suffered from the competition for industrial expansion offered by other States whose guarantee of low taxes has proved to be no idle boast. Annually the flight of industry from tax-ridden States has proved a thorny problem to States like Pennsylvania whose industrial areas are to a great extent among the major distressed areas of the Nation.

The following editorial titled, "The Big Taxers," from the April 8, 1961, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror revcals the tax situation in Pennsylvania and the dismal future confronting the already overburdened taxpayers of the great Keystone State:

THE BIG TAXERS

Governor David L. Lawrence is making sure his administration will be long remembered by Pennsylvanians. It will be remem-

bered as 4 years in which State taxes were raised more than by any other administration in the history of the Commonwealth. It also will be remembered as the 4 years in which fewer people knew how the taxes were spent.

There isn't much that can be done about the Governor. He is an aged man, too old perhaps ever to be elected to another public office, so perhaps he need not care if the pension provisions that politicians have a way of devising for themselves are generous enough. There are, however, ways in which those who have voted for these tremendous tax increases can be remembered and dealt with by the voting public.

The 2-cent-per-gallon gasoline tax increase, the increase in the sales tax, the numerous other increases in State taxation during the Lawrence administration have been passed by the members of the Pennsylvania House and Senate. Isn't it about time the voters began to make a list of those who have voted for these raids on voters' pocketbooks and make a firm resolve never to put them in a place of public trust again?

Naturally it is a little disturbing to vote them out of office at local levels and then find them appointed to higher paying State jobs, but a change in administration at Harrisburg can solve a lot of that type of problem.

When Davy was running for office he promised time and time again that he would do something to restore jobs to those who were out of work in this State. He has done something about the lack of jobs all right—jobs have decreased month by month since the first 6 months he has been in office.

High taxes and the threat of even higher taxes yet to come have kept industries on the outside looking in. Despite the best efforts of communities, the help of a special branch of the State government known as PIDA and a number of other factors, the plain fact is the horses just are not drinking Pennsylvania water. Hundreds of prospects have been developed and interviewed, but relatively few have located here.

The newest plan to put life insurance payments into inheritance tax brackets is one that really will keep them out. Most owners of industry must carry sizable life insurance programs to keep the businesses they build up from being sold by the tax collector at the time of death. More often than not the bulk of the money in big life insurance programs goes to perpetuate the business and the jobs it provides by paying off the inheritance taxes on stock of which the owner died seised.

In smaller estates life insurance has been the safeguard of the widows and children. Tax it and you make the State a much less desirable place in which to live and work and do business.

The more business and industry are taxed and kept out of the State by high taxation and the more unemployment that develops from this situation, the higher the taxload becomes on those who are left at work and doing business. It seems quite probable that even sixth grade students could understand this situation. Why, then, is it so impossible for mature men, and especially those who seek and obtain public office to find it so hard to understand?

The Governor has been accused by many of his political foes as spending too much time outside the State. Perhaps he is just looking for a place to live in retirement that will leave for his heirs a little of the money he has collected as salary from the taxpayers of this State.

High tax States for a number of years have been losing a good percentage of their senior citizens of means to States where a more intelligent approach has been found in the matter of estate taxation. This robs the State of their guidance during some of the best years of their lives, it takes away revenues that would have been derived from a more reasonable tax approach and adds materially to the unemployment problems of the State, since many of these senior citizens of means are good employers and good customers during their golden years.

A tax on life insurance will cause quite an exodus of the older citizens of Pennsylvania who have other plans for their insurance benefits than keeping defeated politicians in high-paying State jobs. Establishing legal residence outside of Pennsylvania is not a complicated matter. It could develop into a serious situation for the Commonwealth.

Patriotic Principles of Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last evening I had the pleasure of attending the national defense evening program of the 70th Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution at Constitution Hall. At this meeting Mrs. Wilson K. Barnes of Baltimore, Md., national chairman of the NSDAR's National Defense Committee, presented a very eloquent address calling for a return in this country to those patriotic principles of Americanism which have played such a vital role in making the United States the most enviable and the greatest nation in the world.

I know of no more patriotic, liberty-loving organization in this country than the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, and I commend the membership of this fine organization for its consistent stand in favor of preserving liberty and reawakening the American people to the importance of patriotism and sound government policies.

Mr. President, I feel that Mrs. Barnes' address of April 18, 1961, merits the attention of every Member of this body, every Member of the House, and every person in this country; I ask unanimous consent that her address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

In bringing you the greetings of the national defense committee, I am mindful of those hundreds of devoted members of this committee throughout our country who are laboring against great odds to restore the spiritual and moral fiber of our people. We have been too busy while we concentrated on building skyscrapers, splitting the atom, and conquering space—to build men. We have ceased to build Americans.

Centuries ago man invented a power greater than nuclear energy—the power of government. Individual citizens can wield this power for their common good, or they can surrender it to the State for their ultimate enslavement. The pages of history tell us that self-government is the only safe repository of freedom and whenever the people have relinquished this power to the State, a nation has fallen.

Five thousand years of reaching out for full expression of human aspirations in a free society culminated in the American dream—the spiritually thwarted and politically oppressed who fled their homeland for this land of hope and opportunity placed security of liberty far above paternalistic protection of their property under tyranny. They held to the principle that man is created with God-given rights and corresponding responsibilities. Today, however, the ominous cloud of so-called world understanding begins to darken the horizon of our freedoms.

The problems which confront the American people are manifold. Legislation proposed in Congress and the State legislatures is fraught with peril to those who are determined to preserve the liberties provided in our Bill of Rights and Constitution, sealed with the blood of the men who fought in every war since the foundation of this country to save our American heritage for their children.

We must alert our fellow Americans to the dangers that confront us. Many still do not believe, in spite of the fact that the United States is ringed and riddled by Communist forces, that communism is the greatest menace our country faces today. Some have never heard of metropolitan government and the death it would bring to local governments elected by the people. Others are brainwashed by pamphlets and courses of study supplied for their enlightenment by organizations many of whose members use them as a front for socialism and who themselves are affiliated with Communist fronts.

There is perhaps only a little one person can do to alert our people to the fact that in 5 years' time or even less the takeover of our country by subversion may be complete. This catastrophe would be accelerated by current appeasement of the Communists and by proposals for complete disarmament which would ultimately abolish even the Military Academy at West Point and the Naval Academy at Annapolis. With our country's credit endangered by reckless expenditures of money both abroad and at home and by the undermining of our children's love of country by the advocates of world government, the ultimate purpose of the Communists to enslave our people is being rapidly accomplished.

It is no longer possible in most instances to bring the true facts of our danger to the public through the press, radio or television. It is, therefore, necessary to rely on private sources of information including such publications as U.S. News & World Report, Dan Smoot Reports, Human Events, National Review, Counterattack, Inform, the DAR Monthly Mailings, and similar publications to determine the truth of daily events. Not only do many newspapers not furnish accurate accounts of world happenings but our leaders in government service are being muzzled, their warnings silenced.

The greatest good that our country can do the free nations of the world is to be and remain strong, spiritually, militarily, and materially. Here, upon this soil, because of freedom from regulation, our ancestors carved out of the very wilderness itself, without foreign aid, a great empire built upon the principles of freedom, equality, and justice. Our Government was proclaimed to be a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, whose just powers were derived from the consent of the governed. This freedom, so dearly bought, was not won in a day but the lessons learned in its winning should be instilled in those who would claim the right to nationhood. Freedom cannot be bought; it must be earned.

Some persons have called the position of the national society, DAR isolationist. Have they ever considered that true isolationists are those persons, who, by their ill-con-

sidered plans, have alienated from this country the best friends it had? What has happened to Syngman Rhee and the many other rulers of countries friendly to the United States, who are now either refugees from their countries or are now frowned upon by the liberal element in this country? Has our foreign aid, so generously given to the point of almost bankruptcy, won this country any friends? What about the neutral nations—is our influence waxing or waning with them in the United Nations? What has happened to our former friends in South America? In the hour of crisis, in spite of our largess and desire to be all things to all people, America will stand alone as she very nearly does now and will do unless she returns to her faith in the principles of government which made her great.

Yes, it is easy to believe in world government. The human heart yearns for peace and surcease from the troubles that beset us. How wonderful it would be to wake up one morning and be told that war would be no more. That one could travel freely from one end of the world to the other. That the imprisoned nations of the earth were again free. That our children could plan their lives and all people everywhere fulfill their yearned-for aspirations. This promise was as nearly fulfilled as anywhere in the world in these United States, because our people knew the secret of freedom—a system of checks and balances, knowing well that that government is best which governs least. The character of a world government, represented today in essence by the United Nations, is reactionary—a return to absolutism and totalitarianism so abhorred by those who for generations have fled from the tyrannical governments of the Old World. There is nothing to check the absolute power of world government, its decrees, its judgments; its legislative acts are final. Nations such as Soviet Russia do not abide by United Nations decrees except when it suits them, but nations who live by moral standards seek to abide by its regulations. Thus, we have noted that the United States picked up the tabs for the international police force and is contributing large sums for the Congo.

Americans who understand the foundations upon which liberty was erected realize that a world order is the greatest enemy of individual freedom, not a means to achieve it. True freedom depends on local self-Government, on effective access of the people to their individual rights and not on a distant and powerful world Government. The heirs of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln know that society is improved by the individuals who compose it, not by forcing a program of social reform down its throat. True freedom cannot be reached by climbing the steps of the welfare state.

Within the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and Bill of Rights lies the greatness of our past and hope for the future. These great documents encompass the rules and regulations of human happiness. Americans should read and study them, understand and live by them. Let us declare our independence from a pseudophilanthropic Government. Let us recapture the knack of being Americans. Then our people will labor for what they want, experience a pride of accomplishment and feel a security which centralized social insurance cannot supply.

Fellow Americans, let us take up our responsibilities and rule, owing no debt of gratitude to a bureaucratic Government. Let us see that our Government obeys us.

Some people say it is controversial to be patriotic; if that is so, then we need more controversy in America. Some say it is sentimental to express love of country; then we need more sentimentality. Some say it is old fashioned to respect the American flag, and if that is true, we have a great need for more old-fashioned people in the United States.

The active enemies of freedom in our country probably number no more than 2 percent of the population. And yet, by constant, crafty effort, they have planted the idea far and wide that there is something a little funny about any outward show of patriotism.

We do not hear the national anthem and other patriotic songs on the air very often. We rarely witness mass recitals of the pledge of allegiance to the flag on occasions where nothing could be more appropriate. We do not find nearly enough patriotic programs on radio and television—although our adversaries have no difficulty in getting their ideas aired. We hear that some patriotic programs we have enjoyed in the past find there is no longer a place for them.

We are wrong—dead wrong—to let the active opponents frighten or ridicule us away from demonstrations of our patriotism. Every American should have a feeling of pride in his heart at any opportunity to tell the world how he feels about this land of the free.

This is the country, let us remember with deep gratitude that gave first consideration to the individuality of man, his hunger for freedom, his faith in himself and his God, and his desire for the expression of this divinely endowed impulse. It is a proud and joyful thing to be an American, and Americans should take pride and joy in expressing their patriotism.

Here is what we must say: "You shall not take our freedom away. Nor shall you, by mockery or deceit, cause us to hesitate to take the course of thinking right—talking right—for America."

Our ancestors produced a great Republic. Let us keep it.

Secretary Ribicoff on Highway Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, for several years now the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, first through the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety and now through the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, has been conducting a study of highway accidents, which account for nearly 40,000 deaths and more than 4 million injuries annually in the United States.

On April 17, in connection with hearings on H.R. 903 and H.R. 1341, bills relating to motor vehicle safety, the Subcommittee on Health and Safety heard a very interesting and constructive discussion of the highway safety problem by the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I wish to include this statement in the RECORD for the information of Members interested in this tremendously important problem. Secretary Ribicoff, who made a great contribution to highway safety as Governor of Connecticut, is one of the leading authorities in the country on this problem and I urge all who are working in this field to study his statement, which follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for inviting me to present the views of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the subject of the Federal responsibility and capability to assist in reducing the tragic annual toll of highway accidents. On this subject, I am sure we shall find a high degree of unanimity of opinion between this committee and my Department.

The almost 40,000 needless deaths in highway accidents cause the loss each year of almost 1½ million man-years of productive activity. These losses drastically reduce the productive capacity of this Nation. While these deaths exact high costs, in both human and economic terms, they fade almost into insignificance when we consider the traffic injuries to over 4 million persons every year. A large percentage of these victims are in, or are approaching, the potentially most useful years of their lives. The sudden removal of this great number of people is a recurring and continuing disaster.

The accident prevention activities of the Department have largely been centered in the Public Health Service. However, other major bureaus of the Department have a very real interest in reducing the number of deaths and injuries from accidents.

For example, the interest of the Children's Bureau in accidental deaths and injuries is assured since accidents are the most important cause of death and disability in children. Much of the excellent services rendered by the fine staff of the Children's Bureau in saving the lives and improving the health of children are erased by motor vehicle accidents.

The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation has a significant stake in accident prevention. Many of their activities are devoted to attempts to partially compensate for permanent disabilities induced by traffic accidents.

The financial burdens of the Social Security Administration are magnified by the mounting welfare costs directly associated with unemployability because of auto accidents.

Fortunately, the nucleus of an accident prevention program (four people in all) was established in the Public Health Service in the early fifties.

For a number of years the rate of growth was small. In 1956 the budget for this activity was in the neighborhood of $50,000.

The first basic research grant for accident prevention was made in 1951.

In 1957 the Public Health Service, together with the American Public Health Association, and other professional groups began to see more clearly the responsibility of the Public Health Service, State, and local health agencies, physicians, and their professional allies in traffic accident prevention.

Recognition of this responsibility, once achieved, has resulted in strong support from Congress and the professional groups involved. For example, in fiscal year 1961, Congress added a million dollars to the appropriation for the activities of the Division of Accident Prevention.

At the same time a decision was made to transfer the administrative aspects of basic research grant management in the field of accident prevention to the Bureau of State Services. This responsibility has been delegated to the Division of Accident Prevention.

Expansion of accident prevention activities both in research and application has quickly followed.

The total staff of the Division of Accident Prevention now numbers 122. Of this total, 34 are engaged primarily in traffic accident prevention activities.

The number of basic research grants in accident prevention rose to a total of 33 in 1961, of which 23 were concerned with re-

search in various aspects of traffic accident prevention.

A few examples of current traffic accident prevention activities alone, conducted by the Public Health Service during 1961 will suffice to illustrate the broad scope and extreme complexity of this acute health and safety problem:

I. Application:

(1) A National Conference on Driving Simulation was held in California in February 1961. Jointly sponsored by the Automotive Safety Foundation and the Department of Commerce, it served to develop a consensus concerning the need for simulation devices.

(2) In Pittsburgh, Pa., in May 1961 a similar workshop on "alcohol and driving" will be held to bring together all available knowledge concerning the relationship of alcohol and traffic accidents. Cosponsored by the National Institute of Mental Health and the Division of Accident Prevention, five regional conferences of experts were held to prepare grist for the mill.

(3) The national seat belt campaign, jointly sponsored by the Public Health Service, American Medical Association, and National Safety Council, achieved its initial success when the five leading American manufacturers of automobiles agreed to install attachment points for front seat belts in 1962 models.

(4) The Connecticut accident prevention study, is making a notable contribution to the development of better scientific research methods in identifying the basic, underlying causes of traffic accidents.

It would be too time consuming to go into detail concerning many other traffic accident activities that have resulted from congressional action. A partial listing follows:

(a) Driving simulation feasibility studies.

(b) Films on seat belts.

(c) Participation in the action programs of the President's Committee for Traffic Safety and the National Safety Council.

(d) The development of cooperative activities between the State motor vehicle administrators, State health officers, and State medical societies through national and regional conferences.

(e) A saturation publicity program in Cleveland, Ohio, in cooperation with the Greater Cleveland Safety Council.

II. Research:

(1) Automotive crash injury research, $118,242.

(2) Experimental case studies of traffic accidents, $86,081.

(3) Causes of auto accidents of adolescent drivers, $30,782.

(4) Evaluating highway traffic safety motion pictures, $14,894.

(5) Accident inducing characteristics of motor vehicles, $84,953.

(6) Research on fatal highway collisions, $159,332.

(7) Safety devices for automotive vehicles, $15,111.

(8) Driving behavior and traffic accidents, $19,610.

(9) Human factors in traffic safety, $9,210.

In addition, there were several other research projects directly related to traffic accident prevention research, as well as several others of broader interest.

The greatest problem currently besetting the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Public Health Service, and the Division of Accident Prevention is making a determination of how best to allocate the personnel, funds, and other resources currently available in the face of what at times appear to be overwhelming demands.

The greatest asset to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in assuming its rapidly expanding role in traffic accident prevention has been the friendly, helpful, and always cooperative attitude exhibited by other Government agencies, with a longer history in traffic accident prevention; the National Safety Council; and other equally well-known voluntary and professional organizations.

Truly, the traffic accident prevention effort has been and, I am confident, will continue to be a genuinely cooperative and mutually stimulating operation.

WHAT THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE CAN DO IN ACCIDENT PREVENTION

Accidents and accidental injuries and deaths have been an integral part of living since the days of primitive man.

As long as man is fallible and human environments continue to provide accident hazards (as they always will) accidents undoubtedly will continue to plague us.

However, a nation which has succeeded in reducing so dramatically the threat of once widespread infectious diseases cannot in good faith reject the challenge to mobilize these same scientific resources to lower the currently large and for the most part unnecessary toll of accidental deaths and injuries.

Past efforts to render human environments less hazardous have not been without success. Such efforts have been particularly fruitful in the case of large industries. Efforts will continue unabated to improve the safety of the environment.

However in the past much less attention has been paid to the importance of human factors in accident causation—to the importance of physical (i.e., vision and hearing); psychological (i.e., moods); and physiological (i.e., drugs and alcohol) factors which so strongly affect people who drive automobiles. This is a phase of accident prevention the study of which is peculiarly fitted to the talents of physicians, public health workers, and their professional allies.

A much better understanding of these factors, based on sound research is essential if the control of accidents is ever to be placed on an effective and truly scientific basis. For example, it is obvious that some people can work, live, and play safely in environments containing many potential accident hazards. It is equally obvious that other people have an unduly large number of accidents in environments containing relatively few accident hazards.

Accident prevention, a complex problem, cannot be solved by the use of signs, placards, and post cards. This has been proven.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is taking the first steps along this research trail the end of which will be the production of lifesaving knowledge which can be applied in every city, town, and hamlet in this country.

RESEARCH

The Cornell crash injury research project in which the Public Health Service cooperated, serves as an excellent example of how research can translate basic research facts into an applicable system of knowledge.

Last month the application phase of this research project culminated in an agreement by the five leading American manufacturers of automobiles to install attachments for seat belts in the front seats of all cars sold in 1962.

Such researches are costly. They are time consuming. They require the recruitment of significant numbers of talented researchers who are dedicated to the accomplishment of a single purpose.

Similar applicable knowledge can be obtained through research involving a multiplicity of factors, both environmental and human, which are the basic causes of many of the 90,000-odd deaths from accidents each year.

The research grant program of the Public Health Service is expanding. As it expands, it will encompass an ever-broadening range of traffic accident research problems with equally applicable results.

Just a few selected examples of needed research will help to pin down this point:

(a) What are the minimum skills and abilities that are needed to safely operate a modern passenger car? No one knows. No one has attempted to find out in a systematic way.

(b) What effect do drugs, fatigue, and alcohol have on driving efficiency? There have been a lot of intelligent guesses but few, if any, truly objective determinations.

(c) Which, of the 250 identifiable psychological factors, contribute significantly to automobile accidents? No one knows. Several researchers have made a small beginning in researching small facets of this problem.

(d) Are elderly people being arbitrarily deprived of their driving privileges because of opinion rather than fact? No one can say definitely until basic research in this area is done.

The Public Health Service intends to pursue such research leads as these as rapidly as possible in order to build a foundation of fact for law enforcement.

Today the Public Health Service has no facilities for conducting intramural research in accident causation similar to the intramural research facilities that are available to other national research centers such as the National Institutes of Health. As soon as possible such facilities will be provided not only because of their stimulating effect on research efforts outside the Government, but also because of their training value for young men and women interested in a career in accident prevention research.

Oftentimes before basic research findings can be applied for the purpose of saving human lives an intermediate step is needed; namely, applied research. The breadth of the accident research problem, its depth and scope, suggest the necessity of greatly increasing the number and types of applied research projects which are so essential to the application of newly won basic knowledge.

There is the problem of attracting, and maturing, a growing number of highly qualified research workers in the field of accident prevention. A technique found very useful and productive by other Institutes has been their program of research fellowships. It is planned that accident prevention research fellowships will be provided to insure steady flow of qualified researchers into the ranks of those who dedicate their lives to finding the true causes of highway accidents.

SIMULATION

No discussion of research, no matter how brief, could be considered complete without at least passing mention of the need for the development of "simulation" devices as tools for research workers who wish to study the effect that human factors have on accident causation.

It is dangerous to experiment with drivers of automobiles in actual driving situations. Such a process is also extremely costly since a traffic accident only occurs about every 60,000 miles of travel. Therefore it is essential to support the developmental research required to permit the construction of several prototype simulators so that drivers can be studied under controlled conditions, in safe environments, thus avoiding the expensive nationwide epidemiological network that might otherwise be necessary (if it were feasible).

In addtion to supporting the construction of several prototypes of "true" simulators in which the driver has the illusion of almost complete reality, there also is a necessity to support the developmental research involved in producing "part-task" simulators which can produce valuable and needed information in such limited areas of driver interest

as vision, hearing, reflexes, etc. However, the validity of the research findings of "part-task' simulators can only be validated by checking out samples of their research findings on a "true" simulator.

At the recent workshop held in Santa Monica, Calif., on the subject of simulation (this conference was jointly sponsored by the Automotive Safety Foundation, Public Health Service, and the Bureau of Public Roads), there was a remarkable unanimity of opinion concerning the need for producing a faithful simulation of the driving situation just as the Armed Forces have found it necessary to produce a faithful simulation of flight experience using various models of planes, and the Navy with various types of submarines.

Since this group of experts in simulation and research have arrived at this conclusion, efforts will be extended to provide to researchers in the field of accident prevention the one tool that apparently is essential to unlocking so many of the hitherto inaccessible mysteries associated with traffic accident causation.

In brief, the Department will move rapidly to close the gap in applied technology between current research instrumentation and instrumentation that will take advantage of present technological knowledge, recently developed.

In no other way can progress toward the goal of identifying and properly evaluating the human factors involved in traffic accident causation be made so rapidly and effectively.

APPLICATION

Some facts are so obvious they long escape detection. This is particularly true of the fact that no matter how enlightening a research project may turn out to be, it remains of only academic interest until, through applied science, it is translated into a lifesaving potential.

Throughout the United States there are scattered concentrations of interest, skill, and ability that can be readily mobilized to fight the war on accidents if only a small contribution can be made available, in the form of project grants, to assist in the inauguration of unused plans and programs. Pump priming is badly needed. It is planned to seek methods whereby these interests and skills can be mobilized, particularly at the local level, in the next few years.

With a little help or boost, there are hospitals which can improve the training of their emergency squads; there are poison control centers which can conduct poison prevention programs; there is a tremendous latent interest in traffic accident prevention projects in many universities and schools throughout the Nation which can be activated if boostser shots are made available. A number of motor vehicle administrators, medical societies, and health departments are concerned and alarmed about the primitive status of driver licensing in their States and communities. They want to change this condition. With a little outside help they can bring about the changes that are needed. The Department plans to assist them in getting their long delayed plans underway.

The capabilities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, particularly the Public Health Service, to give professional advice to the many persons and agencies who daily seek answers to tough problems involving State or local traffic accident prevention will be increased rapidly. Each of these inquiries represents the nucleus of a community activity which, if properly nourished, can grow into a livesaving action program. Experts in traffic safety, many of whom are currently available to the Public Health Service as consultants, will be called on with much greater frequency to extend the capabilities of the Service in the general area of technical assistance and consultation, particularly on matters pertaining to cutting down the toll of highway deaths.

Finally, following the historical success of the Department of Agriculture, young men and women will be trained in the specialty of accident prevention; they will be assigned to State and local areas; there they will encourage and consult with local officials who wish to improve their State or local traffic accident prevention services.

These young men and women will need to be trained, but once trained they will vastly expand the ability of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist in the growth and development of local projects in accordance with the capabilities, interests, and circumstances inherent in local situations.

INFORMATION EXCHANGE

The growing number of projects in all phases of traffic safety in the United States and the mounting interest of the citizenry in this subject has created a deluge of incoming information concerning State and local activities. If this information is not scientifically collected, tabulated, analyzed, and made readily available for rapid dissemination to other interested groups, one of the most valuable weapons of the Department's traffic accident prevention program will have been neutralized.

Why should community B struggle through the developmental phases of a program or project which, if the experience of community A in conducting a similar project were readily available, could be avoided?

If a unique and successful method for motivating citizens to wear seat belts is developed in one community, is it not wasteful and foolhardy for other communities to repeat the same project in order to arrive at the same results?

A wealth of invaluable data already has been collected in the field of traffic accident prevention, both in the areas of research and application, by the Public Health Service. It is planned therefore to continue the development of better and more scientifically sound, effective, and economical methods of soliciting such valuable information, digesting it, and making it readily available to others who show an interest in kindred projects and activities.

A modern information exchange program can serve as the focal point of information gleaned from the experiences of State and local agencies and others.

This center will have the responsibility for producing audiovisual messages in modern garb that can convey even to the mildly interested knowledge that has been collected for educational purposes.

TRAINING

It is the plan of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop three types of training activities to produce an adequate number of physicians, public health workers, and members of allied professions to carry the growing burdens imposed by the complexities of modern traffic.

(1) Short courses and seminars will be held for the purpose of teaching newcomers the concepts, principles, and practices which are peculiar to this new branch of public health. These seminars are in great demand throughout the States and in many localities.

(2) Medium range courses of 4 to 8 months' duration will be held to train young men and women, and public health professionals as well, in accident prevention techniques. Such training courses (curriculums have already been contracted for) will provide the maturity in accident prevention required of staff members assigned to States and localities. These courses however, will also be available for the training of State and local sponsored trainees.

(3) Long-range training will be provided in increasing amounts in a growing number of schools of public health, medical schools, and other professional schools for the purpose of encouraging physicians, public health workers, engineers, nurses, and others to integrate accident prevention activities into their daily tasks wherever they may be located or employed.

Finally, it is planned to provide training grants to institutions to make it possible for more accident prevention materials and projects to be included in everyday teaching curriculums.

The Public Health Service is going to do its best to save lives.

Health Insurance for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the new Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur J. Cohen, addressed the Jacobi Medical Society here in Washington on Monday, April 17, last. I am advised that the cost will be $182.25, which is over the legal limit. I therefore ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the cost, the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

(By Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

I greatly appreciate your invitation to discuss President Kennedy's program of health insurance for the aged and the factors underlying the development of this proposal.

"The health of our Nation is a key to its future—to its economic vitality, to the morale and efficiency of its citizens, to our success in achieving our goals and demonstrating to others the benefits of a free society." These are the opening words of the President's health message, delivered to the Congress on February 9.

The great challenges facing America in assuring the health of the people must be viewed within the broad scope of this overriding context. The President has recommended to the Congress a broad program aimed at getting good health care to people at the time they need it and under the best possible conditions.

Health insurance for the aged is, of course, a key part of the President's health program. But his other health proposals are also of major significance in the total effort to improve the health of the American people. These proposals would help to strengthen community services and facilities for better care, especially of the chronically ill and the aged; expand the Nation's capacity to train physicians and dentists; improve the health of children and youth; accelerate medical research; and control the pollution of our air and water resources.

Thus, the program recommended by the President provides for improving health care in four areas—health insurance, facilities, personnel, and research. I have been asked to address myself principally to the first of these proposals—prepaid health insurance for the aged.

The need to establish some public mechanism through which aged persons might find the means for meeting their health care requirements is universally accepted. A vast majority of our older people face a

situation not of their own making and over which they have little control. As people become older, millions find themselves confronted with the harassing fact of low income on one side and the worry if not the fact of greater need for medical services on the other. I am sure that you can all illustrate this from your own experiences. What the Federal Government has to do, of course, is to try to add all the individual cases together in order to arrive at a reasonable solution of how to accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number without undue strain on available resources.

Income data available on the aged vividly illustrate their limited financial ability. Different studies of this income may come up with somewhat different answers, depending upon the definitions used, but almost any one of these is likely to show that some 50 to 60 percent of all persons aged 65 and over have less than $1,000 in cash income during the year. Data from the Bureau of the Census, for example, show 55 percent of the aged with less than $1,000 income in 1959. Such data for individuals do not, of course, indicate how many persons the income must support, so that some wives dependent upon their husbands may be counted as having little or no income. However, less than one-fifth of all persons aged 65 or over are married women and many of the married couples have an income of less than $2,000 between them—so even if you allow for equal sharing by husband and wife there would be little change in the number with incomes of less than $1,000 a year.

Opponents of health insurance for the aged have quoted one particular survey made last year by two university men which showed a considerably more favorable income figure. However, this survey excluded from its sample all nonwhite persons and all persons receiving old age assistance, the very groups most likely to have the lowest incomes.

It is true, of course, that limiting the discussion to income does not present a complete picture. Older persons are more likely to have savings than are younger persons. In general, however, those with the lowest incomes are those least likely to have a nest egg set aside for a rainy day. Moreover, most of the savings of the aged are in the form of homes or life insurance and are, therefore, not readily available to meet the costs of medical care.

A Federal Reserve Board survey in 1959 showed that of the "spending units" headed by an elderly person, 29 percent had no bank accounts or savings bonds and 17 percent had less than $500. Those aged who live in the home of a younger relative—persons not generally very well off—are not even considered in these figures.

Coupled with this generally low income and poor financial position is the greater need of aged persons for medical care. National Health Survey data show that three-fourths of all aged persons not in institutions have one or more chronic conditions. Two out of every five aged persons have a chronic condition that prevents or limits their usual activity. About one out of every five aged is either confined to the house or has trouble getting around by himself. The health picture grows worse with increasing age. Among those 75 or older, for example, almost every third person is confined to the house or needs help getting around outside.

These increasing health needs lead, perforce, to an increased use of the various medical services. Aged people go to the hospital more often and stay longer than those at younger ages. As a result, older persons spend two to three times as many days in the hospital, on the average, as do younger persons—1,778 as compared with 764 days per 1,000 persons according to the national health survey data. And this survey does not include the hospitalization experience of persons who died during the survey year prior to the interview. Thus, the findings understate the actual situation, probably by a fair percentage.

Aged persons also see the physician more often than do younger persons, 6.8 as against 4.8 visits a year on the average.

This increased need for and use of medical services by the aged is reflected in expenditures for medical care. Persons aged 65 and over spend twice as much for medical care in a year as do persons under age 65, according to a health information foundation survey. This includes only the private expenditures of the noninstitutional population, leaving out the heavy costs for terminal illness among aged persons living alone. It also leaves out most of the cost of care in nursing homes, mental, or tuberculosis hospitals, and other institutions, which are usually publicly financed. Indeed, close to one-fifth of public expenditures for medical care are in behalf of aged persons, although they constitute less than one-tenth of the population.

Again, these average expenditures understate the magnitude of the problem facing many aged persons, owing to the erratic incidence of illness. They conceal wide variations, giving no indication of the very heavy financial burden that may be placed upon many individuals requiring hospitalization. A stay in a hospital usually means total medical costs will be high. A 1957 study of aged social security beneficiaries showed that at least one member of every fifth beneficiary couple was hospitalized during the year. For half of these couples with a hospitalized illness, total medical bills incurred were over $700, more than the cost of a modest food budget for the year. Average costs of hospitalization have been rising, of course, for a long time. In 1951, the average was $18 a day. Now it is about $32, and the end is not in sight. Again these averages do not tell the whole story. They can mean real hardship for many older people, especially those of low income in areas of above-average hospital costs.

To meet the costs of hospitalized illness, less than half the aged have health insurance of any sort and those who need it most to help pay their bills—the retired, those with low incomes, or those with major health problems—are the least likely to have it.

This distillation of life's varied problems into the depersonalization of statistics argues strongly for some action to assist aged persons in meeting the costs of health care.

MEETING THE NEED

All the data which we have and the personal experience which we gather point to an urgent need to protect our older citizens against the hardships of expensive illness. It is apparent that this need is not likely to be met solely by private insurance, since the heavy use of medical care services and facilities by aged persons would necessitate a premium which most could not afford from their limited incomes. As private means by themselves do not appear adequate to meet this need, public programs are necessary. As with other major economic hazards, prepaid basic protection against the high cost of illness in old age can—and in my opinion should—be provided through the national social insurance program.

The social insurance method would provide the means of spreading the cost of health services in old age over the working years. Under it, services to the aged would be provided in a way that preserves the dignity of the individual. Aged persons—including those with average and even above average income—constantly face the threat that costly medical care will wipe out their savings and force them after a lifetime of independence to seek aid from their children or from public or private charity. As the President said in his health message, the health insurance for the aged program will meet the needs of the millions of the aged who do not want charity, but whose entire financial base for security—and often that of their children—may be shattered by an extended hospital stay.

Programs relying upon a means test as a primary criteria for eligibility cannot effectively meet this need. By their very nature, they can become operative only after every other resource has been spent. They cannot provide the sense of security which attends the continuing assurance that the means of paying for needed health care is available whenever that care is required. The many, many aged persons barely able to provide the necessities of life for themselves do not want charity based on a means test. They will not get needed care under these conditions until care is forced upon them by a medical crisis. I take it for granted that we all feel that this is not the best method of dealing with this matter. We all believe, I am sure, that an aged person should be able to receive the care he needs irrespective of his financial resources and without being required to demonstrate complete poverty before the care is made available.

There is another basic reason why I favor providing health insurance for the aged as an addition to the existing social insurance program. Monthly benefits for retired workers and their families under this program are intended basically to serve as a partial replacement of the income lost owing to retirement. They provide a dependable basis on which retired persons can plan expenditures. However, it is impossible to know when serious illness will strike, so heavy medical care costs are unpredictable. They may easily be so great as to undermine the floor of protection established by the monthly cash benefits. They alone, among the expenditures which the aged face, may with unanticipated suddeness, destroy the financial security of an aged person, and effectively render the security afforded by the monthly benefits meaningless. The addition of health benefits to the cash retirement benefits under the social insurance system would do much to close this gap. It would enable people to take a long step toward preventing dependency by helping them remain self-reliant through their years of retirement.

The health insurance for the aged proposal calls for a well-rounded, yet modest, program of health services to be financed through the social security and railroad retirement systems. It, like the old-age survivors, and disability program now in effect, would not provide more than basic protection. It would provide payment for the cost of inpatient hospital care (after a deductible), skilled nursing home care after hospitalization, hospital outpatient diagnostic services (after a deductible), and visiting nurse and related home health services. It would do all this without changing or interfering with the way the individual gets his health care or the way the doctor or hospital provides it.

Since the heaviest medical financial burden falls upon aged persons requiring hospital care, we therefore have felt that the major costs of hospital care was the proper point of concentration in this insurance proposal. However, the proposal includes other benefits which would serve as less expensive substitutes for hospital care, and would assure that care given under the program would be geared to the level the doctor feels is appropriate to the patient's condition. Skilled nursing home services were included in order to assure that less expensive facilities than hospitals could be used for convalescence. Home health services would enable many older people to receive care in their own homes. Hospital outpatient diagnostic services would reduce the need for hospital admissions for diagnostic

purposes. It would also encourage beneficiaries to seek early diagnosis and treatment and thus enable them to avoid later hospital admission and perhaps an early death because of the advances of a detectable malady.

The services of the private physician are excluded from the bill. No service performed by a private physician at either home, office, or in the hospital, and no fee he charges for such services would be involved, covered, or affected.

As is the case with other social security benefits, the individual could build upon this basic social insurance protection and by his own means obtain protection against the cost of physicians' and dentists' services, drugs, and other health items not covered by the proposed legislation. The existence of the basic program would make it feasible for the individual to attempt realistically to obtain adequate health protection in old age. Just as old-age and survivors benefits under social security have been accompanied by a growth in supplementary pensions and life insurance, I would expect the insurance industry successfully to offer supplementary private health insurance to accompany health insurance under social security. In this way we can demonstrate, in these days of international competition, the vigor and strength and adaptability of our system and its ability through the cooperation of public and private agencies to provide a good way of life for older people.

Under the proposed program, some 14¼ million persons eligible for benefits under the social security and railroad retirement programs would be eligible for health benefits by the time the program got into full operation in 1963. The total number of persons 65 years of age and over at that time will exceed 17¾ million and may approach 18 million. Of those not covered, about one-quarter million former Federal Government employees will be entitled to health benefits at least equivalent in value to those proposed. More than half the remaining aged would be eligible for care in veterans' hospitals or under the public assistance program.

Just as in the area of income maintenance—old-age, dependency, and disability—public assistance is a resource when other means have failed. The State assistance program will be able to do a better job if the basic health needs of most people are met through social security and the States do not have to carry a large financial and administrative burden in meeting these needs.

Following enactment of the proposed health insurance program, the States, if they wished, could liberalize their income tests and otherwise work toward a more effective health care program for the few aged persons who would still need help in meeting their medical care costs. The medical assistance for the aged program, established in the Social Security Amendments of 1960, will still be needed. There will always be people with special needs that cannot be met through social insurance and other public and private pension plans and must, therefore, apply for public assistance.

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED PROPOSAL

The administration-sponsored health insurance for the aged bill has been introduced in the Congress by Senator ANDERSON and Congressman KING. Under it, benefits would be available to all persons 65 and over who are receiving or who have applied for and are eligible to receive, social security or railroad retirement benefits.

The services provided would include:

(1) Inpatient hospital services for up to 90 days, with the program paying all costs in excess of a deductible to be paid by the patient of $10 a day for the first 9 days, but with a $20 minimum.

(2) Skilled nursing home services for up to 180 days immediately after discharge from a hospital.

(3) Outpatient hospital diagnostic services with a $20 deductible applied for each diagnostic study.

(4) Home health services of up to 240 home visits in a calendar year. These services would include intermittent nursing care, physical therapy, and part-time homemaker services.

Both inpatient hospital and skilled nursing home services would be subject to an overall limitation of 150 units of service during any benefit period, with 1 day of inpatient hospital services or 2 days of skilled nursing home care equal to one unit of service. A new benefit period would not begin until the beneficiary had been out of the hospital or skilled nursing home for 90 days. In operation, this unit of service limitation would mean that any beneficiary spending 60 days or less in the hospital would be entitled to 180 days in a skilled nursing home. However, any day beyond the 60th spent in a hospital would reduce the potential skilled nursing home benefit by 2 days. Thus, a beneficiary spending the full 90 days in the hospital would be entitled to a maximum of 120 days of skilled nursing home care.

The program would start with respect to inpatient hospital, outpatient hospital diagnostic, and home health services on October 1, 1962. Skilled nursing service benefits would begin on July 1, 1963.

Responsibility for administering the program would rest with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for social security beneficiaries and with the Railroad Retirement Board for railroad retirement annuitants. There would be an Advisory Council to advise the Secretary on policy matters in connection with program administration.

For a hospital, skilled nursing home, or home health agency to be eligible to enter a contract to participate in the program, it would be required to meet certain specified conditions set forth in the bill.

Essentially, these conditions are those generally accepted as being necessary for quality care.

In formulating the conditions for participation, the Secretary would consult with the States, with the Advisory Council, and with such accrediting bodies as the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals. In addition, a State could recommend to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that higher conditions be established for providers of service in that State.

The bill sets forth certain basic requirements for participation in the program that I am sure you will agree are prerequisites to good hospital administration. A participating hospital would need to be licensed by the State, have 24-hour nursing service, maintain adequate medical records, have bylaws for staff physicians, and have a committee of physicians to review necessity for admissions, lengths of stay, and services provided. Similarly, participating nursing homes would need to be licensed, have medical policies established by physicians, maintain adequate medical records, provide 24-hour nursing service, and have a nursing facility utilization plan.

In applying these standards and in the program's relations with providers, we anticipate that considerable reliance would be placed on State agencies. State agencies would advise us whether individual hospitals, nursing homes, and home health agencies met the conditions for participation. The State agencies would also consult with the providers to assist them in improving their services and administrative operations.

This program would be financed by an increase in social security tax contributions of one-fourth of 1 percent each on employers and employees, and three-eighths of 1 percent on the self-employed, plus an increase in the maximum earnings subject to the tax from $4,800 to $5,000. These contributions would amply cover the cost of all the benefits to be provided and would keep the social security systems self-supporting.

EFFECT OF PROGRAM ON HOSPITALS AND DOCTORS

I would guess that as you have thought about this health insurance for the aged proposal, one question has been paramount: "What will be the effect of this program on my freedom to practice medicine and upon my relations with patients? What changes will it cause in hospital practices?"

First, let me underline what the President has already said about health insurance for the aged; namely, that it is not a program of socialized medicine. The prerogatives of doctors and patients would remain unchanged. The patient would choose his own doctor, who in turn would be absolutely unhindered in practicing his profession.

One argument that has been advanced is that the program would crowd the hospital beds with aged persons. We do believe that a program which relieves an aged person of the worry about cost and allows him to get hospital care when his physician recommends it would somewhat increase the use of hospitals by the aged. That this would happen is demonstrated by the fact that aged persons with private health insurance now use more days of hospital care on the average than those without such insurance. However, we believe that the utilization will tend to stabilize over time at little above the present use levels for the insured aged. This level seems reasonable in view of existing need. I have too great a respect for the integrity of doctors and hospital admission practices to believe that aged persons who do not require hospital care will be admitted to hospitals in very many instances.

It seems to me that a program which would lift unmanageable cost burdens from an aged patient needing hospital care would also be a relief to the physician, for he could hospitalize his patient when necessary without fear of the economic consequences to his patient. It would give added substance, it seems to me, to the freedom of doctor and patient together to choose the kind of care best suited to the patient's needs. This freedom of choice is inevitably compromised when an aged patient needs but cannot afford hospital care and is unwilling to plead pauperage to obtain it.

I believe that within the framework of our institutions we have the capacity and the material and human resources to assure a full life and a fair measure of happiness for more of our people. Twenty-six years ago, the initiation of the social security program established a basis for the relief of economic dependency. On signing the Social Security Act in 1935, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "This law represents a cornerstone in a structure which is now being built but is by no means complete." Health insurance for the aged is an urgently needed addition to this structure.

We're Winning the War Against Dope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

wish to include the following report from the top Federal official in the fight against dope, the U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics, Harry J. Anslinger, as it was published in This Week magazine for April 16, 1961:

WE'RE WINNING THE WAR AGAINST DOPE

(By Harry J. Anslinger)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Americans can take heart in the good news that we are defeating the cruelest enemy we've ever faced: The murderous traffic in dope.

Parents in particular should be encouraged because their children are becoming increasingly safer from the vicious infection of drug addiction.

A 5-year survey just completed by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics shows we're achieving a major breakthrough in our all-out war with the peddlers of living death. Here are the key facts in the battle:

The overall number of new addicts—our best gage—is declining. At the end of 1960 it stood at 7,479, a drop of 1,858 from 1956.

Youthful addicts under 21, an alarming 12 percent of the 1956 total, were down to 3.9 percent of 1960; teenagers under 17 came to 148, or 0.3 percent.

Even with these exciting gains, however, I want to emphasize the gravity of the problem. This is especially true in New York and California—two problem areas which are running counter to the national percentage decrease. They alone have more than 60 percent of the 44,906 addicts reported to the Bureau from all over the United States in 1960. Possibly several thousand more have gone unreported.

These Americans are begging, borrowing, stealing, and murdering to buy $500 million worth of dope each year. This is a big challenge to our national welfare. But 30 years ago when the Federal Bureau of Narcotics was set up more than 1 American in 1,000 was an addict. Now the statistics are 1 in 4,000. So from the point of view of Federal law enforcement we are in a position to get our hands around the problem. Before we couldn't.

It hasn't been easy. Most important factor in our recent breakthrough has been the Narcotic Control Act passed by Congress in 1956. It provided for stiff prison sentences of 5 to 20 years for a first offense and 10 to 40 years for second convictions, plus appropriately heavy fines.

It warned the big interstate and international traffickers, like members of the Mafia, that now we could fight them in the only way they understood—by a long-term quarantine in prison. They became more cautious in their operations. As a result, the dope traffic that they control has slowed down and addiction with it.

VICTORY ON SEVERAL FRONTS

I am now able to report that where strict State and local laws have backed up the Federal law, and where tough judges have handed down maximum sentences, we've been able to pick up our agents and move elsewhere.

We've closed our offices completely in several States. Baltimore, which had a severe dope-traffic problem 5 years ago, lowered it by 50 percent. In Ohio juvenile addiction has virtually disappeared.

Seattle, Las Vegas, Washington, D.C., Miami, and Honolulu are other greatly improved spots. So are several areas in New England and in the South.

Significantly, we find a radically different situation in New York and California. At last reports, New York had 20,648 addicts, or 46 percent of the national total. California had 7,411 addicts and 16 percent. The reason for this, as I have testified before the Congress, is that these states have not adopted the more stringent enforcement laws imposing the heavier penalties adopted by the Federal government and most of the other states.

So obviously we're still in for a long fight. Few people know this hard fact better than the 280 agents of the Narcotics Bureau who in slightly more than five years have been responsible for the Federal prosecution of 8,000 cases.

DOPE FROM RED CHINA

Theirs is a cloak and dagger operation, and even wartime espionage holds no greater risks or demands greater skills or imagination.

The biggest headache they have to contend with is the traffic in heroin, an opium derivative used by 93 percent of the addicts in the United States. The bulk originates in Red China and winds up in our west coast ports.

The rest of the supply gets its start in the Middle East and is smuggled into Atlantic seaboard ports, either directly or via Canada, Mexico or Cuba.

Our agents do a fantastic job working underground in cooperation with the police of other countries involved in the traffic (with the exception of Red China, of course). They intercept tremendous quantities of the dope before it gets started or while it is en route. Last year, for example, they seized in excess of $25 million, a wholesale price that is multiplied many times over before it ends up poisoning the addict.

But once the dope does slip through, our men forget all about their lives and safety in the effort to track it down. It may take a day or it may take a year, as it did in one case assigned to an agent—I'll call him Edwards—in San Francisco. And every day of that year he lived with the knowledge that discovery meant violent execution in traditional Chinese tong fashion—a hatchet in the back.

BREAKING THE SAN FRANCISCO RING

We had learned that several tongs, both in California and Oregon, had gone into the dope racket. To get the evidence, Agent Edwards first set himself up as a dope trafficker, one of a hundred different roles assumed by a narcotics agent.

Then he moved into a section of San Francisco where many of the suspected tong members lived. He began to frequent the same bars and restaurants they did, becoming friendly with several of them. He played his part to such perfection that they accepted him for what he said he was. They decided to invite him to one of their clandestine tong meetings.

That was the moment for which he had risked his life for a full year. As he sat there, he heard full details of the complete smuggling operation which, he discovered, was headed by an above-suspicion San Francisco haberdasher. Result: Our seizure both of a rich supply of heroin, and records of how it had been smuggled into the United States.

Although our agents get a number of tips from professional informants, they also possess a sixth sense of sorts that tells them when they are speaking to a trafficker. That was what led another of our undercover men to a surprise catch in Turkey.

It all started when Agent Denis arrived in Ankara and took a taxi from the airport to his hotel. He still can't explain why, but the driver, who spoke English fluently, excited his suspicions. So he casually remarked that he was in town to look for good merchandise. "What kind?" the driver asked him. "Heroin or good morphine base," Agent Denis replied without pulling any punches. The driver said, "I have friends."

He did indeed, and showed up at Denis' apartment with one of them and 30 pounds of opium. Denis managed to keep them waiting outside until the Turkish narcotics police—with whom he had a prearranged signal—arrived. They promptly arrested the taxi driver, but the second man took off with Denis right behind him.

"As I gained on him he turned into an alley," Denis told me. "When I was right behind him, I hit him on the back of his neck with the palm of my hand. He fell, turned around, and got up on his feet. As he did, he pulled a knife from his belt. I drew my gun and fired one shot at his feet. He dropped the knife and raised his hands. I held him there until the Turkish police caught up with us."

My files are filled with these casual, self-effacing reports. Our men come to us from a wide variety of professions—we have lawyers and wrestlers—and are given intensive training. But their courage and devotion to duty can't be taught.

WHAT WE MUST DO TO WIN

However, we need more than our agents to win the war against the trafficker. We have to cure the addict who has already become infected. That's the only way we'll be completely successful.

It's axiomatic that 1 addict makes 4 more, and 4 will make 16, a frightening progression.

The communities not only must provide facilities similar to the two Federal narcotic hospitals—one in Lexington, Ky., and the other in Fort Worth, Tex.—but must make their use mandatory for the addict, not optional.

I know hospital space is at a premium, but perhaps some of the old CCC camps could be reactivated and used for the purpose.

Senator JAVITS, of New York, is sponsoring a bill that would have the Government pay half the cost in cases where the State or city hospitalizes the addict. If his bill is passed, it should serve as an incentive to those communities that say they haven't got the money to treat the addict.

The poppy, symbol of sleep and death, was cultivated as long ago as 5000 B.C. Its menace won't be eliminated overnight. Meantime, I am happy to be able to make this interim report to the American public: Our stronger law and strict enforcement have enabled us to make real progress in beating the traffic in dope.

New York Centennial Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the first regiment to march out of New York on the way to answer President Lincoln's proclamation for troops to protect Washington left the city 100 years ago today. New York units fought at Gettysburg, Bull Run, Chancellorsville, and in other famous battles of the Civil War. One of New York's most famous units was the 7th Regiment, organized in 1826 and the possessor of an enviable reputation as the New York State Militia long before the Civil War. As the crack National Guard regiment of the Nation, it was a natural training school for officers and during the Civil War 660 of its members served in the Union Army. On this memorable anniversary, New York is proud to honor this great regiment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD with my remarks the article by William J. Roehrenbeck entitled "The Day New York Went to War," which appeared in Today's Living, the Herald Tribune magazine, April 16.

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

THE DAY NEW YORK WENT TO WAR—THE SMART 7TH REGIMENT RALLIED THE UNION AS IT MARCHED OFF

(By William J. Roehrenbeck)

New York really went to war on April 19, 1861, when the 7th Regiment marched off to Washington. The previous week had been exciting, but slightly unreal. The news of the firing on Fort Sumter on Friday, the 12th, had come as a stunning and bewildering blow, and no one could quite believe that war had come at last. By Monday, New York, like all the other cities in the North, had worked itself into a frenzy of angry patriotism. President Lincoln's proclamation, calling for 75,000 troops to quell the insurrection and defend Washington, was applauded heartily. Recruiting offices were jammed. Opposition to the new Republican administration suddenly became highly unpopular, and irate patriots appeared at recalcitrant newspaper offices to demand that the flag be hung from the windows. Even Trinity Church, for the first time in history, flew the Stars and Stripes from the top of the steeple.

CURTAIN RAISERS ONLY

The 6th Massachusetts Regiment came through New York on the 18th, followed by the 8th Massachusetts on the morning of the 19th. The city gave them a rousing sendoff, but it was clearly holding back its real enthusiasm for the afternoon: Its own pet regiment, the New York 7th, was leaving then, and the whole town was ready to turn out and shout itself hoarse.

The 7th Regiment, New York State Militia, was in a class by itself among the volunteer military organizations of the day. There may have been one or two—in Richmond, or Philadelphia, or Boston—that could give it some competition. But none could drill quite so precisely; none could put on such a magnificent parade; none was quite so fashionable as the New York 7th. Over the years since its organization as a regiment in 1826 it had maintained high standards (despite the popular indifference to things military) and was now considered the model regiment of the Nation. Its members called themselves "The National Guards" in honor of Lafayette's famous Paris National Guard. Its ranks were filled with members of prominent New York families, who considered the regiment a most important social adjunct to New York City. Marshall Lefferts, its colonel, whose family had come over to New Netherlands in the 17th century, had already distinguished himself in the telegraph industry.

The 7th usually managed to acquire officers of the highest caliber. Like all other militia organizations, it elected its own officers. As the standards for admission to the regiment were high, it followed logically that the choice of officers was handled intelligently and that the results were excellent.

New York, for the most part, loved the 7th, and its reputation had spread throughout the East after a series of yearly excursions to other cities. Some citizens, however, had little use for it and called the militiamen "Old Greybacks." This was a result of the Astor Place riots in 1849, when a mob, goaded by American actor Edwin Forrest and sixth ward boss Isaiah Rynders, set on fire the theater in which English actor W. C. Macready (Forrest's rival) was performing. Astor Place was an area already ripe for riot, because slum clearance there threatened to dispossess and make homeless thousands of families. The 7th Regiment, called out to disperse the rioters, was forced to fire into them. Some citizens never forgot the incident and blamed the regiment.

When Sumter fell, the 7th was ready. As soon as Lincoln's proclamation was announced, Colonel Lefferts placed his regiment at the disposal of Gov. Edwin Morgan. The orders from the Governor came on April 17; the 7th was to proceed to Washington and report to the President. It was vitally important to get troops into Washington as quickly as possible, because Gen. Winfield Scott had only a few companies at his disposal to defend the city against a rebel attack.

Scott was familiar with the 7th Regiment. He didn't have much respect for volunteer troops generally, but he knew that the 7th was a well-equipped, well-disciplined unit, and he was eager to bring it to the Capital quickly. He probably realized also that the early mobilization of a regiment of such national prestige could have a deep influence on recruiting in other cities. Unlike most other militia units, the 7th was up to its full membership quota and didn't have to wait for recruits. In fact, hundreds were turned down during the 3 days preceding the 19th.

THE GRAND SENDOFF

At 3 p.m. on April 19 the regiment marched out of its armory at Tompkins Square and formed in Lafayette Place, filling the street all the way from Fourth to Eighth Streets. Meanwhile the city had gone mad with excitement. From Great Jones Street to Cortlands, Broadway was so packed with cheering citizens that the regiment could barely make its was through. Practically every building was draped with flags, and Maj. Robert Anderson, the Union commander at Fort Sumter, stood on a balcony at Prince Street and reviewed the troops.

At Broadway and Fulton Street was Matthew B. Brady, a former member of the regiment, who was destined to become the official photographer of the Civil War. He'd worked closely with Anthony & Scovill (the predecessors of Ansco) on the wet-plate process, and he was to spend considerable time photographing the 7th in Washington.

Eventually the troops managed to reach Cortlandt Street. Here they boarded the ferry to Jersey City, where again the whole town was out to greet them at the railroad terminal. It took 7 hours to get from Jersey City to Philadelphia because of the crowds that gathered along the railroad tracks. One of the men who marched with the regiment said later, "I think I didn't see a rod of ground without its man, from dusk till dawn, from the Hudson to the Delaware."

At Philadelphia they ran into two problems. First, it was impossible to go on by train to Washington. The 6th Massachusetts had been attacked by a mob on its way through Baltimore, and by now all the railroad bridges between Havre de Grace and Baltimore had been torn up by secessionists. Some other way was needed to reach Washington.

The second problem was less serious, but more annoying. Benjamin Butler, commanding general of the Massachusetts troops, was in Philadelphia, and he immediately started issuing orders to the New York 7th. Lefferts, whose regiment hadn't yet been mustered into Federal service, had no intention of letting New York troops be commanded by a Massachusetts brigadier whose commission was only a few days old—and questionably acquired at that. Butler wanted the 7th to move with the 8th Massachusetts to Perryville and there board a railroad ferry that would take them to Annapolis, thus bypassing Baltimore. Lefferts, who realized that the ferry was barely large enough to hold one regiment, refused. Issuing a draft on his own civilian firm, he chartered an old coastal steamer—the S.S. *Boston*—to take them down Delaware Bay and around the capes up to Annapolis. The *Boston* was much too small for the job, but the regiment was able to squeeze aboard, and they set sail from Philadelphia at 4:20 p.m. on Saturday, the 20th.

At dawn on Monday they reached Annapolis harbor. There they found the 8th Massachusetts crowded into the ferry boat *Maryland*, aground on a mud bank. Lefferts issued orders for the *Boston* to try towing her off, but the attempt was in vain. The 7th then landed in Annapolis, over the protests of the mayor and the governor of Maryland, and the 8th Massachusetts was taken ashore later by using the *Boston* as a landing vessel.

The problem now was how to get to Washington. Lefferts would need provisions and wagons to march across the hostile territory beyond Annapolis. These were impossible to obtain. By this time it had become evident that Annapolis was to become the key transportation center in the movement of troops from the North to Washington; the route through Baltimore was disrupted, and the rebels would probably be able to command the Potomac. The branch railroad between Annapolis and Annapolis Junction suddenly became highly important. It was now torn up, so it would have to be repaired. Once this line of communication was established, troops could be moved easily, as the railroad from the junction to Washington was in Union hands.

After much wrangling, Butler and Lefferts finally agreed that the New York and Massachusetts troops should cooperate in the attempt. Thus, at 2 a.m. on Wednesday, April 24, the advance guard of the regiment moved out through Annapolis for the 16-mile march to the junction. The next 24 hours proved to be a rugged experience for a group of week-old civilian soldiers. They alternately marched, replaced damaged rails, repaired rolling stock, rebuilt bridges, and served as flank guards throughout the next day and night. But they stuck to the job, and at 3 a.m. on Thursday they reached Annapolis Junction, where most of them fell into an exhausted sleep.

During all this time Washington was nervous and close to panic. It was now cut off completely from communications with the North. Everyone expected the rebel troops to appear momentarily and attack the Capital. And Scott had almost nothing to stop them with—just a few companies of regulars and the unreliable District militia. Some small Pennsylvania detachments and the battered 6th Massachusetts had come in, but this was hardly the relief of Washington. The 7th was needed badly, and at the moment of deepest gloom they arrived—12 noon on April 25. At the railroad depot they brushed off some of the Maryland mud from their natty gray uniforms, whitened their crossbelts, and paraded magnificently up Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House. The kid-glove regiment had been ordered to report to the President, and report they did—in style. Washington was relieved, and from that point on to the end of the war it was seldom in danger.

The rest of the 7th's term of service was anticlimactic. It was quartered in the Capitol Building for a few days, went into camp on Meridian Hill out on Washington's 14th Street, participated in the first crossing of Union troops into nearby Virginia, and helped build Fort Runyon on the other side of the Potomac. After 45 days of service the men were discharged with the praises of all Washington and New York ringing in their ears.

Teaching Credential Restored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Jose Mercury, Apr. 7, 1961]

STATE BOARD ORDERS RENEWAL—ERB PICKS UP HIS CREDENTIALS, TEACHING CREDENTIAL RESTORED

(By Harry Farrell, staff political writer)

SACRAMENTO.—Acting unanimously, the State board of education Thursday ordered immediate renewal of the teaching credential of former Camden High School driving instructor Tillman Erb.

The action followed by 1 day the filing of an attorney general's opinion that the credential could not be withheld because Erb invoked the fifth amendment last May before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Similar action was taken in the comparable case of John W. Moss, former San Francisco City College teacher.

Immediately after the board's action, Erb stopped at the State department of education office and picked up the credential which restores his right to teach in the California public school system.

He said he has prospects of another bay area teaching job. Since his employment at Camden ended last year, he has been selling furniture.

The restoration of the credential, which had lapsed last June, does not signal Erb's reemployment by the Campbell Union High School District. Officials of the district have stated he was notified before his Un-American Activities testimony that he was not to be rehired for the current school year. He had not achieved tenure status.

Board of education member Raymond Daba of Atherton, who had delayed restoration of the credential a day in order to read Atty. Gen. Stanley Mosk's 30-page opinion, said Thursday he agreed with conclusions.

The renewal of Erb's right to teach reversed a recommendation made last December by State Hearing Officer Harold Furst, who held that the teacher's refusal to answer the committee's questions constituted unprofessional conduct.

Daba emphasized that nowhere, in the proceedings against Erb's credential, had the State introduced evidence questioning Erb's loyalty, character, or teaching ability.

Neither had the State asserted that he belonged to any subversive movement. The action was based, Daba said, only on Erb's refusal to answer the House committee's questions on possible Communist affiliation.

When he was before the committee in San Francisco, Erb offered to answer questions about himself if excused from informing on others, but the deal was rejected by the committee.

In his opinion Mosk said action against Erb's credential was improper without a hearing and a definite finding by his local school board that his conduct was unprofessional. No such finding was made.

Further Mosk said the State board of education itself, as opposed to the local board, could not make such a determination.

Judge C. W. Webb of Elgin, Tex., Was a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, thousands of Texans were recently saddened by the death of Judge C. W. Webb of the town of Elgin, Bastrop County, which is located near Austin.

It was my privilege and pleasure to know Judge Webb for many years. He practiced law in partnership with his wife and his son Jack, both of whom are capable lawyers. His confidence, friendship and support have been one of my greatest treasures of public life for they were invaluable to me in both defeat and victory. His uniformly encouraging word and philosophy earned him the sobriquet of "the Abraham Lincoln of central Texas."

Columnist Anita Brewer, one of Texas' top-ranking newspaper writers, in her well-known column "Behind the Byline," wrote an exceptionally fine article concerning Judge Webb. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column entitled "Behind the Byline," by Anita Brewer, from the January 11, 1961, Austin Statesman.

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

[From the Austin Statesman, Jan. 11, 1961]

BEHIND THE BYLINE

(By Anita Brewer)

When Judge C. W. Webb, of Elkin, died last week, it was a front page story. The well-known and well-beloved man's death was important news.

But to Mrs. Mourine Amis, longtime friend of Judge and Mrs. Webb, the bare facts of his life—that he was dean of Bastrop County lawyers, that he had been a member of the school board, that he had participated in civic and church activities—did not reflect the essence of this great man, the personality that had been a guide and inspiration to many.

So Mrs. Amis, with her perceptive understanding, thought of the things amusing and inspirational which were so endearing about Judge Webb.

The judge was born with club feet, but he was never heard to complain nor did he consider himself handicapped.

He had never traveled very far from home, but he took great pride in having visited every county in Texas.

Judge Webb was a lifelong Democrat. He believed in party loyalty and could abide no party splinters to weaken the fiber of the organization. He considered himself a conservative liberal.

For 37 years he taught the John Wesley-C. W. Webb Bible Class at the First Methodist Church in Elgin. His Sunday sermonettes helped others to understand that God doesn't dwell just in a small box of a church, but that the Master is everywhere, every day.

Judge Webb for years was president of Cotton Stocking Row. It was the club members' responsibility to do as little work around the house as possible. One morning a report reached the president that a certain member was helping his wife wash. A committee was dispatched at once to check on this rumor. The committee found the wife drawing water and building a fire around the pot * * * her husband was still in bed. His membership in Cotton Stocking Row was intact.

He loved a good domino game and was one of the last of the great domino players and would brook no nonsense from the opposition.

Sunday at the Webbs was a memorable experience. After Sunday School and church, family and friends gathered around the large table. During World War II many lonesome, homesick soldiers stationed at Camp Swift shared the warm hospitality of the Webbs.

Judge Webb was an inveterate reader * * * the Bible, Shakespeare, Mark Twain, and the Austin American. Until just a few weeks ago he would ask for the daily paper and a cigar.

"May it please the highest court," asks Mrs. Amis, "when this kindly soul approaches the throne of grace, to wit * * * 'that he loved mercy, believed in and practiced justice, and walked humbly with his God' all of his days."

Needed: A Drive To Lower Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there have been a number of little noticed comments in the press by leading Government figures urging a drive to lower prices. I think this is a terrific idea.

There is no question that hard work, energetic sales promotion, and diligent attention to cost cutting by individual firms and store owners would permit many prices in our economy to be lowered. Assuming that lower prices would stimulate sales, and I truly believe that they would, a decrease in prices would benefit consumers materially and would help our economy move faster.

Recent information to the fact that President Kennedy is going to appoint a Consumers Counsel led Mr. Joseph R. Slevin, national economics editor for the Herald Tribune, to urge that such a counsel be the administration's major force in launching what he terms "a drive for lower prices." The editors of a very influential upstate newspaper, the Warrensburg News, seized upon Mr. Slevin's suggestion and recently ran a hardhitting editorial calling for a campaign on price reduction. Such a campaign to lower prices would not be to the detriment or disadvantage of any group or individuals in our economy. Quite the contrary, such a campaign, spearheaded by the White House or by vigorous civic groups, would help step up our economy. It would assist our economy and our Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the article by Mr. Slevin and the above referred to editorial from the Warrensburg News. I also ask unanimous consent to include an article by the distinguished New York Times economic reporter, Mr. Richard E. Mooney, dealing with a recent statement by Federal Reserve Board Chairman, William McChesney Martin, in which he too calls for a concerted effort to lower prices as a means of "solving the Nation's economic problem."

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 2, 1961]

U.S. ECONOMIC FRONT—KEY ROLE TO BE PLAYED BY CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy is planning to appoint a special "consumers' counsel" and there will be more than one big job for the new adviser to do.

Naming a consumer spokesman will fulfill a campaign pledge that Mr. Kennedy made to a group of Bronx housewives just before election day. The job is being patterned after a post that Queensboro Community College Professor Persia Campbell held under former New York Governor Averell Harriman.

Many economists believe the most important immediate contribution a consumer's counsel could make would be to persuade the administration to launch a drive for lower prices. They argue that a price-cut campaign is the main ingredient that is missing from the administration's program to spark a vigorous business upturn.

There is no better way to spur consumer buying than to chop prices but the official barometers show that prices have been holding firm during the recession.

PRICE CUTS HELP ALL

Price reductions increase buying power and the happy thing is that they increase everyone's buying power—from Caroline Kennedy's to older workers living on social security.

Organized labor says the best way to boost buying power is to raise wages but that helps only one group of consumers.

Stockholders say the best solution is to increase dividends but that suffers from the same special interest limitations as a wage boost.

The administration is pressing for lower prices on one front. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy is launching a number of anti-price-fixing suits in local communities.

But there is no concerted administration effort to push down prices.

There's nothing, for example, that matches the vigorous battle that the President has been waging to drive down long-term interest rates—the price of money. Mr. Kennedy believes that sticky money prices are a threat to recovery but he hasn't displayed equal concern about the prices of shoes, shirts, automobiles, refrigerators, and other merchandise.

Yet the President and his advisers are making a strenuous attempt to stimulate production by boosting buying demands.

They are trying to supply a large additional amount of demand by adding to Government spending.

ACTION IN CONGRESS

Congress has approved a $1 billion emergency unemployment compensation bill and the Senate and the House have passed different versions of a measure for helping depressed areas.

Mr. Kennedy is urging the lawmakers to enact social security, education, defense, and other measures that are designed to sluice more Federal money into the economy and he has ordered a speedup in Government procurement.

The President has endorsed yet another Government buying power stimulant in principle by promising that he will consider an antirecession tax cut next month if business activity fails to show signs of improving.

The classical method of stimulating demand and of increasing buying power is to cut prices. Former President Eisenhower suggested last January in his final economic report that lower prices would be helpful but the Kennedy administration hasn't chosen to bring the price weapon into play.

[From the New York Times]

HEAD OF RESERVE URGES PRICE CUTS TO RELIEVE SLUMP

(By Richard E. Mooney)

WASHINGTON, April 11.—The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board made a strong appeal today for price reductions as a means of solving the Nation's economic problems.

"Throughout our country, we must not only increase our productivity but also pass some of the gains on to the consumer in the form of lower prices, rather than having all of it go exclusively to labor in higher wages or to management in higher profits," he said.

The Chairman, William McC. Martin, Jr., said that price cuts could stimulate buying demand that would "provide more jobs for those who are now unemployed, keep the economy moving to higher levels, and [provide] still greater job opportunities in the future."

SOME GAINS REPORTED

The Labor Department reported, meanwhile, a modest increase in the factory workweek and factory pay for March.

Mr. Martin spoke at the annual meeting of the Association of Reserve City Bankers at Boca Raton, Fla. Copies of his talk were made available here.

It was not the first time that a voice from Washington had been raised in favor of price cuts. It is a point that gets lost, however, in the debates most often heard here, over what the Government should or should not do. In the form presented, it is simply an exhortation. Neither Mr. Martin nor the Kennedy administration advocates price or wage controls.

[From the Warrensburg (N.Y.) News]

GOP MISSING THE BOAT ON PRICE REDUCTIONS

Joseph R. Slevin, national economics editor of the New York Herald Tribune, argues, as we do, for a national campaign to reduce prices. Noting that President Kennedy is planning to appoint a special consumers' counsel, he comments that "many economists believe the most important immediate contribution a consumers' counsel could make would be to persuade the administration to launch a drive for lower prices. They argue that a price-cut campaign is the main ingredient that campaign is the main ingredient that's missing from the administration's program to spark a vigorous upturn."

There is, he says, "no concerted effort to push down prices."

Republican Members of the Senate and the House are missing the boat when they fail to say on the floor that Mr. Slevin says so cogently here and what we said in our issue of March 16.

Progress in Building Complete Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a very interesting and timely article concerning the problems of modern-day transportation which article was written by Mr. Morris Forgash, president of the United States Freight Co., and who is a renowned expert in the field of transportation. Mr. Forgash recently addressed the Syracuse Transportation Conference at Syracuse University on April 10, 1961. Under permission to extend my remarks I include the very informative article written by Mr. Forgash at this conference:

PROGRESS IN BUILDING COMPLETE TRANSPORTATION

(Remarks by Morris Forgash, president, U.S. Freight Co., at the Syracuse Transportation Conference, Syracuse University, April 10, 1961)

It is a pleasure and an honor for me to participate in this transportation conference which has been arranged as a preliminary to the 13th annual Salzberg Memorial Lecture. The brilliant and outstanding men who have consistently appeared on this program in the past have made this annual event a challenging and a noteworthy affair.

The spotlight is on the railroads today, but the fact that you have on the program such people as Jim Lyne, Dr. Williams, and me, is proof that the subject is not to be considered in a vacuum of self-analysis. Railroads are a very vital element of our national life, and it behooves us to candidly examine their current posture and critically analyze the direction in which they are going, but we must constantly keep in mind that our real objective is a strong transportation system, not merely a healthy railroad industry.

The significance of transportation to the culture, prosperity, and progress of people is nowhere better illustrated than here in Syracuse. The history of Syracuse, which can be traced back more than 300 years, is a veritable saga of American transportation. From Indian village to trading post—from giant salt-producing center to beautiful metropolis—the destiny of Syracuse has been shaped by transportation—Indian travois and packhorse, canalboat, and road wagon, railroad, motortruck, and airplane.

Syracuse is fortunately situated, transportationwise, but enterprise, not fortune, directs the course of events in transportation and it is a curious fact that among the many modes of transport which serve Syracuse today the coordination and means of interchange are not much better than existed between road and canal in the days when freight was transferred where Clinton Square now stands. True, we are at last beginning to make progress in the direction of complete transportation, but it has been a slow and painful process because of the resistance of apathy, atrophied thinking, and entrenched ideas.

The decade of the 1960's, which we have set within the scope of our sights for this conference, is the 14th decade of American railroading. In the last month of the year

1830, "The Best Friend of Charleston," pride of the South Carolina Railroad, pulled the first train of cars ever drawn by a steam locomotive upon a track on the American continent. In the next several decades railroads literally mushroomed over the American landscape, and each road was built to its own specifications, with no thought of connection or completenes or interchange. The width of track ranged from 2 feet on the Brighton and Harrison to 6 feet on the Erie. The running and working parts of cars were equally individualistic.

Circumstances ultimately forced standardization of equipment and completeness of service among the various railroad systems, just as coordination and standardization will be forced upon our transportation systems today. The Civil War showed us the folly of having three widths of track between Chicago and New York. After many years of painful and costly process, we came to standard tracks and cars, and worked out the mechanics of interchange on the rail lines. We have been talking now for a long time about coordination and standardization of the 20th-century transportation plant, and we cannot afford to wait for a war to make up our minds that we must do something about it.

For more than half a century the railroad industry functioned without Federal regulation. In the words of the distinguished first Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Thomas M. Cooley, the railroads "were thus enabled to determine a great measure what rules should govern the transportation of persons and property; rules which intimately concerned the commercial, industrial, and social life of the people."

Then, on February 4, 1887—74 years ago—the act to regulate commerce was approved. The first report of the ICC is an interesting document. There were then an estimated 1,200 railroads, with about 138,000 miles of track. One hundred and eight railroads, operating more than 11,000 miles, were in receivership. The railroads were on the verge of destroying themselves, because they had lost the public confidence, largely because of widespread rebates, drawbacks, and special rates.

Nevertheless, it was not the purpose of the act to restrain or destroy competition. In their first report to Congress, the Commissioners, then five in number, said: "A study of the act to regulate commerce has satisfied the members of the Commission that it was intended in its passage to preserve for the people the benefits of competition as between the several transportation lines of the country." The Commissioners further said—and this is particularly important in the light of recent recommendations that have been urged upon Congress:

"It might possibly be within the competency of legislative power to prescribe for the several interstate railroads equal mileage rates for the whole country; but this, if endorsed, would put an end to competition as a factor in making rates, and to a very large extent deprive the great business centers of the country of their several natural advantages, and also of the benefit of expenditures made by them in creating for themselves new channels of trade."

That interpretation of the intent and meaning of the act has prevailed for three quarters of a century. It was, in effect, restated by Congress in the Transportation Act of 1958. It is still sound, and I am of the opinion that adherence to those first principles will result in rejection of recent recommendations for a statutory floor under competitive rates, and for severe restrictions on fourth section relief, as well as any other efforts to reverse what Congress did in 1958.

Moving down the corridor of time from the 1st to the 45th Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, we find the Commission again commenting about competition—this time a new and different kind of competition—that of the highway hauler whose superiority for certain tasks had been demonstrated by the First World War. In that report, filed in 1931, the Commission said that the railroads "have so many and so great inherent advantages of economy, particularly in the case of the longer hauls and the heavier traffic, that we cannot believe that they will not be able to withstand the competition of the motor trucks."

But, said the Commission, the "service must be provided which the shippers demand and require" and "it is probable that motor service may with advantage be used to supplement or to coordinate with the rail service." Means of making the necessary changes in service, such as "containers, demountable truck bodies, so-called railwagons, and changes in car types" were already appearing on the scene, the Commission pointed out. Finally, the Commission said that the old rate theories "often open a door to effective competition which might well be closed."

It is one of the inexplicable paradoxes of history that in the identical report in which the Commission made these wise and foresighted observations it referred to its decision in the Container case, rendered that same year, which rejected new pricing techniques for this new service, prescribed rates on the old classication basis, and dried up the very service which the Commission advocated for a period of almost 30 years.

When the Commission, in 1931, said that the railroads had many great inherent advantages in the longer hauls, and suggested that motor service might well be used to "supplement or coordinate" with such rail service, it had freshly concluded the most comprehensive investigation of motor service ever undertaken. The decision in this case, docket 18300, rendered in 1928, recommended Federal regulation of motor carriers. At that time the average length of haul of motortruck service ranged from about 20 to about 100 miles, depending on the territory involved. One large truck operator estimated, for the record, that the truckman's advantage over rail in ton-mile cost stopped at a point between 50 and 60 miles.

The kind of coordination the Commission then envisioned and advocated is the only kind that has any meaning—the joining of end-to-end services of differing modes of carriage so that each supplements and complements the other. Each mode must perform within the orbit dictated by its economic and services advantages. I think you will agree with me that this is a most descriptive and concise definition of the term "complete transportation."

It would not have been so formidable a task, back in 1931, to have worked out a plan of coordinated rail and motor service, given men in transportation with the will and the foresight to do so. Motor operations as they then existed were fully within the scope of their economic utility and ideally suited to complement rail service. But we let the golden opportunity pass for lack of initiative and imagination, and as motor service grew and lengthened out to be competitive with the rails for all distances, any idea of effective coordination became vastly more difficult to implement.

However, the picture has not changed to anything like the degree the public has been led to believe. We have long distance trucking, it is true, but it accounts for only a very small portion of the total service. The average motor common carrier haul per ton in 1959 was 273 miles. Although I have no official figures on the subject, I am confident that at least 90 percent of all intercity motor carrier movements in this country are for distances less than 500 miles.

Coordination or complete transportation based on the irrefutable economic facts that the railroads still are the most efficient medium for moving large quantities of freight over long distances, and that the trucks excel in the shorter hauls, can even now be achieved. In fact, it is being achieved on an increasing scale through the newer forms of piggybacking. But those who fear coordination of a type that will reflect the true economic advantages of the respective participants in any given joint haul have raised such a hue and cry that, to some who are not acquainted with the facts, the picture may seem to be one of contrived confusion.

Controversy and confusion are not limited to the area of piggybacking. The railroad industry, which has received a constantly declining share of the total traffic of the country over a period of 25 years or more—which has seen its employment cut exactly in half in just 30 years—stands accused of driving domestic water carriage to the wall, and of engaging in predatory and unfair raids on the traffic of motor carriers. It is time to examine the facts.

DO WE HAVE MORE SOLUTIONS THAN PROBLEMS IN TRANSPORTATION?

What is the problem in transportation? Certainly we won't find any solutions until we define the problem. We have a competitive struggle, yes, but competition is the essence of free enterprise in a democracy. If we ever eliminate competition we will destroy initiative. Could it be that we have mistaken competititve jockeying and jostling for more basic problems?

Let me take just a moment to recount how we came to be where we are today—using broad brush strokes. This is necessary for proper perspective and direction. In the 1930's competition of a lusty young motor carrier industry had a depressing effect on the railroad rate structure. Then came World War II which strained the resources of all carriers, and virtually destroyed intercoastal and coastwise shipping.

It is a monumental distortion of historical fact to charge either the railroads or the ICC with responsibility for the virtual disappearance of American coastal shipping. When the Government took over many vessels in this trade during World War II the industry was already sick. In the 10-year period immediately preceding the war the industry lost $8 million. The fleet of vessels was literally decimated by wartime activities. Many of the lines never resumed operations after the war. Those that did were beset by spiraling labor costs, incessant strikes, and astronomically mounting replacement and operating costs. Mr. Ralph E. Casey, president, American Merchant Marine Institute, summed the matter up very well in an address delivered in July 1959, before the annual convention of the International Longshoremen's Association at Miami Beach, when he said:

"You know, as well as I, that our once flourishing domestic trades are now dead. It is often said that this is the result of unfair treatment by the Interstate Commerce Commission. That may have played a part, but when they tell me it costs more to load a ship in New York and unload it in San Francisco than it does to bring it 5,000 miles around three coasts, including the transit of the Panama Canal, I question whether the Government is primarily to blame."

We should recognize the truth of what Mr. Casey said and should not require the competitors of the ship lines to subsidize them by holding an umbrella over their rates.

Now the railroads have ultimately heeded the repeated and long-continued admonitions of the regulatory agency and the Congress and are embarking on a vigorous pro-

gram of self-help. They have introduced not only new pricing techniques but new and improved services based on technological advancements and new ideas. They are reexamining their competitive posture up and down the line in an effort to recapture the traffic which they once indisputably enjoyed but which they lost to other modes of carriage.

The railroads were told to do these things as long ago as 1931 in the Commission's report to which I earlier referred. They were admonished by the Commission in some of the decisions in the ex parte rate cases to employ different ratemaking techniques. In its report in Ex parte No. 206, decided in 1957, the Commission told the railroads that "the time had probably come when consideration should be given to ways of increasing rates other than by means of horizontal increases." Congress bluntly told the railroads to improve their services and modernize their rate structure when it enacted the Transportation Act of 1958, and it made certain, by enacting section 15a(3), that in doing so they would not be required to hold a rate umbrella over their competitors. But when the railroads at last embarked on a determined program to arrest their declining position in the transportation picture the anguished cries of their competitors were heard across the land.

Again I say, "What is the problem?" Competition took traffic which the railroads once handled and which they perhaps thought, with a trace of complacency, they would always have. Is the problem now to prevent the railroads, by artificial barriers, from getting some of it back if they can do so through the exercise of their inherent advantages and a little initiative? I do not think so.

Congress thoroughly examined all facets of the transportation picture just 2 years ago. The responsible Senate committee heard evidence which now fills 2,300 printed pages in 4 volumes. The corresponding House committee held thorough but less exhaustive hearings. Weighing all the facts, the committees concluded and the Congress agreed, that the railroad industry was in need of immediate help in several directions.

Among the reasons for the plight of the railroads, the Senate committee found, were Government assistance to their competitors and overregulation of the railroads. But by all odds the most significant finding was that the railroads had not consistently been permitted to assert their inherent advantages in the making of rates. To correct that situation section 15a(3) was enacted.

The purpose of section 15a(3), as plainly stated in the Senate committee report on the 1958 act, was "to encourage competition in transportation." But the statement is insistently made, and repeated again and again: "Yes, Congress intended to insure greater freedom in ratemaking, but it did not intend to permit unfair or destructive competition." The statement is perfectly true, but what is it intended to prove? We must all agree that unfair and destructive competition is prohibited by the law. The Transportation Act of 1958 did not create the prohibition—it merely restated a provision of existing law. Is the repeated statement of the proposition now intended to imply that the ICC is ignoring or misconstruing a fundamental precept of the law, and, if so, that the courts will sustain the Commission in perpetrating unlawfulness? That would be a terrible indictment of our administrators and judges. Every decision on a controverted issue leaves a disgruntled litigant, and each of the basic modes of carriage has been disappointed with one or another of the Commission's decisions under section 15a(3), but the courts, not Congress, are where the issues should be reviewed.

The decisional process with regard to such factual situations as have arisen so far under section 15a(3) has not yet run its course, but there are insistent demands that the section be changed to fit this or that preconceived idea of what the final decisions ought to be. I suggest that Congress and the people knew very well what the policy of section 15a(3) was when it was enacted. The words of the statute are plain. They are reinforced by even plainer language in the committee reports. Only the Interstate Commerce Commission and the courts are vested with the legal authority to apply the language of the law to stated factual situations. We do not write our laws in sand, nor should we erase them with hysteria.

However well intended, I strongly believe that efforts to change the policy laid down by the Transportation Act of 1958 at this time are both premature and unwise. You are familiar with some of the specific proposals for statutory change. The Doyle report would place a statutory floor under competitive rates, based on a statistical formula, and establish "umbrella type" ratemaking by force of statute. S. 1197 would add a great many impossible complicating factors to the presently plain and simple provisions of section 15a(3), and hence would no doubt also result in statutory umbrella ratemaking.

These proposals would take us in exactly the opposite direction from the course we so carefully charted in 1958. In fact, they would reverse a policy to which, except for an unfortunate experience with the so-called recapture clause of 1920, we have adhered through the entire history of regulation—careful avoidance of ratemaking by legislative fiat. If we substitute statutory for regulatory ratemaking in the smallest area, it could spread dangerously and rapidly throughout all regulatory law.

Such proposals do not take account of the realities of today nor the potentialities of the future. If they were intended, for example, to aid the motor carriers someone has failed to calculate rightly. They could destroy the motor carrier industry. Ratemaking is not an exact science—it no longer follows a pattern—it reflects the terrific imbalance of traffic, particularly of manufactured products and products of the farm and the forest. The common carrier rate structure has been eroded by the cumulative effect of the contract carrier, the "gypsy" trucker, the "gray area" operator. Yet, we are told that we must be careful not to destroy traditional patterns of ratemaking—that we must protect the integrity of the rate structure. How can you destroy something that no longer exists?

To fill their vehicles and prevent costly empty movement—to meet the irresponsible rates of the unregulated carriers—to fulfill the demands of products that cannot possibly bear their full share of the transportation burden, the carriers make vast numbers of rates that will not meet any formula based on costs.

Statement No. 4-60, released by the ICC in September 1960 lists 80 commodities moving in rail carload service which do not defray out-of-pocket costs. A similar study would undoubtedly show a larger number moving at submarginal rates in motor service. We are not going to change the factors that cause these commodities to move at below-cost rates: What are we going to do—force the common carriers to give up the traffic, or give the first common carrier in the field squatters' rights by refusing to let anyone else meet his rates? I repeat that, whatever alternative we choose, the motor carrier industry may well be the first victim of any scheme of statutory ratemaking or inflexible rate floors. I am, personally, having a great deal of difficulty in visualizing or understanding how any standard of ratemaking in the form of legislative directives to the regulatory agencies can make due provision for these extenuating circumstances and conditions that a carrier encounters almost daily. I have extreme doubt that anyone can produce the appropriate legislative language free of confusion and devastating ambiguity.

Once we embark upon ratemaking by legislative fiat we will have put our feet upon a road that will lead to the ultimate stifling of initiative and stultification of progress. I respectfully commend these observations to the careful consideration of our lawmakers and all others who have a responsibility in the matter.

From what I have said so far you may have gained the impression that I am talking about roadblocks rather than progress in the building of complete transportation. What I have been trying to do is to clear away some of the confusion so as to arrive at a clear point of departure. And I will ask your indulgence for one more detour because it is important that we understand the factors bearing on the subject if we are to understand the subject itself.

GOOD ADMINISTRATION OF TRANSPORTATION LAW REQUIRES GOOD MEN—SOME WAYS TO SECURE AND KEEP THEM

Since 1940 the national transportation policy of the United States as applied to domestic surface carriers has been directed to three ends—the developing, coordinating, and preserving of a national transportation system, by various means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce and defense of the Nation. We have entrusted the implementation of that policy to 11 men. Unfortunately, we could not vest them with magic wands by which to discharge their fateful task. Sometimes I am afraid we have not vested them with even the least of their due—our complete confidence. Lately I have been more apprehensive on that score.

As I said a little earlier, it has become a popular pastime to make the Commission a scapegoat for everything that is conceived to be wrong in transportation. We should always remember that so long as we adhere to our established principles of Government we must depend on these men who sit on the Commission to interpret and enforce the law, and if we so impair the standing of the agency as to make it impossible any longer to obtain the services of dedicated men of talent and integrity, we will have destroyed one of our greatest legacies. We will have sold our birthright for a mess of pottage. Maybe it has only an indirect bearing on my subject matter, but I ask you to consider for a few moments some matters relating to the ICC that I consider to be of vital importance.

I am reminded that the then Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, addressing a meeting of the Association of ICC Practitioners in 1930, said:

"I suppose that no agency of Government has more complicated problems than those which confront the Interstate Commerce Commission, and no intelligent student can fail to realize that the success of this endeavor in a sphere of the highest importance is to a very great extent the measure of our capacity for self-government."

Viewed in that light, to insure the success of the Interstate Commerce Commission in its mission becomes a personal and a demanding obligation of every citizen.

We have been extremely fortunate in the caliber of men who have been attracted to service on the Interstate Commerce Commission throughout its long history. It was Eastman who gave us his famous 12-point Primer on Administrative Tribunals just a few weeks before he died in 1944. The sixth

point has been more quoted than any other. It reads:

"The statutes which the tribunal administer should be well, simply, and carefully framed, but the personnel which does the administering is more important than the wording of the statute. *Good men can produce better results with a poor law than poor men can produce with a good law.*"

What has attracted and held the great men who have made careers of service on the ICC? There is an indefinable spark which kindles in men a desire for unselfish public service—we see it in the teaching profession, in the sciences, and in Government. Over and beyond that, however, is the fact that the high public esteem in which the ICC has traditionally been held has invested membership on the Commission with an aura of dignity like that surrounding the high courts, the National Legislature and the Cabinet posts. If that standing and dignity are lost, a great deal of the incentive to men of stature and dedication will disappear.

In view of the absolutely incalculable importance of the proper administration of our transportation laws, we should, instead of maligning and belaboring the Commission, immediately take steps to strengthen it—give it adequate and competent personnel—put it on a healthy financial diet—and insure its ability to continue to attract men of the highest order of intelligence and integrity. What steps can we take?

A good place to start is with the Commission's budget. James M. Landis recently said that "economic rigor, if not parsimony" has characterized the Budget Bureau's attitude towards the agencies for almost a decade. In the last couple of years a little more generosity has been evidenced, but still the budget of the ICC is ridiculously low considering the importance of its mission. Twenty million dollars to regulate an industry that bills us twenty billion a year for its services. Twenty-three hundred people to man an agency that employed twenty-six hundred in 1940. And since 1940 the Commission has acquired jurisdiction over two new agencies of transport—three parts have been added to the act—we have acquired two new States and added numerous new laws to the statutes which the Commission administers.

If the Commission, accustomed to a starvation diet for these many years, is too modest to ask for what it needs in the way of budget and staff, management consultants can be hired to advise Congress. Delays in the functioning of the administrative processes can cost the carriers and the public in a matter of days what we pay to run the ICC a whole year. Is that the way to run any business—or a Government agency?

We get back, of course, to the fact that that the essential ingredient of good administration is good administrators, and administrators are people—people with families and responsibilities. We should insure them of more adequate compensation and security. No board of directors of any corporation in America or the world makes more important or far-reaching decisions than the 11 members of the Interstate Commerce Commission. To attract the kind of men that you and I want on the Interstate Commerce Commission I suggest that a salary of $30,000 a year be provided. And with adequate salary should go a reasonable allowance to reimburse agency members for expenses necessarily incurred as an incidence of their position.

Tenure of office is more important than salary to men who value their independence. Until comparatively recent times the vast majority of appointees to the Commission quite evidently accepted the post as a career, and those who distinguished themselves, as a surprising number did, were insured of reappointment regardless of the political party in office. Aitchison set a record of service with 34 years and 9 months—then came Balthasar Meyer with 28 years, Eastman and Clements with 25, Mahaffie with 24, and a long list with 15 to 20 years of service. In contrast, all of the present members of the ICC have been appointed since 1953.

This is not something which reflects unfavorably on the current members of the Commission or on the administration, past or present, but it is a symptom which ought to be arrested before it becomes a chronic condition. How can we have any continuity of policy or attract men who seek public service as a calling, and not a stepping stone, unless we insure them a tenure of office that will permit them to plan ahead and relieve them of tension and pressures? We should provide a statutory term of office for members of the regulatory agencies of 10 years, and allow for reappointment up to the age of 65. Retirement pay should be adequate to insure that no ex-Commissioner would have to go out in industry and seek a job.

We are well aware of the constant pressures to which our agency members are subjected. Why not give them a little insulation against these forces by providing them with a tenure that will extend through two presidential terms and into a third?

Precedent is one of the most important facets of our system of jurisprudence. It gives stability to the law and inspires confidence in the people that they can proceed in a given manner without fear of reprisal. Continuity of service helps to insure stability of policy. One other way to insure such continuity and stability is to follow a custom that seems to have fallen into disuse in recent years of elevating career men to Commission membership when career men of stature and ability prove themselves worthy of such appointment.

Perhaps you may think I have unduly emphasized this point, but it is one of the most important issues in transportation today. Crisis has been developing around our independent agencies and, as Chief Justice Hughes said long ago, this is an area so vital to our well-being that its success will measure our capacity for self-government. I have been an advocate of a Department of Transportation for promotional activities and I am convinced that we will ultimately come to that, but the problem of the regulatory agencies is an entirely separate matter. They do not belong in an executive department. I have suggested three immediate steps that we should press for, and we can muster the strength to put them through if we really try. They are:

1. Sharply increase the budget of the ICC with authority and direction to hire the necessary personnel at all levels to get the job done, whether in safety, enforcement, or the decisional process.

2. Increase the salaries of the members of the Commission, and provide them with reasonable allowance and adequate retirement. I would also increase the salaries of the top-level career employees.

3. Provide for statutory tenure of 10 years, with authority to reappoint up to retirement age.

This may not be the complete answer to the problems revolving around our agencies which have given rise to tons of studies and reports in recent years, but it is something concrete. It is a good starting point.

CONTAINERIZATION, STANDARDIZATION AND SIMPLIFIED PRICING—KEYS TO COMPLETE TRANSPORTATION

I can think of no beter way to indicate to you why I have spent so much time leading up to what I shall make a very brief report on progress in building complete transportation—which boils down to progress in containerization and piggybacking—than to quote from the January 1961 issue of Fleet Owner, as follows:

"Month by month piggyback takes on more weight and size than a razorback hog in Arkansas. This consistent growth over the past 2 or 3 years is in spite of a tangled web of rate conditions, a tug-of-war for control between trucks and rails, and a wide range of nonstandard equipment. The reason's simple. Shippers like the lower mileage rates and the convenience."

This innovation in transportation that is growing like a razorback hog cannot be considered in a vacuum. I think, however, that I have discussed enough of the atmosphere in which it exists, now for a brief discussion of the containerization and piggyback movement without which complete transportation is unattainable.

In 1954, in a declaratory judgment proceeding before the ICC, the common carrier truckers vigorously pressed the position that the railroads could not haul highway trailers on flatcars without motor carrier certificates. The Commission brushed this aside, and said that the railroads not only could haul their own freight in their own trailers, but could haul the trailers of shippers, forwarders, and private carriers, but not those of common carrier motor carriers except under joint rates and divisions.

Unfortunately, in my view, the Commission, in its decision in the case I am referring to—and that was in 1954—strained the definition of "joint rates" beyond all recognition. It gave its blessing to a device that had been employed in a few places, whereby motor carriers forwarded their trailers over the rails rather than pulling them over the highways. This was called "substituted service," an apt term. The Commission said the motor carriers could not so forward their trailers, and pay the published rates of the railroads, but when the fiction of a "joint rate" was indulged, and the rate paid by the motor carrier was put in a contract labeled "division sheet," the same result was accomplished. The substituted service arrangements came to be known as plan I. When true joint rail-truck rates are entered into we have plan V.

Notice ought to be taken of the fact that the long-distance motor carriers are not satisfied with the two plans of piggybacking which the Commission has said are available to them—plans I and V. They seek authority to use published tariff rates of the railroads, of a type represented by plan III and IV which I will presently describe. Clearly, as the Commission has said, this would make them carriers and shippers at the same time—it would cause them to violate their permits which specify movements over the "roads, highways, streets, and ways by motor vehicle"—it would require rewriting the definition of a motor carrier and practically the whole of part II of the act. It might even raise constitutional questions.

Plan I—substituted service—has not prospered very well. It has nothing to recommend it to the shipper—he deals only with the motor carrier, pays the regular motor carrier rate, and if any economies accrue from the service they stick to the motor carriers' hands. It is not coordination but substitution.

Plan V piggybacking has had and continues to have a stormy career. As I said, it rests on a true joint-rate and through-route arrangement between railroads and motor carriers—the type contemplated by the statute. But not many such arrangements were ever entered into for the transportation of general freight. In the hauling of new automobiles plan V gained considerable headway, and caused a tremendous furor.

A year or so ago some of the railroads and automobile haulaway carriers—in most cases the short-haul motor carriers—began entering into arrangements for the hauling of new automobiles, in motor trailers loaded on flatcars. A flatcar would hold two such trailers with four or five automobiles each. This improved speed and efficiency and re-

duced costs and it was an eminently satisfactory arrangement to the railroads and motor carriers involved and to the man who pays the bill—the shipper. But it took some traffic from the long-distance automobile haul-away carriers and they cried that they were being driven out of business. A propaganda barrage of unrivaled proportions was mounted against plan V piggybacking, and it still continues.

Oddly enough, advancing technology rendered the original plan V operation practically obsolete before it ever got a good start. Now, instead of loading truck trailers on flatcars the railroads use, very largely, specially designed, lower-level flatcars fitted with trilevel racks which will accommodate 12 standard or 15 compact cars. This still could be termed "piggybacking" and still could rest on a joint rail-truck rate, but it is, in fact, something entirely new in transportation.

Now what crime have the railroads committed in thus initiating a new and complete transportation service? Why, according to widely publicized charges, they are hauling new automobiles at rates generally 50 percent or more under rates offered by the truck-away companies. Think of that. The transportation costs on 5 million new motor vehicles can conceivably be cut in half. What are we to do—ban this innovation which for the first time in 25 years holds forth the hope of halting the continuing upward spiral of freight rates?

But, says truck labor, if you don't stop this it will destroy the jobs of 15,000 truck employees. To this rail labor asks, would it be in order for 450,000 rail employees who have lost their jobs largely because of erosion of rail traffic to send condolences?

The truly phenomenal thing about this innovation which enables the railroads to slice the freight rates on automobiles in half is that it still is only 50 percent as efficient as it could and ought to be. Just as he always has in the case of the automobile haul-away service, the shipper is still required to buy a round-trip ticket for a one-way ride. The rail equipment, specialized like the motor equipment, has to deadhead back to origin after it delivers each payload. Why? For lack of an idea? No—for lack of initiative.

Equipment that will haul new automobiles in one direction and dry cargo—even liquid cargo—in the other, is already in actual production. Isn't it time that we started to give the poor, long-suffering shipper a break? Why not bring back to him what he consumes and uses in the same car that hauls away what he produces? Everybody will be the beneficiary.

Plans III and IV piggyback, under which shipper-owned trailers, or shipper-owned trailers and flatcars are hauled from ramp-to-ramp at a stated charge per flatcar movement, are now too well known and too well accepted to require detailed description. These plans, too, have come under attack in legal proceedings and by propaganda. The opposition reflects the competitive efficacy of the service.

By these plans the railroads found a way of bringing about coordination through the leverage of economics. By publishing a charge that reflects their own cost advantage for the movement of trailers on flatcars, they can and will make it uneconomical for the shipper to use his own trucks for the long haul. The rail and truck services then will seek their own level with a resultant combination of road and rail hauls that is tailored to shippers' needs, not carriers' convenience.

Piggybacking of the type represented by plans III and IV, and automobile hauling, represents the first break the shipper has had in a generation in the matter of freight charges. It constitutes the first simple answer to the equation into which the shipper resolves his transportation problems—time and price. The traffic manager views transportation as a link in the distribution chain and, since it is a very expensive link, he buys it with care. He no longer has to take the carriers' word for how much it costs to move his goods from factory to store—he can find out for himself and he will buy his own trucks if he is pushed too far.

But the railroads have not lost their inherent advantages as mass and distance haulers—they simply neglected to exploit them for a while and the parade of progress almost passed them by before they woke up to what was going on. The railroads can beat the private hauler's costs, and better his speeds. They have proved it by plans III and IV piggyback. There is no other development on the horizon that offers any hope of stemming the tide of private carriage. And the key to success of these plans in meeting private carriage is the simplified freight rate—so many dollars per movement—the same basis on which the shipper calculates his cost of doing it himself.

Piggyback service, once it got moving, developed with such startling suddenness that it is still beset by growing pains, not the least of which is the lack of standardization of equipment and method. The problems are being earnestly studied, and, while there will be a certain amount of obsolescence as we experiment or jump the gun without carefully analyzing the situation, in time uniformity will be achieved.

No transportation service in modern history has moved ahead so far so fast as piggybacking since its revival in 1954. In 1960 piggyback flatcar loadings were more than a third greater than in 1959—more than double what they were in 1958—five times greater than in 1955. This means that well over a half a million cars, loaded with more than a million trailers, were handled in 1960. Still accounting for only about 2 percent of all freight car loadings, it is obvious that if the present rate of growth continues piggyback loadings will account for a very substantial portion of rail service within a comparatively short time.

As a matter of fact, many railroad officials today admit that the fate of the boxcar as the predominant factor of rail transportation—a position it has held for more than a century—is sealed. It will not be good business to continue to buy boxcars from which the railroads obtain only 46 miles of service a day when flatcars in TOFC service average 175 miles a day and some perform up to 450 miles. It will be uneconomical to continue to move freight in boxcars with a 40-percent empty return ratio when that empty mileage can be cut in half, or more, by piggyback service.

An editorial in the Washington Post on March 21 of this year, dealing thoughtfully with the situation in transportation, said:

"The nub of the transport problem is rapid technological, urban and industrial growth and change. It is a problem of rapid adaptation, calling for the closest coordination of all types of common and private carriage."

The editorial does not tell us anything we did not already know, but it is something that should have been said sooner and more often. Industry simply moved away from the railheads. Plans III and IV piggyback are the first practical media the railroads have found for providing the off-track shipper a through service combining the flexibility of the truck with the speed and economy of the railroad.

The shipping public will demand more and more piggyback service—they will demand its speed, its low basic cost at a unit price, its nearly damage-free safety, its predictability and its convenience.

That is, very briefly, a report on progress in building complete transportation as it looks to me today. Rome was not built in a day, so we must have patience and perseverance. On the other hand, we are told that construction of the Tower of Babel stopped instantly when the people were caused to speak different languages. We must understand what we are talking about when we speak of coordination—it is not to be confused with substitution. We must make certain when we talk of transportation problems that we are not speaking simply of somebody's attempt to gain a competitive advantage, or slug a competitor. Our effort should be to produce the best possible transportation for the development of commerce and the defense of our Nation.

Progress in building complete transportation is being achieved despite great turmoil and uncertainty. It is being achieved because some people in transportation, and I am one of them, have faith that when all the shouting has died down we will emerge still holding fast to first principles. It is being achieved because competition is forcing change, stimulating new ideas, putting the spur to enterprise. It will continue so long as we adhere to the principles of regulation first established 74 years ago and consistently followed ever since—a maximum of competition with a minimum of control. Progress will stop when we abandon these principles of free enterprise, for when enterprise ceases to be free it is dead.

This is a time for cool heads and firm resistance to hysteria. Radical changes in basic transportation laws are being urged under the mantle of expediency. We are being importuned to bridle competition with the halter of legislative fiat. Our regulators are being assailed and maligned.

The call now is to statesmanship, in and out of Government. The regulation of transportation, no less than transportation itself, is at a crossroads. Let us remember the truth of what Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes said long ago—the success of this endeavor in a sphere of the highest importance is to a very great extent the measure of our capacity for self-government. The call is to you and to me, and we cannot afford to remain silent. Our destination is clearly indicated—let us march.

Abuse of the United States by the Castro Regime in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial entitled "How Castro Knifes Us His Dupes," which appeared in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, April 4, 1961.

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

[From the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel, Apr. 4, 1961]

HOW CASTRO KNIFES US HIS DUPES

How segments of American citizenship unwittingly, in most cases, were partly responsible for elevating Cuban Dictator Castro to be the power and menace that he is today to the entire Western Hemisphere, and how he continues to add amazing insult to injury by subjecting the United States to the most vicious abuse and vituperative of prop-

aganda was graphically portrayed over the Manion Forum Network nationwide radio program over the past weekend. This horrific, but most authentic revelation of how we were duped by Castro and are now being subjected to diabolic vilification as our reward, was presented to the American people by one who has witnessed the ramifications of the Castro regime at firsthand.

He is H. W. Balgooyen, executive vice president of the American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., which has for years been one of the largest and most constructive U.S. business investments in Cuba and other Latin American countries. Dr. Clarence Manion, director of the Manion Forum Network, on the basis of his own firsthand knowledge, pointed out in introducing Mr. Balgooyen how:

"In the Communist technique, when A robs B, the thing for A to do is to shout the big lie that B has robbed him. So it is that Castro, who has taken a billion dollars worth of property from American industry in Cuba continues to scream the lie that American capitalists have robbed the Cuban people. As a matter of fact, in Cuba and throughout all of Latin America, U.S. business firms have always paid the highest wages and the highest taxes. These companies also provide the best housing, living conditions, and fringe benefits for their employees that are to be had anywhere in the countries where they operate."

"What I have to say," said Balgooyen, "is partly about Cuban Dictator Castro and his ties with the international Communist conspiracy. It is partly about the United States' position in this hemisphere, which has been undermined by Communist propaganda and eroded by years of inattention and abdication of the responsibilities of leadership."

Mr. Balgooyen pertinently added that he was obliged to return an indictment against certain ultra-liberal or positively subversive molders of thought and public opinion, "who have fostered a moral and intellectual climate on which these tragic events could come to pass. He declared that:

"While many of our businessmen have been immersed in their business as usual, our politicians in their politics, as usual; and our intellectuals in their breast beating as usual, the international Communist conspiracy has established a beachhead in Cuba, and a highly organized and fantastically successful campaign of propaganda and subversion has been sweeping through Latin America. The highly-trained professional conspirators who are achieving these spectacular results have been aided and comforted by a pack of Marxist intellectuals in our own country, who bay in full cry with every foreign chorus of vituperation against the United States and against the system of enlightened and socially-responsible private enterprise which is both the inspiration and the practical expression of the American way of life."

Mr. Balgooyen documented chapter and verse how Castro has "completely betrayed his early supporters in Cuba's propertied classes, who lost all their possessions and were driven into prison and exile; has deliberately betrayed Cuban labor whose wages were slashed and whose leaders were liquidated and replaced by Communist stooges; has cynically betrayed the Cuban campesino, who was promised land of his own, but was given instead, a job as a slave laborer on a collective farm; has ruthlessly betrayed private investors whose properties were confiscated; and has heartlessly betrayed Cuba's God-fearing mothers and fathers whose children were indoctrinated in atheistic communism." And he cited how recently "the paean of hate that is spewed forth daily over the captive Cuban radio included the following message to President Kennedy:

"Open letter to an illiterate millionaire, Mr. John F. Kennedy. For some time now, we have been following your political trajectory in your attempt to replace that decrepit and stupid old man who answers to the name of Caesar Attila Eisenhower on the throne of the Yankee empire. We understand, Mr. Kennedy, that you must preach slimy lies; but what we cannot justify and approve, Ediot Mr. Kennedy, is that you use Cuba's name in your political maneuvers. You are nothing less, you imbecile, than a piece of the yoke that oppresses the U.S. people. As to the warning that our revolution will perish, we would like to have you come to Cuba so that we can hang you by your tongue."

We submit that should arouse anyone from his lethargy.

Dr. Philip Loven Elliott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 14, 1961, North Carolina lost one of its most distinguished educators in the passing of Dr. Philip Loven Elliott. At the time of his death Dr. Elliott was President of Gardner-Webb College, an outstanding junior college in Boiling Springs, N.C.

The Shelby Daily Star and the Cleveland Times, newspapers published at Shelby, N.C., carried editorials on April 15 and April 18 with respect to the life, character, and public service of Dr. Elliott.

With the thought that my colleagues in the House would like to read these editorials and the story of Dr. Elliott's passing, which appeared in the Cleveland Times for April 18, I include them in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Cleveland Times, Apr. 18, 1961]

FINAL RITES CONDUCTED ON SUNDAY FOR PRESIDENT PHIL ELLIOTT OF G-W

Dr. Philip Lovin Elliott, for 18 years president of Gardner-Webb College and who would have retired at the end of the present school term, died suddenly Friday morning around 9 o'clock after suffering a heart attack at his desk in his college office. Classes at the college suspended until Monday morning.

Dr. Elliott had previously suffered a heart attack in 1954 and was away from Gardner-Webb for almost a year. He notified the board of trustees several months ago he was willing to retire if a successor could be found and it was announced just recently that he would be succeeded by Dr. E. Eugene Poston.

The beloved president guided Gardner-Webb through its greatest years of growth, having accepted his post in 1943 when the college had 71 students and 12 staff members with total assets of the college listed at around $300,000. A student body of 640 fills the campus today and the institution owns 36 buildings with total assets at close to $3 million.

Native of Wayside in Swain County, he was the son of the late Isaac Bartley and Rachel Jenkins Elliott. He was a graduate of Mars Hill and Wake Forest College from which he received his A.B. degree in 1919. He earned his master's degree at the University of North Carolina in 1925 and did graduate work at Johns Hopkins and Duke University. An honorary doctor of education degree was conferred upon him by Carson-Newman College in 1951 and an honorary LL.D. degree by Wake Forest College in 1959.

He was an ordained Baptist minister and had served as principal of Mitchell Collegiate Institute in 1919–20. At Mars Hill he was dean, vice president, and head of the English department from 1923 to 1930, later going to Western Carolina College at Cullowhee as head of its English department when called to Gardner-Webb.

Dr. Elliott was a member and past president of Shelby Rotary Club and among the positions he has held include: trustee of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary; president of the North Carolina College Conference in 1952; member of the Governor's commission on adult education in North Carolina member of the Governor's commission on interracial cooperation.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Etta Maurine Carringer Elliott; three daughters, Mrs. L. T. Oakes, of Roanoke Rapids; Mrs. Edward Grady, of New York City; Mrs. Geoffry Churchill, of Chapel Hill, and Philip L. Elliott, Jr., graduate student at the University of Georgia, and four grandchildren.

Funeral rites were conducted Sunday afternoon at 3 o'clock in Boiling Springs Baptist Church with the Rev. Max Linnens, pastor, officiating. The body lay in state for 1 hour prior to the services and burial was in Cleveland Memorial Park.

Officials from many educational institutions were in attendance for the funeral services.

[From the Shelby Daily Star, Apr. 15, 1961]

HE PRESSED ON TO A HIGH CALLING

If Dr. Phil Elliott could have chosen the place for his last few moments of physical existence on this terrestrial globe, chances are that it would have been at his desk in the institution he loved—Gardner-Webb College.

There, surrounded by the walls he had helped to build, within earshot of college officers, faculty and staff members, and not far from the students whose lives he sought to enrich through Christian education, Phil Elliott felt at home.

His last, full measure of devotion to the Baptist institution was expressed during the year when he offered to step down early and make the transition smoother for his successor as president. Again, he had placed the good of the institution above the personal interests of Phil Elliott.

Not many years ago a local businessman remarked about Dr. Elliott:

"He never gets enough for that college but that he always wants more."

But a friend nearby rejoined:

"True enough, but you can't deny he wants it in order to better educate your youngsters and others like them."

There were many facets to the abilities of Phil Elliott. He prided himself in being first of all a teacher, and he brought to that calling a background rich in scholarship. He was a successful educator, an accomplished orator, a dreamer who worked to make his dreams come true for Gardner-Webb College.

He was a man of high principle, steady in his faith and rockbound in his convictions. Yet, he was tolerant and compassionate, careful to respect the sincere views of others and jealous of freedom of belief and expression.

Phil Elliott's wants and needs were simple, and they were determined by a finely hued sense of values, a sure determination of what is important in life—family, friends, love, religious faith, education, introspection, nature.

As the officers, faculty, employees and students of Gardner-Webb say an earthbound goodby to their beloved president, it would be well for them to remember his words:

"This is no time to congratulate ourselves on past accomplishments when there is so much yet to be done. We must keep pace with the needs of our people, and like Alice in Wonderland, we must run as fast as we can merely to stay where we are."

Phil Elliott has run the good race. He has finished the course. He has accepted the prize.

[From the Cleveland Times, Apr. 18, 1961]

DR. PHILIP LOVIN ELLIOTT

Dr. Philip Lovin Elliott is dead.

In one of his final addresses to the student body at Gardner-Webb College he quoted these lines from Tennyson's "Ulysses":

"I am a part of all that I have met;
Yet all experience is an arch where through
Gleams that untraveled world whose margin fades
Forever and forever when I move."

Even though death was unexpected and came as a shock to Clevelanders, educators, students, and all who knew and loved Dr. Elliott, still ringing in the ears of faculty members are his recent farewell remarks: "We climbed the hill together * * *," as he quoted Robert Burns: "To me we haven't done all we've dreamed, as I come to the end of the official journey * * *"; "As we come to the end of these experiences together, they melt into a mosaic of beauty for me, like the rays of the sun and the clouds of a beautiful sunset * * *"; "I know a little bit of loneliness, disappointments, heartaches, hurts * * * and being on the brink * * *"; "I shall be watching you wherever I am. It is my hope that this institution, under God, with your dedication, scholarship, and devotion, will be dedicated to the production of human beings that shall be of value and have integrity."

Dr. Elliott was wise, noble, lovable. He stood for all that is good, and this goodness will live with the hundreds of young scholars and friends who knew a better way of life through him, not only at Gardner-Webb but at other educational institutions and communities which can boast of his leadership.

In the words of Gardner-Webb President-elect Dr. Eugene Poston, "The death of a Christian is never a tragedy. It is always a victory."

We, too, believe that this man who achieved so much for Gardner-Webb and lived an exemplary life, continues to be watching over those he loved so well and is praying for us.

His life indeed melted into a beautiful sunset.

Disabled Combat Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a disabled American veteran calling attention to hardships he and other disabled veterans are suffering. I believe his letter should be read so that others may be informed of this unfortunate situation. The letter follows:

[Very urgent please]

APRIL 11, 1961.

The Honorable WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON,
House Veterans Affairs Committee.

DEAR SIR: Fifteen percent compensation increase, desperate appeal in behalf of aging, totally disabled combat veterans, the inadvertently forgotten men.

This is an urgent appeal for a humane economic existence for these men and their wives, by means of a liberal increase in compensation. Out of due respect for them, I ask your forbearance with its lengthy contents.

A vicious economic cycle has clamped a stranglehold on the miserable existence of these unfortunate people. The continued rise in living costs has long ago entirely erased the increased benefits they received in 1957. Everybody drawing money from the Federal Government received an increase in 1960, except our combat disabled veterans. The aging, totally disabled are economically worse off today than ever before. The rapidly soaring prosperity of our Nation has left them far behind, in the lowest one-third of all American families insofar as effective buying income is concerned. Only Congress can, and must help them, without any undue delay.

They exist on $248 a month. Aren't they entitled to live decently in their last years of life? I know you have always been one of their loyal friends. Won't you please do something for them now, by interceding with your Chairman TEAGUE for expeditious enactment into law of a liberal increase in compensation for them? Irrespective of which compensation bill your committee reports to the floor of the House, and as very specifically requested in the President's March 24 budget message to Congress, I very strongly urge that a 15-percent increase be justifiably and belatedly accorded totally disabled combat veterans. Nobody will ever accuse the Congress of being too generous for this worthy group.

I am their spokesman. You won't get letters from them, as they are resentful and disillusioned. As in the past 18 years, I visited many of their homes again last Christmas season, and found deplorable economic conditions everywhere. I assure you their plight is real. I am 100 percent for economy in Government, but never at their miserable expense. I know you agree with me. They only ask for the necessities of life, including medical care for their wives. Are they asking for too much, this minimum of existence?

They won't be with us very long. They have hope and faith in their country, and are worthy of your urgent and favorable action in their behalf. Please don't disillusion them, and thereby destroy their self-respect and human dignity.

Trusting you will favor me with some good news for them at your earliest convenience, and with all good wishes, please believe me.

Very respectfully,

PHILIP E. RICHARDS,
Disabled American Veterans.

Employment up in Port Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the employment outlook in areas of my district is becoming brighter. This is particularly true in the Port Angeles, Wash., area where seasonal unemployment in logging and construction trades is a problem during the winter months. Now with spring upon us and with the possibility of increases in the price of timber products, the employment situation on the Olympic Peninsula is changing for the better.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a story from the Port Angeles Evening News entitled "Work Picture Brighter." This story which appeared March 24, 1961, Mr. Speaker, indicates a firm economy and growing prosperity in the Northwest:

WORK PICTURE BRIGHTER

More than 230 workers in Clallam and Jefferson Counties were called back to work in February, Floyd J. Hill, manager of the Port Angeles office of the Washington State Employment Security Department reports.

And the future looks better. A survey recently completed by the local employment office in cooperation with 78 employers in Clallam and Jefferson Counties indicates that they expect to increase employment before the end of April this year. Most of the increase will occur in the lumber and wood products industry. The anticipated increases may be even greater still if the price of lumber, plywood and shingles improves sufficiently to permit additional expansion, Hill said.

Five contract construction firms were surveyed. They reported a 38.2 percent increase (from February) in employment anticipated in April, and a 55.9 percent increase anticipated in June. In other words, employment stood at 68 persons in February. Anticipated employment in April is 94 and anticipated employment in June is 106.

Twenty-two lumber and wood products and pulp and paper products firms sampled indicated a 3.5 percent increase in April and a 7.2 increase in June.

The number of State unemployment insurance claims filed in Clallam and Jefferson Counties decreased more than 15 percent between the week ending February 4 and the week ending March 4, Hill reports.

Most of the resulting employment expansion occurred in the lumber, logging and related wood products industries.

During the first 10 days in March, more than 100 workers had been called back to work—particularly in logging and construction activities.

Horace Godfrey Demonstrates Leadership in Farm Stabilization Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in checking over the work done by the Department of Agriculture to launch the new feed grains program, I am impressed by the leadership demonstrated by Horace Godfrey, the new Administrator of the Commodity Stabilization Service.

Godfrey's effective performance during his first weeks in office is a matter of personal satisfaction and pride for me,

since he hails from the great State of North Carolina, he is a personal friend, and for many years he successfully directed our agricultural stabilization programs in North Carolina.

I have here a copy of some remarks made by Mr. Godfrey at the Atlanta area meeting on feed grains which point up his emphasis on local farmers' work and cooperation in operating successful farm programs. With the permission of the House I shall insert these remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REMARKS BY HORACE GODFREY, ADMINISTRATOR, CSS, MADE AT THE ATLANTA AREA MEETING, MARCH 27, 1961

There are just a few things we want to say before we adjourn. To start this off, I would like all of the new State committeemen to stand up, if they will. I asked you to do that, because I wanted the rest of the group here to look at the new State committeemen. We have been attempting to do something here today primarily for them, although it applies also to the others, the older State committeemen that have been on for some time—and also to our State office employees.

We told you this morning at the very beginning that we think we set a record in getting this feed grain legislation signed last week, and getting it into the field and into operation. We started out with the meeting in Omaha on Thursday—then one in Denver on Friday, and now the one here today. Maybe we should have reversed the order of the meetings, because the earlier planting area is in the Southeast. But we felt that the kickoff should be in the heavy feed grain producing area.

We found in connection with these meetings, that there were two things that we needed to do—two things primarily. First, we needed to give our new State committeemen and our State office employees a little briefing on their part in connection with the overall activities of the Department of Agriculture, and let them see where they fit into the entire Department. And, second, we needed to give them sufficient information to kick off the feed grain program.

We started out this morning by trying to outline the activities of the Department of Agriculture. We followed that with an address by the Under Secretary, outlining to you some of your responsibilities and pointing out the fact that you are members of the official family of the Department of Agriculture, and that upon your shoulders rests a tremendous responsibility. He not only talked to State committeemen and State office employees, but he also talked to the others representing the Department of Agriculture here today.

Then, this afternoon, we have attempted to outline to you the provisions of the emergency feed grain legislation. We told you that we did not have all the answers, because the legislation was just passed into law last Wednesday afternoon. We started to work on it, of course, approximately 2 months ago. Many of you in the field started to work on it about 5 weeks ago, and much work has already been done. We have attempted to give you a few of the answers this afternoon as you raised them. We will be sending you additional information and additional answers as time goes by, but we felt that we could not wait until we had all of the answers to get into the field and get into operation.

As someone mentioned this morning, spring began a week ago today, and planting had already started in many areas. So, it was necessary that we get into the field with the information that we had, and then furnish you additional information—and maybe correct some that we have already furnished you—just as quickly as we possibly can. That's what we have attempted to do today.

I think that Secretary Murphy pointed out to you this morning, very effectively, that we believe this program will work. He also pointed out that he said, "We believe," because the final decision rests upon State committeemen and State office employees. With whatever program we give you out of the Washington office, or that the Congress gives you, the decision still rests with State committeemen and State office employees as to whether or not that program will be successful. Because upon you, upon your shoulders, rests the responsibility for generating or motivating county committeemen and county office employees. Unless the county committeemen and county office employees want the program to really work, then it will not work. But, if they want it to work, if you create in them a desire for the program to work, then it will be workable.

The statement was also made this morning, and I would like to reemphasize it, that this is our chance as farmers to convince the Congress, and our friends in the city that helped us get this legislation, that we can make a farm program work as far as feed grains are concerned. Now, those of us here in the Southeast know that a farm program can be made workable. We know that in the Southeast, because we have made a tobacco program work. I think we can say that we have made a peanut program work, and, for all practical purposes, we have made a cotton program work. But there is some doubt in a lot of peoples' minds throughout the United States as to whether or not a program can be made workable for feed grains. We believe it can be made workable. We believe we have a program now that will work for 1961, and upon your shoulders rests the responsibility of seeing that it works.

I said a lot of work had already been done. We are well pleased with what's been done in the field. We like the way you took hold of the instructions that we sent you about 5 weeks ago, and went out to the field and obtained the data from farmers. You really did an outstanding job in getting the data in from farmers. The way you went about it reminds me of the old days way back in 1933 and 1934 when we first started farm programs. But that is just the beginning.

We are now on the launching pad, so to speak, and whether or not we get off the ground depends upon you, because the job is yet in front of us. You as State committeemen and State office employees now must go back home—after tomorrow, after you finish your meeting here tomorrow—you must go back home and decide either before you leave here, or imemdiately after you reach home, what you are going to do to get this program into operation in your State, and in every county in your State.

What's necessary? Now, I can tell you that it will not operate by itself. You will not get participation by merely getting out a lot of material through the mail. You will not get participation by merely getting a lot of newspaper publicity. You will not get participation merely by having a lot of TV programs. That all helps, but it takes more than that. I could suggest many things for you to do, but I think the situation is going to be different in each State and possibly in each county within a State. I think you're going to have to use every means that you've ever used before and borrow a few that you haven't used before in order to get the participation that we want in this program.

Secretary Freeman said the other day in a press conference that this is more or less a "beg and pay" program. A "beg and pay" program. We're begging on the basis that this is an opportunity for farmers to show that they want a farm program, and we're paying in an effort to get the fullest participation possible. That's the way he put it. I say you're going to have to use every means that you've ever used before and then borrow some that you've never used.

I would suggest that you immediately decide how you're going about it, that you go back home and hold the necessary meetings of State people. Include your sister agencies within the Department of Agriculture, your allied State agencies of the Department of Agriculture, your fertilizer people, your farm-machinery people—in fact, everybody that's interested in agriculture. Sell them on the provisions of the program.

Then, just as soon as you finish your State meetings, I think you should immediately plan for district meetings and county meetings. I think, it's going to take a lot of meetings where you can have an opportunity to answer questions that are being raised by farmers and by others as to what does this program mean? How does it operate? You'll have to be in a position to answer those questions. You can't do that by merely sending out a piece of letter material. Now, this background information is good. The leaflets that we're going to furnish you are good, but that personal contact is the best means of getting participation.

Now, in your meetings with county people, in your meetings with your fieldmen that work with your county offices, let it be understood that you—as the State committees, and State administrative officers and program specialists—are expecting the fieldmen, county committees and county office employees to do everything within their power to explain the advantages of this program. You let it be understood without any doubt that you expect them from this day forth to have a positive attitude because the attitude of county office employees and State office employees will largely govern participation in the feed-grain program. We've seen evidences of that influence many times in the past. We have seen participation in ACP, for example, more than doubled in a county merely by changing the ACP clerk that contacted farmers in the county office. Merely by changing an attitude. And I say, from here on we must have a positive attitude on farm programs. We have no alternative.

Now, for those of you that are new State committeemen, let me give you just a little advice as to the ways and means of getting a positive attitude. I might say that throughout the Southeast the attitudes are a little bit different than they are in many areas of the country. I don't think you're going to have any difficulty in securing a positive attitude on the part of State office employees or on the part of county office employees. But, let me hasten to say that if you have any difficulty, if there are any individuals in a State office or in county offices that do not feel that they can adopt a positive attitude and attempt to work constructively for this program, then they should be honest enough with themselves and with us to disassociate themselves from the organization. Second, if they are not honest enough to do that, then it should be your responsibility, and it is your responsibility, to see that they find more compatible work outside.

Now let me go a little bit farther. There are employed in county ASC offices and State ASC offices many dedicated and loyal employees that have for several years been waiting an opportunity like this to help a farm program. Now, you new State committeemen can use the experience of these county employees—these State employees who are dedicated. We hope that you will rely upon them and use the knowledge and experience that they have.

I don't think you'll have any difficulty whatsoever in separating the employees that

are dedicated and have a positive attitude, and those that want to drift, or go back. And I think you have the responsibility to separate them. This is a responsibility to the general public, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the President. You have a responsibility now to see that farm programs which come under your supervision are made workable.

We are looking to you to carry out this responsibility. We know that you can do it. We know that it's inherent in every individual to want to do a good job. We know that every individual wants to be recognized for doing a good job. We know that in CSS we can do a good job. We are counting on you to do a good job. With that, let's get on with it. Thank you very much.

Deadly Suds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the problem of water pollution is an evergrowing menace, not only to plant and fish life but to the reservoirs and filtering plants which prepare our water supply for human use and consumption.

The Daily Journal of Wheaton, Ill., is undertaking a project to inform its readers as to the growing seriousness of this problem. One source of concern in solving this problem is the elimination of the effects of using detergents. I commend to you the editorial which follows:

DEADLY SUDS

Cleaning the laundry isn't the only dirty work laid to tons and tons of household and industrial detergents used in every city, village and hamlet in the United States.

In recent months, newspaper accounts have told of conferences on this very real menace to several facets of our American way of life.

As far back as 1959 Arthur S. Flemming, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said, "We may be confronted with a crisis of such gravity as to jeopardize the further growth and development of many areas of the country, and even the health of millions of people."

His successor, Abraham Ribicoff, recently told a House subcommittee in Washington that the waters of the Ohio River are used 3.7 times before reaching the Mississippi.

Ribicoff might have added that each time it is used, the water gets another charge of detergents, only a microscopic percentage of which is lost in passing from one municipal treatment plant to another.

In our State, foam on the Illinois River, as it passes Starved Rock, presents what appears to be whitecaps on the water. Closer inspection shows patches of foam at times 25 feet or more across.

Plumbers complain the insoluble elements eventually clog up drainpipes, while health department sanitarians deplore their use where household sewage depends upon septic fields for disposal.

The porosity of the soil is destroyed by the accumulation of the nonorganic particles.

The reservoirs of many cities depending upon rivers for their water supply have found as much as six parts per million of these cleansing agents in their drinking water.

In 1957 the first conclusive evidence in this country was published showing that detergents were destructive to aquatic life. Clarence Tarzwell, research engineer at the Robert A. Taft Engineering Center, Cincinnati, reported that detergents are toxic to fish in concentrations of four parts per million.

Three research scientists working with Tarzwell cited these facts from their studies. (1) Concentrations of syndets, synthetic detergents, in sewage from various cities have ranged from 4 to 45 parts per million; (2) a concentration of 3.5 parts per million killed 50 per cent of fish in a relatively short time.

The studies were made on five widely sold, packaged household detergent products.

The culprits in each of the cleaners were chemicals called alkyl benzene sulfonates. These are the same ingredients that get daddy's grimy overalls so "spanking clean," mom's clothes so antiseptic white—and which kill the fish in our rivers, kill the bacteria in our sewage treatment plants, create many allergies and rashes, ad infinitum.

The detergent first appeared on the American scene in 1934, but the real boom came as detergents became a war baby to take the place of the soluble fats and greases that went to war instead of into soap.

It is sometimes easy to condemn and deplore a condition, and do nothing about it. This has been done many times since detergents helped out the housewife during the war.

The Daily Journal believes the detergent manufacturers should take it unto themselves to eliminate this great nuisance.

Such publications as Journal of The American Water Works Association have published accounts of experimental research on development of organic detergents, which would dissolve.

One speaker at a national convention of soap manufacturers went so far as to exclaim that things were getting so bad they might even be compelled to return to the manufacture of soap.

We propose that the manufacturers of these products establish a fund, with contributions being supplied by the makers of these Frankensteins of the laundrytubs.

We urge that they put researchers to work to remely the havoc they have wrought, and have permitted to go unchecked for so many years.

Who Was in Orbit, Gagarin or Khrushchev?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in any evaluation of our space accomplishments with relation to the unsupported claims of the Russians it is perhaps pertinent to note the depth of sheer demogogery reached recently by a certain columnist who undertook to place responsibility for our alleged defeat in space on former President Eisenhower.

In refutation of that charge a résumé of the sequence of events following the end of World War II is most revealing and it seems proper to point out that under the Democrats we allowed the Soviets to pick up, gratis, a wealth of scientific missile date captured by American troops in Germany. The real deterrent to a realistic program, however, was had in the outright refusal of the Democrats under Truman to appropriate money or authorize a forthright plan of space exploration.

By contrast the Republicans under Ike, in 7 years, closed the missile gap and gave the United States an actual scientific leadership in space exploration, if certain unauthenticated claims of the Russians are taken with the grain of salt they deserve. Be that as it may, in only one area—rocket thrust—are we behind the Soviets and we surrendered that advantage when the Democrats under Truman were sitting on their hands and doing nothing.

Apropos of the current situation, in discussing with a number of my constituents over the past weekend the Russian claim of having launched a man into space and brought him back without mishap I found most of them strongly skeptical of the Soviet's latest propaganda, their skepticism understandably being based on the known Russian reputation for skulduggery and duplicity.

In my conversations with my constituents I found them reflecting the doubts voiced by certain news media both here and abroad, which point up the obvious discrepencies in the Russian claims. For instance, the claim by Yuri Gagarin, the "cosmonaut", that he orbited the earth suspended on air within his vehicle runs counter to the accepted practice of strapping the astronaut to his seat to protect him from the violent impact of the initial blastoff. It was also noted that while Gagarin reported detailed earthly scenes as he flashed by a 18,000 miles per hour a noted Russian scientist claimed that the vehicle was without windows of any kind.

There is also the matter of timing and with the flight officially reported to have taken place on April 12 we wonder how the London Daily Worker had it taking place on April 7 when they gave out the word that the space traveler had circumnavigated the globe and had returned to earth suffering from acute shock. Failure of the tracking stations of our National Aeronautics and Space Administration to make contact even with the burned-out casing of the lofting rocket until several hours after the Russians reported the astronaut's return further indicates the unreliability of the reports.

The fact also remains that no tracking station outside of the Iron Curtain had advance word of the experiment and none reported catching the spacecraft while in orbit. All of which, coupled with the Soviets' record for fabrication, prompts most of the people with whom I have talked to reach the conclusion that this incident was probably designed to cover up previous failures, in which their space travelers may have lost their lives, and was staged as a face-saving device in anticipation of an American breakthrough at an early date.

In support of these reservations by people who are not inclined to accept unsupported Soviet claims, as so many col-

umnists and scientists seem inclined to do, I would like to underscore that portion of a Washington Evening Star editorial which puts forth these rather pointed questions:

Exactly where, for example is the place that should have a monument built on it as the site of the launching of Major Gagarin into orbit? And precisely where did he land in the U.S.S.R. after his single celestial circumnavigation of the globe? As for the spaceship that carried him on his history-making voyage, what does it look like? Why are there no clear photographs or verable descriptions of it? When will outsiders be vouchsafed the opportunity to inspect it, or at least to read detailed accounts of it? And how explain the fact that the Kremlin's spokesmen, even the "cosmonaut" himself, have been almost ostentatiously evasive in responding to these and similar queries? Is there something to hide? Does the furtiveness cover up facts that the world ought to know? Is a fraud involved here—or a military advance—that the Soviets are determined to keep under wraps?

And then my favorite columnist David Lawrence, in the same issue of the Evening Star, concludes with these pertinent observations:

Just why would the Russians concoct the story if it is not entirely true? One answer is that the Communists have no morals—they regard lying as a legitimate device in national and international policies.

Just now it is important for Nikita Khrushchev to divert the attention of the Russian people from their hardships with an appeal to their national pride. History records that the czars of another era also engaged in huge spectacles, parades, and displays to impress the people and cause them to forget or put aside their woes.

The Communists have much to explain. Scientists throughout the world will remain curious. Science has a way of probing into such things. Already the Soviet Government has declined to make its data public. Secrecy is always the refuge of totalitarian governments which do not hesitate to try to fool not only their own people, but the whole world.

The Futility of Depending Upon Good Faith of the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a recent column by Jim Bishop published in the Washington Evening Star on April 12 contains a valid assessment of the Soviet Union and of the futility of any policy which depends upon the good faith of the Communists. Mr. Bishop makes some thoughtful comments about Communist tactics in the world struggle and the success that they are achieving.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

VISHINSKY MADE IT CLEAR

[By Jim Bishop, reporter]

The Soviet Union, as a phenomenon of the 20th century, will be the first to go down in history as a predatory nation with no honor. The Caesars, at their worst, had some. So did the Huns, the ancient Persians and, of course, the Greeks. The only nation that approaches the Soviets in lack of integrity is Adolf Hitler's Germany, but he lasted only 12 years.

The Russian Revolutionary Government has been in power 43 years. It grows stronger, not weaker, and its goal has remained fixed: Communist domination of the world. The Russian bear lumbers slowly across the snows of Time. Ahead, the Western Powers in their droshky toss the Bear a baby nation now and then to slow him down, but his appetite is insatiable.

He stops for a moment to kill and digest, but he moves on at a trot, never tiring, never frightened, always closing in. The ideology of the Soviet is godless intellect coupled with national aggrandizement. Whatever adds to the power of Russia is good for all.

The sun has set on all the major empires of the West, now it rises in the East. The Communists control a land mass from the Arctic Ocean to Malaya, from Anadyr Peninsula to Berlin—the Caesars of Rome never had an empire like that. It will grow bigger before it starts to shrink.

It was Andrei Vishinsky, prosecutor in the purge trials of 1934, who listened to an unhappy defendant confess that he had been friendly with the Germans because "our policy was to be friendly, at the time." Vishinsky chuckled. He shook his head as though such stupidity was beyond him. "Do you not know," he shouted, "that, no matter what the public policy of the moment, true socialism cannot live with any other system of government? The working class must establish governments in every nation. Has this not been the unfailing, unchanging policy of Marx and Lenin and Stalin?"

It has. Anyone who says that the West can negotiate with the East is naive. Negotiation in Laos, in Berlin, in Korea—anywhere in the world—must result in a Soviet advantage or there will be no agreement. The game, as the West plays it, is to see how cheaply the bear can be bought for a moment's peace.

The Russians fight with propaganda and economics. For a young nation, they use these well. They have beaten us so many times in the field of propoganda that now, when a new crisis develops, the world does not look to Washington for a solution; it turns to Moscow.

These are clever weapons, well honed, and they win battles without sacrificing Russian lives. The Soviets take a chunk of territory here, enslave a few million people there, win a concession somewhere else, and all the time they keep the world in such a chronic state of fright that the West spends more and more, trying to be ready.

The propaganda weapon may not kill us, but the economic one could. Our defense spending this year will come to 43 billions. Each American wage earner will owe $683 for missiles and planes and warships alone. This is an enormous sum for an average man to owe his Government each year. It will grow greater because the policy of the Soviet Government is to keep feinting the United States toward heavier armament while the Russians hold two keys: One to war; one to peace.

It is not necessary for them to put either one in the door of history. They can jangle them, and achieve notable results.

A thousand years from now, children will be studying the witless mistakes of the West in the 20th century. That is, if there are any children.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and Harvest of Shame"—XIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the 13th in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter.

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

CLEAN, GOOD FOOD—NEW COASTAL MIGRANT CAMP

("In the survey of 21 States conducted by the national council of churches, the migrants themselves listed the evils of labor camp life—bad housing, flies, mosquitoes, dirty beds and mattresses, unsanitary toilets, lack of hot water for bathing."—Harvest of Shame)

The Palm Beach County Board of Health eyes with satisfaction a new 600-acre farm of American Foods, Inc., on Lantana Road west of Military Trail.

Joseph Alvarez, the board's chief sanitarian, points to the facility as a good example of the trend toward betterment of migrant labor health conditions in the area.

Inspecting the facility less than 2 weeks ago, Alvarez didn't hesitate to approve its licensing.

Jess Vielma, farm labor contractor, reported 180 men already are employed at the farm. Most are working on 140 acres of strawberries.

But the farm will employ considerably more, according to Archie J. Rutledge, vice president in charge of operations.

He estimated the figure will grow to 600 later this year.

The labor force includes domestic and imported labor.

Rutledge said his company, formerly Florida Mushroom Co., has invested more than $80,000 to provide proper living conditions for the men who will grow the crops of strawberries, cucumbers, bell peppers, watermelons and other items.

Much of the planting already has been accomplished.

The company has erected gleaming corrugated aluminum buildings for the labor force. Numerous jalousie windows provide for cross ventilation and light.

Barracks have been built on concrete slabs, which authorities have found easy to keep clean and sanitary. Double-decked bunks similar to that in some Army barracks have been provided.

Tasty food is served in a military-style mess hall. The dinner menu last Wednesday included fried chicken, green beans, potatoes, rice, coffee, and bread and butter.

"We provide three meals a day and serve hot lunches in the fields," Rutledge said.

For $12 per week, the migrant worker gets 21 meals, his living quarters, electricity,

and water for laundry and bathing, the vice president reported.

"Word about the camp is getting around," he said: "We don't expect any trouble in finding the labor we will need."

The company has provided a small canteen where workers may buy candy, cigarettes, tobacco, and soft drinks. A few items of clothing are stocked, and there is a jukebox.

How much do the men earn?

The hourly rate paid by American Foods is 65 cents, Rutledge said.

"We expect to provide a 9-hour day, 6 days a week," he added.

Vielma said the camp will be in operation this season until May, or perhaps longer.

To expand its operations, the company late last year issued $500,000 worth of stock. Its headquarters is in Miami. It has growing ventures at Delray Beach, Goulds, Immokalee, and Burgaw, N.C.

Rutledge was unable to estimate the cash value of the crops to be grown at the new farm.

"Our volume last year was over $2 million," he said.

The company has leased a plant formerly occupied by Strazzula Bros., near Lake Worth, and will use it for precooling of its crops before shipment.

The firm processes and markets as canned goods much of its production.

The Price of Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the morning mail recently brought this notice:

The U.S. Department of Agriculture today, April 13, announced the fair and reasonable wage requirements for the 1961 crop of sugar beets in all producing regions. USDA officials stated that the wage rates of this determination are within the producer's ability to pay under the prospective price and production conditions for the 1961 crop.

Payment of wages not less than those set by the Secretary of Agriculture is a requirement that producers must meet to qualify for payments under the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

This notice is a clear example of the price we pay for Federal aid, be it in agriculture, education, or any other field. The Government does not aid without naming its terms. At first the terms may be simple. Sooner or later, strings are attached. In the case of aid to sugar producers, the strings are many and strong.

It all started innocently as a means of assuring dependable sugar supplies. Now Government runs the whole show with the U.S. consumer paying an artificially high price for every pound of sugar he buys off the grocery shelf.

Is that bad? It is if you are not producing sugar, but would like to. It is if you want freedom in managing and marketing your product, and in negotiating for wages. It is if you are a consumer and want a fair price for sugar you buy.

Organized labor is involved, too. When a country shifts from a free-enterprise economy to controls, many of the gains of collective bargaining are tossed aside, and the voice of labor is hushed. Wages are determined by Government edict.

The controls are acquired a little at a time. Suddenly, as in sugar, we realize the price of Federal aid, but there seems to be no escape. Tobacco growers are now so entangled in controls that the privilege to produce has a dollar value. It can be sold, traded, or inherited. When you buy an acre of tobacco land, you pay between $1,500 and $3,000 an acre for the right to grow tobacco.

Controls get built into business procedures and into the soil itself, so much so that even a gradual relaxation is complicated.

A Real Missile Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, too many times we are prone in our legislation to doctor the symptoms of the diseases rather than get to the causes thereof. The Wall Street Journal of Monday, March 27, 1961, had a revealing editorial on the real missile gap, which is so thought-provoking, it should be widely read:

A REAL MISSILE GAP

There seems to be doubt inside the Kennedy administration about whether this country faces a missile gap vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. But there can't be any doubt about the reality of the gap between planning and launching pad in construction of key missile bases—a gap which the Pentagon warns will remain despite urgent speedup orders.

Investigating the snail's pace of the base program, the Senate Government Operations Committee has found a fantastic loss of time through strikes, work stoppages and wildcat walkouts by union construction workers. Since July 1959, for example, 4 major missile bases have suffered 125 strikes, causing a loss of more than 100,000 mandays.

Trivial jurisdictional disputes and ludicrous grievances are often the cause of the base work stoppages. Union members are quick to strike these essential projects because, in contrast to civilian jobs, missile base construction must proceed on a top-priority schedule, and hang the overtime. Hence, a strike means a big payoff. Some skilled union craftsmen have pulled down as much as $1,000 a week catching up on work they refused to do at straight time.

Obviously, these delays weaken national security and could conceivably exact a catastrophic cost. The dollars-and-cents cost is already staggering. Indeed, some unions themselves are belatedly talking of self-restraint and adopting "no-strike" pledges.

The country is entitled to something more binding, such as tougher legal restraint on the secondary boycott and other union practices. Yet, amazingly, a bill introduced in Congress with strong administration backing would legalze secondary boycott picketing at "common situs" construction sites, thus inviting new delay and waste in the missile program.

The taxpayers have given unstintingly of their dollars to obtain the best possible defenses, and the administration plans to ask further sacrifices. Dollars won't be enough, however, so long as the unions are permitted to exploit the very real gap they have opened in this country's missile program.

Individual Americans Hold Key to Preservation of Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Evening Tribune of April 7, 1961:

INDIVIDUAL AMERICANS HOLD KEY TO PRESERVATION OF FREEDOMS

The key to the preservation of our freedoms lies in the understanding mind and patriotic hearts of individual Americans.

Not in fuzzy wishful thinking about the aim of communism.

Not in fainthearted unwillingness to meet its deadly challenge.

But in knowing where we stand, and why * * * what we must do, and how, individually and as a Nation blessed with a priceless heritage of liberty.

Let us get with it.

This theme ran ringingly through remarks of two eminent speakers in San Diego Tuesday.

One of them was former Vice President Richard Nixon.

The other was Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States.

Said Nixon, in his call for direct involvement of every individual American in the great issues of our times:

"It is very easy to talk of freedom in the abstract and fail to recognize that it is impossible for any individual in a free country to sit on the sidelines. Whatever your politics may be it is the responsibility of people in your stations of life to provide leadership for our political institutions.

"The political bosses, to whom some want to leave government, are only as good as people like you. Only to the extent that you provide leadership can our possibilities for development be realized. Only in this way can you make the ideals you believe in prevail in this world."

Romulo, speaking at the sixth and last "Pillars of American Freedom" luncheon sponsored by the San Diego Kiwanis Club, gave three premises by which Americans should judge our Nation's actions in international affairs.

First, the United States is not imperialistic.

Second, the basic Communist objective is world domination.

Third, the United States is engaged in a life and death global struggle with the ruthless monolithic ideology that is communism.

These are valid yardsticks—borne out by the record, ours and the Communists'.

We neither sought nor accepted an inch of territory after emerging victorious with our allies from World War II. In fact, we shared our abundance with prostrate friend and foe alike.

At the same time the free world was opening the gates of independence to millions, the Soviet Union and Red China were

enslaving even more millions of once-free peoples.

Neither Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev nor Communist China's Chairman Mao Tse-tung have denied that the ultimate goal of the Communists is world domination. On the contrary, they boast of its inevitability.

These are the facts that we must face squarely and accept unflinchingly.

To do less is to fail our forefathers, to forfeit their legacy of liberty.

The Drive To Subvert Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, everywhere the focus these days is on youth. Much of the publicity, however, does not call attention to the strength, courage, enthusiasm, and constructive attitudes that almost every young American possesses. They know that they have the greatest of stakes in the results of the current ideological struggle, because they will live longest under its resulting regime.

The Communist knows this all too well and is constantly working to win by fair means or foul the minds and loyalty of youth to programs consistent with the Communist goals, usually not carrying the Communist label.

Recently an article appeared in Life Lines, published in Washington, D.C., that exposes this scheme and offers some suggestions. I think it deserves wide readership.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article entitled "Mistaken Continue Their Drive To Subvert Youth" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

MISTAKEN CONTINUE THEIR DRIVE TO SUBVERT YOUTH

The mistaken drive on youth, in America and around the world, continues. The freedom-haters have coldbloodedly determined to make every possible effort to turn the enthusiasm and vigor of young people to forwarding their own evil ends. They are using all the subtlety and craftiness in which they have long been trained to subvert youngsters in the United States, in Latin America, in Japan, in Europe.

The Un-American Activities Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives is much aware of the problem in this area. The committee is on the job, making studies and conducting hearings of Communist activities and propaganda among youth groups. Much information of value to fighters for freedom has been developed.

Committee Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER has said:

"I know that this committee's investigation in this area will probably precipitate a barrage from the Communist press and from Communist sympathizers characterizing our work as an investigation of youth. The Communists know as well as we do that the overwhelming majority of the young people of this Nation are of unquestioned patriotism and dedication to all that is good and noble in our society. But by equating an investigation of Communist activities among youth with an investigation of youth itself the Communists and their sympathizers hope to becloud the issue.

"This, of course, is an old trick which the Communists repeatedly use. When this committee investigates Communist activities in defense plants, the smokescreen that the Communists use is that we are investigating organized labor. When we investigate Communist activities in an educational institution it is protested by the Communists that we are investigating education.

"I am sure that the overwhelming majority of Americans readily see through this fraud and it shall not dissuade us from our task."

One of the witnesses appearing before a recent hearing of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on Communist activities and propaganda among youth groups was Herbert A. Philbrick of Rye Beach, N.H. Mr. Philbrick, a former undercover agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation serving in the Communist Party, stated that youth has always occupied a top position as a target of the Communists. But, he said, the mistaken antifreedom forces recently have felt that they are in an especially favorable position for a new drive on young people.

Mr. Philbrick said that the overall purpose of Communist-front youth organizations is "to strengthen the position of the Soviet Union and to weaken the position of the United States, to break down if possible, the loyalties of young people, their respect, their regard for their own nation, their own country, their own background, their own heritage."

In discussing the role of a Communist-front organization as a transmission belt for Communist propaganda Mr. Philbrick stated:

"The Communists knew that perhaps very few of the young people would be vulnerable to direct appeals by the Communist Party itself.

"They knew, for example, that if a leaflet or a pamphlet were to be given to the young people and it was clearly and accurately labeled Communist Party, they might tend to disregard it or perhaps not to believe it. However, if they were to take the same propaganda written at Communist Party headquarters, take off the label 'Communist Party' and put on a new label, such as 'American Youth for Democracy,' this they hoped would sufficiently disguise the subversive propaganda and the material would be accepted. The Communists called these organizations transmission belts. That is not my term. That is their term."

Commenting on the doubletalk used by the mistaken forces in their efforts to penetrate youth groups, Mr. Philbrick testified:

"When the Communists, for example, speak of the sharp struggle for peace, democracy, and security, what they really mean, of course, is the struggle on the part of the Soviet Union to win, to be victorious over the free world. When they speak of the democratic movements of youth, they, of course, do not mean democratic movements. They mean a totalitarian movement.

"They say groups of youth interested in Marxist study and action have appeared in a number of cities among college students, teenagers, and other youth.

"When they talk about Marxist study groups, they mean, of course, Marxist indoctrination groups, and it is interesting to note that the Communists are here bragging that these Marxist indoctrination groups have been formed among college students, teenagers, and other young people."

Mr. Philbrick recognizes the fact that the overwhelming majority of American young people are loyal and patriotic. In his testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, he offered this advice:

"I would first of all, suggest that our loyal young people support this committee in its efforts to make the truth be known, because there is one thing that the Communist Party fears more than anything else and that is the truth. They know they cannot survive if the truth were known. Hence, it is important that this committee and other investigating committees constantly procure and obtain the truth and make known these facts about communism and Communist activity in our country. Therefore, young people should support the work of this committee and of the Congressmen who give so much of their time to it.

"Secondly, our young people should demand that their schools and colleges provide them with information about communism. This is not being done now. There are very few schools and colleges which have adequate courses concerning communism. This they should demand because it is impossible for them (or for anyone) to fight an enemy unless they know their enemy.

"Third, our young people should not only be aware of the great crisis that we are in today, the worldwide crisis, the threat that communism poses against all of the free peoples and all of the free world, but they should also diligently study, learn, and come to appreciate the wonderful heritage, the great things of value which we have to protect and defend in this country."

There is thrilling evidence that young America is rising to the challenge of mistaken propaganda. Recently a group of college students formed what they call Young Americans for Freedom. Their organizational statement in part said:

"We, as young conservatives, believe that foremost among the transcendent values is the individual's use of his God-given free will, whence derives his right to be free from the restrictions of arbitrary force; that liberty is indivisible, and that political freedom cannot long exist without economic freedom; that the purposes of government are to protect these freedoms through the preservation of internal order, the provision of national defense, and the administration of justice; that when government ventures beyond these rightful functions, it accumulates power which tends to diminish order and liberty."

This is an affirmative program. It suggests a course that America will do well to follow.

Textile Industry

SPEECH
OF
HON. VERNON W. THOMSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished Congressman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], for bringing to the attention of this body the tragic plight of the textile industry, and particularly the woolen and worsted manufacturers. He has at long last touched upon one of the very basic reasons for the so-called depressed areas and surplus labor communities in this Nation. In my district we not only produce wool in large quantities, but also have there located the only surviving woolen and worsted mill in the Middle West. While woolen and worsted mills are closing all over the Nation, last year alone 61 million yards of woolen fabrics were imported into the United States.

This is enough fabric to keep between 60 and 70 mills operating the year round. The well-being of American industry is vital to the economic health of this country and the prosperity of wage earners and business, but this industry, along with many others such as rubber, zinc, storage batteries, furs—to name a few in my district alone—can no longer compete successfully with low-wage imports which have become a clear and present danger to the industries mentioned and to our national security and welfare. These industries have modernized their plants, improved their efficiency, invested huge sums in their businesses, and now face economic ruin by the tremendous increase in imports at prices below the American manufacturers' costs. If we act now we can save these American industries, provide jobs and wages, reduce unemployment, and eliminate the need to appropriate money from the Federal Treasury as aid and redevelopment for labor surplus areas in this Nation. Huge sums for redevelopment provide relief for the effect of these imports, while action in this field will remove the cause, and I again commend my colleague from Georgia and his associates for their efforts in this field which is so basic to the welfare of America. I would like to associate myself with the purposes outlined so ably by Congressman VINSON.

Effects of Foreign Textile Importation in Wisconsin

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to briefly show some of the effects which the increase in foreign textile importation has had in my district, Wisconsin's First.

In 1950 the First District of Wisconsin had 13 manufacturers of textile products; today there are 9. In addition one of the remaining firms is sharply curtailing its employment. This happens to be one of the largest.

The areas which have been most effected are those which now are suffering from chronic unemployment. The basic problem of unemployment cannot be entirely contributed to the loss of some textile jobs. Nevertheless, the total loss of these facilities has, and will continue to have, a detrimental effect upon the economy of the areas deprived of these jobs. This loss is not only felt by those who have lost their means of livelihood. When an industry closes its doors every merchant who services these people suffers loss. The local tax rolls are depleted. In actuality, the general economic complexion of a community is caused to degenerate.

Another aspect of this force upon the industry of the district which I represent are the problems caused by diversification. One of the larger manufacturers in my district has told me he is going to purchase more and more of his uncut fabrics on the foreign market instead of producing it himself. He will proceed to make finished garments from this material. He now employs 200 people making uncut fabric, but if he makes finished products from his own material he cannot compete with foreign imports. Nearly all of these 200 people are skilled in the uncut fabric field. However, this skill will be of no value to them as this manufacturer changes the orientation of his operations. This individual says he is sorry this must come about, but to stay in business these moves must be made.

These people are caught in the infamous cost-price squeeze. They are being priced out of the market by the foreign imports. This merchandise is being manufactured in countries where U.S. foreign aid has been used to assist in the revitalization of industry. The money to support these programs has come from the taxes levied upon the incomes of the very people who now face unemployment. I feel it is the duty of the Government to protect and maintain our domestic market for these so very generous people.

This body is well aware of the many constructive proposals made to alleviate this unpardonable burden upon one segment of America's economy. I would like to add my voice to those of my distinguished colleagues urging remedial action as soon as possible.

Bloomington, Minn., Athletic Stadium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of this week the citizens of Minnesota, and especially those in the Twin Cities area of Minneapolis and St. Paul, will embark on a new adventure which I think is significant of the growing economic life of our State. During 1961 two new major league professional athletic teams are making their new home at one of the finest athletic stadiums in the country, at Bloomington, Minn.

The Minnesota Twins baseball team will play its opening home game Friday afternoon. The Minnesota Vikings football team will begin its play in Bloomington in the fall. We think these new ventures are appropriate additions to the rich recreational, educational, economic, and cultural life enjoyed in Minnesota for the past many years.

The suburbs of the Twin Cities are the fastest growing suburbs, in terms of the rate of growth, in the Nation. I invite the Congress and the Nation to note our growth, as symbolized by the coming of two major league athletic teams to our area during this year.

Unemployment: Federal Reserve Versus Council of Economic Advisers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a basic controversy as to the nature of our present unemployment and the proper means for combating it has become evident in the statements which have been made regarding this very important subject. A comment on this controversy, as it was recently presented before the Joint Economic Committee in its hearings on the state of the Nation's economy, appeared in an editorial "Showdown Ahead?" in the April 12 issue of the Journal of Commerce of New York. I would like to enter this editorial at this point in the RECORD:

SHOWDOWN AHEAD?

The administration's economist and the Federal Reserve Board may have sought to minimize the differences between them after their spokesmen testified before Congress last month on economic conditions, but their actions since give every indication that their basic disagreement is as strong as ever.

It had appeared in the first week of March that Dr. Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and William McC. Martin, head of the Federal Reserve Board, had clashed in their opinions of what was needed to bring full-scale recovery after the economy started turning up. But immediately every effort was made to indicate that there was basic agreement—for both pointed out that there was enough basically wrong with the economy to require continued stimulation after business starts to pick up.

Yet no mention was made of the fact that they remained in basic conflict as to what means should be used to bring about this full recovery.

And what makes the situation even more arresting is that each of these men has since that time taken occasion to restate his own view of the conflict.

Dr. Heller's restatement of his basic position took place in an address to a press group in Washington a full 2 weeks after his testimony before Congress.

Simply, his position remained that the administration desires and plans to keep interest rates from rising again after business recovery get underway.

Instead of having interest rates turn around as soon as the recovery begins, the council chairman said, the administration wants the present rate structure to hold as long as unemployment continues high and the gap remains between potential and actual output of the economy. This, in essence, Dr. Heller restated his position that credit ease is needed to bring general economic recovery, and that this is a basic prerequisite to a lessening of the number of jobless.

Federal Reserve Board Chairman Martin also passed up his opportunity to let the whole matter of conflict drop. For he had his testimony before Congress reprinted in its entirety in the latest Federal Reserve Bulletin. Mr. Martin thus took the best means at his disposal to publicize the Board's feeling that the present unemployment is nothing easy money can help, but structural—caused by lack of training and need for relocation of the unemployed.

And in publishing the full reasons why the Board feels interest rates must be allowed to rise as the economy recovers rather than being kept low to fight a type of unemployment it can't cure, Mr. Martin is challenging the administration's concept that credit ease must be maintained as recovery progresses.

The willingness of both parties to restate their positions, even though they realize that it would be possible to assume a public posture of harmony, indicates how important each side holds its position to be.

It is thus hard to see how a showdown between the administration and the Federal Reserve can be avoided as the recovery develops, unless the administration beforehand takes basic steps to solve the structural unemployment problem.

Without doubt, the Federal Reserve realizes the truth of the administration's contention that easy credit and a general business recovery can do something to relieve joblessness. It just fears that if too much reliance is placed on credit ease to do a job it can't perform, the monetary authorities will cure only a small amount of the unemployment but at the price of a considerable amount of inflation.

Thus the administration has a chance to save face if it can induce Congress to help cure unemployment through specific actions, such as retraining, relocation, and measures to keep the very young out of the working force.

Otherwise it is apparent that a showdown with the Federal Reserve will be unavoidable. And that would have sharp unfavorable domestic and international consequences no matter which side won the battle.

The Constitution and What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DELBERT L. LATTA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Legion of Ohio promotes an essay contest among the high school students in Ohio.

The subject assigned was "The Constitution and What It Means." I am proud that the Fifth Congressional District of Ohio is represented among the 12 winners selected this year.

Mr. Hal Hanna of Bowling Green, Ohio, is one of the ninth grade winners. His prize winning essay is as follows:

THE CONSTITUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS
(By Hal Hanna)

The Constitution is a written plan for building a "government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived by the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a perfect union; established upon the principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity." It may be likened to a blueprint which architects draw.

This "blueprint" was drawn with great thought, prayer, patience, and compromise by dedicated, learned, and wise men who had risked their lives and fortunes for freedom. These architects, first of all, stated what they thought to be true purposes of a government: to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty.

To carry out these purposes, the architects planned a strong but limited central government. They described and stated all the powers of the national government, the powers and rights of the States, and the rights and freedoms of the individual citizen. The plain laid out the machinery for government with checks and balances to make sure no group could usurp power. It provided for government by law instead of by men. The written Constitution was the supreme law of the land. The architects allowed for careful and deliberate change, but they made the process of amendment difficult so as to avoid hasty and unwise changes.

After a workable form of government had been built, the architects of our Nation added "specifications" to the "blueprint" in the form of a Bill of Rights. These first 10 amendments guaranteed certain basic rights and freedoms for which people have worked and fought for many centuries. They include: freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, of assembly; the right to petition the Government for the redress of grievances; freedom from unreasonable search and seizure; the right to a fair trial by jury; just compensation for property taken for public use. Twelve other amendmens have been made since the Constitution's existence. One of them forbids slavery, and another gives women full voting rights.

Gladstone, a great English statesman, said, "The American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." It has been a working blueprint for America for more than 172 years. It is the oldest written Constitution still in force in the world today and has been preserved only through great idealism and great human sacrifice.

We Americans today dare not take the Constitution and our free Government for granted. Its usefulness is being challenged. There are some who say it is out of date and they would impatiently toss it aside. Some are indifferent, neglectful, or cynical and so have no reverence or respect for a "welfare state." Some say life has become so complicated that we must submit to increase control by the Government. Communism threatens our free way of life at home and abroad. Farseeing as the early architects were, they alone cannot safeguard our Constitution and liberties. If neglected, they will slip from us or be changed by selfish, ambitious, or foolish men from within our own land or from foreign shores. We must be as vigilant in guarding and preserving our Constitution and Bill of Rights as were the founding architects who achieved them.

Let's Encourage Rather Than Discourage the Buying Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, reports from a variety of business sources indicate the recession low is past and the level of business is pointed upward. In fact, there are economic experts who insist that the 1960–61 recession will be the mildest in the postwar period.

It also appears now that while we may be plagued with spotty unemployment for quite some time, there will be a gradual pattern of expanded business activity and consumer buying in the months ahead. Recently one of the national magazines carried an article which forecast a boom year in 1962 and another year of high prosperity in 1963.

There is no question that many enterprising small business leaders were upset by the pessimistic reports of some of the top people in the Kennedy administration. The fact of the matter is that no economic slump is helped by casting a pall of gloom and doom upon the Nation's buying public. This statement by no means purports to minimize the plight of the unemployed nor the conditions which create serious personal problems for many of our people who are hit by business recessions.

Perhaps one of the best letters I received dealing with the problem of public confidence was written by Mrs. Lillian M. Baar, a local businesswoman, who had this to say in a letter also directed to President Kennedy, Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, and our two Illinois Senators:

Too much fear of recession is being thrown into the hearts of the American people with such overemphasized talk, and it doesn't help matters in America or our prestige abroad to hear so much of this talk. It is like a cancer; it grows and grows—and becomes worse.

I have been in business for over 16 years and have been doing very well. Now buyers of homes are bringing in newspapers with quotes from the President and Mr. Goldberg saying there is a recession which may get worse and develop into a depression. So, many prospective buyers are saying that they will not buy at this time. Yet these people are qualified and are in a financial position to buy. In fact, in most cases, if they were to buy homes they would improve themselves, put more money into circulation and improve matters generally.

Recently I spoke to a woman who a few months ago was going to purchase $2,000 worth of new furniture. When I visited her home recently, she didn't have the new furniture and when I asked her if the furniture company had delayed in delivery it, she simply told me that she had canceled her order because she had been reading about Mr. Goldberg predicting a possible depression.

I should like to quote the entire letter which my constituent wrote, but suffice it to say that this portion clearly illustrates the point of these remarks.

The very nature of some of the legislation which may be foisted upon the American people seems to create a lack of confidence in our free enterprise system—a lack of confidence which is funneled right down to the level of John Q. Public, whose consumer dollars keep the wheels in motion.

What this country needs more than anything else today is a shot in the arm of good, old-fashioned confidence. Favorable economic climates are more than often created by public confidence in the future of this great Nation of free enterprise. If we get into the spirit of talking positively rather than negatively, we will best serve the interest of all the people of this country and its institutions.

San Antonio Girl, 15 Years Old, Inspired To Write and Dedicate a Poem to 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a group of 95 high school students from south Texas made the trip to Washington to attend the inaugural events.

One of these youngsters, Miss Carole Whitehead, a 15-year-old San Antonio high school student, was so impressed by the visit that she wrote a poem which she dedicated to the 87th Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have the poem with the accompanying letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

DEAR SENATOR: In the month of January, I had the privilege to attend the inauguration of the President, accompanied by 94 other high-school students from south Texas.

The ceremony was so solemn and beautiful it brought tears to my eyes. I'll never forget that day as long as I live. It was so moving, I can't begin to tell you how it affected me.

There I was in the heart of America witnessing the workings of freedom and democracy. The things I saw would go down as historic events in the annals of history. Standing there in the snow on Capitol Hill, I realized and truly understood what America meant to me. The love I cherish for this country and the men who govern it is unparalleled to anything in my life. I am only 15 but if I live to be 1,000 that will be the most thrilling moment of my life.

I also recently completed "Profiles in Courage." That marvelous piece of literature combined with the inauguration absolutely overwhelmed me.

Perhaps this letter and explanation will help validate my reasons for writing this poem dedicated to the heart of America's democracy, the Congress of the United States.

Sincerely,

CAROLE WHITEHEAD.

AN HONOR SO RARE

(By Carole Whitehead, dedicated to the 87th Congress of the United States)

The goal that great men work to,
Great men of faith and virtue,
Is one that sets them off from all the rest.
These men of greatness honor
The work of our forefathers
And make their code of morals free from fear.

These men that we elect
Are men of intellect.
They represent the people the best they can.
No matter their ambition
They'll fight for freedom's mission
Should conflicts come between them and their duty.

Men like Norris, Webster, Houston,
On high hopes had built their future
To reach the highest honor in the Nation.
But they cast their hopes aside
And withstood the pressing tide
For they could not give up fighting for mankind.

Their duty lay before them
And they progressed up and onward,
But their lives as public servants had been harmed.
They well knew the consequences
For they had taken many chances
Throughout their lives as servants of the people.

These men of courage hold
Their freedom and the sword
Above all else including their desires.
The Nation sees and waits
And knows it's not all fate
That sees the country through its times of need.

Few men can claim the goal
That a fewer number hold.
But the men that hold this office can be proud
That they found the needed courage
Many evils to discourage
From corrupting the foundations of our freedom.

Not just any man can be
A leader of the free.
Each must look inside his heart and find the truth.
He must find the wine of honor
In his heart above all others.
He must keep in mind the foundries of our hopes.

Some men have held this office
And not fulfilled the promise
They swore to when they took the oath of office.
But the great have pledged their all
And more will follow—rise or fall.
So, hurry, gentlemen. America is waiting.

The Coming Din of Inequity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in order to assist the Members in a better understanding of the true nature and implications of the social security financing mechanism, I would like to include a series of statements written by Mr. Ray M. Peterson, vice president and associate actuary of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States. Mr. Peterson has long been recognized as one of the Nation's outstanding actuaries and authorities on the social security system.

Following is the introduction to Mr. Peterson's articles on "The Coming Din of Inequity":

THE COMING DIN OF INEQUITY

(By Ray M. Peterson)

A great national debate is now in progress as to the issue of providing medical care and hospital benefits under the social security system. That debate can be pursued intelligently and wisely only if we understand the true nature and implications of the social security financing mechanism. Advocates of the social security approach assert that it is best because the social security financing mechanism is time tested and tried and proved. In my opinion this is not so. The social security financing mechanism has not yet met the test of time; its crucial tests still lie ahead. To argue otherwise either reveals an inaccurate or incomplete conception of the true nature of the social security financing mechanism or suggests a willful attempt to distort and misrepresent.

One purpose of this paper is to set the record straight by portraying an accurate picture of the financing mechanism as now operating and by exposing the distortion and misrepresentation, no matter what its origin. Another purpose, and the main one, is to show that there are excellent reasons for grave concern as to the probable ultimate effects of continued distortion and misrepresentation by interpreters of the Social Security Act, by statements of inadequately informed Members of Congress, and even by publications of the Social Security Administration itself.

Such concern arises because the public is being given the false impression that our social security program has many of the unique attributes of voluntary private insurance—attributes which the American people have come to value highly. When the American people ultimately come to know that the nature of our social security program is distinctly different, a rude awakening may well occur, one which could have important political and economic consequences. Will the youngsters of the future protest what the oldsters of this generation have voted for themselves? During the decade ahead, will we oldsters, as we seek to enjoy our social security benefits, hear a rising clamor of unfairness—a din of inequity? Let us examine the situation that is building up.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Here is some vital background information. In financing a national old-age pension program, there are possible two approaches as extremes—pay-as-you-go and full reserve—and an infinite number of combinations of the two.

Pay-as-you-go financing, as the term is used in the field of social insurance, means that the Government raises currently through taxes just enough funds to pay the cost of benefits currently due. No reserve is accumulated; no element of prepayment is involved; money is raised as and after payees become eligible to receive benefits. In this latter sense (i.e., relative to the time persons become eligible for benefits) pay-as-you-go is really a postpaid system of financing.

Full reserve financing, on the other hand, is a prepaid system of financing. All benefits are fully paid for or financed during the years prior to the time they are entered upon. Under full reserve financing, the dollar sum of all payments into the fund, together with the interest income earned from its investment, is sufficient to pay off all liabilities for guaranteed or promised benefits. No benefits are promised beyond what can be provided for—at any given point in time—by payments into the funds, plus interest earned.

Full reserve financing in the field of private insurance is the test of actuarial soundness, and it is the only concept of actuarial soundness with which the American people are generally familiar. The actuarial soundness of private insurance is assured by the use of insurance principles; any fiscal soundness (not actuarial) possessed by social insurance depends mainly on the taxing power of the Government. To call a social insurance program actuarially sound just because income balances outgo is to misuse the term.

Two other important points need to be made. One is that under voluntary private insurance the principle of individual equity is preserved; i.e., there is a direct relationship between contributions and benefits; one receives as insurance or annuity coverage precisely what one pays for. This is rarely the case under a social insurance pro-

gram. There a new concept, called social adequacy, prevails. As defined by R. A. Hohaus, in 1942: The measure of protection should be social adequacy for the insured and their families—that is, it should represent, as far as practicable, a basic layer of protection. Social adequacy usually makes it impractical to have individual equity for the insured in the sense of a mathematical quid pro quo return on account of the contributions made by or on behalf of the individual. A socially adequate benefit provides an income sufficient as basic protection against want and destitution, and, consequently, may be much more, or even much less, than an "equity" benefit.

TRUE NATURE OF SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCING

Now, let us establish the true nature of our social security financing mechanism. Evolving through a political process, there has been, beginning with the 1939 amendments, a continuing shift away from substantial individual equity toward social adequacy, and the financing method has become a mixture of full reserve financing and pay-as-you-go, with the latter far outweighing the former. All this has been clearly stated by the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration. With respect to the gradually emerging philosophy of benefits, the Chief Actuary said:

"The issues of underlying philosophy for an old-age benefit formula under the social insurance approach have been summed up in the expression individual equity versus social adequacy.' It was generally recognized that individual equity is of paramount importance in administering voluntary old-age insurance on a sound financial basis since each individual has the right to purchase insurance or not as he wishes. However, under a governmental social insurance plan, individual equity in the relationship of the individual's future benefit to his current contribution is not essential to financial soundness, since the individual has no choice as to being covered or as to his rate of benefits or contributions.

"The issue was resolved in the 1939 amendments by a major change in emphasis, as a result of which the old-age benefit formula is based largely on the adequacy concept—and thus to only a small extent on the equity concept."

Then, as to the financing method, he added:

"The principles upon which to base the financing of old-age and related benefits in a social insurance system have been discussed at great length both in this country and abroad.

"This debate was especially active early in the development of our old-age insurance system, when the size of the fund to be accumulated was a burning question. As is often the case in this country, the answer was arrived at through a pragmatic political process rather than through a theoretical philosophical process. And, as is also often the case, the pragmatic process has resulted in an answer which, to date at least, has worked out satisfactorily. Just as the benefit formula is a blend of equity and adequacy, with much greater emphasis on the latter, so is the financing method a blend of reserve and pay-as-you-go, with the latter having the greater weight."

Are these blends so bland as to blind us to blunders? There is grave danger of this.

Let us turn now to another authoritative source, which describes the pay-as-you-go nature of our financing method and shows that an individual's benefits are not financed by his own contributions but by the contributions of others. In an opinion handed down on June 20, 1960, the Supreme Court of the United States had this to say:

"The program is financed through a payroll tax levied on employees in covered employment, and on their employers. The tax proceeds are paid into the Treasury 'as internal revenue collections,' and each year an amount equal to the proceeds is appropriated to a trust fund, from which benefits and the expenses of the program are paid.

"Persons gainfully employed, and those who employ them, are taxed to permit the payment of benefits to the retired and disabled, and their dependents. Plainly the expectation is that many members of the present productive force will in turn become beneficiaries rather than supporters of the program. But each worker's benefits, though flowing from the contributions he made to the national economy while actively employed, are not dependent on the degree to which he was called upon to support the system by taxation."

In Great Britain, the national pension scheme was recently modified so as to bear considerable resemblance to ours both as to benefit formula and financing method. A recent British observer had this to say:

"The conservative scheme is dignified with the actuarial name 'assessmentism' (the cost of the pension is assessed annually and the contributions to pay them arranged accordingly), or in common parlance 'pay as you go'; the future pensioner is paying for existing pensions and will in turn have to trust to a future generation of taxpayers in his retirement.

"What is the employee's security in a state scheme? It accumulates no funds; the money he pays in goes out almost at once to pensioners; when he retires he will have to rely on the contributors and taxpayers, on the value of money, on the government, on the economic and social climate, and on world conditions which the government cannot control. If employees were told these things, would there be an overwhelming vote for state pensions? For 'pay as you go' they might read 'hope as you pay.' "

For the years 1956 through 1965, tax collections for old-age survivors, and disability insurance (OASDI) will total $115.1 billion and OASDI benefits and expenses will total $114.5 billion. These figures clearly show that we are now almost completely on a "pay as you go" or "hope as you pay" basis.

Anniversary of Warsaw Ghetto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1961, I sent the following telegram to Jewish Labor Committee Workmen's Circle, Congress for Jewish Culture, on the occasion of a dinner to commemorate the Warsaw Ghetto uprising against the Nazis on April 19, 1943:

APRIL 18, 1961.

JEWISH LABOR COMMITTEE WORKMEN'S CIRCLE,
CONGRESS FOR JEWISH CULTURE,
New York, N.Y.

Message to antitotalitarian grouping to be read at meeting, Hotel Statler, April 19: "The brave and nameless heroes who displayed superhuman courage and the deepest love for human freedom by standing against the subhuman hordes of Nazis in Warsaw are as immortal as their deed. It is right that they should be honored at any time, but particularly now during the trial of a chief Nazi criminal, as a reminder of the inhuman acts against which the Warsaw heroes fought and as a warning that there shall never be another Nazi era nor another such sacrifice as the Warsaw ghetto annihilation. I salute the brave men among you who survived that costly freedom stand."

JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Member of Congress.

Savings-Loan Holding Units Buy Banks, Rent Offices, Build Homes—They Invest in Rivals' Stock, May Enter Insurance Field; Trend Arouses Criticism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on April 12, 1961, describes the expanding activities of a bank holding company. I feel that this article points out the need for immediate remedial legislation in this area. I have been working on a bill toward that purpose and I hope to have it ready for presentation to the Congress very shortly. I am pleased to commend the article to the attention of our colleagues:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 12, 1961]

SAVINGS-LOAN HOLDING UNITS BUY BANKS, RENT OFFICES, BUILD HOMES—THEY INVEST IN RIVALS' STOCK, MAY ENTER INSURANCE FIELD; TREND AROUSES CRITICISM

(By Mitchell Gordon, staff reporter of the Wall Street Journal)

Philip J. Matthew, energetic executive vice president of Empire Financial Corp., a Los Angeles-based savings and loan holding company, is currently in the Bahamas, where finishing touches are being put on a new bank Empire will open there officially next week. When that's done, Mr. Matthew plans to return to southern California to start a personal loan company and he hopes to acquire a casualty insurance company as well.

Says Mr. Matthew: "We intend to create a supermarket of finance—and we may get into other businesses besides."

Such activity reflects, admittedly to an extreme, the intense diversification effort now being made by an industry which until recently hardly knew what the word meant. Until a few years ago, only a small number of savings and loan units were set up as holding companies legally entitled to enter any business they pleased. The rest, some 6,200, were established as individual associations required by State and Federal laws to put most of their funds into mortgages on real property, mainly single family homes, or in municipal or Government bonds.

FEDERAL LIMITATION

Today, however, there are more than a dozen savings and loan holding companies in operation with better than 50 associations under their wings. A growing number of these companies are turning to other kinds of businesses even though the savings and loan field remains prosperous. The reason: Federal legislation enacted last year prevents holding companies from acquiring additional interests in savings and loan associations if they hold a 10 percent or greater interest in one such association. But the law says nothing about other activities the holding companies might pursue.

Consequently, the holding companies are speedily entering other fields. Trans-World Financial Co., another Los Angeles-based savings and loan holding company, expects to complete its first development of homes—61 are being built in all—in Northridge in the San Fernando Valley by the middle of June. Forty-two of the homes, which range in price from $30,000 to $35,000, already have been sold and the company may soon pick up 40 acres for an additional 80 to 100 homes, according to Louis J. Galen, Trans-World's 35-year-old president.

In Hawthorne, Calif., Hawthorne Financial Corp., also a savings and loan holding company, is negotiating for the purchase of the Pacific State Bank. The bank, which has a headquarters facility in Hawthorne and four branches elsewhere in the Los Angeles area, had assets of $20 million at the end of 1960. Cecil Garton, Hawthorne Financial's president, says his company hopes to have a string of at least four banks within the next year or two.

INTEREST IN BANK

Besides its new operation in the Bahamas, Empire Financial has an 88.25-percent interest in another bank, the Erie Bank of Erie, Colo.

Since it began operations about 2 years ago, Midwestern Financial Corp. of Boulder, Colo., has added to its string of three savings and loan associations the following diverse concerns: A mortgage loan company (which acts as an intermediary between mortgage lenders and borrowers), and an industrial bank (which makes installment loans to consumers and businesses) in Colorado, a real estate agency in Kansas and a land development company in Missouri.

Lytton Financial Corp. is considering erecting a multistory office building adjacent to its headquarters on Sunset Boulevard in Los Angeles and recently announced the acquisition of the Southland Co., a Beverly Hills mortgage loan outfit with a capitalization of $1.5 million.

At least one savings and loan holding company is delving into the investment business for its own account. An executive says the company so far has put more than $100,000 of spare cash into the common stocks of some of its holding company competitors and into certain insurance firms. He says the holding company realized a capital gain of "a penny or two a share" in 1960 and has a 20- to 30-percent paper (unrealized) profit on its portfolio at present.

Such activity on the part of the holding companies is kicking up considerable criticism from more conservative members of the industry, particularly by executives of savings and loan associations that are not affiliated with holding companies. These associations, owned by their savers, comprise about 90 percent of all the savings and loan institutions in the Nation. Says one such executive in reference to the holding companies: "These people are being allowed to do, indirectly as holding companies, what they're prohibited from doing directly as associations. Furthermore, if they get into trouble financially, some savers are going to be confused and pull out their money and that could have repercussions throughout the entire savings and loan field."

Holding company executives argue few savers know which holding companies own which associations since rarely do their names indicate any relationships. Furthermore, these officials declare, accounts in most savings and loan institutions are insured up to $10,000 each by an agency of the Federal Government and this in itself tends to assure stability. These executives also argue that State laws in the case of State-chartered associations and Federal laws in the case of federally chartered institutions prevent holding companies from raiding their associations, no matter how desperate their need for funds might become.

Critics of the holding companies' diversification also contend the companies are pushing too deeply into fields that are unrelated and perhaps even unfamiliar to savings and loan executives. If the holding companies can enter the homebuilding and office rental business, these critics argue, they might even get into manufacturing enterprises someday. Most opponents of the diversification trend hope for some sort of legislation that will limit the activities of the holding companies to areas traditionally associated with savings and loan institutions. But no such legislation has been introduced at the Federal or State level, so far at least.

Holding company officials take exception to the charge that they are entering unfamiliar fields. Mr. Galen of Trans-World Financial, for instance, notes he was a builder before he ever got into the savings and loan business and that anyway building isn't foreign to savings and loan associations. Federal law, he notes, permits federally chartered associations to invest up to 20 percent of their resources in raw land for development as they see fit. Mr. Galen says a number of individual associations have used this provision in the past to contract with builders to build and sell houses for them, with the associations carrying the mortgages.

Address by Congressman Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 the Sertoma Club of Mesa, Ariz., was fortunate to be able to present as the speaker for an all-community and area meeting the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives. Congressman WALTER spoke on the subject about which he knows so much and feels so strongly—communism, and its threat to our way of life and the freedom of the world. His speech was so outstanding and so enthusiastically received by his audience that I am proud to share it with all the Members of the Congress:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WALTER TO THE SERTOMA CLUB OF MESA, ARIZ.

It was with great pleasure that I accepted the invitation to address you men of the Mesa Sertoma Club who have dedicated yourselves to services to mankind. The goal of your organization is certainly most praiseworthy, one that is in the best tradition not only of our American heritage but of our entire Judeo-Christian civilization. It is also a goal which, if properly pursued in the context of today's developments, can perform an extraordinary service to mankind—because mankind today faces an extraordinary peril, one that it can meet only by extraordinary effort. This peril threatens the eclipse of freedom and the destruction of civilization which makes it possible for us to meet here today with the tremendous political, social, economic, and cultural advantages we enjoy—advantages far greater than those enjoyed by any other people in the past.

It is not necessary for me to spell out in detail the nature of the peril mankind faces. I am sure that recent and current developments in the Congo and Laos—and just 90 miles from our shores, in Cuba—have made that peril plainly evident to all thinking persons.

A recent report indicates that, in western Cuba, an installation has been completed which required hundreds of tons of portland cement. It is more than probable that this installation is a missile base. If so, it means that every single city in the United States is within a few minutes range—and I want to stress that, a few minutes range—of Soviet nuclear missiles.

In the light of these developments, what service can you perform for mankind and for your fellow American citizens? In the past, the Mesa Sertoma Club and Sertoma Clubs in all parts of the country have completed many worthwhile projects of assistance, in one form or another, to a variety of deserving organizations, agencies and individuals in the fields of medicine, education and social welfare, to name just a few—not only in the United States but abroad as well. To the best of your ability, you should certainly continue such undertakings which serve to make your community, your country and the world a better place to live in.

As worthwhile as these projects are, however, I believe that, today, all of us must do more because, if the threat we face is not defeated, your ability to perform the services you have rendered in the past will be taken away from you—completely. If it is not defeated, in place of freedom to serve you will have only the compulsion to slave, to serve a totalitarian, monolithic state that considers man no more than another kind of animal, a kind of rational cog in a political and economic machine.

What can you do? To answer that question you must first analyze the nature of our Government and how our Nation is geared to meet all challenges.

In our representative form of government we have four major weapons in meeting any problem, whether it is domestic communism, flood control, conservation or military defense. Our weapons are information or knowledge; legislation, that is, laws; prosecutive or law enforcement agencies, and finally—and most important of all—an alert, informed and active citizenry.

It is the function of the Congress and its committees to develop information on national problems through investigation, research and hearings, and to pass appropriate legislation, if it is needed, to cope with these problems. It is also its job to plug loopholes in existing laws and to oversee the operations of the executive branch.

Congressional committees, in the course of their hearings, perform a valuable and essential side function—that of informing the American people, who are the ultimate rulers of this land, about a problem and the issues involved in it.

This informing function is accomplished through the committee's published hearings and reports and also, of course, by press, magazine, radio, and TV coverage of committee proceedings.

For over 20 years the House of Representatives has relied upon the Committee on Un-American Activities to perform its vital legislative and informing functions in the field of countering Communist subversion—and the committee has done a creditable job in this field.

The committee's enemies claim that it has accomplished little in the way of legislation and that it has operated primarily to expose people. The truth is very much the opposite.

Independent studies made by the Library of Congress reveal that in the years 1941 to 1960, the Committee on Un-American Activities has made 96 separate and distinct legislative recommendations to the Congress. They reveal that 35 of these recommendations have been adopted by the Congress and are now a part of the law of this land which

is designed to protect you and the Nation from the destructive, subversive forces of communism.

These studies also reveal that 52 bills and 1 House resolution embodying recommendations of the committee were pending at the close of the last Congress, the 86th, and that 8 of these bills had been passed by the House, although the Senate did not act on them.

Again, these studies reveal that the executive branch of our Government has adopted 13 recommendations of the Committee on Un-American Activities which covered policy matters rather than legislation.

It is unsound, of course, to judge a congressional committee solely on the quantity of its legislative recommendations and the number of them enacted into law—just as it is unsound to judge an artist by the number, rather than the quality, of the works he produces. The facts I have cited, however—plus the findings of the courts on legislation which has resulted from committee recommendations—completely refute the charge that it has ignored its legislative function.

As far as its informing function is concerned, the many thousands of published pages of committee hearings, reports, consultations, and scholarly works—on numerous facets of communism—have been a vital service to the Congress, the executive branch, and to the American public. I believe I can say without fear of contradiction that there is no agency in the United States today that has provided the Government and the people with both the quantity and quality of information on communism that the Committee on Un-American Activities has.

Once legislation has been passed, it becames the duty of the executive branch to enforce it. This is where, in the field of Communist activities, the Federal Bureau of Investigation enters the picture as a branch of the Department of Justice. The Federal Bureau of Investigation operates under directives of the Attorney General of the United States, our country's chief law enforcement officer. It is his investigative arm.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation's job is to collect evidence that will make possible the trial and conviction of lawbreakers. Over the years, in the field of Communist subversion the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under its great Director, J. Edgar Hoover, has done a marvelous job of penetrating the Communist Party, keeping track of all its activities and the identity of its members. Numerous Communist Party leaders have been tried and convicted under the Smith Act—on evidence collected by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Others have been tried and convicted under our espionage laws, or, if diplomats, have been exposed and shipped back behind the Iron Curtain as persona non grata—all on the basis of evidence provided by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

It is most important that we remember, however, that most of the extensive information the Federal Bureau of Investigation collects on the operations of the Communist conspiracy in this country, for a number of good reasons, is kept absolutely secret. For the most part, it is never revealed to the public except in the case of a court trial.

Because the FBI is purely an investigating agency and has neither the legislative nor the informing function of a congressional committee, it, alone, cannot do a thorough job of protecting this country from communism.

I have heard some people criticize the Committeee on Un-American Activities because it has not "convicted" any Communists or spies lately. It is not the committee's job to do this. As I have just indicated, this is the work of the executive branch of the Government, the FBI, and the Department of Justice.

In some cases, in the course of its hearings, the committee has produced evidence that was later used in the courts to convict certain individuals. The most famous of these cases was that of Alger Hiss. There have been quite a few others. But when this happens, it is more or less an incidental development, on offshoot of the committee's primary function of holding hearings for legislative purposes.

Here, then, we have in a nutshell, the picture of how our Government is set up to meet the threat of internal communism:

The Congress, with the Committee on Un-American Activities playing a special role, develops information and legislation pertinent to the problem. The Department of Justice, with the FBI playing a special role, then develops the evidence to prosecute those who have broken the law—with the courts judging innocence or guilt.

Many people wrongly believe that this is all that needs to be done to defeat communism. They feel that they can relax and forget about the problem because appropriate governmental agencies are taking care of it. I am sorry to say that these people are wrong. The committee and the FBI have found Communists operating in every important phase of American life—in Government, in trade unions, in the moving-picture industry, radio and TV fields; in the theater, the publishing industry, the Armed Forces, the teaching, legal and medical professions. It is difficult to name an area, profession, trade, or industry that has not been infiltrated by the Red fifth column.

The most dangerous type of Communist activity is the day-to-day semiconcealed agitation and propaganda which is being carried out by this fifth column in the cities, towns, and villages across the country; in schools, colleges, and churches, in clubs and organizations of all kinds, in unions, in industry, and in the press.

This is the weapon with which the Communists have subverted other nations and weakened them for the kill. It is the weapon with which they can eventually destroy this Nation—if it is not wrenched from their hands.

Most important, this activity is not illegal. The FBI can do nothing about it—except to add to its bulging files the names of the individuals taking part in it.

What can the Committee on Un-American Activities do?

J. Edgar Hoover testified in February 1960, that the FBI then had 160 known or suspected Communist controlled and infiltrated groups under investigation. Party members in this country number many thousands and fellow travelers many, many thousands more.

Obviously, the Committee on Un-American Activities, in the course of each year, can investigate no more than a very small fraction of the activities of these groups and individuals.

This means that for the most part, as far as governmental agencies are concerned, most of the Communist Party's most dangerous operations are completely unimpeded.

Let me give you one example of how fateful these operations can be.

A new nationwide Communist front is set up. It establishes branches in many cities and towns. Its members start passing out propaganda and hold public meetings and rallies at which pro-Communist and concealed Communist speakers are featured. By a concerted campaign of deceptive propaganda and agitation, it induces many citizens in many communities to accept a position on some vital national question—such as that of nuclear weapons testing—which follows exactly the line of the Communist Party and of Moscow. It succeeds in getting many of these people to promote this position in letters to Members of Congress, the White House and the Department of State—and to sell their friends the idea that the United States should sign an agreement with the Soviet Union banning nuclear tests, even though Moscow will not permit adequate inspection of its territory so that we can be sure it is living up to the agreement.

Concerted nationwide activity along these lines—if not fought and exposed—could have disastrous effects, not only on our country's testing policy but, through it, on our very survival.

The Communist Party's extensive activity of this type, designed to gradually bring about Communist conquest of America, must be fought on the community level by Mr. and Mrs. America. It must be fought by businessmen, educators, clergymen, municipal officials, the press—people in every walk of life.

How can you fight it? Through letters to local newspapers; by countermeetings and rallies at which persons well-informed on Communist activities, startegy, and tactics are featured as speakers; by the issuance of effective counterpropaganda; by the exposure of the backgrounds of the Communist and pro-Communist agitators doing the conspiracy's work.

Because it is so difficult to obtain documentary evidence of Communist Party membership today—there has been no such thing as a card-carrying Communist since 1948—those who would fight the Communists must be better informed on national and international issues than ever before. When you cannot destroy the effectiveness of the Communist propagandist by revealing his subversive ties, you must then be able to meet and defeat him on the facts and issues of each case.

Communist front organizations are not the only danger. There are many other types of Communist-serving activity which the American people must fight:

A Hollywood producer hires a person who is a Communist to write the script of a film admirably suited to promotion of the Communist Party line. He may do so openly or in a sneaky, under-the-table manner, with the writer's true name concealed;

A respectable publishing firm releases a party-line book on some foreign country or on a vital foreign policy matter which is written by a man who is a member of the Communist Party and has extensive affiliations, over a period of many, many years, with Communist front organizations.

Again, there is nothing illegal about any of these activities. The FBI can do nothing about them and, in most cases, neither can the Committee on Un-American Activities. Yet each incident such as these—and there are many of them taking place all the time—is a battle or engagement in the continuing internal conflict the Communists are waging against the Untied States to weaken and destroy it as a free nation.

What are now the main goals of the Communist Party? What are the issues on which you must be particularly well-informed today if you want to be effective in fighting communism?

On January 20 the Communist Party's national secretary, Gus Hall, addressed a meeting of its national executive committee in New York City. He told the leaders of the conspiracy that, to promote world Communist victory, the new administration must be pressed to act in the following directions:

"1. To begin immediately to dismantle the whole system of camps.

"2. To end all squabbling and obstruction by our representatives and to reach agreement to abolish all nuclear testing now.

"3. To put an end to all policies of brinkmanship and the fomenting of increased world tensions. To * * * accept as our policy the outlook of peaceful coexistence."

(By this he means, of course, the abandonment of any resistance to Soviet aggression—such as in Laos.)

"4. To take up seriously the task of disarmament and to plan now for the use of

the billions being squandered on arms for houses, hospitals, schools, roads, and other social service and social welfare needs.

"5. To end the Dulles-Eisenhower era of was alliances and war pacts * * *."

(In other words, disband NATO, SEATO, and all other international, mutual defense agreements.)

After outlining these five key Communist goals, Hall said that the Communist fight for general, universal disarmament was "of special importance" and that the movement to ban nuclear tests and outlaw nuclear weapons was "of the most immediate importance" to the Kremlin and "must be pressed with the greatest vigor."

So here are the keys, immediate goals of the Kremlin and its fifth column in the United States. Not every one who believes in these goals is a Communist. But I would say that anyone who agrees with all or most of them had better do some rethinking and studying the facts and issues involved.

They may sound fine on the surface but you can be sure there is a joker in them somewhere. If not, Communists in all parts of the world, under Moscow's orders, would not be working day and night for them.

As you can readily see, neither the FBI nor the Committee on Un-American Activities can determine whether or not the United States will sign a nuclear test ban with the Soviet Union, and if so, what the provisions of that pact will be. They cannot decide whether this country will adopt a policy of universal disarmament, or whether it will begin dismantling its oversea bases. The vital question of U.S. policy in the face of Soviet aggression will be decided by neither of these agencies.

The same applies to the question of recognition of Red China, the abolition of compulsory ROTC, repeal of the Smith Act and the Internal Security Act, the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and numerous other matters which are the openly stated goals of the U.S. Communist Party and, therefore, of the Kremlin.

Each one of these questions—and they are all significant issues as far as the outcome of our battle for survival is concerned—will be decided largely by the average citizen and the views on them he makes known to the Congress, the White House, to the press and his fellow citizens.

The key battles in this war are being fought in the towns and villages of this country, in our schools and colleges, in the press, and in citizens associations and organizations of all kinds.

The people of this country, on the local level, can meet—and defeat—the traitors and their collaborators who are trying to sell America down the river. Morever, they must do it.

This country has never won any war without the all-out support of the great majority of its people. It is engaged in world war III at this moment. At the present time, within this country, we are in a nonmilitary phase of that war, but it is a war nevertheless, and the all-out support of the American people is needed if we are to win.

Many years ago Lenin wrote: "We must train men and women who will devote to the revolution, not merely their spare evenings, but the whole of their lives."

Communist success in training such men and women is the key reason for the tremendous power they wield today. Members of the various Communist Parties of the world comprise only a little more than 1 percent of the world's population—yet they completely rule one-third of the people of this globe and have extensive influence on millions of others. They have devoted to their cause not merely their spare evenings, but the whole of their lives.

Sixty years ago when Lenin wrote the words I have just quoted, he faced the challenge of converting the world to his philosophy and of destroying ours. Today, we are faced with a similar challenge. If we are to defeat the international Communist conspiracy so that our own way of life may endure, we must devote ourselves to our cause as wholly as the Communists have devoted themselves to theirs. There is no other way.

The Communists have thrown a challenge to the members of the Sertoma Clubs—as they have to all Americans. It is a challenge to your good citizenship, your loyalty and devotion to your country—and your true devotion to mankind. It is also a challenge which, I am sure, all of you will accept and on which you will not give ground until it has been totally defeated.

Politics and Social Security: A Dangerous Combination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on March 6 of this year I placed in the RECORD a speech which I had made entitled "Politics Can Destroy Social Security" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 87th Cong., 1st sess., pp. A1512–A1514). I believe that it is necessary to evaluate proposals made in the field of social security legislation with respect to the basic premise of my speech, that political tampering with our social security system can do it serious damage.

One aspect of this danger is cited in the report of a statement by Mr. Ray M. Peterson, vice president of Equitable Life Assurance Association, in the New York Times of Saturday, April 8. I would like to insert that report at this point in the RECORD:

ACTUARY HITS BILL ON MEDICAL CARE—FEARS FINANCING THROUGH SOCIAL SECURITY MIGHT PERIL INTERNAL PEACE

(By Russell Porter)

An insurance expert said yesterday that proposed financing of medical care for the aged through social security might eventually endanger the Nation's internal peace.

Ray M. Peterson, a leading actuary, said the proposal might lead to further costly expansion of the social security system that might have "important political and social consequences." Future generations might ultimately revolt against the cost to them of benefits that present older citizens voted to themselves, he suggested.

Mr. Peterson, a vice president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, made these statements in an article in the current issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association. The article was released to the lay press yesterday.

The title of the article, "The Coming Din of Inequity," refers to a "rising clamor of unfairness" that Mr. Peterson predicted would be heard from younger generations unless social security was reorganized and unless medical care was kept out of it. The entire social security structure might collapse unless put on a sound basis, he warned.

AMA LEADING FIGHT

The AMA has led the fight against President Kennedy's program and other Democratic proposals in Congress to bring medical care under social security. The President sent Congress a message in February with a program to finance health benefits for 14,200,000 citizens 65 years old or over through higher social security payroll taxes.

Others have proposed greatly increased social security benefits and taxes in a broadly expanded program. Some critics have predicted that medical care for the aged would lead to a health insurance program for everybody with a tremendous tax burden.

Mr. Peterson said the various Democratic proposals for medical care for the aged now before Congress would add $15 billion to $30 billion to the permanent debt of the social security system. He charged that future generations would have to pay interest forever on this debt, which he estimated had grown from $150 billion in 1952 to $300 billion in 1958. If all current proposals to expand social security were enacted into law, he went on, they would raise the debt to more than $500 billion.

RUDE AWAKENING SEEN

Charging that the system had been officially misrepresented by likening it to private insurance, which he said sets up a full reserve to provide for benefits, he went on:

"When the American people ultimately come to know that the nature of our social security program is distinctly different, a rude awakening may well occur.

"Will the youngsters of the future protest what the oldsters of this generation have voted for themselves?"

He said older members of the social security system received large unearned benefits compared to their contributions, but "the pendulum swings the other way for the youngest members and all new entrants." He said they had to pick up the tab in the form of paying interest on the debt for unearned benefits paid to their elders.

Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1962

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 6345, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, 1962.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1962, I would like to say that I am pleased to have voted in favor of the Ryan amendment to that bill—the amendment which would, if it had passed, have prohibited the expenditure of Civil War Centennial funds appropriated by the Congress for the use of facilities in which individuals are segregated because of race, religion, or color, or for activities in which individuals are discriminated against for reason of race, religion or color. I am sorry that the amendment was voted down, but I am pleased that the Chairman of the Com-

mittee of the Whole House ruled that such an amendment was germane.

If segregation and discrimination did not exist, an amendment of this nature, naturally, would be unnecessary. Unfortunately, these practices do exist, and there is some evidence that they have existed in the activities of, and in the facilities used by, the Civil War Centennial Commission, a Commission whose real purpose is to commemorate the historic convulsion which, at the expense of many lives and great suffering, decided that America would be perpetuated as the land of equality of opportunity for all, regardless of race, religion or color.

As a Kansan I am particularly pleased to have had the opportunity to lend my support to the amendment. The Kansas Centennial Year and the Civil War Centennial Year come at the same time. A great deal of the history leading up to the admission of Kansas into the Union and the beginning of the conflict of 1861 are one and the same. Kansas was admitted to the Union just a few days before the war began. Abraham Lincoln raised the first 34-star flag, the flag with the star of Kansas, over Independence Hall in Philadelphia while en route to his inauguration here in Washington. Of course, Kansas stood with Lincoln and the Union and the idea that "all men are created equal." Many rivers ran red with the blood of Kansans who fought to insure the idea of equality of opportunity for all, and for me to vote "yes" on the Ryan amendment was consistent with those ideals for which my forebears fought and died, and those same ideals in which I firmly believe.

Minority Views on Social Security Amendments of 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for the convenience of the Members who are interested in the actuarial soundness of the social security system, I herewith include as a part of my remarks the minority views on the report on H.R. 6027, the bill now before you:

VIII. MINORITY VIEWS

We believe in a soundly financed and equitably conceived system of social security that properly seeks to provide a basic floor of retirement and survivorship protection for the American people on a nondiscriminatory basis. The existing old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program falls considerably short of meeting these requirements.

We are opposed to a system of so-called social insurance that (1) discourages individual productivity, (2) impairs individual ability to achieve self-sufficiency, (3) illogically and arbitrarily differentiates among citizens in regard to benefit eligibility and amount, and (4) spends currently the savings of the present generation so that the commitments of the system to one generation will inevitably fall on succeeding generations in increasing magnitude. The present old-age survivors, and disability insurance program tragically possesses these shortcomings on every count and with seemingly unshakable firmness persists in their retention.

We are opposed to the enactment of H.R. 6027 because it seeks to enact a combination of illy conceived or inadequate modifications in a social security structure that urgently requires much more basic and sweeping reform to be acceptable and workable. There seems to us little merit or future in adding another room to a house built on sand.

We associate ourselves fully with the criticisms in the supplemental views by our Republican colleagues with respect to the proposal to reduce the possible retirement age for men to 62 years. We also tend to support the recommendations of our Republican colleagues to liberalize the retirement test and to end the present unconscionable discrimination against those present aged who through no fault of their own are precluded from a benefit entitlement even though their need is the greatest and even though they may have contributed as much to the OASI trust fund as many present beneficiaries. With respect to the proposed increase in certain dependent's benefits, we can see no reason or rationale for saying to a widow that she can have only 75 percent or 82½ percent or any other percent less than 100 percent of the amount paid to a retired man. We would support a proposal to equate the benefit entitlement between these two classes of beneficiaries.

We should frankly recognize that the present social security system is not insurance and we should end the cruel pretense of maintaining on the basis of an insurance concept that some citizens are deserving of higher benefits than others and some citizens are deserving of no benefits. It serves no useful purpose to characterize as insurance what is merely a statutory mechanism combining welfare and insurance characteristics which emerge as a hybrid that is not insurance and that provides welfare only on a hit-or-miss basis. This mechanism is essentially a device for taking the productivity of one group of our citizens to provide for the welfare of another group and these groups may or may not be of the same generation.

We support the portion of the supplemental views of our Republican colleagues expressed in regard to the tax schedule in existing law and proposed in this legislation necessary to finance the OASDI program. In commenting on the tax burden we stress the fact that the OASDI system has not met the critical test of time. We are told that the system will not mature until well into the 21st century. In the interim it is entirely possible that experience will prove the present tax schedule inadequate. We are perhaps not justified in assuming that future generations will acquiesce in tax burdens to which we are now so willing to commit them.

We also join in the supplemental views of our Republican colleagues with respect to concern over the willingness of the administration to utilize the OASDI program for pump-priming purposes. The fact that the administration did not recommend any comparable liberalization of the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act reveals a dangerous inclination to use the OASDI trust funds for fiscal policy purposes to pursue an objective that, if it is to be done at all, should be done through the Treasury general fund route.

Our reservations with respect to the existing social security program and the amendments proposed in H.R. 6027, aside from considerations of equity and fairness, are primarily directed to our serious doubts over the financial ability of the program to sustain itself in perpetuity. The assumptions on which the system is pronounced sound are inescapably predicated almost completely on economic and population forecasting. There is less reason to question the actuarial conclusions if the assumed economic and population forecasts are correct. Our concern is that these forecasts may prove to be at substantial variance with experience, with the result that the tremendous obligations already accumulated under the OASDI system will prove an intolerable burden.

The existing system is established on the principle that taxes will be imposed on future earned income of future workers to pay benefits obligations that have been previously incurred. The magnitude of these obligations can be demonstrated by an examination of certain actuarial data:

First, an employee with maximum taxable earnings since the program began in 1937 would have contributed, through December 31, 1960, a total of $1,290, so that the combined employer-employee taxes are $2,580. If such an individual reached age 65 on January 1, 1961, and had a wife the same age, the average total amount of benefits that would be paid out in this case would be about $31,200.

Secondly, a similar individual who qualifies for the minimum benefit could have contributed as little as $6.50 (by obtaining 13 quarters of coverage at the minimum rate of $50 of wages per quarter during the period 1937–49, when the contribution rate was 1 percent); in such case, the combined employer-employee taxes would be $13. The total amount of benefits that would be paid out, on the average, in such case (considering that the widow would receive the full minimum benefit under the present law of $33) would be about $9,100.

Thirdly, the total contributions that have been collected by the OASDI system since the inception of the program through 1960 amount to approximately $81.6 billion. The present value of future benefit obligations incurred with respect to existing beneficiaries is estimated at about $95 billion. This latter figure does not take into account the benefit obligations currently being developed for persons who have not as yet reached retirement age or died, or the total benefits paid since the inception of the program through 1960, amounting to $62.9 billion. The combined OASDI trust funds at the end of 1960 amounted to only $22.6 billion.

And, fourthly, the present unfunded obligations of the OASDI system are estimated to be approximately $300 billion on the assumption that no new workers enter the system but that only presently covered persons and their employers make contributions and acquire benefit rights.

These actuarial data give some meaning to the magnitude of the future obligations that have already been incurred under the social security program and suggest the compelling reasons why care must be exercised in the evaluation of the existing program and any proposed liberalizations thereof.

We favor a program that is sound in principle and in its financing features. We are opposed to imposing on future generations the obligations that we should be meeting for ourselves. For these reasons we are constrained to express our opposition to the favorable consideration of H.R. 6027.

NOAH M. MASON.
JAMES B. UTT.
BRUCE ALGER.

World Court Headed by Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article from the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item:

WORLD COURT HEADED BY COMMUNISTS

The International Court of Justice, usually referred to as the World Court, is a product of the United Nations.

Our readers will remember that the Congress last year was confronted with a strong group of Members who sought to have the Connally amendment repealed.

This amendment reserves to our Government the right to decide whether a case taken to the World Court involving the United States is purely a domestic issue or whether it involves international affairs.

As long as the United States can safeguard our internal matters from becoming entangled in world political issues we can prevent control over our affairs as they pertain to our domestic laws, principles, and practices.

But within our Congress and among our national leaders there are advocates of repealing the Connally amendment. Their campaign for repeal came close to winning in the last Congress. New attempts are expected in the current session.

It should be of interest to all of us that there now is a Soviet Communist judge as head of the 15-judge World Court. There also is a Communist judge from Poland among the world jurists.

While there are 15 judges, a majority of 9 judges can convene and make decisions. With nine judges considering a case, it takes only a majority of that nine to make a ruling. This means five judges out of the nine could decide an issue. Two of those judges would be known Communists.

If that issue involved our Panama Canal agreement, or the maintenance of our naval base at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba, we would have to accept the decision if our Connally amendment were to be repealed by the present Congress.

The Court also could rule that our tariff schedules were too high, or that our foreign aid to dozens of foreign countries should be increased, including greater aid to pro-Communist governments.

Such action by an international court would be final. Our United States Constitution would be no protection. No precedent would stand in the way of a World Court which itself would establish its own precedents for the future decisions of the Court.

There would be plenty of other countries outside of the big Communist countries which would be glad to take a slap at us if they, too, thought they could profit at our expense from a World Court decision.

The Connally amendment should, by all means, be retained. Our people and our Government should never open the way for international political crooks to rule us through a World Court supporting international dictatorship.

Social Security Conditioned Germany for Hitler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as we are faced with demands by the administration to expand the social security system, it may be well for the Members to pause and note the following excerpt from the book "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich," by that well-known correspondent, William L. Shirer. Mr. Shirer's comments on how social security conditioned the German mind to accept Hitler is most intriguing.

The excerpt follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE THIRD REICH

Bismarck put through between 1883 and 1889 a program for social security far beyond anything known in other countries. It included compulsory insurance for workers against old age, sickness, accident, and incapacity, and though organized by the state it was financed by employers and employees. It cannot be said that it stopped the rise of the Social Democrats or the trade unions, but it did have a profound effect on the working class in that it gradually made them value security over political freedom and caused them to see in the state, however conservative, a benefactor and a protector. Hitler took full advantage of this state of mind. In this, as in other matters, he learned much from Bismarck. "I studied Bismarck's socialist legislation," Hitler remarks in "Mein Kampf," "in its intention, struggle, and success."

An Analysis of Depressed Areas Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 10, the Wall Street Journal published a column by Paul Duke analyzing the politics and potential of the depressed areas legislation which this body has passed. Mr. Duke's treatment of the Congress acts is harsh, but I am sure we all recognize them as both fair and truthful. I should like to insert this column in the RECORD at this point:

DEPRESSED AREAS—AID LEGISLATION RAISES SKEPTICISM EVEN AMONG BACKERS

(By Paul Duke)

WASHINGTON.—Within the next couple of weeks an uncertain Congress will put the final legislative touches on an ambitious new Federal program that even some ardent supporters doubt will be able to accomplish its assigned task.

The bill, a major recommendation of the Kennedy administration, is designed to rehabilitate areas suffering from prolonged unemployment by funneling more than $400 million in Federal grants and loans into hard-hit regions of Pennsylvania, New York, West Virginia, Kentucky, Michigan, Illinois, and elsewhere.

Yet, even those who have fought hardest for the new program are skeptical of its potentialities. A Democrat from depression-ridden West Virginia is typical. "If anybody thinks this will solve the unemployment problem, he's crazy," the lawmaker declares.

If such a remark seems strange, it expresses perhaps the overriding contradiction of a new Federal program that is riddled with paradoxes. Consider: President Kennedy listed aid-to-depressed-areas as part of his antirecession program to pep up the economy quickly and put people back to work. Yet, Labor Secretary Goldberg and "liberal" Democratic sponsors in Congress don't regard the program as an antirecession device at all, but rather an attempt to revive communities over a period of years. "There's nothing (in it) that will put a man back to work tomorrow," says a House Democrat from Ohio.

Far from curing unemployment, many liberals who support the new program fear its chief impact may be merely to reshuffle unemployment geographically. That's because, despite alleged safeguards written into the bill, they're afraid the result may be to encourage the pirating of industry from one region of the country to another. "The Jolly Roger is flying at the masthead of this bill," gripes a New England Senator.

To win the votes of southern Democrats, a special provision was inserted in the bill to permit Federal aid for rural areas. Yet, almost no one thinks such a program is necessary because the Agriculture Department already has a rural development plan.

LOTS OF CAPACITY

Though the aid-to-depressed areas scheme is designed primarily to help medium-sized communities, such industrial giants as Detroit and Pittsburgh would also qualify for assistance in building new plants and for community face-lifting projects. Yet, their unemployment troubles stem more from unused rather than a lack of industrial capacity. "We've got more damned plant space in our State than we know what to do with," snaps a Michigan Democrat.

These, then, are just some of the more obvious difficulties involved in undertaking from Washington the job of invigorating local economies. The more subtle complexes can be enormous. Solutions that may seem logical on the surface can turn out to be illogical upon closer examination; actions to help can produce counteractions of harm.

Consider, for example, the plight of a major company that planned to move its plant from one area of a State to another. To soften the impact on the community it was leaving, the company decided on what it thought was a bold stroke—save the jobs of its 300 workers by taking them along. Not that simple, however. New employment opportunities were scarce in the community where the plant was relocating, and the influx of 300 new workers threatened to create bitter antagonism from the local citizenry.

If the program's chances of success are so doubtful, why then is it all but certain to become law? The answer is not unfamiliar in the realm of politics: It's hard to oppose extending a helping hand to the downtrodden, even if the gesture outdoes the accomplishment. Most liberals, when discussing aid to depressed areas, will echo the philosophy voiced by President Kennedy in his inaugural address: "If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich." But many of these same liberals, when pinned down on the potential effectiveness of the legislation, agree with one colleague who concedes that the chief value of this bill will be symbolic. Or, in the words of still another: "This is like the United Nations, the faith will greatly exceed the accomplishment."

To be sure, supporters of the depressed areas legislation see some solid good coming from the new multimillion dollar rehabilitation effort. The very passage of the legislation, they believe, will lend new encouragement and hope to scores of areas on the economic skids. In more practical terms, backers believe the program will genuinely help some areas which have been unable to attract industry because of a lack of lending funds.

In West Virginia, for example, a shortage of private credit is cited as a major adverse factor in the State's drive for new businesses. Proponents of the new legislation note that the Pennsylvania Industrial De-

velopment Authority has lent $17 million since its creation 5 years ago and this has accounted for 26,000 new factory jobs with payrolls of $93 million annually. If such a program can work at the State level, they ask, why can't it work on a bigger scale nationally?

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-SIX EMPLOYMENT ACT

Advocates claim that the Government already has a mandate to clear up pockets of depression under the 1946 Federal Employment Act which calls for policies promoting full employment in the United States. The longer Uncle Sam remains aloof, they contend, the more serious the blight becomes. Besides, the argument goes, the Government is losing potential tax revenue from economically depressed regions while Federal and State welfare and unemployment compensation payments mushroom.

Moreover, the plan's pushers envision it as the last barrier to a general public works program that would cost billions instead of millions. Commerce Secretary Hodges has already said that a new Public Works Administration will be necessary unless the economy snaps back soon and reduces the number of areas with substantial unemployment, now at 101.

Critics don't question the motives behind the new program, only its chances for success in easing unemployment. "This is one of the biggest phonies to come down the legislative pike in a long time," grumbles a Virginia conservative. What provokes him and others of like mind is that the program probably will take years to produce results, which may well be niggardly. For example, it has been estimated that only about 1 of every 17 unemployed workers in a depressed locality could hope to obtain a job as a direct result of the Federal help that's contemplated.

Most importantly, perhaps, many opponents think the program skirts the root problems of persistent unemployment. "It prescribes a painkiller without being concerned whether the pain is caused by an incurable cancer or a hangover," cracks a western GOP critic. Better, the foes say, to remove the 10-percent excise tax on automobiles to help stimulate car sales; or to launch a crash program to find new uses for coal; or to undertake a major job retraining program; or to reconsider trade policies.

Besides, the argument goes, factors other than favorable financing are frequently more important to business in choosing a plant location. What industry can overlook an area's transportation connections, the availability of raw materials, and the closeness of markets? Too, business is increasingly concerned about the character of the community—its schools, its recreational facilities, the quality of the work force. Some lawmakers suggest the Federal inducements will tend to attract only speculative and undesirable industries looking for windfall aid.

And, of course, it's pointed out that the Federal Government already is offering some area assistance through the Small Business Administration and the Community Facilities Loan Program. Moreover, 22 States now have privately financed development corporations to help in the obtaining of credit; Pennsylvania and nine other States have gone even further and set up State-supported credit corporations. New Hampshire and Maine have established public authorities for the construction of industrial parks.

PHILOSOPHICAL QUESTION

But even granting that economically stricken regions do need more help, there's the philosophical question of whether the job should fall to a special Federal program. And opponents pose these other questions: Should hard-hit communities be helped while others, only less slightly depressed, be denied assistance? What about the communities which aren't depressed but are earnestly trying to build up their economies and will face rougher competition in attracting new businesses? Should the Government favor some areas over others? Concludes a New England conservative: "This is a bad bill because it forces Uncle Sam to play favorites among his children." Possible upshot: Greater political pressure to enlarge the program to include more areas.

For all their self-doubts, supporters of the new depressed areas legislation tend to reject as exaggerated claims that the program eventually will expand significantly. "This is a rifle for a specific target," proclaims a Pennsylvania Democrat. "It was never meant to be anything else, and if properly administered, should not be anything else."

Nevertheless, friend and foe alike can pretty much agree on one basic conclusion: Even if the rifle does strike the target, it's not likely to penetrate deeply.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—XIV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the 14th in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter:

[From the Palm Beach Post-Times, Feb. 3, 1961]

MIGRANT COLLEGE GRADS BUSY TEACHING OTHERS

"The U.S. Office of Education reports that the migratory workers have the highest rate of illiteracy in the country. Approximately 1 out of every 500 children whose parents are still migrant workers finished grade school. Approximately 1 out of every 5,000 ever finishes high school. And there is no case upon the record of the child of a migrant laborer ever receiving a college diploma."—"Harvest of Shame."

At Lake Shore High School and Lake Shore Elementary School in Belle Glade there are at least three degree-holding teachers who are former migrants.

And the parents of Mrs. Earline Hudson, Mrs. Delores White, and Mrs. Addie Pearl Hill still are engaged in the business of following the crops.

The three teachers agree that there are other degree-holding persons here whose parents were migrant laborers. Most are teachers. Examples? They point to the following:

Gerald C. Burke, Eddi Queen Oates, Helen Vereen, Ollis Davis, Jordan, John Mays, Willie Pyfrom, and his wife, Lenoir Lincoln, Eugene Lincoln, Doris Davis, Leola Miller, and Mary Elizabeth Thompson.

Mrs. Hill and Mrs. White said there are many others.

"It would take a while to list all of them," said Mrs. Hill apologetically. Can others break out of the migrant stream and go on to better lives?

"That's one of the first things I begin teaching them," said Mrs. Hill, a first grade instructor. "I tell them I myself once worked in the fields."

The bright and energetic little teacher said this frequently leads her into conversation, she said.

"Often they tell me of how much work members of their families have done, and then I tell them of my own experiences," she said.

Mrs. Hill said she constantly impresses on her pupils that they must let nothing interfere with their education if they want to follow a better line of employment than that of their parents.

"I'm preaching all the time to the children," she said. "It's the only way."

Mrs. Hill, a graduate of Bethune College at Daytona Beach, was one of four children. She and Mrs. White were classmates through high school at Belle Glade.

Mrs. White attended Florida A. & M.

The two come from families of workers, not crew leaders. Interest shown by their parents caused them to go on to higher education.

Their parents, they said, made arrangements for them to stay in Belle Glade for the full school year. But they joined their families and worked with them after school was out.

Mrs. White, a fourth grade teacher, agreed with Mrs. Hill and Mrs. Hudson that education is the answer to getting out of the migrant stream.

"Children now have a better chance than we did," said Mrs. Hill with obvious conviction.

Would adult migrants go to the trouble of improving their education if facilities were available?

Mrs. Hudson said most would find it impossible because of their working hours and the physical effort involved.

Mrs. White said it wouldn't work "unless they knew there would be jobs waiting at the end of the education."

"Then you'd have lots of them," she said.

Has the life of migrants shown any improvement here over recent years? "In the last 2 years, some of the migrants have started building homes in the Belle Glade area," Mrs. White said. "This is one of the most hopeful signs."

Mrs. White was one of nine children. Her parents bore the basic cost of financing her college education, but she helped both at school and on the farms during some of her summer vacation periods.

Smiling, she and Mrs. Hill recalled that some of those vacations were devoted to picking beans and harvesting potatoes.

Mrs. White was graduated in 1956 and reported immediately to school here. She has been here continuously since except for 14 months spent with her husband in Germany. She was married after college graduation.

Mrs. Hill is in her 4th year of teaching here.

Mrs. Hudson, a physical education instructor, stressed that although it might be difficult to break away from the farm labor, it is not impossible.

"If there's something you really want to do, regardless of where you are, you can find a way to do it," she said. "If they are determined enough, there is a possibility. They can find a way."

In her own case, Mrs. Hudson said, the chief difficulty in getting through college lay in the fact that the family income was not steady.

"During some months, there was no trouble," she said, "but in others, it was tough. The main thing is to have the desire."

Two other children in Mrs. Hudson's family began college but failed to graduate.

Mrs. Hudson is a daughter of Ed King, a crewleader seen on the Murrow show. She had her primary and secondary schooling in Belle Glade and attended Tuskegee University from 1953 to 1958.

During at least two summers while she was in college, Mrs. Hudson worked in the harvest fields, she said, and found other work during other summers.

Her education was interrupted for a year when she married just before entering the senior class. Her husband now is employed by a Fort Lauderdale bakery. They have one child.

Mrs. Hudson believes Palm Beach County education is being provided by "a good, competent staff."

But the education of children of migrant workers suffers because some of them are not here for more than 2 or 3 months of the school year, she said.

The three teachers are in accord that the interest of the parents is of paramount importance in kindling within children the desire for self-improvement.

They pointed out it was only through the sacrifice of their parents that they themselves had been able to go on to college.

Did Sanctions Against Trujillo Help the U.S.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of April 1, 1961; a cogent comment on Dominican-United States relations:

DID THE SANCTIONS AGAINST TRUJILLO HELP THE U.S.A.?

(By Donald M. Dozer)

It is time to appraise the effects of the action taken against the Dominican Republic by the Foreign Ministers of the American nations at San José, Costa Rica, last August.

Last summer, at a time when the Castro revolution in Cuba was boiling furiously, the Inter-American Peace Committee, headed by U.S. Ambassador John C. Dreier, attributed the increase of tensions in the Caribbean to the "flagrant and widespread violations of human rights which have been committed and continue to be committed in the Dominican Republic."

Later a special Inter-American committee of five members, including Mr. Henry C. Reed for the United States, reported to the Foreign Ministers' meeting that Generalissimo Rafael Trujillo Molina, who has ruled the Dominican Republic for the past 30 years with dictatorial force and considerable brutality, had been implicated in an attempted assassination of President Betancourt of Venezuela. Thereupon, the foreign ministers, including the then Secretary of State Herter, emphatically condemned the Dominican Republic, called for a rupture of diplomatic relations with it, banned all trade with it in arms and implements of war of every kind and agreed to study the desirability of extending this boycott to other articles of trade.

The Inter-American system, for the first time since its establishment in 1889, outlawed a member. Several American governments, including the United States, broke relations with the Dominican Republic. In doing so at the behest of the Organization of American States, the State Department abandoned our previous diplomatic practice of not employing this drastic sanction except where the interest of the United States itself is definitely involved. The Eisenhower administration sought to deny the dicator's government a portion of the Cuban sugar quota that was due it under an act of Congress, but could not receive the necessary congressional authorization. Though it was forced by law to assign the sugar quota to the Dominican Republic, it nevertheless penalized that country by offering to pay 35 percent less a pound than we are paying other foreign suppliers of sugar.

What has all this done to America's position in the Caribbean? For one thing, Trujillo, whose cooperation with the United States in anti-Communist measures has been exemplary for a quarter of a century, has removed the ban on the Communist Party and now allows it to operate as the only legal opposition party in his country. He has temporarily withdrawn into the background of Dominican politics and is permitting the restoration of civil rights, many of which were denied by his regime. His newspapers and the powerful Radio Caribe are subscribing for the first time to Tass, the official Soviet press agency. A rapprochement between the Dominican Republic and Cuba is in the making. Politics has often made stranger bedfellows than Trujillo and Castro.

The choice at San José seemed to lie between the principle of nonintervention and the goal of representative democracy. The foreign ministers decided in favor of the latter, but in trying to impose an unfamiliar system upon the Dominican Republic they weakened the solidarity of the Americas and impaired our national defenses in the Caribbean, which have deteriorated to an alarming extent.

They did so at a time when Castro is making a squeeze play on our naval base at Guantánamo, when the United States has been forced by nationalists in the West Indies Federation to surrender five of the bases that we acquired in the destroyer-bases deal of 1940. Any compensating advantages to this country from going along with the OAS in this matter is difficult to detect.

Samuel Gompers on Compulsory Social Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the demand by those who profess to speak for labor in urging an ever greater expansion of the welfare state I would like to call attention to the following words of one of the most able leaders of labor of all time, Mr. Samuel Gompers. Perhaps it would be well for those who believe in the freedom of the individual to ponder his words on compulsory social insurance legislation:

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Compulsory social insurance is in its essence undemocratic and it cannot remove or prevent poverty. The workers of America adhere to voluntary institutions in preference to compulsory systems, which are held to be not only impracticable, but a menace to their rights, welfare, and their liberty. Compulsory sickness insurance for workers is based upon the theory that they are unable to look after their own interests and the State must interpose its authority and wisdom and assume the relation of parent or guardian.—Samuel Gompers, January 22, 1917.

A Reappraisal of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is a speech given by the Honorable Alf M. Landon at the 13th annual Institution of International Relations, Washburn University, Topeka, Kans., April 9, 1961. In view of the international situation, I think all Members of Congress will find Mr. Landon's comments of great interest. The speech follows:

A REAPPRAISAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

I speak tonight to focus attention to the facts in this momentous monument of world history. My final conclusions will be neither pessimistic—or optimistic—since it is uncertain yet whether reason will prevail.

There have been incredibly dangerous developments in world affairs in the past few weeks. There has been a failure to make clear the true import of events and their long term consequences. If anything, I am particularly dismayed by the opposite tendency—namely the sugarcoating of deliberate optimism. In some cases, there has been downright concealment of important and deadly significant facts.

One of my major purposes tonight is to try—as fairly and objectively as possible—to reveal what the truth is and how all the elements of crisis revolve about and ultimately center on what I believe to be the most dangerous single conclusion—the potential death of the United Nations.

Let me first clarify certain technical administrative problems which are central to an understanding of the political processes of the United Nations. The U.N. is not—and I must emphasize this point—is not—an independent entity. It has no being and no reality outside of its membership and is entirely the dependency of its membership. In the same sense that a mirror reflects the face—so the U.N. is as strong or as weak, as good or as evil, as much a success or failure as the world it reflects.

But does the U.N. in reality reflect the world? Only the naive would believe that. Member nations are not equally powerful; member nations are not totally independent of political control and manipulation. What the world really is today—and the U.N. beautifully mirrors this—is that Communist power bloc which will act predictably on crucial issues according to the dictates of the Soviet. Of course, on minor matters, there are factions and differences. But don't let that confuse us. On all matters of substance, bloc discipline is enforced.

The secretariat of the United Nations—and in particular, its chief executive officer, the Secretary-General, is the servant of the membership. No matter his personal convictions, he is bound by the language and the substance of the instructions of the membership. He is further bound, as we are tragically learning, by the willingness of the membership to obey their own directives—on all levels—including the financial one.

At this very moment, two international problems are most revealing—Laos and the Congo.

The history of Laos is a most distressing one. From the very inception, this problem was dealth with outside the United Nations and represented the bitter conclusion of the French collapse in what was then French Indochina.

At the meeting in Geneva of the great powers conference, it was agreed that Laos would be constituted as a neutral state and that all participants to the great powers convention would obey the conventional terms of neutrality. As I have already stated elsewhere—the United States as well as the Soviet Union disobeyed the convention. And no matter how we attempt to justify this in terms of Chinese, Russian, and Vietnamese intervention, we did not take this case to the United Nations, but supplied arms and military personnel to a faction in Laos in contravention of the Geneva agreement.

In the face of the deepening crisis—we did not steadfastly rely on the United Nations—but on SEATO—a rather ineffectual structure, built by late Secretary of State Dulles. A structure which has admittedly been of little value because of Britain's and France's indifference—amounting to negative policies. Even in the face of the devastating lesson of the Baghdad Pact, we still followed a course of reliance on a jerry-built power alliance. Furthermore, for 6 years, both SEATO's military and political values were hamstrung by the Eisenhower administration's lack of any positive, definite, and consistent policy in Laos.

In the final analysis—great harm can come from dealing with Laos as an independent problem. Because of its strategic position, it is a part of the whole world's fateful issues.

Despite sugar-coated official pronouncements—Britain, France, and the United States did not present a solid front in SEATO—nor with the United Nations policies in the Congo.

I now turn to the Congo—another key country—unable to defend itself against imperial Soviet control.

Prior to the eruption of the Congo crisis, Dag Hammarskjold had been carefully, skillfully and bravely attempting to strengthen the position of the United Nations so that it would best serve the smaller nations in the face of the East-West power struggle and make possible efficient, immediate action in the face of crisis. Hammarskjold had made great progress in his efforts—so that at the beginning of the Congo crisis—it was possible to field a United Nations army with speed and precision. But here the simmering, underground dangers suddenly burst to the fore. The United Nations blundered in administering policy in the Congo—blunders partially due to the improvision necessary in the planning and administering of new and uncharted procedures.

The Soviet Union, which felt the time ripe for a major imperialistic move, felt itself frustrated and the stakes were big enough to make major battle. The stakes were and are the continent of Africa. The Soviet Union waged its war on many grounds, but the most important ground was the United Nations itself.

It would first destroy the Secretariat and, by so doing, create anarchy within the United Nations itself. When the initial attack failed and Dag Hammarskjold refused to resign, the Soviet Union extended its attack by creating a precedent by refusing financial support.

Without money from the Soviet Union and its satellites, United Nations effort would be seriously hampered. The arbitrary withdrawal of troops by member states created near panic in attempting to field a force large enough to cope with the most difficult situation. And finally, the various political factions in the Congo itself, seeing dissension and disunity in the United Nations proper, were encouraged to defy the United Nations, thereby creating increased economic and political instability which always favors Communist expansion.

In the face of the impudent and cynical junking operation other member states were handed a precedent for like action. Not until April 3 did Belgium agree to withdraw its military personnel from the Congo in compliance with U.N. resolutions.

The French have refused payment of their financial commitments to the Congo operation and—with the inadequate exceptions of Australia, Ireland and the Netherlands, who have made only partial payment—the United States alone has paid the 1960 Congo assessment in full.

There has been much talk—at times of past crises—of the capacity of the United Nations to survive. It is my considered opinion that it is this crisis now which represents the great turning point—for it is this crisis which has produced general disobedience and not disobedience merely on the part of the imperialist Soviet bloc.

The League of Nations died in the face of the Italian invasion of Ethiopia—not simply because of unilateral disobedience on the part of Germany and Italy—but of general failure throughout the membership to provide support. No single nation of power and substance elected to go to the defense of the League in clear and certain terms.

At this moment the question of survival by the United Nations relies largely on American leadership. We are compelled to act both within and outside the United Nations to save its very existence. And our actions within and without must be consistent. In terms of our allies and all those areas of the world where the United States is central for aid and survival the United States must demand compliance with the Charter of the United Nations. But it can do that only when it, too, complies with the charter.

And when it acts unilaterally—as in Laos—its political position and its moral position in support of the United Nations evaporates. If we don't value the maintenance of the United Nations as the only essential organism which breeds hope for peace we must then clearly face the alternative and the certain inevitability of war. No other organism—no other structure—no other mechanism exists which can act as well to inhibit "the seeds of destruction" leading to eventual general conflict.

Having presented a general background to this momentous crisis, let me deal with those elements which bring us closer to the heart of the problem. The best way is to cite opposing viewpoints and reveal the counter arguments. We all agree on certain basic matters, namely:

1. The policy of the Soviet Union is clearly and by its own admission imperialistic. It will use all means at its disposal to secure world dominion.

2. Even if there be no other choice—in the last analysis, the prospect of war is too dreadful to accept with a casual shrug of the shoulders.

3. If there is any way—any way at all—to preserve freedom—the only condition appropriate to man and that makes life postively good—every effort must be made to find that way—without war.

4. The only way that offers hope is the existence of a third force—a force capable of channeling—focusing—concentrating the power—the idealism—the will of peoples everywhere. That third force presently exists in the form of the United Nations.

Here are some recent countering positions:

The first of March, Paul Henri Spaak—a Belgian statesman of impressive stature—said that "the idea of a general war such as those of 1914–18 and 1938–45 could now be ruled out. Competition with the Communist East now is in the economic sphere. The test is taking place in Asia—Africa and South America rather than in Europe."

Dr. Spaak went on to say that NATO and the new Organization for Economic Collective Development are the best reliance of the free world and the United Nations is ended.

That is merely one variant on a position held by many—that the United Nations has failed. And there should be a return to out-and-out power bloc alliances.

In the first place, I cannot agree with Dr. Spaak's optimistic conclusion that a general war can now be ruled out—and his optimistic reliance on an empty shell like NATO and an untried organization like the OECD. While the United Nations is facing tis greatest test—neither do I agree with him that it has been ineffective and is finished.

But far more important, at the heart of what Dr. Spaak proposes is a return to tested methods, mehtods predicated on the certainty of general war, and not, as he says the end of the possibility of general war. Power alliances are formed for purposes of mutual defense against aggression. They do not contain within themselves the ingredients for buffering antagonists. Two armed camps facing each other with no middle ground define the logical conclusions of their existence—ultimate conflict. And if the grounds for that conflict already exist, then the greater the need for a common meeting ground. Despite his vast experience, Dr. Spaak starts with a false premise, a premise utterly out of accord with a rational world. His conclusions are consequently false.

Another argument gaining recent support calls for a withdrawal to our own shores, the Fortress America theory. This would mean turning the world over to imperial communism, and act of betrayal and almost inhuman surrender of our fellow men. It would also hasten, rather than retard, war, for with massive control by the Soviet Union of the resources of the world, attack would surely follow, an attack against a weakened and demoralized America fearfully awaiting the awful day.

Against the background of the need for immediate decision, I propose the following as the necessary steps for reasonable men:

I emphatically believe President Kennedy and our Congress must make up their minds soon whether we are going to emphasize the key place of the United Nations in world affairs, as our President did in his inaugural address.

I have made it plain in every address I have made on international relations, that we must keep our armed forces and our military strength second to none. That involves our own defense, even though, like an umbrella in a storm, it covers others.

While keeping second to none in our armed strength, I believe we must concentrate on more support of the United Nations.

We really only started that policy last September. It must be continued to a greater degree than heretofore, because, as I have said, the United Nations, as a result of that policy, was steadily growing in responsibility and strength until the member nations failed to keep even their financial commitments.

There has been much talk that the United Nations—to be effective—would have to be

equipped with a permanent international army to force peace on the world.

I do not believe that is wise.

It is hard for all peoples to break away from age-old customs and believe that international affairs and basic major conflicts can be ultimately settled only by armed force.

However, slowly and falteringly, homosapiens is feeling his way to new rules, new methods, for avoiding that folly. I believe there are sound grounds for optimistic conclusions that, given persistent and consistent strong support by the major powers of truly peoples' government, the United Nations can and will grow in strength and responsibility.

That is not to say that we're not testing fate by our policies in world affairs.

The incredible danger we face is whether Khrushchev and the Soviet, Mao and his Chinese echelons, are going to make the same mistake of Kaiser Wilhelm and his war lords, of Hitler and his Nazis, of Mussolini and his Black Shirts, in underestimating the latent power of the undisciplined peoples of popular governments like Britain, France, and America.

The Prussians—Nazis and Fascists relied—and the Russian Soviet Imperialists are relying—on the same erroneous basic principle. The Soviet believes that disciplined peoples can conquer the undisciplined peoples of true democracies, where—as in America—local labor unions attempt to establish their own foreign policy contrary to their government's international trade agreements.

Khrushchev cries the free press does not understand him. So did Kaiser Wilhelm II and Hitler.

Khrushchev and Mao keep pushing here and pushing there—testing the will and the determination of truly peoples' governments to stand their ground for their principles and their freedom. So did Kaiser and Hitler and Mussolini.

All three made the great mistake of believing Great Britain and France were decadent and America "too proud to fight." Well, they got their answer in two world wars. However, Mao and the Soviet apparently are still not convinced that governments that permit organized pacifist demonstrations, unrestrained criticism and ridicule in all phases of national life, and are devoted to the rights of the individual, can and will do a better job in war when the incentive is there, than their disciplined masses. They confuse willing-to-live-and-let-live policy, up to a point, with faint heart. Therein lies the danger of destruction of the world by a great nuclear war.

Khrushchev, a superb actor or a superb statesman and possibly both, has truly said no nation can win a third general nuclear war. Therefore, the Imperial Soviets' policy is a methodical process, both economically and militarily, in brush wars involving internal conflict. Questions of internal conflict anywhere can quickly become a matter of unilateral action between two major powers and thus resolve themselves into a general war.

When the United Nations charter was adopted—many people vowed that was the answer to war and peace. That reminds me of a conversation I had with an old hard-boiled Republican leader in the 65th Congress that enacted national prohibition.

He told me of a visit he had with several other leaders in the Congress who liked their nip. They talked about brilliant colleagues whose opportunity for great public service had been ruined by overindulgence in intoxicating liquors. They were willing to make the sacrifice of their own tastes in order to eliminate that evil.

When I was talking to him, he was disillusioned by the results. He said, "It never occurred to us that the law would not be obeyed."

And it never occurred to people who built too high hopes on the United Nations Charter as the complete answer to settling difficulties by collective process instead of unilateral actions—that the U.N. would not be obeyed forthwith.

The United Nations is going through the same period of trial and error—of growth—that our Republic has gone through—that the British Commonwealth has gone through—that France has gone through—and Germany—and free country after free country.

Take Kansas for an illustration. Its trials and tribulations in the days of horrible brutality of bitter border warfare were born of the failure of the Missouri compromise and the Kansas-Nebraska Act—and of leadership in both the North and the South—the follies of statesmen and of generals—which resulted in approximately 600,000 casualties on both sides in the Civil War.

And yet—100 years later—we have not yet reached the solution of the basic principles of that war—or, for that matter, in the Bill of Rights adopted almost 200 years ago. That is, civil rights for all in this great country of ours.

Two groups represent the Despair theme of Washburn's Institute of International Relations:

1. The despair of negative thinking is expressed by the tinkling cymbals of pacifists who would supinely surrender to the tyranny of communism—or reach the same end by appeasement. This very principle of nonresistance is an invitation to the Soviet and Mao.

2. The sounding brass thinking by those who believe another world war is inevitable.

I do not agree with such extreme positions. I believe that—in the basic interest of the world's mankind—our eagle must neither fold its wings nor yield to the natural impulse in combating danger. We must not abandon our presence of mind and become—as it were—a cosmic vigilante committee.

The United Nations is neither the failure some claim—nor the shining forceful success that others expected. It is now facing its greatest test. Its survival is at stake, precipitated by the failure of all the member countries to pay their share of the Congo expenses—thus playing into the hands of Khrushchev and Mao.

If the U.N. is forced to depend on the United States to pay more than its share—in order to continue the United Nations policies in the Congo—the collective position of the United Nations in world affairs is drastically altered by being heavily dependent upon one nation for the financing of its Congo policies. To that extent its collective function is weakened.

Although the possibility of the most dreadful and destructive war in the history of mankind cannot be completely ruled out—the prospects of avoiding that holocaust will improve as the free people's governments learn to compose their divergent views and pool their strength by and through the United Nations.

The hope—the creative theme—is expressed by such meetings as this that grasp the fact that the days of self-dependence by a nation are gone forever.

This is a new day and we must adjust ourselves to fit the new rules of the world in which we live. That calls for omniactive leadership by men of determination—of insight—whose eyes are open to the necessity and opportunity of fighting for extended cooperation by and through strengthening the United Nations as the most effective agency for peace.

If it is impossible to present a firm and united position by the United Nations—for equity and justice in the world—I fear a great calamity may be in the making, with the United Nations fading away as did the League of Nations.

Minority Has Questioned the Unsoundness of the Social Security System Since Inception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, since the very beginning of the program for old-age and survivors insurance, warnings have been sounded that such a program is of dubious constitutionality and that the basis upon which the program was financed is unsound.

In order that the older Members may refresh their memories and the newer Members may have the historical background of the minority views, I would like to include as part of my remarks minority views on the social security system beginning with House Report No. 615 of the 74th Congress:

THE COMPULSORY SOCIAL INSURANCE SYSTEM

The provisions we oppose will increase the cost of this system at its maturity by approximately $3,500 million a year and this amount when added to the huge and pyramiding cost of the other features of the program may well mean the difference between the success or breakdown of the system.

In our opinion, the purpose of compulsory social insurance is to provide a basic floor of economic protection for the individual and his family and in so doing to encourage and stimulate voluntary savings through personal initiative and ambition. It should not invade the field historically belonging to the individual.

We believe that such a form of compulsory social insurance which unnecessarily takes from the individual funds which he would invest or otherwise use for building his own security is incompatible with our free-enterprise system. Accordingly, we do not conceive it to be a proper function or responsibility of the Federal Government either to compensate individuals for all types of losses in earning capacity or to provide a scale of benefits which pay substantially higher amounts to those with higher income.

We believe further that if this vast program is to fulfill its social objectives, the most important factor is to restrict the burden of its pyramiding cost within an amount which the economy can bear. This is so because in the final analysis the basis of all security is a productive economy and the burden in any one year of the mounting cost of this program will have, in the main, to be paid for out of the production of the goods and services which the system seeks to distribute. In 20 years the payroll tax provided for in this bill will be 6.5 percent or a dollar cost based on present wage levels of over $8 billion a year in this one program alone. If this burden becomes too great, the system may well be repudiated by future generations, and if benefit payments are carried to extremes, the inevitable result of the companion tax burden will be a stifling of the incentive and ambition to produce.

Daniel A. Reed, Roy O. Woodruff, Thomas A. Jenkins, Richard M. Simpson, Robert W. Kean, Carl T. Curtis, Noah M. Mason, Thomas E. Martin, Hal Holmes, John W. Byrnes.

Minority views as expressed in House Rport No. 1300, 1st session, 81st Congress, in the report on the Social Security Act Amendments of 1949:

COMPULSORY OLD-AGE ANNUITIES

The bill is separated into several titles. Title II provides for compulsory old-age annuities, and title VIII provides the method by which the money is to be raised to meet the expense thereof.

The two titles are interdependent, and neither is of any consequence without the other. Neither of them has relation to any other substantive title of the bill. Neither is constitutional. Therein lies one of the reasons for our opposition to them.

The Federal Government has no power to impose this system upon private industry.

The best legal talent that the Attorney General's office and the brain trust could marshal has for weeks applied itself to the task of trying to bring these titles within constitutional limitations. Their best effort is only a plain circumvention. They have separated the proposition into two titles. This separation is a separation in words only. There is no separation in spirit or intent. These two titles must stand or fall together.

The learned brief submitted by the Attorney General's office contains in its summation the following, weak, apologetic language:

"There may also be taken into consideration the strong presumption which exists in favor of the constitutionality of an act of the Congress, in the light of which and of the foregoing discussion, it is reasonably safe to assume that the social security bill, if enacted into law, will probably be upheld as constitutional."

We also oppose these two titles because they would not in any way contribute to the relief of present economic conditions, and might in fact retard economic recovery.

The original bill contained a title providing for voluntary annuities. This was another attempt to place the Government in competition with private business. Under fire, this title has been omitted. It was closely akin to title II. In fact, it had one virtue that title II does not possess in that it was voluntary while title II is compulsory. These titles impose a crushing burden upon industry and upon labor. They establish a bureaucracy in the field of insurance in competition with private business.

The minority membership of the Ways and Means Committee have at no time offered any political or partisan opposition to the progress of this measure, but on the contrary have labored faithfully in an effort to produce a measure that would be constitutional and that would inure to the general welfare of all the people.

ALLEN T. TREADWAY.
ISAAC BACHARACH.
FRANK CROWTHER.
HAROLD KNUTSON.
DANIEL A. REED.
ROY O. WOODRUFF.
THOMAS A. JENKINS.

Excerpts from the minority views of CARL T. CURTIS, then a Member of the House, to the report on the Social Security Act Amendments of 1949:

MINORITY VIEWS

My dissent from the bill reported out does not stem from opposition to a liberalized social security program; instead it arises from the fact that the bill reported out fails in some major respect to do the very things a liberal and effective social security program should do.

The old-age and survivors insurance program is a grossly unsound and ineffective tool for the social security purposes it attempts to accomplish. Because it is so unsound and ineffective, I cannot agree that the mere extension of its coverage or a mere numerical revision of its benefit formula, such as the majority of the committee proposes, can bring about significant improvement. Instead, the very fundamentals of the program should be objectively reexamined, and to the extent that such reexamination indicates the need for drastic overhauling of the program, that overhauling should be done, even though it proves necessary to abandon completely those concepts on which the present program rests.

Social security funds are necessarily limited in amount, since they depend upon the amount of economic productivity in the Nation and the possibility of drawing off a portion of this productivity for social security purposes that is not too large to injure the Nation's economic health. Because of this limitation, it is of the utmost importance that these funds be distributed wisely.

On frequent occasions Congress has voted a very costly program, such as in the field of veterans' legislation or housing. There is an end to such programs. They do expire. There is no end to our social security program. It runs into perpetuity. We bind oncoming generations to pay untold billions of dollars not only 50 years from now, or 100 years from now, but so long as the Government of the United States stands. It is totally unmoral.

Let us permit our children and our grandchildren to decide how much per year they of their generation will pay for social security. We should not bind them by contract to pay untold billions each year, as the present system does. The right of self-government means not only freedom from kings, tyrants, and dictators, but it means freedom from the past.

Minority views to the report on the Social Security Amendments of 1954:

DISSENTING VIEWS ON H.R. 9366

The committee has the grave responsibility of framing social security legislation which will improve and maintain the system on a sound basis, compatible with its purpose and with our system of free enterprise.

Some of the hastily adopted amendments contained in H.R. 9366 are highly questionable and probably would not have been adopted upon mature consideration. The most important of these amendments, expanding the social security tax base from $3,600 to $4,200, are fundamentally wrong and have far-reaching implications. The inflated wage base proposals were adopted with a strong dissenting vote and mark a departure from the basic purpose and justification of social security—that of affording a basic floor of protection—and would directly impair both the ability and incentives of the individual to achieve security through the normal processes of free enterprise.

Private arrangements for security, in contrast with the sterile taxing and spending processes of social security, are an integral part of free enterprise and provide the funds for capital investment upon which our economic system is based. Private thrift and insurance purchases also provide a flexibility of protection adaptable to the particular needs of the particular family. This flexibility is impossible under social security. Furthermore, security privately achieved by voluntary action, as contrasted with unnecessary inflated compulsory social security, is compatible with our traditions and our way of life.

Thus, even though social security were in fact bought and paid for by the individual and his equities, typical of free enterprise, were preserved, it would violate our basic principles to extend its taxes and benefits beyond the levels required to meet its purpose of providing a minimum floor of protection against destitution.

The bill's provisions extending the system's taxes and benefits to earnings in excess of the present $3,600-per-year limit, manifestly raise the fundamental issue of whether we shall progressively depart from the original purpose of the system. The proposal assumes that the $4,200 man requires more compulsory, publicly provided protection that does the $3,600 man. The next step, already proposed and urged, is that of providing still greater Government protection for the $6,000 man than is provided for the $4,200 man. There is no stopping point when one accepts the philosophy of more and more compulsory reliance upon the State, with the corollary of less and less reliance by the individual upon his private voluntary arrangements.

These amendments are indefensible in our opinion. The proposed superbenefits for the high-income man are incompatible with the purpose of the system. Burdening other social security taxpayers with their payment shocks one's sense of equity.

The powerful drive for expanding the wage base and providing higher and higher benefits, and the lack of public understanding of the consequences of this action, place the committee and the Congress in a most difficult position—particularly in an election year.

But the inescapable fact is that younger people, including those not yet of voting age, and millions yet unborn, must largely support benefits for persons who retire in the next two or three decades. This situation places a special trusteeship on this committee and on the Congress. For not only the purpose of social security, but the welfare of our young people and their children, strictly limits the social security benefits which can be provided for the aged through taxation of the young. We must halt the constant increases in present and future benefits, and in the taxes required to support those benefits.

It is far from certain that the present tax schedule will support the presently scheduled benefits, and still less certain that the proposed increased taxes would support the increased benefits.

It is manifest, in any event, that the proposed wage base extension would provide an unwarranted increase in benefits of persons with high earnings, who least need social security protection. It is also manifest that the unwarranted increase in benefits—and for younger people the lifetime burden of the additional social security taxes—would adversely affect individuals and our economy and would be contrary to the general welfare.

FURTHER DISSENTING VIEWS OF MR. UTT

In addition to the foregoing minority report, I wish to state it is my fearful belief that the social security tax is fast shaping up to become a secondary graduated income tax upon wages and salaries, a tax which, when its full impact is felt, will shake our social security system to its very foundation.

Supplemental views to the report on the Social Security Amendments of 1955:

BASIC PROBLEMS

Cost: In order to finance the multibillion-dollar increase in benefits contained in this bill, a higher tax schedule is provided. An almost immediate increase to 2½ percent each on employees and employer, respectively, is provided effective January 1, 1956. Each of the subsequent periodic increases provided under existing law is also increased by one-half of 1 percent. As a result the ultimate tax rate projected under the bill, effective in 1975, is 9 percent shared equally by employees and their employers. The self-employment tax, applicable to professional individuals, will become 6¾ percent at that time.

As high as these future rates are, the rates themselves do not convey a complete picture of the true burden they involve. The tax on

wages is a tax on gross wages without any allowance for personal exemptions, dependents, or other deductions. The tax on self-employment income only permits certain business deductions, such as depreciation. It is, in effect, a tax on adjusted gross income. Therefore, unlike the income tax, the social security tax is not limited to net income. As a result, that tax, as a percentage of net income, is substantially higher than the actual rates would indicate. In fact, the eventual 6¾-percent rate on the self-employed would be the equivalent of a net income tax in the neighborhood of 20 percent and higher in many cases.

Let us take the example of a farmer with a net income from self-employment of $4,200 in 1975. Assuming that he has a wife and two children and uses the standard deduction, his Federal income tax under present rates, will be $276. His social security tax, on the other hand, will be $283.50. In this example, which is a completely average case, the social security tax, as a percentage of net taxable income, would be in excess of 20 percent. If the same individual had three children his income tax would be cut to $156 but his social security tax would still amount to $283.50. In such a case, the latter tax would be the equivalent of a net income tax of 36 percent. We again point out that this would be an ordinary case and not at all an unusual one.

It is estimated that in 1975 the total social security tax collections will approximate $20 billion annually, a colossal sum. Moreover, this estimate assumes continuation of existing wage levels and makes no allowance for the increase in those levels which past experience indicates will occur. The $20 billion estimate, is therefore, extremely conservative.

We are concerned over this fact, moreover, because by their very nature, the liberalizations contained in this bill will create demands for additional changes involving further costs.

We are further concerned over these ultimate costs because of the danger that they may eventually weaken or even destroy public acceptance of the social security system. A social insurance program cannot be expected to provide against all insurable risks. It must be designed to provide a basic protection at a cost within the reach of all, especially those in the lower income brackets who are most in need of that protection. Despite this fact, we are creating a scale of benefits which must be supported by a social security tax which, in the not too distant future, will be equal to and in many cases higher than the Federal income tax.

Finally, insofar as the cost of this program is concerned, we should take sober warning that, in our zeal to provide ever greater benefits and to provide against an ever wider area of need, we do not destroy the very system which we have created. We have succeeded in avoiding the full impact of the cost by shifting most of the burden to the future. At that time, the high tax rates may make it very difficult to retain the contributory principle which we believe so essential to the program. However, we would be deluding ourselves should we believe that the general revenue could be depended upon to support the system. We have already pointed out that, under the present schedule, social security tax collections in 1975 will amount to about $20 billion. If such a vast sum were financed through the individual income tax for example, it would necessitate approximately a 50-percent across-the-board increase in that already burdensome tax. These figures show clearly the magnitude of the problem we are so casually creating.

It is our earnest hope that the questions we have raised will lead thoughtful citizens everywhere to search for the answers. The social security system was created to give our people confidence and faith in their future. It should be above politics.

THOMAS A. JENKINS.
RICHARD M. SIMPSON.
ROBERT W. KEAN.
NOAH M. MASON.
JOHN W. BYRNES.
ANTONI N. SADLAK.
THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Brief excerpts from the committee report on the Social Security Amendments of 1958:

The old-age and survivors insurance benefit structure and the contribution schedule by which the benefits are financed have not been revised by the Congress since 1954. Since that date there have been significant increases in wages and prices; also, new cost estimates have shown an increase in the actuarial deficit of the program. In the light of these developments, it is imperative that the Congress take prompt action to assure that the program be kept both effective and actuarially sound.

The latest long-range cost estimates prepared by the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration show that the old-age and survivors insurance part of the program (as distinct from the disability part) is further out of actuarial balance than your committee considers it prudent for the program to be. When the last major changes were made in 1956 the estimates prepared at that time showed an expected long-range actuarial deficit for old-age and survivors insurance of two-tenths of 1 percent of payroll on an intermediate cost basis. More recent estimates show that the old-age and survivors insurance part of the program is now expected to be out of balance by fifty-seven one-hundredths of 1 percent of payroll. Your committee believes that a deficit of the size indicated by present cost estimates should not be permitted to continue.

Textiles Essential to National Defense

SPEECH
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

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

Mr. KORNEGAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to associate myself with the remarks of the speaker now in the well of the House and with the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], and the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I think they are to be commended for bringing this issue to the floor of the House this afternoon, and not only for this effort but for the effort they intend to put behind a program that may at least lead to a solution of this problem.

I listened with interest a moment ago after the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] yielded to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] and was particularly interested in his reference to the competition that we are receiving in connection with products that go with our national pastime, the game of baseball.

A few days ago I inserted an editorial from the Sporting News, which is the bible of baseball in this country and the leading publication in the United States on sports, that commented on the competition of American producers in the sports field which they were receiving from Japanese imports. I was startled to find that as of the present time 40 percent of the equipment used and sold over the counter at retail in American stores for our own national game of baseball is now produced in Japan. So I think it is about time we become alarmed and alerted to this problem. It is serious and affects every section of the country.

I want to commend you gentlemen this afternoon for trying to forcefully bring this to the attention of the American public.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I thank the gentleman for his very timely and appropriate remarks.

Did Biased Reporters Cost Nixon the Election?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Human Events of April 7, 1961:

DID BIASED REPORTERS COST NIXON THE ELECTION?

(By Willard Edwards)

This is a report on some research since the election last November on a subject which has disturbed the newspaper world, although it has gained very little public notice.

To put the question simply—did a substantial portion of the American press sabotage Vice President Nixon in the Presidential campaign, thereby cheating the American public of its right to a fair and unbiased report of the Republican candidate's words and activities, and thereby helping him to lose the election?

I covered the Nixon campaign from the time of his nomination at Chicago in late July to election day, November 8. I heard every Nixon speech—hundreds of them—was present at all press conferences and traveled a total of 64,000 miles including the flights to Alaska and Hawaii.

After I returned to Washington November 9 and had a couple of days rest I reentered the civilized world and joined in the great Washington sport of explaining the election outcome.

I attended a number of gatherings of conservatives and here I first ran up against the complaint that Nixon had lost the election because he conducted a me-too campaign. He hadn't hit Kennedy hard enough. There were, of course, other reasons discussed but this one complaint has grown in volume until it has reached the peak of alleging that Nixon threw away a sure victory, just like

Dewey in 1948, through the soft and ineffectual nature of his campaign.

I was confounded by the complaints of Nixon's me-too-ism. In arguments on the point, I would cite from speeches he made during the campaign.

Here are some of the things he called his opponent:

Dangerously irresponsible, reckless, utterly unfit to assume the duties of a President.

He lashed Kennedy for downgrading the United States and caught him in falsehoods. He accused him of aiding Communist propagandists. He called him a bare-faced liar, dangerous and dead wrong, a rash, impulsive, immature, inexperienced young man who wanted to use the White House for job-training. He said repeatedly—and these are his exact words—that Kennedy stood for wild spending, higher taxes, higher prices, seizure of industry, and raiding of the Treasury.

He also called Kennedy an ignoramus, a divider of America, one of Khrushchev's most helpful aids.

On the domestic side, he said that Kennedy's program would bring about ruinous inflation. He jabbed at Kennedy's wealth and charged him with attempting to buy the people's votes with their money—not his.

But when I mentioned these things, people looked at me blankly. "When did Nixon make these remarks?" they asked. They hadn't read them in the newspapers.

So I decided to do a little research and discover just what they had been reading. Since these were residents of Washington, D.C., I concentrated on the newspapers which are read in the Capital.

The task was enormous. A one-man survey could do little more than make a spot check. And yet, the results were significant. I began to understand why some supporters of Nixon grew indifferent as the campaign progressed.

First, let me make you acquainted with the atmosphere among the newspaper followers of the Republican candidate. Ninety percent of this press corps, which ranged between 50 and 100 at various periods in the campaign, were all-out supporters of Kennedy. They were not only opposed to Nixon, they were outspoken in their hatred and contempt of him.

This attitude was not concealed. It was loud and open. When Nixon was making a speech, there was a constant murmur of ridicule from many in the press rows just beneath the platform. It was an extraordinary hostility and I can recall no precedent for it in all the campaigns I have covered.

Their adulation of Kennedy was just as open. Most of them shifted back and forth between Nixon and Kennedy during the campaign. They regarded service with Kennedy as a lover regards a honeymoon and assignment to Nixon as a penalty—an enforced association with a discreditable character.

I have not drawn too strong a picture and I think the condition can best be described by telling an incident which occurred during Nixon's whistlestop tour in mid-October. On October 26, as the train was pulling out of Cincinnati, a stranger appeared in the press car where some 50 newsmen were present.

The man was introduced as Mario G. Remo, a New York department store executive, who had been serving as finance chairman of the Democratic National Committee's nationalities division.

Mr. Remo was a man of high standing in Democratic Party councils in New York City and his post was a very important one in the campaign.

He had decided to quit his job and switch over to Nixon. Leonard Hall, the Republican campaign chairman, regarded his decision as so important that he had asked Remo to join the Nixon train and explain his position to the big press group, thereby gaining the maximum publicity for what appeared to be a big political break for Nixon.

There was silence and a growing chill in the press car as Remo stated his reasons for resigning his Democratic post. He said he was alarmed about Kennedy's foreign policy and convinced that Kennedy, as President, would involve the United States in war within 2 years.

At this point one or two reporters raised a yell of "turncoat." There was a chorus of agreement and backs were turned on Remo. Although it was a good story, especially for New York newspapermen, only the two wire service reporters and a few others took notes and filed dispatches.

Mr. Remo was understandably puzzled. He had sacrificed his Democratic political career for patriotic reasons. He was quitting a winner for a loser because, by that time, it was evident to all that Kennedy was going to capture the New York metropolitan area where Remo made his home.

He now found himself treated as a cowardly deserter, a turncoat, a renegade, by the great majority of correspondents assigned to cover the Republican candidate.

I think I can assure you that if one of Nixon's top assistants had shown up on the Kennedy train to announce a switch of allegiance, he would have been greeted like the prodigal son and thousands of words in press dispatches would have been filed. Do you know where the Remo story showed up in a leading New York paper? On page 27—at the bottom—two paragraphs.

Here's another story to give you the flavor of the Nixon press corps. Toward the end of the campaign, a young reporter for a large eastern newspaper joined up. Older correspondents had covered Nixon to this point. Apparently the young man's editor had been a little dubious about his political faith and had made a checkup.

"He called up my wife the night before I left," the young man told his friends, "and he said he was a little worried that I might be brainwashed by Nixon. He asked her how I felt about the candidates."

Then, very proudly, "When she got through telling him about my feelings for Kennedy, he didn't have any more doubt about me."

This was regarded by his colleagues as a pretty funny story. None of them found it strange that an editor should regard an assignment to cover the Republican candidate somewhat like a mission into an enemy camp where his loyalty might be undermined. I feel pretty sure that this young reporter sent no stories on the Nixon campaign which might savor, in any manner, of "brainwashing" by Nixon. This state of affairs became so scandalous that just before the election, Editor and Publisher, a trade journal for the newspaper business, rather uneasily brought it out into the open. The article opened with a quotation from a story I had written which stated that most of the newspapermen covering Nixon were staging a premature victory celebration for Kennedy, the man they favored.

Then Editor and Publisher presented the findings of its own representatives. It carried interviews with a number of reporters. Here are some quotes:

"If the publishers only knew how emotionally involved some of their reporters are for Kennedy, there'd be some real pink-slipping going on."

This was a pertinent observation. A survey had shown that Nixon had the editorial support of more than 57.7 percent of the Nation's daily newspapers while Kennedy was supported by 16 percent. The remainder proclaimed themselves uncommitted.

It seems obvious that some newspapers, which endorsed Nixon, were publishing dispatches on his campaign written by reporters who regarded his possible election as a national calamity.

Here are what some other reporters said when interviewed by the trade journal:

"I've already cast my absentee ballot for Kennedy but I don't like the way the press covering Nixon reacted while watching the television debates. They kept saying things like 'give it to him, Jack.' I figure every guy deserves a fair shake."

Another: "The Democrats are relaxed and carefree and almost haphazard. When I was with Nixon I felt an oppressive suspicion of the press. They think newsmen are out to get Nixon and they may be right."

After the election was over, the New York Daily News brought the whole affair into the open with an editorial which created a stir in the newspaper world. It flatly stated that some reporters covering Nixon "sabotaged" Nixon and his cause with every dirty-pool device known to dirty-pool newspaper people—of whom, unhappily, there are still too many.

"They slanted their dispatches against the Republican candidate. They left out incidents and sidelights which might have been helpful to him. Editors shirked their duty by permitting these slanted, distorted, biased or downright false statements to be published as allegedly honest and factual news."

The editorial continued:

"The whole disgraceful performance was bad journalism, bad ethics and a breaking of faith with the readers of the newspapers we are talking about."

These were harsh words but I have yet to hear of any indignant rejoinder. When Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalistic society, staged its annual convention in New York City a few days later, it called upon Herbert Klein and Pierre Salinger, press secretaries for Nixon and Kennedy, to discuss the question of press fairness in the campaign.

This didn't disclose much. Klein suggested only that the society investigate charges that political reporters had been unfair to Nixon. He said the Vice President had received many complaints accusing newspapers, radio and television of biased coverage.

Salinger agreed that the majority of reporters covering the candidates apparently decided, as he put it, that Kennedy was the better candidate. He remarked, with gratification, that the great majority of newspapers were very fair to Kennedy—a decided understatement in my opinion.

Thus, there is no dispute that most of the correspondents were supporters of Kennedy. You will find no newspapermen, who had anything to do with the campaign, who will deny it. In fact, there has been a great deal of conversation—all private of course, in which misgivings were expressed and even a small amount of remorse in some instances. Nobody, however, seems ready to repent in public.

So now we come to the heart of the matter. Did some of these correspondents permit their partisanship to tinge their accounts of the Nixon campaign? Did their fierce conviction of Kennedy's superiority cause them to subordinate, even unconsciously, the Vice President's most telling attacks on their idol? Did their contempt and scorn for Nixon warp their news judgment so that they played up trivia and neglected major developments?

Well, even after 35 years in the business, I'm pretty naive about my fellow reporters. I'm also proud of my profession. If asked these questions during the campaign, I would have ridiculed the suggestion that these colleagues, almost all skilled veterans, did not keep in separate compartments their private views and their judgment of news values when they sat down to their typewriters.

I did not, of course, know what they were writing at that time. In the whirlwind of a campaign, you're lucky if you can keep up with what your own newspaper is printing. Now and then I picked up a newspaper which gave me an uneasy feeling. I saw leads on Nixon speeches which did not seem justified.

But it was only after I decided to do some research on selected newspapers that I realized what the New York Daily News was talking about when it charged sabotage and dirty-pool tactics.

I must emphasize again that this research was limited to a spot check of several newspapers which are widely read in Washington. A survey of this nature is no one-man job. An exhaustive investigation would require a big staff, well-financed, of the strictest impartiality, and with at least 6 months to do the job.

But my findings force me to this conclusion: There is at least a prima facie case for the charge that animosity for Nixon, concededly felt by most of the newspapermen covering him, did creep into dispatches. In an election as close as this one, the possibility certainly arises that this type of reporting may have affected the final result.

What did this research disclose? It revealed that a substantial portion of the newspaper reading public did not get what it was entitled to get—a full and fair account of the Vice President's words and actions in his campaign for the Presidency.

Time permits only a couple of samples here but I assure you they are typical. Let me describe to you how a major Nixon campaign speech in the very first week of his campaign in September was treated in one of our greatest metropolitan dailies.

On September 15, Nixon delivered a speech in St. Louis before the International Association of Machinists. The audience was hostile but he boldly accused Kennedy of submission to the dictates of organized labor and he just as boldly proclaimed his own independence of pressure from any group.

He quoted from a speech made by Kennedy in Detroit a few days earlier, describing Kennedy as having pledged himself to be for whatever labor was for, and against whatever labor was against. That kind of promising, he said, wasn't good for labor or America. A President ought not to be 100 percent for any group—labor, farm, or business—and ought not to set one group against another. For himself, he would play to no group, no class, no section.

It was a bold talk in the camp of the enemy. This was the Nixon whom a great many Americans had come to admire since his visit to Russia in 1959—the man who poked his finger into Khrushchev's paunch and told him he didn't know everything. Here was a tough-talking candidate, jabbing his opponent in one of his softest spots, and it certainly could not be described as a me-too speech.

How was the speech covered in the great newspaper to which I am referring? A first reading of its bulky columns seemed to indicate that the speech hadn't been reported at all.

True, there was a two-column story from St. Louis which referred to the speech but didn't quote from it. Instead, it carried about 1,000 words of quotes from the labor leaders who had heard it and described the scorn they felt.

This story led with the news that the machinists union, after listening to Nixon, had voted overwhelmingly to endorse Kennedy. Then followed the quotations from labor leaders. They agreed that Nixon had a smooth delivery but the very adroitness with which Mr. Nixon met their hostility had reinforced their feeling that he was still a "tricky Dick" and that both the country and labor would suffer if he won in November.

Some readers, at least, must have wanted to read the speech for themselves and thus savor its "tricky Dick" qualities.

To do this, they would have had to engage in a real hunt. They would finally have discovered, as I did, that there was a report on Nixon's St. Louis speech in that issue. It wasn't very long—about 400 words and paraphrased—and it was buried near the bottom of another story on page 20 telling of another speech made by Nixon in Roanoke, Va.

So, if you wanted to read what Nixon actually said in St. Louis, you had to read 500 words about the Roanoke speech, then you came upon this notation: Nixon spoke earlier in St. Louis.

The writer seized upon a statement Nixon had made at the very end of his labor speech—a polite assertion that, if elected, he would never close the doors of the White House to any group representative of a great segment of the American people.

"The Vice President promised that he would always have the door of the White House open to labor whether it supported him or not,"—that was the lead.

Nixon's sharp jab at Kennedy's Detroit speech emerged in translation this way: "By implication, he [Nixon] suggested that Senator Kennedy had abandoned the interests of all the people when he said in his Labor Day speech in Detroit * * *."

Nowhere in this brief account, even entombed as it was where very few readers would find it, was there a suggestion that the Republican candidate for President had made a major statement of his views on the pressures of organized labor and the vulnerability of Kennedy to such pressures. Nowhere was a hint of its toughness and forcefulness.

In fact, some of the labor delegates were themselves impressed. Sitting in the press section, I heard one delegate say to another rather grudgingly: "This guy talks straight, doesn't he?"

Instead of this, readers of this newspaper did indeed get an impression of me-tooism—Nixon would throw the White House open to labor, whether it supported him or not.

Or—you could take your choice—he was still "tricky Dick."

I found this pattern developed in a number of instances. Whenever Nixon intensified his attacks on Kennedy, he promptly became the "old Nixon" with the ugly connotations of that term built up over the years—the ruthless character assassin who had incurred the anger of Harry Truman by his unprincipled attacks upon the Democratic Party.

On another day, and in the very same newspaper, he would be depicted as exercising the "soft sell"—an equally repellent role in which he sought to ingratiate himself with voters by promoting the image of a lofty idealist. He was Uriah Heap one week and bloody Lord Jeffreys the next.

Here is another sample of the kind of reporting that dogged Nixon's footsteps during the campaign.

The Vice President had imposed upon himself a vow not to discuss the religious issue during the campaign. It was constantly pounded, of course, by the opposition. On October 24, the provocation was so great that press secretary Klein issued a statement which referred to a television broadcast by Bobby Kennedy, brother of the Democratic candidate.

Bobby had charged, among other things, that Republican headquarters in San Diego, Calif., was "openly issuing anti-Catholic literature."

Klein said he had checked this report and secured denials not only from Republican officials but from the Democratic chairman of San Diego County. If there was anti-Catholic literature in San Diego, no one had seen it. Klein suggested that the younger Kennedy had made a false charge to exploit the religious issue. Continuance of such tactics, he stated, might force Nixon himself to take cognizance of them.

This is how Klein's mild statement was handled by the correspondent for a large Midwest liberal newspaper:

"Vice President Richard M. Nixon has cleared the way for using the cruelest of all issues, religion, against Senator John F. Kennedy."

In the long story which followed, there was no mention of the denials by both Republican and Democratic leaders that anti-Catholic literature had been issued in San Diego.

But the story did say that the Vice President had revived memories of the "old Nixon" by the ominous warning that he might open up the Pandora's box of religion.

I submit that the total effect of such journalism was to confirm Nixon's opponent's in their conviction that he was a devious scoundrel and to convince many of his supporters that he was wavering back and forth in his campaign methods in an uncertain, indecisive manner. The net result was certainly not to win votes for him. In the opinion of some political authorities, it cost him thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands of votes by producing an indifference or repugnance to him among many who would otherwise have voted for him.

These incidents are typical of a number discovered in what could only be a spot-check of some prominent newspapers. I can assure you they are not isolated instances.

Let me summarize:

First, the great majority of the newspapermen assigned to report the Nixon campaign were openly hostile to hm and openly favored Kennedy.

Second, a spot check of several newspapers disclosed evidence sufficient to raise a presumption that some of this animosity crept into dispatches, to the detriment of Nixon's candidacy.

Third, the case seems strong enough, at least, to be submitted to a jury—in this case, a research organization, of unquestioned standing and impartiality, with sufficient staff and funds to conduct an exhaustive survey.

Finally, the press itself should take the lead in providing such a survey.

Many reasons have been advanced for Nixon's loss to Kennedy by a small fraction of 1 percent. He faced a big Democratic superiority. He was opposed by big-city political machines who used the customary fraudulent methods to roll up tremendous majorities against him.

Some Republican leaders have opined that he should have hit harder. His performance during the television shows has been criticized. The factor of the religious issue in the campaign awaits definitive analysis.

If there was still another obstacle to his candidacy—slanted reporting which did not fully and fairly acquaint a portion of the voting public with his words and actions during the campaign—that condition demands exposure.

The people are entitled to it. The press itself is most vitally concerned. It faces an evil which threatens its honor and its proud estate.

The Fall of Bataan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, April 9 was the 19th anniversary of the fall of Bataan. In honor of that event the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia named two streets near

the Philippines Chancery, Bataan and Corregidor. In the official ceremony, Secretary of State Dean Rusk delivered the main address.

The names of these two streets in our Capital City recalled the deep and binding brotherhood between the people of the United States and of the Philippine Republic that was welded in the fire of war and quenched in the blood of heroes of American and Filipino descent who suffered and died together in that area.

It is also particularly appropriate that our country and our Capital should celebrate this day while the Republic of the Philippines is represented by the Honorable Carlos P. Romulo, its outstanding and distinguished Ambassador.

Not only is General Romulo remembered for his services in the Congress of the United States, but for his contribution in the long and difficult struggle against tyranny by our two peoples from 1941 to 1945. General Romulo during that time served as General MacArthur's aide-de-camp in Bataan, Corregidor, and in Australia and returned to the Philippines with the U.S. forces which landed in Leyte. General Romulo has continued to distinguish himself as a diplomat, scholar, and world statesman. In the United Nations his voice has been heard always on the side of freedom and on the side of the ancient and unbreakable friendship of the American and Filipino people.

General Romulo has never swerved from his friendship with the United States and by act and word has constantly enunciated the common ideals which we share so well with the Republic of the Philippines.

The fall of Bataan was regarded as a great victory by the Japanese Army but was in a more real sense a symbol of a victory of the human spirit. It was in reality the first step on a road traveled not only by the citizens of the Philippines but of the United States and other free nations to a world in which we hoped we would enjoy lasting peace and a sharing of our different backgrounds and origins in a common cause for liberty. The suffering and loss which followed the fall of Bataan proved to the people of the Philippines and the United States their common heritage and their need to rededicate and renew their devotion to freedom and the ideals of liberty and self-determination. In the words of that great statesman, Gen. Carlos Romulo:

Bataan proved that the men of the west and the men of the east can face a common foe in absolute and unquestioned equality. That was the victory of Bataan. It sealed the bond of friendship between Filipinos and Americans—a bond already established through the long years that led up, before the war came, to the guarantee of national independence. As the long shadows of military defeat fell over those Filipino and American warriors in the tropical night in Bataan, the victory of the free spirit hovered overhead. It foretold the irreversible march of nationalism in Asia and Africa, the massive and exciting roster of nations that would quickly win their freedom in the years to follow—India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, and all the others.

General Romulo had other great words to say on this day of mixed sadness and rejoicing:

To us in the Philippines and to you here, Bataan is a symbol of the bond between us. Bataan is of the past; but the bond lives, and must never be shaken.

So today, in 1961, we Filipinos and Americans recall the symbolism of Bataan—the spiritual victory that makes the military defeat look puny—and in the remembrance of that great moment in our common history we have the right to stand side by side through all the years to come, certain of the rightness of our case and the timelessness of our friendship.

It is for us now to remember and to carry with us, in all the days of the future, not only the ideals for which our two peoples suffered in the late war but also a firm remembrance of the warm friendship and good will which our steadfast friends in the Philippines share with us, which is so well exemplified by the great and distinguished representative of the Philippine Republic, the Honorable Carlos Romulo.

The Coming Din of Inequity—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, following is the second in a series of statements explaining the structural mechanism of the social security system written by Mr. Ray M. Peterson, an outstanding authority on social security:

A PERMANENT AND GROWING DEBT
(By Ray M. Peterson)

Now, let us return to the terms "individual equity" and "social adequacy." What is their significance? Individual equity, remember, equates contributions (or taxes, employee's and employer's combined) and benefits; the benefit is earned by the contribution. A socially adequate benefit, however, may be more or less than an equity benefit. The fact is that, for the vast majority of present members of the OASDI system, benefits will be much greater than an "equity" benefit. An income that meets social needs includes a large element of unearned benefit or unearned increment for most of the present members. But the pendulum swings the other way for the youngest members and for all new entrants. Social adequacy for some means individual inequity for others.

The decided swing away from substantial individual equity toward social adequacy which began with the 1939 amendments has been accelerated since 1939. This has been the result of deferring scheduled tax increases, extending coverage to new groups, and increasing benefits for both retired and nonretired groups without increasing the taxes with respect to them by an amount sufficient to cover the cost of their increased benefits.

One need not be an actuary to realize that if large classes of persons receive benefits of greater value than the taxes paid with respect to them, then somebody else must pick up the tab. The unearned benefits are in one sense a subsidy which the older generation has voted for itself, and in another sense a debt representing the present worth of the subsidy which that same generation has assigned to younger generations for service or payment. In view of section 1104 of the Social Security Act giving Congress "the right to alter, amend, or repeal any provision" of the act, this debt does not have the same legal character as the national debt represented by Government bond promises to pay, but if social security promises are to be honored, the debt is just as real as the national debt. The younger generations can either pay off the debt or they can settle for just paying the interest on it. Under the present system of self-support through payroll taxes, these are the only two choices seemingly open to them, short of congressional repeal.

But, is it that simple? Are there really two choices? The great emphasis on social adequacy has some very disturbing implications.

The first is the dawning realization that we have but one choice, and that choice is to pay the interest on the debt forever, since the debt is premanent. The only way the debt can be reduced is to have a given generation of workers build up a huge reserve fund (over and above present payments) solely for that purpose. To expect this to happen is to be politically and economically unrealistic. With no reserve fund in sight to reduce the debt, the burden being passed on to future generations is permanent. It is not something that will somehow work itself out, or go away; it is not an actuarial fantasy.

Second, not only is the debt permanent, but the burden being passed on to future generations is a growing one. Under the 1956 act, the debt arising out of the unearned increments was estimated to be $269 billion. This is the difference between (a) the present worth, $486 billion, of all future benefits and expenses for all persons then OASI members and (b) the sum of the present worth, $194 billion, of all future taxes with respect to such members and the trust fund, $23 billion. The corresponding present worth of unearned increments at the end of 1958 was $289 billion. Estimates of the writer, based on available data, show the debt growing from about $150 billion under the 1952 act to $200 billion under the 1954 act, and on to about $300 billion under the 1958 act. The 1960 act will produce some further increase.

Third—and most serious of all—because of this debt, employee and employer taxes with respect to the average new entrant will always exceed the value of the benefits such a new member will receive. The constant combined employer-employee tax rate estimated as sufficient to pay for all future benefits was 7 percent of taxable payrolls under the 1954 act. Of this, 4.6 percent was needed to support benefits for the average new entrant, and 2.4 percent was interest on a debt of about $200 billion. Under the 1958 act, such tax rate requirement was about 8.75 percent, of which 5.25 percent was needed for a new entrant and 3.5 percent for interest on a debt of about $300 billion. Under the 1954 act, the value of total new entrant taxes was 152 percent of the value of the benefits (7 divided by 4.6); under the 1958 act this became 166⅔ percent (8.75 divided by 5.25). There is no intrinsic reason why this percentage cannot exceed 200 percent. At this point, the average new employee, alone, more than pays his own way. Today, the average new self-employed person is paying 20 percent more than the value of his benefits. The taxes payable by and in respect of the new entrant must forever be greater in value than the value of the benefits that the new

member will receive. The price of social adequacy is perpetual individual inequity.

When the magnitude of this individual inequity becomes more fully understood, will a "din of inequity" arise? Will there be a demand for support from general revenues? Will there be a refusal to pay increased social security taxes? Will there be a demand for reduction of benefits? Will an employer ask a private insurance company whether he can obtain larger benefits for new employees with the same joint employer-employee contributions? If he should ask me, this is what I would have to say. "About 80 percent of joint employee-employer taxes involving your new employees is for old-age benefits for the employee, his wife or widow. The remaining 20 percent is for survivor and disability benefits before retirement. Depending upon the marital status and the sex of your new employees and the rate of earnings, this 80 percent of taxes would buy under an Equitable group annuity contract, at our present rates, 40 to 60 percent more in old-age benefits than are provided under the OASI system."

The foregoing situation would be further aggravated if more is added to this unearned-increment debt by deferral of scheduled tax increases and by benefit increases without fully compensating tax increases with respect to those receiving the benefits. This is to be expected because the 1958 advisory council on social security financing questioned whether the 1969 tax increase should go into effect, and benefits are almost certain to be increased by Congress.

TRSUT FUND VERSUS VALUE OF CURRENT BENEFITS

The shift in principle from individual equity to social adequacy and from "full reserve" emphasis to "pay as you go" financing is vividly reflected by the change in the relationship between the amount of the old age and survivors insurance (OASI) trust fund and the value of the benefits for persons currently on the benefit rolls (disability benefits and trust fund excluded). The following table shows, for example, that if taxes had ceased in 1950, the trust fund would have covered 113 percent of the benefits promised for the future for those then in receipt of payments; but if taxes should cease in 1965, it is estimated that only 20 percent of the benefits for those then on the rolls would be covered, with no provision for those not on the rolls.

Relation of trust fund to value of benefits in current payment status [1]

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Trust fund	Value of benefits	Ratio of (2) to (3)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1945	$7.12	$2.31	309
1950	13.72	12.10	113
1955	21.66	39.32	55
1960	20.15	88.28	23
1965	23.14	114.23	20

[1] Estimates based on (a) Annual Statistical Supplement, 1958, Social Security Bulletin; (b) "Present Values of OASI Benefits in Current Payment Status, 1940-1956," Actuarial Study No. 45, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Division of the Actuary; and (c) reference 6.

In the 20th annual report of the trustees of the OASDI funds, an estimate is made of the progress of the OASI trust fund "in the unlikely event of a sharp reduction in the level of economic activity during calendar years 1960-64, with a relatively high rate of unemployment during the entire period." Based on these estimates, the OASI trust fund would drop to only 10 percent of the value of benefits current in 1964.

EXPANSION BEYOND SOCIAL ADEQUACY

We have observed the growth of unearned increments and the departure from individual equity in the name of social adequacy. For a social insurance system established to provide only a minimum basic coverage as protecttion against want and destitution, this is fully justified. It is in harmony with the 1937 Supreme Court decision which declared the system constitutional as a welfare measure. The advocates of great expansion of social programs, however, have now dropped the adjective "social" and speak only of "adequacy." Here are proposals for departure from social adequacy to higher orders of "adequacy."

Prof. Wilbur Cohen, of the University of Michigan (now Assistant Secrtary of Health, Education, and Welfare), recently said we must develop a concept of "greater adequacy." Speaking of the 50-50 payroll tax financing, he said that there was no reason why it could not be 40-60, or have the Government make a substantial contribution.

Nelson H. Cruikshank, director of the AFL-CIO Department of Social Security, recently wrote:

"The proportion of present earnings that is represented by benefits on retirement must be materially increased for workers in the middle- and upper-income brackets. A worker with average wages in industry today receives only about 30 percent of his present earnings. In order to keep pace with the rising levels of living and to maintain confidence of the system on the part of those in the middle- and upper-wage ranges, he should receive 25 years from now, or sooner, at least 60 percent of his earnings on retirement."

(Based on a current average wage of $4,600, the primary amount is about 32 percent for an employee, and the total benefit for a married couple is 48 percent.)

These proposals go far beyond the concept of social adequacy. Their enactment could increase the permanent social security debt to more than one-half trillion dollars.

TRUE NATURE OF SOCIAL SECURITY RIGHTS

The true nature of social security rights has been well stated by the Solicitor General of the United States and by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Solicitor General: "Social security must be viewed as a welfare instrument to which legal concepts of 'insurance,' 'property,' 'vested rights,' 'annuities,' etc., can be applied only at the risk of a serious distortion of language. We are dealing with a social instrument by which public action, involving compulsion, is invoked to deal with the social problem—the lack of basic economic security of large segments of our society. An understanding of the difficult and changing problems of public policy arising out of attempts to eliminate individual or family insecurity on a national scale will be obscured by Procrustean efforts to force the social security program into the mold of inappropriate analogies."

Supreme Court: "The social security system may be accurately described as a form of social insurance, enacted pursuant to Congress power to 'spend money in aid of the "general welfare." * * * It is apparent that the noncontractual interest of an employee covered by the act cannot be soundly analogized to that of the holder of an annuity whose right to benefits are bottomed on his contractual premium payments.' "

Proposed Federal Courtroom, Oakland Main Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, as we consider S. 912, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members some data prepared for me by a highly reputable contractor and engineer that clearly refutes statements made by the Judicial Council in August 1958 about the cost of adapting facilities in the U.S. post office at Oakland, for use by an Oakland division of the northern California Federal District Court.

I would like to insert the findings of Mr. John F. Tulloch of Oakland, Calif., in this regard:

JOHN F. TULLOCH,
Oakland, Calif., February 24, 1961.

OAKLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Oakland, Calif.

(Attention Mr. James Cowart).

GENTLEMEN: Our estimate for the proposed alterations to the center section of the present Oakland Main Post Office Building for a Federal court of original jurisdiction as discussed with Mr. James Cowart, Mr. Gilbert Calden, and Colonel Herrick, postmaster, is in the amount of approximately $40,420 as discussed with these gentlemen, as shown on our attached sketch No. 1, and as noted below.

We include in the above price the following work:

(1) Preparation of architectural design drawings and details including submittal for bids and negotiations of contract.

(2) Necessary demolition and removal work in removing present partitions in civil service examination area, cutting of new doors and stripping of present lighting system, installation of new partitioning for jury room complete with necessary millwork, finish hardware and trim as well as installing new entry doors to courtroom and to jurist's office.

(3) Modernization of entire area including jury room, jurist's office, and courtroom, approximately 3,750 square feet, with new acoustical tile ceiling glued on existing plaster ceiling, new vinyl tile floors and base, necessary patching of existing walls and complete paint job in jury room and courtroom and with hardwood paneling in jurist's office.

(4) Entire space to be air conditioned with air-conditioning equipment mounted on roof and supply and return ducts run into new diffusers in ceiling.

(5) Present lighting fixtures to be removed and new modern fluorescent lighting installed of 50-foot candle level with necessary switching and convenience outlets.

(6) Exterior windows facing on court to have new venetian blinds with plastic tapes and metal slats.

(7) Job to be cleaned up at conclusion and left in first-class condition subject to a 1-year guarantee.

We do not include in the above price jurist's bench or any furniture or draperies, but otherwise include everything necessary for a complete workmanlike job in accordance with all applicable codes.

This should be the information you need for your appropriation request and we are happy to supply it with the thought that this will improve the Government facilities available to our city. If further is necessary, please advise.

Very truly yours,

JOHN F. TULLOCH, INC.,
J. B. TULLOCH.

You Must Stand for Something or You Will Fall for Anything

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, a good teacher will not only impart knowledge, but also will do all in his or her power to get the student to think for himself. Such a teacher is Mrs. Nancy Arter, who teaches the fifth grade in Lincoln School in Prescott, Ariz.

One day Mrs. Arter wrote on the blackboard of her room the sentence "You must stand for something or you will fall for anything." The next day, she asked the pupils of her class to write interpretations of this sentence. I think the results are not only outstanding, but encouraging to persons who are concerned about the preservation of our American way of life. Therefore, it is a pleasure for me to share the answer of each pupil with the Members of the Congress:

This means to me that if you don't believe in some form of government enough to protect it, you will soon become involved in some other form of government you don't want to have anything to do with—Carole Cline.

I think that means that you must stand for what you want or you'll go for what somebody wants you to do. You must think over which party you want to be for, either Democrat or Republican. If you don't know which party you're for, a friend could talk you into being a Republican—Shelly Lyttle.

To me these words mean that if you don't believe in something you won't know which way is right. Then if someone tells you he is right you would believe him for you have never known which way is right—Susan Henson.

At this point it seems to me that there are only two great beliefs in life, communism and democracy. I live within the democratic law. I feel that someday there will be a great war between democracy and communism. When that day comes, if I still live on the face of the earth, I will stand up for democracy—Jill Goodell.

It means to me that you learn something that you know is right, so if someone who you know is wrong cannot lead you in the wrong way—Paul Martin.

You must stand for honesty, keep your pride. Say a man came to you and said, "Let's rob a bank." You must stand for something or you'll fall for anything. You must have the ability not to go and do what the crowd wants you to do. You must have the ability to say, "No."—Ronnie Seets.

You have to be "a somebody" or you will do almost anything. Try to have people respect you, follow the Golden Rule during your lifetime. If you let people talk you into things that you know are not right you're bound to get into trouble—Tom Ravey.

You must stand for something important or you'll fall for something not so important.—Irene Kinder.

I think that means you must stand for something such as the Republican or Democratic Party and what it says or you'll fall for anything. I think that means you'll fall for anything such as communism.—Celia Devereaux.

A Worthwhile Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, today will mark the presentation of the first major contribution to finance the publication, the Talking Lion, to be provided free of charge to thousands of blind citizens of Illinois. Soon many blind adults in my State will be able to read a recorded magazine especially written for them and transcribed for use on their talking-book machines.

This very worthwhile project is sponsored by the Lions Clubs of Illinois and founded by Don O. Nold, a longtime resident of my congressional district.

The Talking Lion will contain original writings in addition to specially selected items from well known published periodicals. The contents will be divided in six general classifications and a well-rounded assortment of interests will be presented in each issue. At present, plans call for four editions annually.

Section 1 will be devoted to items of general interest, including many informative messages concerning the special regulations of social security and income tax regulations, the work Lions Clubs are doing for the blind, news of public and private agencies offering services to the blind. Section 2 will be dedicated to women, with articles on fashions, homemaking, household hints, and child care. Men's interests will be the feature of section 3, with items on sports, hobbies, business, clothes.

Fiction will be the keynote of section 4, with short stories and poetry as material. Blind authors will have an opportunity to have some of their works published in this section. Section 5, nonfiction, will feature biographies, vignettes, verbal portraits, travelogues, essays. The final section, No. 6, will be a potpourri of assorted subjects, including letters to the editor, questions and answers wherein blind persons can seek answers to problems, book reviews of the latest talking book releases, editorials, commentary.

Mr. Nold states:

At present most of this information is not now available to blind persons in a form which they can read. The American Foundation for the Blind estimates that less than 8 percent of blind persons read braille, largely because most of them lose their sight at an advanced age. Except for radio or friends who read to them, there is no reading matter available which is especially designed for their use and which concerns itself with their problems and desires.

The Central Lions Club of Chicago has contributed $1,000 to this project and the Berwyn Lions Club has pledged $500 to the publication fund for 1961. The Stickney-Forest View Lions Club has also sent in a contribution and other clubs in district 1–A have shown an interest in participating in this project. Several personal contributions have been made by those interested in having blind residents of the State receive this aid. Needless to say, the corporation being formed to conduct this venture is one of a nonprofit nature.

This project is one that deserves wide commendation because it provides for a great need of our blind citizenry which is too often neglected or bypassed in the hubdub of our daily lives. It might well set an example for other groups and organizations to serve those among us who are deprived of sight and many of the benefits of self-education and entertainment which the rest of us enjoy. This will be made eminently clear to the representatives of some 92 Lions Clubs in the Chicagoland area who will witness the fund presentation ceremony this evening.

The Coming Din of Inequity—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, following is the final part of an article on the structure of the social security system prepared by Mr. Ray Peterson, a well-known and able actuary.

I urge all the Members to study these three insertions as a single unit in order that they may better understand the financial structure of the social security system and the built-in dangers which make it actuarially unsound:

INACCURATE PRIVATE INSURANCE PARALLELS

Space will permit only a few illustrations of statements which seek to liken social security to private insurance.

I. MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Congressman (now Senator) KEATING: [1] "It has always been my feeling that since social security is essentially an insurance system, there should be no limit on the amounts which beneficiaries can earn, and still receive benefits * * * it is my feeling the ceiling should be removed entirely."

Senator PROXMIRE: [2] "The fact is that this is an insurance system. This is a premium that he is paying. His employer is paying a part of the premium. It is entirely different from income tax. It is a benefit that comes back to him. He is buying something for himself."

Footnotes at end of speech.

Senator DOUGLAS: [3] "I'm in favor of eliminating completely the limit on earnings of OASI recipients. To require all those getting OASI payments to give up gainful employment is, in reality, attaching a condition to insurance which they themselves have bought."

Senator (now President) Kennedy [4] (campaign statement): "I believe, with Governor Rockefeller, that people should be able to save for the medical care of their retirement years in the same way that they set aside money for other needs—through the social security system. My health plan would extend to our older citizens a life policy of paid-up medical insurance. It would afford them hospital benefits, nursing home benefits and X-rays and laboratory tests on an outpatient basis.

"It would allow people to provide for the costs of their retirement while they work—so that their needs could be met in later years without burdening their children."

It is evident from the earlier analysis in this paper that the social security financing mechanism is not a savings system, that the granting of unearned increments creates a debt that employees and employers of the future must cope with in perpetuity, and the Supreme Court opinion makes clear that there would be no such document as a "life policy of paid-up medical insurance."

II. SOCIAL SECURITY OFFICIALS AND DEPARTMENT STATEMENTS

Robert M. Ball,[5] Deputy Director of the Bureau of OASI (in defense of the policy of fixing social security taxes without any initial income-bracket exemption): "The argument as used in the United States for such a policy under old-age insurance is that the contributions, though legally a tax, are a premium for social insurance benefits."

Charles M. Schottland [6] (formerly Social Security Commissioner): "Medical care for the aged can best be approached through the social insurance route. Nine out of ten persons reaching age 65 today are eligible for OASI benefits. They have paid for these benefits through a tax system which has been proved workable and financially sound."

"Insurance for You and Your Family" (1952): [7] "Your account number on your social security card identifies your old-age and survivors insurance account. Your card is the symbol of your insurance policy under the Federal social security law."

Social Security Administration release of November 1959: "Beginning January 1, 1950, 50 cents more social security tax on every $100 you earn (and 50 cents more from your employer) * * * provide monthly payments for you and your family at retirement, or when you are between age 50 and 65 and severely disabled."

III. WRITERS

Arthur Larson: [8] "Social security is a combination of old-age pensions, disability insurance, and life insurance. The premium for this combination of benefits is a payroll tax of 5 percent on your wages up to $4800 a year.

"Social security is based on the same principle as private insurance, with variations to accomplish its social purpose and to keep it inexpensive.

"Social security differs in important ways from commercial annuities and private life and disability insurance, but the general idea is the same. The idea is that contributions are made by you (and on your behalf by your employer), in return for which you get certain insured rights, including pensions and death benefits."

Wilbur J. Cohen: [9] "The proposal [social security financing mechanism] uses the tried and tested insurance method of payment for hospital and medical care with which millions of Americans of working age are familiar through Blue Cross and other private insurance."

Sidney Margolius [10] (referring to 1960 amendments): "You and your family ought to know your social security benefits as thoroughly as you know how much money you have in the bank. For that's what social security really is: money in the bank against the day you might lose your income because of disablement, death of the family breadwinner or old age."

It must be clear to all discerning readers that, in the light of our initial analysis, there is no foundation for these inaccurate parallels. Indeed, there is desperate need to dispel these self-mesmerizing, foggy concepts.

SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCING OF MEDICAL CARE

What happens when the social security financing mechanism is used for medical care benefits? Let us first recall that the proponents of the contributory old-age and survivors insurance system, led by Arthur Altmeyer, have always been axious to preserve the contributory principle; that is, no one receives cash benefits under that system unless he contributes for a minimum period of time. Even though contributions have been only token payments for hundreds of thousands of members, Congress has adhered to this principle. Now, with an entirely new type of proposed benefits, i.e., medical care, for which the present persons on the old-age payment rolls would pay nothing, this principle is thrown overboard; all present social security payees would be blanketed in. Also, millions of active workers and their employers would pay in taxes only a fraction of the cost of the benefits.

With no necessary applicaiton of the principle of social adequacy, another segment of unearned increment would be granted which would add to the permanent social security debt on which future generations and their employers would need to pay interest forever. A good guess would place this sum at $25 to $30 billion for the Forand bill, $15 to $20 billion for the Kennedy-Anderson bill, and around $30 billion for the McNamara bill. This would be only the start. The admitted political technique is a fragmentary approach: separate pieces of benefits are added from time to time. The McNamara bill had two steps in benefits and a two-step progression of taxes. Furthermore, most students, pro and con, believe that it will be virtually impossible to limit benefits to the aged. Such benefits will inevitably be extended to all ages. In this steady procession of developments, the principle of social adequacy—the idea of basic protection against want and destitution—is lost, with no replacing anchor of control to restrain expansion of so-called social insurance.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

What to do? The objective of the social insurance system should be clearly enunciated. It is imperative that the objective be to serve only the limited purpose of social adequacy, the recognition of society's obligation to provide basic minimum protection against want and destitution. The objective should be unequivocally declared by the Congress. As our society becomes more affluent, the relative role of social programs should diminish. The following measures are necessary to meet that objective:

1. No further increases in OASDI benefits should be enacted except those required to recognize changes in living costs for the aged. For this purpose, a special consumers' price index for the aged is needed and should be developed. Changes should be made only after careful consideration by Congress, and not automatically.

2. Congress should enact legislation that will provide tax incentives for all persons to save for their own old-age needs, including, in particular, funds dedicated to pay premiums for medical care insurance.

3. The self-supporting principle must be retained so that we do not lose its values of cost control and cost consciousness. If benefits are restricted to the social-adequacy level, pressure for support from general revenues can probably be successfully resisted.

4. To promote better public understanding of the nature of the financing method and of social security rights, a separate agency, similar in function to the Federal Trade Commission and State insurance departments, should be responsible for checking all statements and publications of the Social Security Administration for the purpose of disclosing to the public inaccurate and incomplete statements.

5. To promote better understanding of costs, congressional committees and other responsible persons not in Government should know, with respect to each proposed social security amendment under consideration, in addition to a single constant tax-rate requirement: (a) the tax-rate requirement for the average new entrant; (b) the present worth of the unearned increments for present members; and (c) the tax-rate requirement for the interest on the additional debt represented by such increments.

The adoption of these measures may be expected to have the following salutary effects:

1. As real wages increase, lower rates of social security taxes than those now in the law will suffice to support the present level of benefits; workers will have greater margins to save for their own old-age needs, and the wage-related feature of OAS I benefits will become less of a feature as more persons in the course of time will have the same flat benefit represented by the present maximum.

2. As the American people gain a better understanding of the nature of the social security system with the social objectives limited as herein stated, and of the differences between private and social insurance, changes of public acceptance of a certain measure of individual inequity for coming generations would be much improved.

3. As the following factors become effective it should become increasingly clear that provision of medical care benefits under the social security mechanism is unnecessary and unwise: (a) tax incentives to save for cash- and medical-care needs in old age; (b) the increasing capacity of present workers to save, as compared with the former capacity of the present aged; (c) the vigorous development of the Federal-State medical aid for aged program; and (d) the further evolution of voluntary private insurance.

Our social security system can be preserved only if we keep benefits within the limits of carefully defined social objectives. Abraham Epstein, a pioneer in the development of old age income programs, is reported to have said that social insurance is like a drug: a limited quantity can serve a vital need; an excessive quantity can be fatal.

If the recommended measures are not substantially adopted, but, instead, we attempt to finance cash benefits of greater adequacy and also full medical care benefits through the social security system on the self-supporting principle, and the system continues to be likened to private insurance, then surely a great din of inequity will be heard. The towering social security structure which we will have piously erected in the name of taking the burden of the old from the shoulders of the young will fall flat on our posterity.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] KEATING, K. B.: Statement, hearings before Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 85th Cong., 2d sess. on all titles of Social Security Act, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958, p. 1075.

[2] PROXMIRE, W.: Statement, hearings before Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 85th Cong., 2d sess. on all titles of Social Security Act, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958, p. 149.

[3] DOUGLAS, P. H.: Quoted in the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 17, 1957, "The Reader Writes": "OASI Payments," letter from A. L. Dunn, New Orleans.

[4] Kennedy, J. F.: "You Asked Them: They've Answered: Medical Care for Aged," Daily News (New York), Nov. 4, 1960.

[5] Ball, R. M.: Statement made by Deputy Director of Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance of Social Security Administration to Prof. R. M. Clark, quoted in Economic Security for Aged in United States and Canada. Report prepared for Government of Canada, 1959.

[6] Schottland, C. M.: "Medical Care Through Social Security: What Lies Ahead?" Public Welfare, July, 1960.

[7] "Insurance for You and Your Family," Social Security Administration, 1952, p. 11.

[8] Larson, A.: "Know Your Social Security," revised edition, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.

[9] Health and Social Security Task Force to President-elect Kennedy; Cohen, W. J., chairman, report, Jan. 10, 1961, unpublished.

[10] Margolius, S.: "New 'Security' Rules Aid Young and Old," Solidarity, Oct. 28, 1960, p. 9.

Bipartisan Efforts To Give Relief to Nation's Textile Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to give my strong support to the bipartisan efforts being made in the Congress to effectuate some relief by the administration for the Nation's textile industries. As the Representative of Maryland's Sixth Congressional District, I can speak out on the economic distress increasing foreign imports have caused in the manmade fiber industry. As many of my colleagues who have traveled through the Free State know, the city of Cumberland, Md., lies in the "narrows" of the Allegheny Mountains. With a population of 33,400 people the city depends on a diversified and healthy industry, and one of its mainstays is the Celanese Fiber Co. which produces such manmade fibers as acetate and triacetate.

As the Members of the House know, we have recently been informed that the Federal budget will operate at a deficit for this fiscal year of at least $2.2 billion and for next year nearly that amount again. With the increased spending for defense and other programs requested by the administration, we certainly must realize that this deficit will go even higher if all these programs are approved by the Congress. In the meantime, the Secretary of Labor has added 25 new industrial areas where substantial unemployment conditions exist, making a total of 101 such areas where unemployment is present or 6 percent or more of the work force is out of jobs. It would certainly seem proper to review whether it makes good sense to permit excessive quantities of foreign imports that destroy our own industries to continue at a time when conditions of deficit financing and unemployment exist at home.

Mr. Speaker, what are the economic facts in the manmade fiber industry? Currently, over 20 percent of the U.S. industrial capacity is idle. That is the first statistic.

Second. There is no adequate protection against those nations increasing their already growing imports to this country and thereby liquidating the domestic manmade fiber industry. If the excess capacity in those foreign nations were exported to the United States, the idle capacity at home would increase to 83 percent.

Third. In the last 11 years, foreign imports of manmade fibers to the United States increased by 440 percent.

Fourth. The labor costs of manmade fiber production workers in some foreign production centers make it economically questionable for our industry at home to be confronted with a constant upward trend in foreign imports. Average hourly wages are as follows:

Japan	$0.26
Italy	.62
West Germany	.78
United Kingdom	.54–$1
United States	2.76

Fifth. Imports of manmade fiber fabrics and apparel have also increased substantially. From 1957 to 1960, imports of manmade fiber fabrics increased by 194 percent, and imports of apparel and other manmade fiber products increased 137 percent.

Sixth. The domestic rayon staple fiber industry operated at a loss in 1960. This is a major segment of the manmade fiber industry. It foreshadows developments in the rest of the industry. Reductions in employment in the rayon staple fiber industry have brought the 1960 work force 30 percent below the 1957 level.

Mr. Speaker, these facts speak for themselves. Even though the industry expended 6.5 percent of its sales dollar last year in research, we can no longer claim a preemptive position for our technological advances in manmade textiles. We must continue certainly on a steady course in looking for the new advances in this technology, but we must not sacrifice to foreign imports the minimum economic status necessary to keep our industry's research laboratories operating. Production and sales of products are the prerequisite ingredients to vigorous research programs, and other industries at home in recent times have been washed down the drain by excessive and basically unfair important trade policies.

If the time should come when this Nation faced a world military conflict again, the essentiality of the textile and apparel industries to national security would be made apparent then, as it was apparent in World War II and the Korean conflict. In the event of such emergency, the manmade fiber industry—not dependent on production periods of natural fibers—alone presents the ability to meet urgent military requirements. The Soviet Union understands this fact of reality since it is now engaged in a crash program to catch up with the manmade fiber technology of the United States.

In view of the current conditions in this industry, Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in urging the President to study carefully the relief being requested from these foreign imports. Industry can again, as it has in the past, play the major role in ending current unemployment and deficit financing, too; it only requires an interested, sympathetic, and enlightened policy of its Government in Washington.

The President must, of course, examine this request in the light of the whole national welfare, including our diplomatic posture with our allies. He must consider the question as it bears upon existing commitments of the United States. Subject to these considerations, I hope that it will be possible for the President to grant this relief.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate worked on minimum wage bill.

House passed omnibus judgeship bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 5833–5844

Bills Introduced: Nine bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1672–1680; and S. Res. 126.

Page 5836

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 1372, authorizing the release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments, with amendment (S. Rept. 172);

Supplementary report of Committee on Commerce entitled "Problems of the Domestic Textile Industry" (S. Rept. 173); and

H.R. 6169, to clarify the membership, functions, and responsibilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Council (S. Rept. 174). Page 5836

Bill Referred: H.R. 6345, Interior Department appropriations for fiscal year 1962, passed by House yesterday, was referred to Committee on Appropriations.

Page 5833

Minimum Wage: Continuing its consideration of H.R. 3935, Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961, Senate took the following actions on further amendments to committee amendment (in nature of a substitute), as amended:

Adopted: Prouty amendment regarding definition of "enterprise" with respect to certain employees of retail and service establishments; McCarthy amendment regarding exemption of employees of certain radio and TV stations; Hill amendment regarding exemption of agricultural employees also employed in livestock auction operations; Young (North Dakota) amendment respecting exemption of country elevators employing not more than five persons; Russell amendment respecting exemption of certain cotton-ginning operations; and Williams (Delaware) amendment to exempt homeworkers engaged in manufacture of evergreen wreaths; and

Rejected: By 39 yeas to 55 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Goldwater amendment respecting investigation of effects of foreign competition on unemployment and authorizing limitation on entry and imposition of duties on imports based on such investigation; by 39 yeas to 56 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Monroney amendment to limit coverage under bill by defining enterprise engaged in commerce as one operating establishments in two or more States; by 45 yeas to 52 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Smathers amendment to retain the exemption in present law for laundries and drycleaners; Morse amendment respecting exemption as to certain employees in lumbering or forestry operations; Curtis amendment respecting definition of term "employer" so as to exempt certain religious and charitable organizations; and Holland amendment barring, except by express provision of law, any regulation of wages and hours of those employed in agriculture. Pages 5844, 5845, 5849–5887

Record Votes: During Senate proceedings today three record votes were taken. Pages 5857, 5871, 5877

Confirmations: Senate confirmed the nominations of William P. Daniel, of Texas, to be Governor of Guam; and Philip Elman, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner. Page 5911

Nominations: Senate received nominations of Erwin N. Griswold, of Massachusetts, and Spottswood W. Robinson III, of the D.C., to be members of the Commission on Civil Rights; and one judicial nomination.

Page 5911

Program for Thursday: Senate met at 11 a.m. and adjourned at 6:10 p.m. until noon Thursday, April 20, when, following routine morning business, vote will be taken on passage of H.R. 3935, minimum wage bill, following which Senate will consider H.R. 4884, financial aid to dependent children of unemployed parents. Majority leader also announced the possibility of action on conference report, if filed, on S. 1, area redevelopment. Pages 5887, 5892, 5911

Appendix

Senator Dodd, of Connecticut, Delivers Americanism Conference Speech at Annual American Legion Event in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was the privilege of our esteemed colleague, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, and the Senator from West Virginia who now speaks, to have been invited to participate in the annual Americanism Conference of the West Virginia Department of the American Legion held in Fairmont, W. Va., April 15, 1961.

Senator DODD delivered the conference keynote address—a forthright and thought-provoking message which was declared by seniors among the active American Legion members in attendance to have been one of the most inspiring in the long series of the West Virginia department's annual lectures on Americanism. Adjutant Tommy Jones announced that he had arranged to have the address by Senator DODD broadcast by radio on stations throughout the State.

In being privileged to introduce our distinguished colleague, I said:

I am especially gratified to bring to you tonight a speaker who has developed high competency in areas that are particularly relevant to the theme of this conference.

As a citizen, as a practicing lawyer, as a legislator, and as the father of two charming daughters and four sons, our speaker, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, has a very real investment in Americanism and in the problems of our achieving a more viable democracy.

His professional engagement in this field began with the conferring of his law degree at Yale University in 1933. In 1935 THOMAS DODD established and directed the national youth administration in Connecticut, thereby initiating a very deep commitment to juvenile problems and the development of our youth. This interest and responsibility he has carried with him to the present time, in which it guides his very able work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

In 1938 our speaker joined the Department of Justice, where he served with distinction until 1945 as special assistant to the Attorney General. In that year he was called from the Department of Justice to serve with Justice Jackson at the Nuremburg Trials for the War Crimes. During the remainder of 1945 and 1946 he acted as vice chairman of the board of review and executive trial counsel in the U.S. Chief of Counsel for the Prosecution of Axis Criminality, earning a Presidential Citation and the Medal of Freedom for the high service he rendered.

After several years of active practice in law, our guest returned to public service as a Member of the House of Representative in the 83d and 84th Congresses, and was elected to the Senate in 1958. Throughout a wide and varied practice of law, as a private practitioner, as a public servant, and as a legislator, the consistent thread of Senator DODD's career has been his high dedication to the principles of Americanism and his devotion to the task of making those principles secure.

It is with a keen awareness of the clarification which he can bring to the deliberations of this conference that I take pleasure in presenting the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, a distinguished U.S. Senator from the State of Connecticut.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Senator DODD's speech.

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

SPEECH BY SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD, OF CONNECTICUT, BEFORE THE AMERICAN LEGION CONFERENCE, FAIRMONT, W. VA., APRIL 15, 1961

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure for me to be here with this group of American Legion members and their wives, who have contributed so much in the effort to inform the American people about the essential evil of communism and the threat it poses to freedom.

I am glad to be here in West Virginia for another reason. Thanks to the energetic and effective efforts of Senator RANDOLPH and Senator BYRD, I probably know more about the problems of West Virginia than those of any other State in the Union, excepting my own State of Connecticut. In Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, I have been fortunate to have a warm and wise friend, who is known and respected as one of the most eloquent and capable Members of the Senate.

I have been privileged to know Senator BOB BYRD for a long time and have served with him in the House and Senate. I have always regarded him as one of the most earnest and dedicated public servants in America. West Virginia can well be proud of its representation in the Senate. There is no State whose interests are more effectively or tirelessly represented.

The word "Americanism" has, I am afraid, been much misunderstood.

It has been abused by ultraconservative extremists who claim it as their peculiar property.

On the other hand, it has been unjustly vilified by the ultraliberal extremists, who equate it with bigotry and reaction.

Why there should be such confusion, I find difficult to understand. The meaning of "Americanism" should be plain enough.

"Americanism" means loyalty not merely to our country but to its traditions and to the moral values for which it stands.

It means dedication to the concepts of justice and tolerance and fairness that are enshrined in our Constitution.

But above all, it means dedication to the cause of human freedom—the kind of dedication to which Thomas Jefferson gave voice when he wrote the line: "I have sworn upon the altar of Almighty God eternal hostility to all forms of tyranny over the minds of men."

No American who is true to the traditions of his country could fail to be opposed to Nazi and Communist tyranny.

Americanism in our day and age does not mean simply opposition to communism. It means adherence to a positive set of values. Dedication to these values, however, automatically brings us into opposition to communism.

Whether they realize it or not, those "ultraliberals" who repudiate the word "Americanism" have in effect turned their backs on the American tradition.

By "ultraliberal" I mean those intellectuals, naive or softheaded, who refuse to believe that communism can be all evil; who insist that the Communists are like ourselves and that, if we are prepared to be reasonable, coexistence with them is possible; who close their eyes to all the massive evidence that communism is an international conspiracy committed to the destruction of freedom and religion; who cry "witchhunt" or "McCarthyism" at every effort to investigate Communist-front operations and Communist infiltration of Government positions; who are not pro-Communist, but react with far greater emotion against every manifestation of anticommunism than they ever seem capable of displaying against communism.

But the American tradition is equally betrayed by those ultraconservative extremists who pretend to speak in the name of Americanism, but who forget that fairness and moderation and justice are essential ingredients of our nationhood. The result is that these extremists of the right frequently take the stand that everyone who disagrees with them is either a Communist or a dupe of the Communists, that every political figure who has been guilty of an error in judgment or a policy that failed, is, ipso facto, a member of the Communist conspiracy.

In reply to the ultraliberal extremists, I say that there is a problem of Communist infiltration in government, a very real problem. It has been with us before and I am sure it will continue to be with us so long as the cold war exists. Let me review a few pertinent facts in this connection.

Alger Hiss, one of the top officers of the State Department and the secretary of the founding conference of the United Nations, was identified as a Communist agent and was convicted of perjury for denying that he turned over state secrets to Whittaker Chambers, a self-confessed Soviet agent.

Harry Dexter White, who, as the energetic assistant to Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, in effect ran the American Treasury, has also been proved, beyond any reasonable doubt, to have been a Communist agent.

Frank Coe, one-time assistant to White, was compelled to resign as head of the International Monetary Fund when he claimed protection of the fifth amendment in refusing to reply to the question: "Are you a Communist agent?" Mr. Coe is today in Communist China.

Think of the implications of this: Communist agents have at different times directed the American Treasury, the International Monetary Fund, and one of the key offices in the U.S. State Department.

Those ultraliberals who charge that every investigation into the possibility of Communist infiltration or of Communist influ-

ence in government policy is a witch-hunt, are either wrongheaded, or blind, or worse.

But as bad as the ultraliberal extremists are those ultraconservative extremists who charge, for example, that President Eisenhower and the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and Mr. Allen Dulles were conscious members of the Communits conspiracy.

To accuse people like Presiednt Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles of being Communist agents is an affront to both decency and intelligence. It brings our leaders and our institutions into disrepute, it sows division, it makes it easier for the Communists and the ultraliberals to equate opposition to communism with political lunacy.

In the realm of foreign policy, Americanism means certain concrete things.

Above all, it means commitment to the principle of freedom for men and nations.

It means that we can never reconcile ourselves to the enslavement of hundreds of millions of people in Europe and in Asia by the most bestial despotism in history.

It means that we must seek, by every means short of war, to help these peoples recover their freedom.

It means that we must avoid all measures which might be construed as an acceptance of the permanence of these regimes.

It means an abiding faith in the triumph of good over evil and freedom over slavery.

It means that we must call a halt to the partial surrender and partial retreats that have characterized our foreign policy since Yalta and Tehran.

It means a willingness to fight, if fight we must, to protect our freedom and the freedom of other peoples.

It means the kind of courage and the kind of dedication our forebears had when they pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to the cause of freedom.

I know that I do not have to agitate or exhort the members of the American Legion on the subject of communism. But we must be frank in realizing that the viewpoint which we in this hall hold, is shared only by a minority in our own country and by a much smaller minority throughout the free world community.

With the exception of the fellow travelers and the ultraliberal extremists, the majority will agree with us that communism is inherently evil, that it has cost the lives of scores of millions of people, that it is militantly opposed to belief in God, that its totalitarian government violates all of man's God-given rights, that the leaders of communism have on frequent occasions proclaimed their intention of burying the free world.

But after admitting all these things our friends of the majority will turn around and say: "We have to be realistic. We cannot afford a nuclear war. Therefore we must seriously attempt to negotiate with the Communists, seriously strive to achieve coexistence with them."

This brief statement of position is, I am certain, an accurate characterization of the present attitude of the free world. But within these brief sentences there are so many grave fallacies that I sometimes wonder what has happened to the intelligence and sanity and morality of civilized men.

This position assumes that the essential differences between communism and freedom are negotiable. But while many minor and peripheral differences are negotiable, the essential difference between freedom and slavery is not.

It also assumes that the cold war is two-sided in origin, that if we abate our hostility, the Communists will abate theirs. But the cold war does not originate on our side; the hostility of the Communist world to the free world does not spring from anything we have done. The Kremlin is opposed to us because of what we are and what we believe. It seeks to destroy us—in fact I would say that it is under compulsion to destroy us—because we stand for the dignity of man and it stands for human enslavement; because we stand for freedom and it stands for the total subjugation of the rest of the world; because we stand for belief in God and in man's God-given rights, while the Kremlin denies these beliefs; because America is the one thing that stands in the way of global victory for the Kremlin.

Unless we are prepared to abandon belief in God and freedom and all the other virtues of our civilization, we will remain what we are. And so long as we remain what we are, communism will seek—must seek—to destroy us. Let us have no illusion on this score.

This quest for coexistence, where coexistence is not possible, represents an abandonment of the first of all moral and religious precepts: Thou shalt love thy brother as thyself. It also represents an abandonment of the moral foundation of the American revolution and American civilization. Whether they realize it or not, those who argue in favor of an entente with the Kremlin, are urging that, for the sake of preserving our own precious skins, we forget about the agony of the hundreds of millions of people enslaved by communism.

I say that we cannot forget about their agony. I say that if we declare peace with the tyrants, morally we are declaring war on their victims.

I say that we cannot defend freedom if we limit it to mean only our freedom.

I believe that in the long run we will protect ourselves best and defend freedom best if, together with Thomas Jefferson, we "swear upon the altar of Almighty God, eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the minds of men."

I have repeated this quotation from Thomas Jefferson because I feel that it is something that every American should remind himself of every day of his life.

I say that the hesitant, compromising, coexistential foreign policy of recent years encourages aggression, endangers the peace, imperils our freedom, and every day erodes our own integrity.

I say that we can neither preserve the peace nor defend freedom, nor win the cold war unless, as the very first act, we commit ourselves to the universal triumph of the faith in God and freedom which is the very heart of our civilization and culture.

I say that this is the essence of Americanism in our time, that only thus can we defend our freedom, perpetrate the American tradition, and ultimately make the American dream available to peoples everywhere.

Rt. Rev. Theodore G. Kojis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 30, the Right Reverend Theodore G. Kojis, abbot of St. Andrews Benedictine Abbey of Cleveland, Ohio, will be honored by the entire Cleveland community on the occasion of his 25 years in the priesthood and his dedicated service to the Cleveland community.

The Right Reverend Abbot Theodore G. Kojis, O.S.B., of Cleveland, is a native of Slovakia. He came to this country as a 4-year-old in 1914. His family first settled in Milwaukee and later moved to a nearby town in Wisconsin. After completing his elementary education in St. Matthew's Parochial School, the future abbot of St. Andrew's Abbey enrolled in St. Procopius Academy in Lisle, Ill., in the fall of 1923. He obtained his high school diploma in 1927 and spent the next 2 years in St. Procopius College before entering the novitiate at St. John's Abbey in Collegeville, Minn., in the summer of 1929.

Abbot Kojis came to St. Andrew's Abbey in the summer of 1930. Besides teaching in the Benedictine High School, he studied at John Carroll University and St. Mary's Seminary. In 1934 he received his bachelor of arts degree from John Carroll University. He was ordained 2 years later on May 1 by Bishop Schrembs. Before preparing for preaching missions at Catholic University, he continued teaching for a number of years at Benedictine. Moreover, he served as prefect of the boarding-school students and procurator of the abbey.

At the time of his election as the second abbot of St. Andrew's Abbey on June 20, 1946, Abbot Kojis was the youngest Benedictine prelate of abbatial rank in the world. While in Europe for the general election of the abbot primate in the fall of 1947, he visited Slovakia. The hometown folks in his birthplace of Koseca gave their renowned son a warm welcome.

The abbot attended the International Eucharistic Congress in Barcelona, Spain, in 1952, and made a tour of Italy, Germany, France, England, and Ireland. He became acquainted with many Slovak refugees while on the continent. Giving aid to the needy Slovaks in exile has been one of the favorite charities of the abbot who has always shown a generous heart to his fellow countrymen now living in exile.

Despite his manifold duties as abbot of St. Andrew's and president of Benedictine High School, Abbot Kojis studied art at Western Reserve University and obtained his master's degree several years ago. He holds membership in the First Catholic Slovak Union, First Catholic Slovak Ladies' Union, Slovak Catholic Sokol, Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, Slovak Catholic Federation, the Slovak League of America, and is a fourth degree member of the Knights of Columbus. The abbot has been honored with honorary offices in most of these organizations. Moreover, he is the president of the Slovak Institute here, and protector of the Slovak Catholic Center in Rome. In addition he is honorary president of the Slovak News Association.

The entire Cleveland community and the Nation is proud of the achievements of this distinguished citizen.

Address by Senator Robert S. Kerr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Wabash Valley Association is an organ-

ization dedicated to the control of the great water resources of the Wabash River and its tributaries. One of the high points of its 13-year history was the annual meeting held this year in Mount Carmel, Ill., on March 9, 1961, when they were addressed by my distinguished colleague and the champion of America's natural resources, Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his inspiring speech on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT S. KERR AT THE WABASH VALLEY ASSOCIATION, INC., ANNUAL MEETING, MOUNT CARMEL, ILL., MARCH 3, 1961

Thank you for the invitation to speak here today. I accepted it gladly. I realized it would give me an opportunity to meet more of the fine folks from the great States of Indiana and Illinois. It gives me an opportunity to talk on my favorite subject—water.

We in Oklahoma are deeply indebted to Indiana for a lifetime of service from one of your greatest sons. Elmer Thomas, born in Greencastle, became one of Oklahoma's great statesmen. We called him the tall Sycamore from the Wabash Valley. As Congressman and four-term U.S. Senator, he made a great contribution in developing an unparalleled program of soil and water conservation for Oklahoma. We build today on the foundation he helped to lay. If I can be of any help to your great Senator HARTKE and those who assist him in developing a conservation program for Indiana, it would be but a small payment on the debt I owe to your State because of what HARTKE does today and what Elmer Thomas did in other days.

As indicated by his message to Congress last week, it is apparent that our new President is keen on the development of natural resources and water conservation, in every sense that these broad terms embrace. Therefore, I think your water problems in the Wabash Valley will receive every consideration from the White House. I know—that due to the splendid efforts of VANCE HARTKE—your water problems will continue to receive favorable attention in the Senate of the United States.

The Wabash River, celebrated in song, story, and poetry, is more beautiful than it is long, stretching as it does only some 475 miles.

But the beautiful Wabash is like all rivers. It is a Jekyll and Hyde thing, gracing the countryside with its stately flow on the one hand and devastating it with flood torrents on the other. Unleashed it is appalling as it endangers and even tramples the 2½ million people in Illinois and Indiana who live in its basin of 33,000 square miles.

The Wabash River Valley with its fertile valley and its mighty volume of water are yours—your to neglect if you desire, or to use if you choose. Yours even if you permit its uncontrolled floods to destroy fertile land, vast agricultural crops, cities and towns with their homes, mills and factories, and human lives. Also, it is yours to control, chain, and harness, making it a mighty reservoir of stored water and the source of abundant resources, out of which to fashion vast farm production and unlimited industrial output.

I first saw a river prove itself both Jekyll and Hyde while I was Governor of Oklahoma. But it was my father who pointed out to me, when we were living in a log cabin in Indian territory, the importance of water. His words lived on with me—but I did not fully know their meaning until I saw one river valley in my State twice devastated by roaring floods, and once seared by burning drought in one short spring and summer season. Then did I fully realize the great truth he had taught me.

As a result of his teaching and that experience, my first bill in the U.S. Senate was one to set up the Arkansas-White and Red River Interagency Study and Planning Commission—a bill similar to which Senator HARTKE is pushing in the Congress for the Wabash.

In Oklahoma, we are now well along with our program. We have, for example, more completed watershed projects under the Soil Conservation Service than any other State on a comparable basis; we have more projects under construction, more authorized projects, more planned projects, more applications for planning, and more organized soil conservation districts.

Water is fast becoming a controlled asset in Oklahoma with vast recreational advantages which are almost as important to our State as flood control, power, and other features. For example, Oklahoma has more lakes and farm ponds than any other State in the Union except Minnesota. More than 8½ million tourists come each year to our lakes and reservoirs, to fish and boat, to water ski, and play. I believe that is as many as in your great Indiana, even though you have a million more people than we do.

And consider this: The one recreational area in the United States which for many years has attracted most visitors was not Yellowstone nor Yosemite—it was Lake Texoma, on the border of Oklahoma and Texas.

This is just one of the benefits that result when you control water, when you make it work for you instead of against you.

You may well ask—how come Oklahoma, a prairie State of rolling plains and oil, has all this water development? How can all this be possible?

Well, my friends, Oklahoma was fortunate indeed in her early days. We had a few—and there were only a few—men who had a dream of water for Oklahoma, water clean, water abundant, and water for power and recreation. We had men of vision—men who were crusaders for a cause—men who would not give up in the face of ridicule and opposition.

Their dreams are not yet complete, but certainly well on the way to a day of realization.

Ten years ago, these pioneer watermen (or as you say here, "river rats") were pressing the Congress for leadership and cooperation. They sought and got community backing. They hired experts. They raised money. They joined the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. They belonged to the National Reclamation Association. They joined hands with other water conservationists throughout the land. And Oklahoma moved.

You, too, have had a long, hard struggle in the Wabash. Ten years ago, I am reliably informed, the legislature of Indiana passed a resolution, which stated for all to hear, that Indiana could take care of her own water problems * * * that the development of her water resources was a local matter, that she neither wanted nor needed help or interference from the Federal level.

You and the forerunners of the Wabash Valley Association have certainly had a hard row to hoe. When Senator HARTKE was mayor of Evansville, for example, he must have been sadly reminded of that legislative action when floodwaters covered the city.

But his disappointment over that action—and yours as well—must be lessened in the knowledge that only a few days ago the legislator at Indiana passed a joint resolution asking the Congress to cooperate in the development of the Wabash.

I congratulate you that you and your leaders, such as Vance Hartke, Roy Dee, and George Gettinger, are now getting your message across. Neither you nor these men have lost heart. You know, and they know, that just because the Wabash is in bad shape today, it need not stay this way. As Senator HARTKE said last August, "I know that some Government agencies will say it cannot be done but it can be done." He knows that a very few letters in the alphabet make the difference between a "pork barrel project" in Indiana and a fine "foreign aid project" in India.

One of the great opportunities for water development in the Nation is here. The St. Lawrence Seaway is now operating at long last, and Indiana's participation in it makes it all the more valuable.

In many ways, Indiana and Illinois are going through the same problems we had earlier in Oklahoma, and unfortunately still have—though not to your extent. We have had—and still have—some stream pollution. I am sorry to say that formerly some oil operators, through ignorance and carelessness, contributed to that pollution. But today, they are among our most zealous advocates to clean up our Oklahoma streams and rivers.

Like you, we have streams which have been polluted by raw, untreated sewage. We have streams which have become silted, banks which have eroded, and streambeds that have become clogged with debris and flotsam.

Oklahoma has another common problem with your valley. There was a time in our history when the Arkansas-White and Red Rivers were plied by steamboats, when such a famous historic figure as Sam Houston looked out over our rivers and saw a veritable tide of boats and shipping.

Our water pioneers wanted navigation of our streams again. And we have been working toward it with a program of bank stabilization, planning programs for locks, and dredging, as well as the construction of reservoirs. We expect our plans will come to fruition for navigation by way of the Mississippi and Arkansas to eastern Oklahoma by 1970. I hope to see the day when boats and barges will again haul their cargoes to Oklahoma on controlled waterways.

But the streams and rivers in Oklahoma never played the part in our economy that yours have here in Illinois and Indiana. The Wabash floated many a craft that bound together your communities in a solidly flourishing economic unity.

Yes, this great stream that drains 70 percent of Indiana and 30 percent of Illinois is a prime example of man's neglect and misuse of a great national resource. But it will not long remain so.

The dynamic growth of your Wabash Valley Association indicates a tremendous growing interest in this famous river. In the 12 months of 1960, your membership has almost doubled. Your county chapters have tripled in number. You have sent your messengers to Washington to tell your story. You have held meetings that counted attendance from 45 counties in your two States. You have even dropped State designations and divided your basin into districts so that you propose remedial action with greater unity.

You have convinced your legislature that your future is bound and tied up with the cleanup and utilization of this great river.

You have set your goal as 10,000 members. You should have no trouble. Remind your people that the river at their back door in the last 12 years has 10 times threatened to wash away their homes. Remind them there have been almost three times as many floods in the last 12 years as there were in the 43 years before.

I would remind them of the time that the Wabash was a great water highway. I would remind them of the time that the Wabash was a stream, the mere sight of which inspired poets and songwriters—a stream where fish abounded and where an outing on

its waters was a never-to-be-forgotten time of beauty.

Remind them that today the Wabash suffers from the foul odor of neglect and untreated sewage, that even its indigenous inhabitants, the fish, have ceased to regard it as a suitable place to swim and propagate.

Yours is a giant education job. These facts must be presented time and time again, even though you, yourselves may be full of it up to the ears. You must tell your story so often and so well that not a single one of the more than 2 million people who live in this basin will be unaware of the potential of this glorious river.

In this educational program, you must enlist the support of every possible newspaperman, and his paper, and the support of the radio and TV people. With the economic shot in the arm that utilization of the Wabash can bring, the news media stand to gain as much as any part of the valley economy. There will be greater newspaper readership, more listeners for the radio, more viewers for the TV, and more advertising revenue for all. These people are your natural allies in this educational campaign. You must have their help.

And above all, you need the support of the other Members of the Congress from Illinois and Indiana to cooperate with Senator HARTKE in his interagency bill. This is a matter above partisan politics. Development of the Wabash is entitled to the support of the men who represent you.

Once you enlist the people in the Wabash Valley and have them thoroughly and completely with you, putting through the Hartke program will not be too difficult.

The Senator has carefully outlined the steps which must be taken. He has called for a jet-propelled program. He realizes the need for speed. You are already too far behind the States where water has for years been crucial and vital. With hard work you can catch up. You can be thankful that others have travelled the road before you. You can count on much help from many Members of the Congress who have had in their States the same problems you face here in Indiana and Illinois.

The Interagency Commission bill which Senator HARTKE has introduced will place the planning resources of all the Federal agencies involved directly at your disposal. Senator HARTKE's estimate of $271 million to complete all of the water projects in Indiana, most of which are in the Wabash Valley, is a relatively modest one. Speeding up surveys and studies is a reasonable request as well.

You are fortunate indeed that you have a dynamic power in the person of VANCE HARTKE. From his long experience as a leader and worker in his State, he has a great knowledge of the Wabash watershed. From his years as mayor of Evansville, he brings official experience with him to the U.S. Senate.

In these remarks I have dealt often with the progress made in Oklahoma in water development. From a firsthand viewpoint, I can tell you that water is going to be more and more an object of national attention.

During the 1957 drought, people in nearly 1,000 communities across the Nation had to cut down on their use of water. One of every seven persons in the United States even then suffered some kind of water shortage. In Dallas, water was sold for half a dollar a gallon—and the people queued up to buy it at the price. In Orange, N.J., people were subjected to fines for leaky faucets.

Droughts have periodically occurred throughout our history. We know they will occur again and again. We must move in time to store and save and protect our water supplies to take drought in our stride.

To meet this need a special committee was created in 1959 by the Senate. It was called the Select Committee on National Water Resources, and I was proud to serve as its chairman. Its membership numbered some of the leading water statesmen of our times. There were such men as CHAVEZ and ANDERSON of New Mexico, KUCHEL of California, ELLENDER of Louisiana, MAGNUSON of Washington, CASE of South Dakota, HART of Michigan, and MCGEE of Wyoming.

Our committee contacted the Governors of our 50 States. We held 26 hearings throughout the United States. We welcomed every private and public water expert who was willing to testify. We were in touch with local and county governments and their officials. We had the help of every Government agency interested in water, including the Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, etc.

In short, we made the most exhaustive study of national water resources this country had ever seen. And we came up with some startling conclusions before our committee was disbanded early this year.

We learned, for example, that the water requirement of this Nation will double by 1984 and triple by the year 2000. We learned that local, State and the Federal governments will have to spend $60 billion or more by 2000 to keep up with the urgent demand for pure water.

We learned that this Nation might easily need more than the vast quantities of water in our streams and rivers, even though we use it over and over again. We learned that we must turn to other means of conserving and reclaiming water. We learned that water conversion plants to desalt the ocean would be part and parcel of our future way of life. We learned we might even have to use solar distillation methods. We learned that at the end of 1960, fresh water was being produced from saline or brackish water in at least 17 plants scattered throughout the world—on islands in the Persian Gulf, Aruba, Bermuda, and in Greeland, Italy, Latin America, and the United States.

Look at these facts in connection with our exploding population; 270 million by 1980, 350 million by the year 2000, and you better understand the great value and potential wealth in your vast volume of water in the Wabash Basin.

Already the pressing question of usable water supplies is influencing the location of vital industries in new areas. Along with favorable tax structures, favorable labor supplies, and suitable economic land areas, there is inevitably the question of water, its availability and abundance, for consumptive use, for transportation, for recreation.

When the Governor of Illinois about 10 days ago asked his legislature for funds to attract new industry to the southern part of his State where it is greatly needed, he realized that industry will be looking closely at the future availability of water in the Wabash Valley.

In fact, your eyes, and those of people far beyond, must be on the Wabash if you are to build a prosperous and stable future. The control and use of its water will determine the strength of your economy and the pattern of your living. Now for a moment let us gaze into this mirror of destiny.

Come with me and stand on the banks of the beautiful Wabash. The imagination soars as we mentally wander this legendary valley.

We see two phases of the river—what it is and what it can become. I see what it is and what it has been.

I know that it has overflowed its banks year after year—15 major floods since 1875. I know that drought also can bedevil this land, which is so often plagued by roaring floods. I know that 20 million acre-feet flow down the Wabash and into the Ohio every year, almost uncontrolled and unused—a treasure going to waste.

I look again, and I see a paradise of plenty in Indiana and Illinois.

I see a great market for the industries who would build in this valley of natural wealth. I see a growing population, a growing income, a growing capacity to produce for your children and future generations.

I see great barge tows taking out raw material—the beautiful limestone and bountiful coal, the products of the farm—such as corn and soybeans; an infinite variety of finished products of industry now in being and to be built.

I see other great barges coming up the river, bringing you, at more favorable freight cost, goods from all over the world.

I see a great area restored to a competitive basis. I see more and more of your people staying at home. I see new people coming to share in the development of this storied region. I see income rising, full opportunity to develop your basic resources of soil, water, and the infinite capacities of your people.

Such a bright new epoch looms over the horizon of the old Wabash. Already I have seen this drama being enacted in my homeland of the Arkansas Valley, and I know that with your association, with such capable leaders as Senator HARTKE and Roy Dee, there also will be a magical change in your valley. The legendary river will be chained and then harnessed and put to work. There will be the hum of better days and permanent prosperity. I can hear a new lilt to the old songs about the Wabash.

The Judgeship Bill of 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. WM. J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill S. 912 to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I support S. 912 as reported with an amendment on March 30, 1961, by the Committee on the Judiciary which provides for the appointment of an additional circuit and district judges. In the report submitted by the commitee to accompany S. 912, being Report No. 215, a document of 359 pages, containing a wealth of statistics which shows conclusively that the bill is justified and should be passed. At page 10 of the report starts the listing of the creation of the judgeships approved by the Judicial Conference on September 21–23, 1960, and then at page 11 appears a letter from Warren Olney III, director of the Judicial Conference of the United States addressed to the chairman of the Committee of the Judiciary under the date of Monday, March 13, 1961, when the Conference voted to recommend to the Congress the creation of additional judgeships in the several district. It was in this letter that was included one

additional judgeship for the western district of Missouri. At page 12 of the report is a letter from the Attorney General, Robert F. Kennedy, addressed to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee stating that the Department of Justice concurs in the action of the Judicial Conference and specifically mentions and includes one additional judge of the western district of Missouri. That same letter recommended the early enactment of legislation creating all judgeships approved by the Judicial Conference.

As Representative in Congress for the Fourth District of Missouri which is located and situated in western Missouri, I noted in the report at page 181 that there is a rather comprehensive description of the judicial business of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Missouri which continues through and including page 189. It is not my purpose to review all of these facts and figures but it is noted that the chief judge is the Honorable Albert A. Ridge, who has occupied the bench since 1945 and a statement furnished by Judge Ridge came to our office which was also presented to the Judiciary committee for consideration when hearings were held on the bill. I think that it is important that there be preserved in the RECORD excerpts from this statement as follows:

The three judges who serve the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Missouri continue to have a civil caseload which is 40 percent above the average. The caseload per judgeship in this district at the close of the fiscal year 1960 was 218 private cases. I am not informed as to the location of all the additional judgeships your committee presently has under consideration; but the fact is, that the caseload per judge in this district exceeds the caseload in 14 of the districts for which the Judicial Conference has previously recommended additional judgeships. In other words, in but six districts in which additional judges have been recommended by the Judicial Conference does the caseload exceed that of the western district of Missouri.

On a comparative basis, the private caseload per judgeship in this district is thus established to be in excess of the caseload per judgeship nationally.

The median time interval for disposition of civil litigation pending in this court continues in excess of 11 months. With the number of cases commenced in this district exceeding the number of cases terminated, the only reasonable expectation is that such median time interval will continue to grow.

In considering the caseload of the judges in this district, it should be noted that, statistically, 91 condemnation cases were pending in this district as of December 31, 1960, with 670 tracts involved, as revealed in table C–10 of the second quarterly report ending December 31, 1960; also, that the judges in this district are constantly called upon to consider numerous habeas corpus proceedings by reason of the location of the Missouri State Penitentiary and the U.S. Medical Center for Federal Prisoners, at Springfield, Mo., being within this jurisdiction. During the first half of the fiscal year 1961, 39 habeas corpus proceedings were commenced in which the United States was named a defendant, and 10 such cases in which the warden of the Missouri State Penitentiary was named a party.

The western district of Missouri is not an average district, statistically or when human equations are considered. The location of the western district at Kansas City is in a metropolitan area of Jackson and Clay Counties, in Missouri, and Johnson and Wyandotte Counties, in Kansas. The homogeneous character of that area places the three divisions of court held in Kansas City, Mo., at the hub of business for a population of over 1 million persons, around 35 percent of whom travel via interstate commerce to work in this district.

As the 1960 report of the administrative office reflects, the statistical caseload per judgeship is enhanced in the 86 districts by reason of consideration given to metropolitan courts of the southern district of New York, the eastern district of Pennsylvania, the northern district of Illinois, and the southern district of California. Be that as it may, a study of the statistical data in the annual and quarterly reports of the administrative office will reveal that only in 20 other districts is the caseload exceeded as to cases pending and commenced, and that this district is 18th as to the number of cases terminated.

With the growth in population in the metropolitan area in Kansas City, Mo., and the continuously growing backlog of cases, there is no foreseeable shortening of the interval between filings and trial in this district, unless one additional judgeship is created for the western district of Missouri. A consideration of statistical reports of the business in the western district does not reflect that the three judges in this district do not take a full month's vacation, and that the trial of cases in this district occurs in each month of the year by one, if not all, of the three judges.

The above information as supplied by the chief judge at Kansas City constitutes a solid foundation which the Judiciary Committee acted upon when it reported out S. 912 which included one additional judgeship for the western district of Missouri.

During the course of action by the other body in the Congress and during the course of hearings before the Judiciary Committee, a respectable volume of mail has been received, all of which urged the passage of a bill which would include the additional judgeship for western Missouri.

In consideration of the showing by Judge Ridge and further from the presentation made in the report by the committee and from some personal knowledge concerning the average workload of the judges now sitting in this district, it is my conclusion that an additional judgeship in western Missouri is needed and for these reasons I support S. 912.

Address by Senator Wiley Over Wisconsin Radio Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on April 15, the 1961 shipping season opened for the St. Lawrence Seaway.

This is expected to be the most rewarding year in the history of the waterway.

The expansion of traffic through the seaway should, in my judgment, be a high priority target for the Great Lakes region and the Nation.

Why? Because this less expensive route to consumers around the world, if utilized to the maximum, offers a great opportunity for economic growth and progress.

Recently, I was privileged to outline some steps in which I believe we can reap maximum benefits from such expanded trade and commerce, as well as comment on other problems confronting us and the economy, in a radio broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the broadcast printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN, OVER WISCONSIN RADIO STATIONS

Friends, the economic crisis in business confronting the country continues to be extremely serious. The rates of unemployment are far too high. Throughout Wisconsin, these total about 117,000, or over 7 percent of the labor force of 1,576,000. Lags in job-creating, economy-bolstering business and industry also have serious repercussions in the economy.

The unemployed and their families are suffering severe hardships;

Progress is retarded in the economy;

The loss of buying power is being felt by sales, services, and other enterprises;

Uncle Sam, too, feels the pinch in reduced revenue.

Fortunately, signs on the horizon are pointing to an upturn in the economy.

Although this won't be magically accomplished overnight, our task now is (1) to speed full recovery; (2) to get our jobless back to work; and (3) to learn a lesson from the setback and develop more effective machinery to curb such dips in the economic cycle in the future.

To guard against such setbacks in the future, also, we need to mobilize, and fully utilize the available economic potential.

During the past week, I was privileged to meet with civic, labor, business and other leaders in Wisconsin. The purpose was to take a new look at the situation and try to find new ideas for improving the economic outlook.

Working on the spot, these leaders have a firsthand knowledge of the situation. Consequently, they are in a good position to evaluate the economic factors and make recommendations for improving the outlook.

To an ever-larger degree, the Nation, in my judgment, needs to depend upon enlightened leadership in business and labor to find solutions to problems in the economy.

In these difficult times, particularly, we need real economic statesmanship.

Now, what can be done?

In Congress, legislation is being considered for improving the economic picture.

The State and local governments, also, could well speed up timetables for procurement and construction of public projects.

Business and industry—as economically feasible—could well move up plans for plants and operational expansion.

Communities can undertake self-help "bootstrap" operations to evaluate potential human and natural resources and better utilize these to bolster the economy to meet the needs of the people.

The creation of multicommunity cooperative programs for pooling of manpower and natural resources also can help to resolve problems and improve the economic outlook. The potentials of an area may be

neither local, nor State, but rather intercommunity, or interstate. Pooling such manpower or resources on an area or regional basis often can result in more effective programs.

We can establish a higher priority for Buy American policy in times of national economic distress.

We can encourage wise investments of private business and public funds and job-creating enterprises. The purpose would be to promote further economic recovery. Today, there are about $12 billion in financial savings by individuals; and $33 billion in corporate funds.

The total assets of life insurance companies amount to about $114 billion. One of the problems is to encourage the use of such funds in more productive investments.

We need a reexamination of our tax system also to provide encouragement and incentive for expansion of job-creating enterprises.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Now, I want to discuss with you one of the great, new opportunities to improve our economic life; that is, the St. Lawrence Seaway.

As a sponsor of the Wiley-Dondero law, authorizing U.S. improvement of the waterway, I am naturally deeply interested in its ability to better serve all of us, and the economy.

Since its completion in 1959, the seaway has experienced a promising expansion of trade and commerce.

Now, the 1961 shipping season is about to get underway and it is expected to be the most rewarding year of the history of the waterway.

True, the volume of traffic—until now—has been less than the more liberal "guesstimates."

All of us around the Great Lakes, including commercial, industrial, agricultural, civic and all other interests, have a deep interest in assuring maximum utilization of the seaway, however.

Why? First, because we, as taxpayers, have a $140 million investment in the project. The Seaway Corporation, designed to be self-supporting, will be able to pay off the debt by charging tolls only if there is an adequate traffic.

Second, there is economic advantage in fully utilizing the seaway, a less expensive trade route for traffic now flowing between Great Lakes and the ports of the world.

Third, we need to develop new markets for the products of our farms and factories. Unless this is done, we will miss a great opportunity; and also find our domestic economy seriously handicapped. Over the years, human ingenuity and technology have dramatically increased our productivity. As a result, the domestic economy, more and more, will not only be fully supplied, but, in some instances, glutted.

Consequently, we need to look for consumers elsewhere in the world. Today there are nearly 2 billion consumers outside the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Except for a relatively few industrially advanced countries, they need literally everything.

This is a great potential if we develop the programs and policies to profitably supply such markets.

And, fourth, the seaway, defensewise, also plays a significant role in the transportation of vital materiel to and from the lakes region.

These, then, are a few of the reasons why we need to encourage cooperation among all Great Lakes States to fully utilize, and benefit from, the seaway.

Progress, however, has been sufficient to inspire optimism of new economic life, transfused through the seaway, for the Great Lakes region and America.

Now, what are some of the steps that need to be taken to reap maximum rewards? These include constructive efforts to—

Assure fast, smooth handling of shipping through the seaway itself, eliminating bottlenecks and expediting traffic;

Finish the job of deepening and improving the Great Lakes connecting channel, so that deepsea vessels can sail to all lake ports; at present rates of progress, it appears that the channels will be usable at a controlling depth of 27 feet by June 1962, the target date;

Expand promotion efforts to provide shipping, trade, and related interests with a better knowledge of advantages;

Speed up completion of port and harbor developme t projects, to enable ports to expeditiously handle available traffic and larger volumes of trade and commerce for the future;

Enlarge research efforts to find markets for the wide variety of products of the agricultural-industrial complex of the upper Midwest—the greatest in the world;

Undertake pilot studies on deicing to determine the feasibility of attempting to further extend the shipping season;

Find early, favorable solutions to problems arising out of pilotage, labor-management negotiations, and other situations; and

Encourage greater cooperation among Lake States in the development of trade and commerce.

In addition to these measures, there is a need for:

Carrying forward the kind of national trade policies that will encourage trade and commerce on the Great Lakes;

Establishment of "tie-ins" in road, rail, and air transportation; and

Encourage an ever-greater flow of traffic through the Great Lakes ports and the St. Lawrence Seaway—a less expensive route to destinations around the globe.

Maximum utilization of the seaway can prove to be a vital lifeline for improving the economic outlook.

OUTLOOK IN AGRICULTURE

Now, let's turn to another important aspect of our economy, agriculture.

To maintain balanced economic progress, we need to assure the farmer a proportionate share of the national income.

The objectives of a realistic program include—

Creation of a positive—not a negative—image of the American farmers' contribution to our economic progress.

Attempting to establish a relatively good supply-demand balance for production or consumption of farm commodities;

Finding better ways to utilize farm surpluses, plus reducing costs of storage, and using these invaluable resources as assets, not as economic millstones around the neck of the economy; and

Assuring the farmer of a fair share of our ever-growing income.

Today, there are about 7 million people working on farms. Sixteen million additional persons process and market farm products. Farm sales for cash total about $32 billion a year, twice that of total auto and truck sales. Farms also employ 10 times as many people as automobile manufacturing and 14 times as many as in steelmaking.

These highlights of the farm picture help to illustrate the significance of agriculture to the overall economy.

FARM PROGRAM

In the near future, the President is expected to propose legislation to Congress for a new farm program. As recommended in his message, a highlight involves recommendations for establishment of the National Farmer Advisory Committee system. The committees would be established to handle production and marketing programs for each commodity in which supply adjustment is required. The developed programs, involving controls over production and marketing, however, would not go into effect until approved by two-third of the producers.

The committees would make recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture. If approved by the Secretary—and not vetoed by Congress within 60 days—the programs would go into action.

Personally, I have long felt that (a) the farmer should have a stronger voice in programs affecting his economic future; (b) that solution to the supply-demand imbalance of farm products can best be resolved on a commodity-by-commodity basis; and (c) that self-help as a principle should be encouraged—reducing the load on Uncle Sam.

However, there are serious questions to be resolved, including—

How much authority should be granted the committees and the Secretary of Agriculture in controlling production and marketing of farm products?

Can the farmers and their organizations, until now unable to agree on a national farm policy, develop acceptable plans for separate commodity programs?

How complex will be such a multicommodity program?

How much will it cost the taxpayer, and what effect will it have on consumers?

Congress, of course, will have to examine these recommendations very carefully. As yet, the farm message has not been followed up by proposals for legislation. It's expected, however, that this will come to Congress in the near future.

REVIEWING FEDERAL MILK ORDER SYSTEM

Recently, also, the President appointed a committee to make a special study of the Federal milk marketing order system, which offers a real opportunity to make a useful, much-needed study—one which I have long recommended. Over the years, dairymen in Wisconsin and throughout the Midwest have received far less for fluid milk than producers elsewhere in the country.

A view of the milk order system—I sincerely hope—would provide evidence to wipe out inequities in the system.

EXPANDING SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Looking now at another program—of interest not only to farmers, but to the youth and parents of Wisconsin and America, we find that, regrettably, the national school lunch program is running out of money for the current year.

Consequently, the program is in danger of being cut back severely.

Over the years, the program—benefiting more than 13½ million students—has been (1) an important factor in maintaining the health of our youth, and (2) a significant outlet for surplus farm commodities. About 265,000 students in Wisconsin are enjoying and benefiting from lunches served in the schools.

Because of a shortage of funds, Gordon Gunderson, director of the school lunch program for Wisconsin regrettably found it necessary to inform participating schools that it would be necessary, on May 1, 1961, to cut back Federal reimbursement for lunches from 5 to 1½ cents per lunch. This serious curtailment would occur not only in Wisconsin but in other States throughout the Nation.

The history of the school lunch system, I believe, well justifies Federal support at the current level of reimbursement.

Consequently, I have introduced a bill to provide an additional $10 million supplemental appropriation for the current year.

Moreover, I shall urge Congress to take early and favorable action on such legislation.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is a brief look at some of the challenges and opportunities confronting Congress and the country.

As always, I welcome the opportunity to report to you.

As there is legislation of particular interest to you coming up in Congress in the days ahead, I shall be glad to hear from you.

Now, this is ALEC WILEY signing off.

Apparel Industry and Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the textile import situation is critical and needs our urgent attention. The following fact sheet concerning the apparel industry should awaken all of us:

FACT SHEET ON THE APPAREL INDUSTRY AND THE APPAREL IMPORT PROBLEM—INTRODUCTION

The term "apparel" refers to all forms of men's, women's, and children's garments, underwear and outerwear, including work clothing. The apparel industry uses all types of fibers; cotton, wool, and manmade fibers. This industry is the largest user of cotton textiles in the world.

EMPLOYMENT

The apparel industry employs 1.2 million workers. Add to this figure 900,000 persons employed in the basic textile industry, plus the workers in manmade fibers and those in other textile products lines, and the overall employment approaches 4 million. Thus, a major economic and social problem is aggravated by steadily rising imports.

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION

The apparel industry is located in 43 States from coast to coast. There is some concentration along the Atlantic Seaboard because of nearness to the historic source of the basic supply of cotton. In recent years, however, the industry has spread across the Nation to get closer to its market.

SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF THE APPAREL INDUSTRY

This is essentially a small business operation. There are over 31,000 plants employing an average of 250 workers each. Only 30 factories employ more than 1,000 people.

The apparel industry is located, for the most part, in smaller communities. Usually, these factories are the major employers in the area and with their payrolls and purchases of local supplies and services are often the economic lifeblood of the community.

AUTOMATION AND MECHANIZATION

The apparel industry, because of its peculiarities, defies automation or mechanization. The basic machine is the sewing machine. Most labor is human. There are no machines in existence, nor on the drawing boards, that will put the cut parts of a shirt, slacks, or other garment together for stitching. This can only be done by people. Speeding up the machines would do little good, they still could be operated only as fast as the worker.

PAYROLLS

The annual payroll for apparel and allied products, but excluding footwear, is in excess of $3½ billion. (Statistical abstract of the United States, 1959).

FACTORY VALUE OF SHIPMENTS OF THE APPAREL INDUSTRY PRODUCTS

The value of apparel industry products at the factory level is $9.2 billion.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

As noted, the apparel industry does not require heavy expenditures on capital equipment. Most of its capital outlay is for textiles and labor.

PROFITS

The apparel industry averages 1 to 1.3 percent profits on sales. This is the second lowest profit ratio in the Nation.

STABILITY OF PRICES

The U.S. Department of Labor, BLS, reports on February 28, 1961: "Continuing the downtrend, average apparel prices dropped by 1.1 percent from December to January and accounted for the major share of the decline in the national Consumer Price Index. For January 1961 all items in the index were at 127.4 (1947–49=100). Apparel, except footwear, is at 101.1, the lowest figure in the index."

IMPORTS

The import figures for the six major apparel imports from Japan and Hong Kong only are:

	Japan	Hong Kong	Total
1958	5,112,000	3,176,000	8,288,000
1959	5,217,000	6,788,000	12,005,000
1960	5,026,000	9,760,000	14,786,000

(Note that under the voluntary quota arrangement with Japan exports have remained stable, while those from Hong Kong, without a quota, have soared.)

(For the impact of imports on jobs, payrolls, etc., see the table on the last page.)

The dollar value of the same six categories of imports from Japan and Hong Kong in relation to imports from all countries is:

	Imports	
	From Japan-Hong Kong only	From all countries
1958	$31,296,111	$40,083,235
1959	36,724,796	41,555,936
1960	65,190,108	80,594,091

THE FUTURE OF IMPORTS

Taking only a few items at random and comparing January 1961 imports with imports of the same items for January 1960, clearly indicate the trend.

[In dozens]

	January 1960		January 1961		Increase
	Japan	Hong Kong	Japan	Hong Kong	
Dress shirts	10,336	10,931	7,291	25,243	11,769
Sport shirts	25,574	16,718	24,222	25,106	7,036
Trousers, walking shorts	1,939	7,286	4,250	11,434	6,469
Playsuits, swimsuits, etc	348	550	180	1,689	971
Brassieres	63,767	73,814	14,236	133,418	10,073

EXPORTS

The apparel industry has sought every possible means to boost its exports. In practically all foreign markets American producers are unable to meet the price competition of products from the Orient.

Fifty-five nations do not permit U.S. textiles or textile products to be shipped into their countries.

Despite these facts the industry has managed to keep exports about level for 1958–59 and showed a slight increase in 1960.

Exports to all countries of six major categories of cotton apparel only:

1958	$13,663,962
1959	13,226,743
1960	15,656,332

These exports will slide sharply in 1961 because a big share of these exports went to Cuba. Now, for reasons of national policy, this market is closed and exports will reflect this development this year.

The facts of the effect of excessive imports from low-wage areas are explicit.

The only equitable remedy, it seems to us, is country-by-country, category-by-category quotas. This seems fair to American producers, foreign manufacturers who gear production to the U.S. market and to the emerging nations which are certain to enter the textile and textile products fields with the U.S. market their primary outlet.

EXHIBIT C

Analysis of effect of imports, 1958 through 1960

	1958	1959	1960
Dozens imported from Japan and Hong Kong	8,288,000	12,005,000	14,786,000
Units	99,456,000	144,060,000	177,432,000
Direct labor man-hours lost	28,427,840	41,177,150	50,715,980
Direct labor man-days lost	3,553,480	5,147,144	6,339,498
Resultant direct labor disemployed [1]	14,214	20,589	23,358
Resultant indirect labor disemployed [2]	4,738	6,862	8,452
Total disemployment	18,952	27,451	31,810
Lost direct labor payroll [3]	$34,113,408	$49,412,580	$60,859,176
Lost indirect labor payroll [4]	18,952,000	27,448,000	33,808,000
Total payroll lost	53,065,408	76,860,580	94,667,176
Wholesale value of imports [5]	$207,200,000	$300,125,000	$369,650,000
Equivalent factories lost [6]	76	110	127

[1] Assuming 50 weeks per year production at 250 man-days per employee.
[2] Calculated at 1 indirect to 3 direct.
[3] Based on $1.20 per hour.
[4] Calculated at $2 per hour or $80 per week or $4,000 per year.
[5] Calculating average domestic wholesale price of $25 per dozen.
[6] Average 250 employees per factory.

Inter-American Development Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Pedro G. Beltran, Governor of the Bank for Peru. Dr. Beltran is also Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of Peru, and is one of the hemisphere's most farsighted and courageous statesmen.

I have just returned from the Conference which was held from April 10 through the 14th. I thought Dr. Beltran's address one of the finest that was given there. It represents the type of Latin American initiative necessary for implementation of the Act of Bogotá and the Alianza para Progreso. It is a stimulating and interesting statement, and I recommend it to my colleagues.

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

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE GOVERNOR FOR PERU, DR. PEDRO G. BELTRAN, PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE OF PERU, AT THE CLOSING SESSION, HELD ON APRIL 14, 1961

While enjoying the generous hospitality of the Brazilian people, we have found in this meeting of the Inter-American Development Bank many other motives of satisfaction: In the excellent speech of our President, Mr. Felipe Herrera, in which he showed the tremendous importance the Bank has for the present and future of this hemisphere. In the equally eloquent remarks of the delegates, and in the warmth and enthusiasm of the roundtable discussions; in short, in all our activities, in the very fact of meeting beside the beautiful Bay of Guanabara, we have been able to confirm the family spirit which inspires the governments of this hemisphere and the peoples they represent.

That is the way it ought to be. That is the way it is. The inter-American system has never been better described than when it has been called a family of nations. As in any family, the ties which unite our countries, our peoples, are ties of natural affection and of an inevitable common destiny. And as in any family, we find not only mutual respect but the duty to help one another.

The presence of one rich and powerful member, in our American community, could be a disadvantage and even a cause of irritation and estrangement but this would be true only if we lost sight of the family concept. Fortunately as we have seen in the words of President Kennedy, and in the deeds which accompany these words, and as Secretary Dillon has just confirmed in this room, the bigger and richer brother, moved by higher considerations of morality, and in accordance with the common interest, which includes self-interest, has extended his hand manfully and fraternally to his less fortunate and still growing brothers. In doing this he fulfills a family duty. He strengthens the hemispheric unity essential for the survival of the family as such, and for the survival of each member.

We of America are engaged in what we can call a task of bringing ourselves closer together. In terms of the hemisphere we are united in the close brotherhood inspired by our common history and geography, and by the clear ideals of liberty which we all share. And that same spirit of brotherhood must reign equally within each country. Thus, at the national level and not only at the continental level, the more prosperous must understand their obligations toward their less fortunate brothers. Those who have much must understand their fraternal and Christian duty toward those who have nothing. They must accept sacrifices and renounce privileges for the great task which awaits us with such terrible urgency and which consists in raising the standards of living of all the men and women of America.

That is the clear objective to which we aspire: To improve the way of life of the American, equip him for the battle of life, free him from the scourge of misery and the torture of ignorance, respecting his liberty and his dignities as a creature made in the image of God. We know well that for this objective, as Mr. Dillon has said, the stability of our economy is the cornerstone, a proper tool and certainly not the final goal in itself.

There is a false notion that we must choose between stability and development. As if stability were an obstacle to development or as if for unexplained reasons development required the instability of our economy. The truth is exactly the opposite. There are the countries of America which have been able to stabilize themselves financially through policies of austerity—difficult to apply, resisted by demagogery, sometimes poorly understood even by the people who benefit. But they have done this, not to stop at mere stability, but to lay the groundwork for sure and sound progress in direct benefit of the great majority.

But we could not seriously defend collaboration among countries of America, if the action of the United States, through the Inter-American Development Bank and other entities, represented a subsidy for an unbalanced budget, for financial anarchy, for political ineptitude, or especially for administrative corruption or slothfulness of the people.

We believe it is our obligation to put our houses in order and to dedicate ourselves to hard work. We believe in the necessity of freely elected governments, governments which respect liberty, governments which are honest, prudent and diligent, governments which are imbued with the idea of the common welfare. We believe in the protection of the law as the best and indispensable guarantee to encourage saving and investment of capital. We believe in economic stability as the only way to protect the peoples from the burden of continental rises in the cost of living. Exactly because we believe in all these things we believe also in Operation Pan American, conceived and expounded by Brazil, and in the Alianza para el Progreso proposed by President Kennedy.

For our countries of Latin America where the population increases so rapidly, where the production of goods and services does not always increase in the same proportion; where each year new useful jobs must be found for the increasing population; the question of progress is, literally, a question of life and death. We must face the double challenge of the growth of population and the general longing for a better life. Because if we do not meet this challenge, we shall certainly perish.

Progress, economic growth, expansion of wealth, industrialization, expansion of markets, substantial increase in buying power, whatever words you use, we all understand the concept. But we do not believe in the methods of the Pharaohs. We do not believe in their present-day counterpart, totalitarian methods, which consist in planning great works but with the sacrifice of millions of human beings and of several generations. Therefore we must think in terms of the human being of today, not as a figure of statistics but as a man of flesh and blood, who lives and breathes, who knows hunger, perhaps is attacked by sickness requiring medical attention, lacks schools, needs a roof over his head, and longs for a bit of land to work and to call his own and to be able to pass on to his children. The present living conditions of our peoples in many cases are terribly difficult. Therefore paralleling a plan of economic growth, we must carry forward without delay a bold and creative program of social betterment.

In view of such formidable and essential obligations, I must say that it seems to me frankly foolish for governments to use up their always insufficient resources in trying to take the place of private enterprise in economic activities which private individuals can carry out for the benefit of themselves and the community. On the other hand, it also would be absurd for a government to use public funds merely to help private businessmen to get rich. As I have already indicated private enterprise needs only the safeguards of law and a reasonable expectation of profit to develop itself and to contribute to the progress of the nation.

Private capital has a duty, moreover, to contribute to the acceleration of the development process by a policy of reinvestment in our countries. This policy, as our President, Felipe Herrera, has well said, will help to overcome the deficit in the rate of economic growth which is one of the most pressing problems which we have to face.

If we will do what must be done; that is to say if we will encourage and stimulate private investment, and if, on its part, private capital will recognize its duty to work for the good of the great masses of our population, this problem will be on its way to solution according to the capacity of each country and for the common good.

In my opinion, once a government has met such basic responsibilities as police protection, public administration, health services, education, and national defense, public funds should be used with the most scrupulous care for two purposes: in the economic field to carry out works which are indispensable for progress but cannot be executed by private enterprise because they involve too much risk or because there is no immediate profit, or because the benefits would be spread over a very long period of time.

And in the field of social progress, the government as servant of the common welfare, must think exclusively of the less fortunate, the dispossessed, who are everywhere the most numerous. And government must mobilize the energy of the nation for that vast cooperative effort which is the Alianza para el Progreso.

President Kennedy's proposal is without parallel in the magnitude and nobility of its aims and which is intended to satisfy the basic necessity of the peoples of this continent, bringing to them housing, jobs, land, health, and schooling.

Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the honor shown my country in selecting me to express, on behalf of all the delegations, our thanks for the many attentions received from the Government and people of Brazil which I do with all my heart.

As for myself, I take this opportunity on this day, which is by auspicious coincidence the Day of the Americas, to ratify publicly my faith as a citizen of the Americas, and as a democrat. I must say, with the utmost frankness, that the ideal and yearning for progress in our hemisphere cannot be represented even remotely by a revoltuion such as the Communist revolution which, to the regret of all, has now seized one of our countries; a revolution which represents the degrading spectacle, from a moral point of view of executions by firing squad without due trial, of imprisonment for indefinite terms; a spectacle of terror and despotism. From a material point of view it presents the spectacle of hardships, privations, and wage cuts.

Our forefathers did not rise up against colonial domination a century and a half ago merely to convert our countries into concentration camps of any hue whatever, be

they red, black, or yellow. In our American community we do not conceive of the individual as being at the service of the state or politics. On the contrary, we believe the state and politics to be instruments at the service of the individual. We do not see the individual as an abstraction but as a human being with a name and life of his own.

We cannot forget either the spiritual or the material side of man. This is the true Christian human spirit which animates our peoples. For us liberty is incomplete without economic welfare. But at the same time we reject the fallacious promise of economic welfare which not even the totalitarian regimes fulfill, and which begins by depriving us of our divine gift of liberty. Here also there is a false notion that we must choose between liberty and economic welfare. No; because liberty is not sufficient or authentic without welfare; and welfare is not possible and would be humiliating without liberty.

I confess that I am not only impressed, I am deeply moved by the success of our meetings, by the enthusiasm which I have observed here. At last we are busy with the task of today and with thought for tomorrow, and no longer with the sterile recriminations of yesterday suitable perhaps for a debate of historians but not for an assembly of economists. How small and how pointless seems the artificial bickering among our countries when we contemplate the great enterprise on which we have embarked.

I have the conviction that we still have time to take up and complete the work which the peoples of the Americas are awaiting. I also have the certainty that tomorrow would be too late. Happily, we all now have understood this. I have the conviction that in the Alianza para el Progreso the Inter-American Development Bank is going to be an increasingly useful tool. It already has made astonishing headway in a few short months thanks to its own resources and to the moral and intellectual qualities of our president, Felipe Herrera, and of the other executives.

At this time there can be no doubt of the fundamental role which the bank is playing to bring our countries together and to work united in the knowledge that we are all pursuing the same objective. Joint action based on the sincere spirit of solidarity among our peoples is the only secure base from which success can be achieved.

The fervent hope which should arise in all of us is that the family of American nations should continue united. In carrying out our common efforts for the common goods, the Inter-American Bank will be decisive in that the philosophy with which it is inspired transforms it into not merely a financial entity but rather a collective organism dedicated to the spiritual and material progress of Latin America.

Finally, I am convinced that nothing has contributed more to the cooperative spirit of this meeting than the friendly and charming atmosphere of Brazil, our sister nation, the colossus of South America, a country great also in its spirit, forged by civilization and democracy, warm in climate and cordial in heart, which is without doubt the most important.

Many thanks.

God Love You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent distress about Africa, the following article from Our Sunday Visitor by the Most Reverend Fulton J. Sheen is most pertinent:

GOD LOVE YOU

(By the Most Reverend Fulton J. Sheen)

Behind the minor political struggles in the Congo is the implacable war of the Communists against the church. Here are the inside facts of the Congo story:

Russia plans to "Sovietize" Central Africa.

For 2 years the Soviets gave Lumumba $400,000 a month to buy followers and provide them with cars.

Lumumba set up a Communist organization among his fellow tribesmen, the Batelca, making them believe he was the incarnation of his ancestors.

During the elections, Lumumba's troops destroyed most of the ballot boxes of the other candidates. But only 23 percent of the population voted because of their opposition to him; in other regions, 85 percent voted.

The plans for the Communist revolution in the Congo were prepared in Prague and in the first 3 months Lumumba carried out the first three points: 1. Organize mutiny in the army; 2. put the blame on the Belgians; 3. organize a terrorist regime.

The resentment of the Soviets against the death of Lumumba reveals their disappointment in not taking over the Congo. (The Soviets could astonish the world by telling their part in his death. Remember, Lumumba failed them.) But the Soviets have a substitute for Lumumba in Gizenga, the Communist dictator in Stanleyville who was educated in Moscow and Prague. Others are Kashauka, who visited Peiping, and Dayal who works under Communist orders.

The Communists have planted two advisers in Washington, both of whom were thrown out of Lovanium University in the Congo for their Communist activities.

Seventy percent of Leopoldville's population are unemployed. Communists have introduced moral degeneration to the youth of the city. Some 90 percent of the boys smoke hemp; immorality is encouraged; attendance at mass has declined to 10 percent of the men, 7 percent of the women.

Missionaries have been persecuted beyond description—priests mutilated, nuns tortured and ravished. Next week we will give you the full story of this religious persecution.

Hill-Burton Program Helping With Texas Hospital Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, all of us are keenly aware that one of the most important legislative issues before the Congress at this time is the President's sound proposal on health and hospital care for the aged.

For this reason, I think it is especially appropriate, while we are considering Federal action in this field, that we not only consider what needs to be done, but also what has been done.

I would like to call the attention of the Senate to the Hill-Burton Act, which has proven of tremendous national benefit to millions of Americans by helping provide for construction of needed hospital facilities.

If the Congress had not acted to extend financial assistance for hospital construction in areas of greatest need, the problem before us today would be even much more serious then it is.

So to those individuals and organizations which so strongly oppose President Kennedy's health care for the aged proposals on the basis that the Federal Government should leave the problem's solution up to the individual, or the local or State government, I say look at the success of the Hill-Burton program. It is a sound example of Federal and State and local government cooperation to meet the needs of the people all levels of government serve.

Mr. President, recently Mr. Charles O. Bettinger wrote an excellent article on the Hill-Burton program for the March 1961 issue of the Texas Business Review. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Hill-Burton Program Spurs Hospital Construction," by Mr. Bettinger.

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

HILL-BURTON PROGRAM SPURS HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

(By Charles O. Bettinger)

The construction of new hospital accommodations did not keep pace with the growing populace and post World War II Texans and citizens of other States found themselves in dire need of additional medical facilities. Acting to remedy this situation, the Congress of the United States passed the Hill-Burton Act. The act was adopted as a measure to provide Federal assistance to those areas with the greatest need for supplementary hospitalization. Construction in Texas of more than $250 million in additional facilities under this plan alone is completed, under construction, or in the planning stages.

Although the maximum limit of Federal participation was set at 50 percent, the large number of applications requesting a portion of the Federal allocation to Texas forced the Government's share of expenditures down to only 34 percent since the institution of the program. However, some projects are still able to secure the maximum subsidy, depending upon the needs of the area and the type of hospitalization that is being considered.

Laurels must also go to the state department of health in Texas for a speedy job in developing the Texas plan which was necessary before Texas could get any allocation of Federal money. On the basis of surveys of existing medical care and equipment available, the Texas plan set forth all the requirements necessary to participate, established priority areas on the basis of needed facilities, and set all other regulations necessary for the smooth, nonpolitical operation of the Hill-Burton program under the direction of that State agency. In addition, this agency has administered and directed the activities of the program for almost 15 years at a cost which is now less than 1 percent of the total funds allocated. When the extensive supervision necessary for the proper operation of this program is taken into account, these administrative costs are indeed low.

Due to the strict construction requirements set forth in the Texas plan of the Hill-Burton program, Texas hospitals have also pushed the standards of their accommodations up to a peak in 1960. The state department of health has set specifications to control the sanitary aspects of the hospitals falling under this subsidy. The ventilation

system is one such example, and it must meet rigid requirements. For instance, the same air must not be circulated into the maternity ward and then into surgery.

Although this program has nothing to do with the operation of the hospital after it is opened, several administrative policies assist in getting the hospital off to a good start. The excellent sanitary precautions are but one of the minimum standards set up in the Texas plan. Other Board decisions as to the original allocation directly affect the working policies of the new hospital. For instance, two organizations with the same basic priority may not have an equal chance of getting an allocation if one group has included training facilities to help in staffing the new unit. The administration, therefore, can recognize good planning and amply reward that group with the allocation. Usually, however, the Federal funds available are distributed to as many applicants as possible thus lowering the percentage participation that is represented by the Government and encouraging much more construction.

Excluded under this act are private hospitals established for profit reasons. Also, until an amendment of the original law which made it possible for groups to borrow money and repay it to the Government, several organizations refused to accept Hill-Burton money because of certain moral objections to this use of Government money. However, some of these objections have been overcome with the amendment since the amount of assistance may be issued in the form of a loan rather than a subsidy. Certain other hospitals will not participate in the program due to the high standards and restrictions of the Texas plan. Others may go ahead and build a hospital unit without Federal assistance due to the low priority rating of the area where they are building.

Costs of hospital construction have continually risen until the average construction cost per bed in Texas is from $17,000 to $19,000. This figure represents the total costs of all equipment, designing, and other costs of the project. While this figure seems high, a comparison shows that Texas is one of the lowest States in the United States. As an example, it is not exceptional to find the cost per bed in California as high as $35,000. Another method of expressing relative costs is by the square foot which fall between $22 and $25 in Texas. Comparison with other States illustrate the fact that Texans are getting a bargain in hospital construction.

On the above map (not printed in RECORD), the density of projects by total cost is shown for projects constructed or planned under the Hill-Burton program. Houston and Harris County led in the dollar value of these projects with a total construction of over $37 million since the institution of the program. Other counties with over $10 million were Dallas, Tarrant, El Paso, Galveston, Nueces, Travis, and Bexar. This construction and future construction give each community a great stimulus to the industrial trade in the area. Other than the labor used to construct a hospital, the specialized nature of hospital construction requires tremendous quantities of plumbing equipment, ventilation supplies, and wall and floor finishes that can be cleaned and scrubbed easily. Supplying unusual building design features and special equipment can be especially beneficial to local dealers in the area of construction.

Two types of funds are available for the construction of new hospitals. The largest allocation goes to general hospitals or public health centers, and the funds thus allocated are called C-funds. The remaining classification consists of institutions such as diagnostic, rehabilitation, nursing, and chronic illness centers and receive G-funds. In 1960, G-funds accounted for 97 percent of construction under this program.

Some mention has been made of priority areas based on the need and the population in those areas. The first step in assigning classifications to these areas was to get a complete census of the facilities available all over the State. This count was expressed in the number of beds available. The second step was to determine the need of the areas expressed in comparable terms. This was accomplished by assigning an established number of beds needed for each 1,000 persons depending on density of population of the area, such as rural or metropolitan. Then the number of beds available is compared to the number needed, and that percent determines the priority classification of the area. There are four classifications ranging from A to D, with the A grouping having the range of 0 to 40 percent of available beds to needed beds. The D group with minimum priority ranges from 80 to 100 percent.

Estimated value of building authorized

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Classification	January 1961	December 1960	January 1960	Percent change: January 1961 from December 1960	Percent change: January 1961 from January 1960
All permits	$103,200	$91,220	$95,057	+10	+9
New construction	92,436	84,740	85,120	+9	+9
Residential (housekeeping)	48,572	35,788	55,073	+36	−12
1-family dwellings	43,088	32,037	51,168	+34	−16
Multiple-family dwellings	5,484	3,751	3,905	+46	+40
Nonresidential buildings	43,864	48,952	30,047	−10	+46
Nonhousekeeping buildings (residential)	2,788	3,451	1,327	−10	−19
Amusement buildings	360	37	183	+873	+97
Churches	1,319	1,851	3,056	−29	−57
Industrial buildings	2,624	1,851	3,056	−29	−57
Garages (commercial and private)	445	208	310	+114	+44
Service stations	659	648	982	+2	−33
Hospitals and other institutions	13,171	834	1,096	+1,479	+1,102
Office-bank buildings	3,918	8,643	2,391	−55	+64
Works and utilities	2,390	6,339	2,130	−62	+12
Educational buildings	8,037	12,835	8,262	−37	−3
Stores and mercantile buildings	6,355	8,041	6,798	−21	−7
Other buildings and structures	1,799	856	8,840	+110	+114
Additions, alterations, and repairs	10,764	9,480	9,937	+14	+8

Source: Bureau of Business Research in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Leading the Hill-Burton projects in size in the calendar year of 1960 were the Scott and White Memorial Hospital in Temple, Tex., total $7,675,000, and the Galveston County Memorial Hospital with a value of $4 million. These two units alone were responsible for adding a total of 480 beds, which greatly alter the previous classifications of the areas involved. Total cost of hospitals receiving allocations in 1960 totaled $26,385,045 with the Government share of this bill amounting to $9,277,045, or 35 percent. Due to a 2-year limit on the allocations, work must be started on most of these projects in 1961.

Actual construction work started on hospital projects in 1960 is best evidenced by the number of authorizations to build during the year. Total authorizations amounted to over $37 million in 1960. This represented an impressive 56 percent increase from the previous year. January 1961 permits authorized exceeded $13 million to start the new year with a total which was more than one-third of all 1960 permits. Therefore, with just 2 more months like January, the 1960 total will be passed. With this rate of growth, Texas should soon catch up with its hospital needs.

While the Hill-Burton program has largely been responsible for much of the stimulated growth, hospital construction has progressed equally in other categories such as proprietary hospitals which numbered 219 of the total 556 listed by the American Hospital Association in 1959. Federal hospital care has also increased substantially in VA hospitals and on military bases sinec World War II.

Texans appear determined to use both the Federal program and private enterprise to meet the requirements of this State. With the spectacular start in 1961, this year may set a record for some time to come. Many of the 1960 Hill-Burton allocations will carry over into 1961. Long-range projections do not indicate a major slowdown of activity but, instead, show continued increases in Federal spending in this area. This should prove especially true if the liberal Democrats in Congress can get their proposed plan for Federal medical care for the aged passed. These plans make Federal money available through the social security tax for medical care of elderly people.

To sum up, hospital construction prospects in Texas are good. Another record-breaking year as well as excellent long-range prospects in this area of construction can be forecast.

Hill-Burton project allocations in Texas

[In thousands of dollars]

Fiscal year ending June 30—	C funds	G funds	Total allocations
1948	$4,828	0	$4,828
1949	4,864	0	4,864
1950	9,492	0	9,492
1951	5,359	0	5,359
1952	5,011	0	5,011
1953	4,641	0	4,641
1954	3,827	0	3,827
1955	4,476	$934	5,410
1956	5,437	962	6,399
1957	6,302	911	7,213
1958	6,140	935	7,075
1959	9,409	1,970	11,379
1960 [1]	8,962	229	9,191
Total	78,749	----------	84,691

[1] Allocation of 1960 Federal quota is not complete due to the 2-year life of the funds available.

Source: Texas State Department of Health, Division of Hospital Services.

Award to Miss Mary Lindsey Hoffler, of the Cradock High School, Portsmouth, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks made by Miss Mary Lindsey Hoffler, of the Cradock High School, Portsmouth, Va., at ceremonies held at Augusta, Maine, in connection with the presentation of the National Bellamy Award to Cony High School.

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

MISS MARY LINDSEY HOFFLER, SENIOR SCA REPRESENTATIVE, CRADOCK HIGH SCHOOL, PORTSMOUTH, VA.

DAVID ELVIN. Next we have Miss Mary Lindsey Hoffler, senior SCA representative at the Cradock High School, Portsmouth, Va. Her school received the second Bellamy award for the State of Virginia. Mary Lindsey is a member of the National Honor Society, is State vice president of the Student Virginia Education Association; was one of eight Virginia delegates to the White House Conference on Children and Youth, in Washington, D.C., in the spring; and this past summer was awarded the gold key for outstanding scholastic achievement at the National High School Institute, Northwestern University.

MARY LINDSEY HOFFLER. When you hear the letters C-H-S what do you think of? Cony High School—the building, the students, the fun? This morning I would like to tell you a little about my C-H-S—Cradock High School. These letters mean a great deal to me. The C stands for community, the H for school and State history, and the S the student body and its spirit.

Our school spirit has been created by students and teachers alike. Some schools only express themselves on the cheering line as they shout athletic teams on to victory. Our enthusiasm for all projects, through the full cooperation of student and teacher alike, brings the ultimate reward. Our teachers work tremendously hard to bring out and display the talents of all Cradock's students. Our vocational and work programs have in past years captured almost every State honor, our dramatics, future teachers, and SCA are known throughout Virginia.

Cradock is a nautical school in name and theme. We were named for Sir Christopher Cradock, an admiral in the British Navy during World War I, my community was originally a housing project for war workers. Cradock proper is laid out in the form of an anchor with the main streets forming the shaft, stock, and arms. The nautical theme was further carried out in the naming of its streets for such famous naval men as Farragut and John Paul Jones.

Therefore, it is not surprising that our school newspaper should be called the "Shipmate," our literary magazine, the "Log"; our yearbook, the "Admiral"; and our student handbook, the "Quartermaster." Our yearbook cover carries the admiral's stripes and stars, Cradock's own special stars and stripes.

You are all familiar with Virginia's history because it involved the beginning of our Nation. I understand that an exploring party of Englishmen sailed up to the site of Augusta in 1607. The date of the first permanent English settlement in Jamestown, Va., as you know, is 1607. Before coming here I was told that if I mentioned Jamestown, I had better stress the word permanent so as not to be confused with your own historical first.

Virginia, called "Mother of Presidents"—and rightly so because she has given birth to six "first men" of the Nation. Cradock High School has also earned this title. This year our students have held the offices of fouf presidencies in the State. We are mighty proud of our distributive education, diversified occupation, Future Teachers of America, and Student Cooperative Association State presidents.

The schools represented here today differ in many ways. We come from different parts of the country; the enrollment of the schools may be unusually large or small; the school buildings may be very old or comparatively new; and the students speak with different accents and inflections; but we have all been drawn together by one great occasion—the National Bellamy Award. I am glad to say: Cony High School—welcome to our Bellamy Award family.

David, I would like to present a copy of our 1960 yearbook, the "Admiral," for your school library from our student council, and as a permanent record of one of your proud sister schools.

Edward P. Halline of the Milwaukee Sentinel Tells Why America Must Triumph Over Tyrants Over the Human Spirit, Whether From Left or Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the man from Mars, landing on our shores, must think we have all gone "wacky." We are the inheritors of Leonardo and Shakespeare, Tolstoy and Beethoven, yet the art forms which seem to engross our people at the moment are a movie called "Operation Abolition" and a book called "The Politician" by the founder of the John Birch Society. America is better than this, and it is time we began to realize it.

Most welcome, therefore, is the astringent advice from the talented and honest dramatic critic of the Milwaukee Sentinel, Edward P. Halline, from last Sunday's edition:

A DIFFERENT APPROACH—FREE, BOLD MEN BRING LIGHT INTO DARK WORLD

(By Edward P. Halline)

The lights of civilization, dimmed during the Hitler onslaught and then darkened by the chilling fear spread by the coldblooded Communist empire, have gone on again in the Western World.

Men's minds are not in chains. Free enterprise is comparatively free for the necessary but uneasy cooperation between Government and private industry in the United States. A bold and fearless young President gives us new hope for stopping the Communist tide. His leadership in the world transcends politics, bitter quarrel over domestic policies, and the wait and see attitude of those who have not yet caught the spirit of confidence.

In Milwaukee, as in other great cities, practically all segments of our politico-economic body are cooperating in the rebuilding and reinvigoration of the city which has lived on praises for good government, law, and order and the scent of a fabled gemuetlichkeit. The lights are on aagin in Milwaukee. Great plans are being made for the future, and dreams are becoming realities.

The long needed Music Hall-Theater is just ahead. The few years before it is built are but weeks in this Rip Van Winkle of metropolitan cities.

The intensifying interest in music and theater is a sign of the ferment which needs but unity and organization to reach a new level. The press is free, debates over national policy are protected from the agents of a police state.

Always the potential foe of tyranny, the theater is widening the horizons of free men and exerting its right of inquiry, into our still imperfect civilization and culture. Culture implies growth and it cannot grow in darkened worlds. Great music, is stirring the hearts and bringing a greater glow to the spirit abroad in the land as never before.

Bach, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Wagner are for freemen though Haydn and some of the other composers had to make private adjustments with their patron's antiquated beliefs and foibles, such as Haydn made with the demands of the Esterhazy family. When Haydn was free of them, he wrote his greatest music, notably the 12 last symphonies composed for enthusiastic British audiences.

Except in Soviet Russia where Communists have found a way to fetter their greatest composers, Western music stays free.

Is ours then the sick society, bloodless and decaying as the Communists and present day Fascists and their fellow Fascist travelers would have us believe? And who is sick? Francois Mauriac, the celebrated French writer who has discussed the problem of literary creation as seen in the light of a Catholic faith, said:

"I belong to a generation which believes in man and in Him of whom man is the unchallengeable witness."

"Freedom, not capitalism or communism, is the supreme issue in the world today. Yet the world is divided on what it means," says the Saturday Review. "To the underprivileged peoples—the majority of mankind—it means escape from tyranny or exploitation. But this is only its negative aspect. For the nations that have won their way to freedom, it is also responsibility, economic and social justice, and political security, discipline as well as a privilege."

But the weepers and wailers and the gnashers of extreme right-wing teeth continue their lamentations over the sickness of American civilization today and their own nostalgia for some remote era when the mob, that's you and I, groveled under the patriarchal lash of the oligarchs. These oligarchs, presumably men of means such as Texas oil billionaires and a few generals, would cure this Nation with the disciplinary measures of an army in war. Their captive intellectuals, voices of despair, keep in step. Their great foe is communism and they would turn this democratic Republic into a quasi-Communist police state in order to fight the enemy. They are like the Communists in methods, and in believing that the ends justify the means, that a vigilante society operated by lynch law from kangaroo courts is the way to crush freedom and dissent.

They would destroy the American Constitution in promising to save it from its foes.

Hitler, using the same terroristic methods in Germany, won the support of big industrialists and a good proportion of the masses by promising to save the nation from the Communists and the Jews.

The result was the Nazis got control and proceeded to enslave not only the people but the very industries they were supposedly saving. Communists propose to rescue the masses from slavery by seizing industry.

So it was complete government control in both countries, just a matter of which form of tyranny helped you more than the other.

Both groups wore masks of respectability in the communities. The current American neo-Nazis are utterly respectable, have influence in American politics and are extensively admired as strong men dedicated to preservation of American institutions, so they say. Most of the present day American Communists on exhibition are a seedy lot, but when the revolution comes they will have to step aside for the now respectable butchers from the Kremlin.

The neo-Nazis and the Communists are so much alike in their belief in an authoritarian state that it is not difficult at all for an avowed American Communist of the 1930's to recant and come up as a pillar of orthodoxy preaching ostensibly against communism but more against moderate conservatives and moderate liberals who dominate American politics today. It is easy to transfer their allegiance from one tyrant to another.

Even former President Eisenhower is denounced as a Communist stooge and a traitor to America. What they think of others slightly to the left of Eisenhower can well be imagined. And, of course, they would impeach Chief Justice Earl Warren because of the Supreme Court decision ordering integration. Naturally, they get the support of the diehard southern Senators who longed for the last century when Negroes were serfs, not even citizens but menials and happy in their lots until they got educated and uppity.

Robert Elliot Fitch, dean of California's Pacific School of Religion at Berkeley, has written a book, "Odyssey of the Self-Centered Self." Dr. Fitch was originally a Presbyterian, then a Congregationalist, an atheist, and a Socialist who supported Norman Thomas in 1932. Like others, he recanted and made the complete turnabout to the new orthodoxy. So his switch is not a surprise.

Dr. Fitch concentrates more on religion and psychology and perhaps does not seek to repeal every advance in the 20th century. But, as quoted in Time magazine, he is against atheism, agnosticism, romanticism, rationalism, humanism, positivism, extentialism, and cubism. He inveighs against such diverse men as the famous Rousseau, Schopenhauer, Walt Whitman, Kinsey, Adlai Stevenson, Aldous Huxley, Jack Parr, Caryl Chessman, Boris Pasternak, Charles Van Doren, Tennessee Williams, Francoise Sagan, Archibald MacLeish, Samuel Beckett, and James F. Powers. This is a typical bracketing by neo-Fascist minds.

They worship the false god of self, says Fitch. Man began with God, the only true faith, and finally wound up with the self. The self as deity pursued power as Faust did and pleasure as Don Juan did. The self is sick, says Fitch, looking through a small chink of his secure castle of orthodoxy to see a world which is poisoning itself with the venomous fumes of moral and mental bankruptcy.

Dr. Fitch, of course, surveys gloomily the hijinks and Bacchanalian revels of 20th-century man. He seems to have forgotten that he was a teenager once himself and that these outbursts of despair, of letting the morrow bring what it will of moral and mental anarchy itself, are encountered periodically throughout history.

And what is the world which Dr. Fitch does not see? We have been through two World Wars, a great depression, a frustrated Korean war and a cold war which may run to the end of the century. We are literally living under the gun as the Europeans have for centuries. Annihilation can be only a few minutes away. Yet Americans as a whole are taking it in their stride. They have bigger families despite imminent catastrophe. They are building more schools and sending through high school and college more children than ever. More and more are going to churches, more and more are searching for God. It is an explosive age where the sciences and technologies are fortunately outstripping the comprehension of most people.

All over the country the interest in good music has multiplied. People go to concerts to listen and not just to be seen there. The Metropolitan Opera, once the exhibitionistic ground for society, belongs to opera lovers who listen by the millions to its radio broadcasts. The sale of good records, complete operas, and symphonies of such towering masterpieces as Bach's "B Minor Mass" and the "Matthew Passion," is far above the puny driblets manufactured for a small audience of esthetes 30 and 40 years ago. Does that show sickness, Dr. Fitch?

The theater is free to pursue its inquiries into the relationship between God and man. We have seen Archibald MacLeish's "J.B.," a modern version of the great debate in the book of Job; Jean Anouilh's "The Lark," the story of Joan, as intensely moving as Shaw's "St. Joan," and this same French playwright's "Beckett," a vivid dramatization of the age-old struggle for power between the church and young ambitious kings like Henry II of England. We have seen Frederick Duerrenmett's "The Visit," where a whole community decays, and Tennessee Williams' plays about the dark miasmatic swamps where men and women decay. Duerenmett and Williams are not writers of shockers nor are they contributing to delinquency. They are scourges of God.

Who is sick? The answer is easy. Dr. Fitch and his phony prophets should get out of the light if they can't stand it and crawl back into their fever-stricken beds.

People-to-People Medical Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HIRAM L. FONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to the observations of Dr. Mary A. Glover of Kailua, Hawaii, who recently served on the steamship *Hope I*.

The SS *Hope I* is a medical mercy ship transporting volunteer medical personnel to ports in the Far East and southeast Asia for the purpose of rendering medical assistance to the people there. It is a project of the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc., and significantly, the letters H-O-P-E stands for health opportunity for people everywhere.

Through the work of the SS *Hope I*, a program of people-to-people diplomacy is effected. It demonstrates the American people's willingness to share their resources when and where needed.

Dr. Glover has written of her experiences and observations for the daily newspaper, the Honolulu Advertiser of March 12. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Glover's news article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Honolulu, Hawaii, Advertiser, Mar. 12, 1961]

ISLE MEDIC FINDS "HOPE" EXIT HARD

(By Dr. Mary A. Glover)

(Dr. Mary A. Glover of Kailua returned last month from 4 months aboard the medical ship *Hope*, while it visited Indonesia to care for patients and teach new methods to local medical people. Project Hope is financed by gifts of the American people. In this story, Dr. Glover sums up her impressions of the time she served aboard the ship.)

After my experience on this project, for which I thank my patients, Dr. Dixie Soo, and the many of you who have contributed money and written encouraging letters, I will never be the same again.

I guess this is inevitable. Reading or hearing about life in a less privileged country cannot begin to give one a concept of what those hardships are like.

You have to see the patient faces of men and women with goiters so big they can hardly turn their heads. You have to walk up the dusty, worn trail with its betel nut and tuberculosis-spit stains.

You have to watch the stoop and then the straightening of the shoulders of the barefoot betjak driver when he sees that the price of rice in Djakarta has doubled in the past 8 months but his income is the same, with no way he can see to increase it.

You have to run your finger over the smooth surface of the beautiful wood carvings a white-haired craftsman has produced.

Singing alternate Indonesian and American songs in the back of a dusty pickup truck; trying to ignore the heavy ache of your muscles when you have slept 4 hours in 36, and are trying to start a transfusion on a desperately ill patient; surreptitiously watching the face of a young Indonesian nurse as she samples a bowl of poi and then eats it all.

These are very different pictures in very different moods, but they add up to something that brings a lump to the throat and sometimes a few tears to the eyes.

It was difficult to leave. I had the feeling that in many ways I was departing at the time when I could contribute the most.

It always seems to take a while to develop trust, respect, and friendships. This period had elapsed, and we and our Indonesian staff members were known quantities to each other.

Through the hours when all of us applied the best of our knowledge and ability to relieve suffering and save lives of other human beings, we saw in each other qualities we like and admire.

Indonesia is ideally suited to mutual projects for peace which have a well-equipped ship as a base. Communications and transportation are two of this country's major problems.

Naturally, in a pilot project, there is much that one learns and would do differently a next time.

For example, we felt that we had too brief a stay in some ports; we would have liked to follow the patients just a little longer after starting treatment.

In the three medical school ports we visited, several of us general practitioners began to realize that we might be of most help if we worked in the outlying hospitals and dispensaries rather than in the city hospital "polykliniks" where more doctors were available.

A large portion of the medical care in the outlying areas necessarily must be carried

out by only partially trained personnel, as one doctor cannot care for all the illnesses of 60,000 people. We can contribute greatly by teaching these nondoctors.

Although I am now back in Hawaii, the SS *Hope* is still in Indonesia, between Ambon and Kupang, Timor. On it are the 65 American medical staff members, approximately 35 Indonesian medical staff members, and 135 American crew.

They are providing proof that the "people to people" feeling of concern is not dependent upon politics or geography or race.

They can continue because enough of us in the United States believe that this is the firmest foundation for world peace, and are sending some of our money to prove it.

The address, by the way, is Hope, Post Office Box 9808, Washington, D.C.

The Great Tourist Bill Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, for well over 14 years it has been my privilege to carry the responsibility for presenting and explaining to the House most of the legislation dealing with immigration problems.

I believe it is my duty now to advise the House that we may have to deal soon with legislation vitally affecting immigration and, in a broader context, bearing on vital national interests.

I have in mind the bill, S. 610, which passed the other body and is now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a bill purporting to promote tourist travel to the United States.

In my opinion, this legislation, if stripped of its verbiage, represents simply an attempt to have the Federal Treasury finance advertising and promotional activities of private transportation business, mostly the shipping lines and airlines.

In the Sunday magazine section of the New York Times of April 16, 1961, there appeared an article adorned with the name of the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Washington. Having read the article carefully and being fully aware of the Senator's sincerity as well as of his exceptional ability to express his views with clarity, precision, and ever-present realization of facts, I am inclined to believe that the article attributed to him has actually originated on Madison Avenue in New York City, rather than in the Senate Office Building.

I do not intend to contribute at this time to the amusement of the House by quoting the characteristic Madison Avenue "punch line" of the article, its opening paragraph, in which it is stated that Christopher Columbus would have been denied a tourist visa to the United States because he was born in Italy, was an indigent, and—believe-it-or-not—insane, says the article entitled "Columbus Couldn't Get a Visa."

The basic premise of this splendid example of promotional prose is the alleged fact that a foreign tourist who wishes to visit the United States is faced with insurmountable difficulties.

What are the facts?

According to the annual report of the Attorney General of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, there occurred a total number of 68.5 million—exactly 685,563,571—entries across the borders of the United States in that year. This number of entries includes U.S. citizens and aliens, immigrants and nonimmigrants, border crossers, seamen and airmen, and it includes, of course, multiple entries made by the same person.

However, excluding entries made by all seamen and airmen; excluding entries made by our neighbors coming from Canada and Mexico; excluding returning residents and foreign students returning to their studies; excluding persons entering without documents, the total number of entries was 1,406,134. Of this number 1,140,736 aliens entered the United States as nonimmigrants. Of this number 108,130 were visitors for business, while 671,075 were visitors for pleasure, or tourists. Exactly the type of tourists with which the Columbian article concerns itself.

According to the Attorney's General report, the number of visitors for pleasure, or tourists, is increasing year by year. Looking back over the last 5 years, this country played host to 399,704 tourists in 1956; 453,514 in 1957; 514,599 in 1958; 597,982 in 1959; and, as I said, 671,075 tourists in 1960. In addition to that, we had in 1960, 32,569 foreign government officials entering the United States; 119,291 alien travelers passing in transit; 35,415 students entering for the first time and a steadily increasing number of exchange visitors—25,233 in 1960—industrial trainees, temporary workers in the highly skilled category, and so forth.

I believe it would be safe to assume that somehow even Christopher Columbus could have squeezed himself into this flow of tourists.

If the difficulties in obtaining temporary visas were even partially as prohibitive as described by the Madison Avenue drum beaters mobilized by the shipping interests to press for the enactment of S. 610, it would hardly be possible to have those visas issued around the world at a steady pace of over 2,000 visitors' visas every day of the year.

But this is not all. The article attributed to the Senator from Washington goes on to stress further difficulties encountered by foreigners who desire to pay us a visit. This, according to the article, is a second wall erected around the United States by our immigration officers who are just mercilessly excluding visitors displaying a valid visa stamped into their passports. Let us have a look at this exclusion wall.

Out of 1,406,134 aliens entering the United States in 1960, 411 persons were excluded at the ports of entry. Is not that a terrifying proportion? Of the 411, only 53 came from Europe and only 7 from Asia, while 12 came from South America. One hundred and forty-two of those excluded attempted to enter from Cuba, 96 from Mexico, and 42 from Canada.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that I have to dwell further on the veracity of the article. Let me turn, however, to the administrative operations of our consulates.

The New York Times conducted, just a short while ago, a worldwide survey of the visa issuance operations. I wish to include at this point the reports carried by that newspaper in its issue of March 5, 1961:

FRENCHMEN ARE PLEASED

PARIS, March 4.—The U.S. consulate here is now able to issue nonimmigrant visas to French applicants in 30 minutes instead of the 8 to 10 days it used to take.

John R. Diggins, Jr., in charge of the visa section, described the new approach as follows:

"In the old days our system was geared to screening the 2 percent we didn't want. Now we're concentrating on making things as easy and pleasant as possible for the 98 percent who are welcome."

The French applicant simply turns over his passport and waits in a comfortable chair in the waiting room while the staff and the latest in electronic machines quickly process the application.

Before the visa is issued the tourist is interviewed for about 5 minutes on possible Communist affiliation, contagious diseases, and length of residence in France.

The officials in charge of interviewing applicants lean over backward to pose these questions in the least embarrassing way possible. They report that very few French tourists are disturbed by the questions.

LONDONERS GET QUICK ACTION

LONDON, March 4.—Consular officials at the U.S. Embassy in Grosvenor Square today began asking applicants for nonimmigrant visas only four simple questions.

The new short form is a further refinement of the simple visa procedure that has been in effect for more than a year at American consulates in Britain.

Its additional abbreviation was spurred by a directive received this week from the State Department that said, in effect: Make it as easy as possible to get a visa and still comply with the basic requirements of the law.

In the nonimmigrant (tourist and businessman) section of the consulate this afternoon there was a steady flow of applicants through the comfortably appointed waiting room in the new Embassy building.

It took only 10 to 20 minutes for each applicant to obtain a visa, provided he had proper photographs, a valid passport, and some sort of informal statement indicating that he intended to return to Britain after his visit.

It took Mr. and Mrs. E. G. Brooks, of Eastbourne, about 20 minutes to get their combined tourist and business visas.

The four questions asked were:

Does the applicant suffer from mental illness or a serious contagious disease; has he had a serious criminal conviction; has he ever been deported from the United States; is he a member or an affiliate of a Communist organization?

SWISS GET QUICK VISAS

GENEVA, March 4.—The receipt of instructions to simplify visa formalities and the speed with which Mme. Edouard Wurmser got her visa were a pure coincidence.

"My husband and I obtained our first visa a year ago and we have nothing but praise for the prompt and courteous service we

received at the U.S. consulate," Mme. Edouard Wurmser said.

"We found the questions we were asked to be a little unusual, but there was nothing objectionable about them," she said.

Consular officials here say they have been issuing visas without any delays for Swiss. Local travel agents confirmed that the processing had been rapid for several years.

IRISH FIND IT EASY

DUBLIN, March 4.—This must be one of the most pleasant cities in Europe in which to obtain a tourist visa for the United States.

That was the impression formed after spending some time sitting among tourist applicants at the U.S. Embassy in Merrion Square.

Both the consul in charge and his secretary dealt with each applicant in helpful and friendly manner. No embarrassing questions were asked and, in fact, it was learned that only two applicants had been refused visas in the last 2 years. Those were for health reasons.

There has been no change in the procedure since President Kennedy assumed office. But the whole atmosphere of the visa section has become more relaxed and friendly without short-circuiting State Department regulations. Twelve hundred tourist visas were issued last year, compared with 900 in 1959.

GERMAN TOURIST SURPRISED

BONN, GERMANY, March 4.—A would-be West German tourist in the United States consulate here today said:

"If I had known before that all I had to do was to fill out this little thing, I'd have applied for a visa long ago."

The "little thing" he referred to, the size of a playing card, was an application form asking for name, address, profession, date and place of birth, nationality, ethnic origin, marital status and passport details. The applicant had heard he would have to fill out a lengthy questionnaire.

This is a thing of the past, according to American consular officials here. It was used in what are described as "emergency cases," where the consular officer could not satisfy himself of the nature of the applicant's visit. But on March 1 all copies of the questionnaire were burned, consular officials said.

For a number of reasons, Bonn is not a typical visa office in West Germany. This is a comparatively small town and nearly everyone wanting to go to the United States is known to the Embassy. The average number of visa applications has been 100 monthly. The processing has been swift and competent.

IDENTITY CARDS IN BELGIUM

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, March 3.—Getting an American visa became easier for Belgians on February 13 when the State Department ruled that they could present identity cards in place of passports.

All Belgians are obliged to carry identity cards but not many every take the trouble to get passports.

This change of procedure, which seems to have been in the works for some time but which occurred soon after President Kennedy showed an interest in tourist travel from Europe, has impressed transport men. A typical comment was that of Robert H. Jerosch, director of Pan American World Airways in Belgium.

"This change in regulations is helpful to tourists," he said. "But I hear comments to the effect that Belgians think there is still too much redtape about traveling to the United States. As they put it: 'We let Americans come here without a visa so why shouldn't they let us visit them on the same basis?'"

The procedure for obtaining a visa takes about a half hour.

Usually the questions asked of an applicant are those on form FS 257, which are about the same as those asked on an automobile license application.

FORM DROPPED IN OSLO

OSLO, NORWAY, March 4.—The consul here, Karl Ackerman, said that the order would have little practical effect here as it had been necessary to make only sparing use of the forms in granting visas to Norwegians. But he termed it the first concrete step by the Kennedy administration to speed the process.

The consul said that the applicant was required to read through a statement listing criminals, prostitutes, those affiliated with Communist organizations and the like as ineligible to receive visas. The applicant is then asked whether he is eligible, and his reply is under oath.

GREEKS ARE SPECIAL PROBLEM

ATHENS, March 4.—The Greek immigration quota to the United States is limited to 308 persons yearly.

Owing to Greek population pressures and the fact that almost every Greek family has a member in the United States, more than 100,000 applications for emigration are on file. The result is that many Greeks try to obtain tourist visas and hope for a later change in status after arriving in the United States.

Well-known businessmen and convincingly bona fide tourists have been able to get a tourist visa within 24 hours or less. The average lag for other applicants is about 2 months.

Joseph B. Costanzo, U.S. Consul General here, said:

"We have to be most careful with tourist visas and establish beyond a doubt that the applicant has no reason whatever to abandon Greece."

He said that about 11,000 persons called at his office each month—twice as many as 5 years ago.

VISAS ISSUED IN AN HOUR

MEXICO CITY, March 4.—Even with the substitution of the short form, there is some opinion here whether the process has improved.

Under the long form a series of questions was posed calling for a "yes" or "no" answer. The questions were based on law 212a listing the restrictions for issuance of non-immigration visas.

This law specifies that persons are not eligible for such visas if they have been treated for instanity, have been narcotic addicts, have engaged in prostitution, vagrancy or a number of other things. Finally it was asked in the long form whether the applicant had ever belonged to a Communist organization.

If any of these questions had to be answered in the affirmative, it would require that the applicant bring the details to the attention of the visa official.

Now it is the responsibility of the examining consulate officials to decide whether the questions based on the law, which remains valid, should be asked verbally.

No oath in the issuance of nonimmigration visas has been necessary for more than a year.

BRAZILIANS MUST GIVE COLOR

RIO DE JANIERO, March 4.—The stress has been switched from security to public relations in granting visas to Brazilians, U.S. consular officials said today.

In Brazil, the question as to ethnic class usually has been answered as Latin and race as white or black. In Brazil anyone half white is classed as white.

Rio's Jornal do Commercio on February 7, published a story by its traveling correspondent, J. Barros de Morias, which said: "One of the things which cause a magnificent impression on a Brazilian traveling to the United States today is the readiness with which American consuls attend Brazilian nationals, thus disproving hostile propaganda spread by elements interested in creating unfriendly atmosphere for the sons of Uncle Sam.

"Naturally, any great nation has an obligation to prevent the entry of dangerous elements to its territory."

NO RECENT CHANGE IN TOYKO

TOKYO, March 4.—The visa situation here has improved since formalities for obtaining visas were instituted last fall.

Before, it took at least 1 month for Japanese applicants to obtain U.S. visas. Local applicants can now get their visas in a week to 10 days. In some cases, visas have been granted in 2 days.

All of more than 10 applicants who were interviewed at the U.S. consulate here said that it was easier to get U.S. visas than they had been told by their friends who had gone through the formalities.

Goro Hasegawa, a business executive in Tokyo, said:

"A marked improvement has been made since I applied for my first American visa about 2 years ago. I have never been asked any embarrassing questions."

The elimination of oathtaking in obtaining a visa has been welcomed. Local applicants were not familiar with that custom.

Currency restrictions are still a major factor responsible for holding down the flow of Japanese tourists to the United States.

No changes have been made in procedure since January 20, so far as Japanese applicants are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, could the process of visa issuance to visitors be further simplified?

Having reviewed the regulations promulgated by the Department of State and personally observed the operations abroad, I do not believe that much could be further improved in a situation where a nonimmigrant visa to the United States is issued in 30 minutes flat, authorizing the holder to enter the United States an unlimited number of times within 4 years without practically anyone taking an additional look at him. Similarly, I do not believe that the application form establishing the visitor's identity and nationality on a card, size 2½ inches by 5 inches, could shrink much further.

Could visas for tourists be abolished altogether?

Certainly not, considering the fact that as of January 25, 1961, there was a worldwide total of almost 1 million—966,675—aliens who by registering at an American consulate have taken the affirmative step to indicate their desire to come to the United States and remain in this country permanently. Of this number, 253,183 are registered for immigration in Italy; 100,022 in Greece; 71,057 in Poland; 38,891 in Portugal; 135,630 in Yugoslavia; 23,433 in Jamaica; 14,833 in Spain, and so forth.

Considering this constant pressure upon our immigration quotas, how could this country forego one simple—and rather perfunctory—check on whether the tourist is not, in fact, an immigrant who desires to enter the United States in the guise of a nonimmigrant, while he

actually intends to evade the regulatory laws.

I would invite my colleagues of the House to review the files of the Committee on the Judiciary and see how many of the alleged tourists have private bills introduced in their behalf for the purpose of granting them permanent residence status. The Immigration and Naturalization Service would also, I am sure, be happy to indicate the number of tourists who, having entered the United States, fell in love with this wonderful country to the extent that they do not mind violating its laws by remaining here.

Having said all that, I wish to stress, Mr. Speaker, that the committee upon which the House has imposed the responsibility for handling immigration matters, have done all that is possible to encourage the Departments of State and Justice to facilitate the issuance of visas to bona fide tourists, businessmen, newspapermen, students, transit passengers, and others. Your committee has been responsible for legislation providing for a variety of waivers of excluding provisions in the case of visitors. Your committee has encouraged the administrators of the law to use the waivers and—naturally—to use good sense in granting them. Your committee has promoted the stationing of immigration officers abroad in order to expedite and facilitate the granting of waivers. Your committee is convinced that any further relaxation of these procedures would be detrimental to the best interest of the United States. Existing procedures, however, provide for fair, equitable, and speedy removal of the obstacles that a deserving alien visitor might be faced with.

What then is behind all the drum beating?

The answer is simple. Private travel agents, transportation, and hotel interests would like to obtain Federal funds, taxpayers' money, to pay for the printing of posters, pamphlets, and other publicity material promoting travel to the United States. That is all. There is nothing in the bill, S. 610, of substantive nature except the provision authorizing the financing of tourist propaganda. That, however, I submit, is the business of those who sell tickets, and rent rooms and cars and buses, who derive profit from tourist trade. That, I submit, is the business of hotelkeepers and travel agencies, airlines and shipping lines, the sole beneficiaries of S. 610.

Obviously, national economy would benefit if more Fords, Chevrolets, Chryslers, or Ramblers were sold abroad. However, how would this House look upon legislation providing for the utilization of Federal funds to pay for advertising in the newspapers and magazines of Europe, Asia, and South America of the splendid American cars? How would this House look upon legislation appropriating taxpayers' money for advertising abroad the blessings of nylon or of the soft or not-so-soft drinks manufactured in the United States?

Senate 610 would do precisely that for the tourist transportation interests.

Let me return once more to the Columbian article of last Sundays. It says there that when you walk along Fifth Avenue in New York—and Madison Avenue, too—you will see the splendid window displays of tourists offices maintained in this country by the governments of foreign countries like France, or Italy, or others. Certainly, but these governments are the owners of the airlines and the shipping lines which they advertise. They advertise their own business. They are not financing publicity for private business. This, I submit, is a difference which the article failed to notice.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my able colleagues on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will not be misled by the smart boys of Madison Avenue and that they will accord the Senate measure the same treatment they accorded its predecessor bill last year—sit on it.

Free World Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, twice in a few short years has Russia electrified the world with spectacular space conquests. These have captured not only the imagination but also the minds of men. Yet while they are remarkable scientific feats, they also pose political and military dangers for the free world. This threat, these dangers, will persist and bedevil us until the United States and its Allies catch up and surpass the Russian achievements in space.

Until then, we must rely on the great atomic defense systems in missiles and planes of the free world as well as on the great shield called NATO. What other practical alternatives have we at this time?

In this connection I invite attention to the public service editorial efforts appearing in leading newspapers throughout the free world in paid space from the pen of A. N. Spanel, founder of International Latex Corp., of Dover, Del. For 22 years this company has continued its tireless efforts on behalf of free-world unity and for over 10 years it has championed NATO as the shield and sword of the Western World.

Certainly this public-spirited business organization deserves the highest of praise, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial by Mr. A. N. Spanel which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Monday, April 17 be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

BACK TO EARTH—THE TARGET IS THE WORLD
(By A. N. Spanel)

The hypnotist's pendulum, used by some practitioners of the art, forces the subject to focus his mind on the swinging device to the exclusion of everything else, until his will is paralyzed.

This has been roughly the Kremlin's technique, too. The pendulum swung by Khrushchev, as by Stalin before him, takes the form of a periodic crisis. The free world is so overwhelmed by an acute immediate danger in one spot that it is apt to forget the larger, continuous, and worldwide danger. This leaves the Communists free to operate everywhere else with a minimum of hindrance from our side.

RED HAND IS QUICKER THAN THE EYE

In varying measure, such penetration is taking place in several strategically located African and Asian countries. Without benefit of a real issue or crisis, the Red tourniquet is being tightened around these vital regions.

Free world statesmen have been too frantically occupied with fears, hopes, and debates around the crisis of the month to give more than cursory attention to these slower boring-from-within processes elsewhere.

As long as we deal with the fundamental challenge of world communism on a crisis-to-crisis basis, rather than on a systematic and continuous global scale, the hypnotist's pendulum will continue to work its Red magic. Africa, Asia and even Latin America will continue to be pilfered under our unseeing eyes in the pattern of pillage that has already enslaved a third of the human race.

These facts are especially pertinent today. NATO needs an immediate reappraisal of its role, its scope, its tools. For NATO, in the eyes of the Communist axis, is the symbol of free-world power in the aggregate.

NEED FOR NATO ENORMOUSLY ENHANCED

"The basic reasons which led to the signature of the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949," the NATO Council said in its communique after its anniversary session in Washington, "remain valid today." This is the understatement of the decade. Actually the threat to what remains of freedom on this planet is vastly greater than it was 10 years ago. The enemy's military might has been expanded year by year, and the conquest of China has given him colossal new potentials of penetration and intimidation. The role of NATO today is therefore far larger than anyone envisaged at its birth.

To play it effectively, NATO must be rapidly strengthened and expanded in terms of physical power, political and moral authority.

Though NATO is an Atlantic enterprise, the communique rightly stressed that the challenge is worldwide. The organization, as one writer put it, "is going to have to adopt a less Atlantic and more global look."

NATO urgently needs more power to protect more of the free world than its members had foreseen in the original concept of the alliance. Whatever the merits of the specific proposals along these lines by France under President de Gaulle, there is no doubt of the validity of the principle—the need, that is, for a realistic widening of the geographical commitments. The planned aggressions of Russia and China are our daily warnings that for the Communists, the target is the world.

Above all, what is called for is unity of the free world—not merely legalistic unity but a unity of spirit in a common dedication, unity in depth and in breadth.

TYRANNY AND TERROR UNITE THE COMMUNISTS

The Soviet bloc is a monolithic entity. The free allies are at best a loose collection of strong-willed individual countries and governments. In order to cope with the life-

and-death menace posed by the Red monolith, we have no alternative but to provide a voluntary unity to match. Only by pooling more of its resources, brains and skills and facing up to the need for sacrifice—including the sacrifice of some types of national sovereignty—can the free world hope to thwart the Soviet pattern of pillage.

In his splendid book, "What's Wrong With U.S. Foreign Policy," Mr. Cyrus L. Sulzberger cites the lessons of an alliance, some 2,500 years ago, resembling NATO. It was the first Delian League, in which Greek city-states led by Athens banded together for common defense against Persian aggression.

As fear of Persia receded, Mr. Sulzberger points out, the League's vitality ebbed. Its strength was also sapped by bickering and by an increasing tendency of Athens to ignore the will of lesser allies. On the basis of this ancient experience, Mr. Sulzberger concludes about NATO: "We must seek new methods to invigorate the psychological will to common effort."

Certainly there has been no decline of fear in our world. The tasks facing the free world are costly, long-lasting and exhausting. Fatigue and the human weakness for wishful thinking encourage illusions of easy solutions, of cures with unguents of good will bearing labels like "coexistence."

These debilitating delusions, feeding on our failure to see the pattern of the Communist menace in all its global varieties, must be overcome if freedom is to survive. An enormously invigorated and expanded NATO would be both symbol and substance of our commitment to victory.

The National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Congress the following excellent and timely speech delivered by Maj. Gen. Frank D. Pinckney, the adjutant general of South Carolina, on the occasion of the dedication of the Belton, S.C., Armory, April 2:

THE NATIONAL GUARD

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to tell you, briefly, something about your National Guard and its mission. This outstanding unit, 116th Signal Company, which we have here in Belton, is one of over 5,000 Army and Air National Guard units located in over 2,500 cities and communities throughout this great country of ours. The National Guard is organized in every State and territory and the strength of its Army and Air Force units totals nearly a half million men.

These units are all organized in accordance with the plans prescribed by the Department of Defense and each has a definite mission in the overall defense of our country and consequently is an integral part of America's defense team.

Here in South Carolina we have 110 such units located in 76 cities and towns with a total strength in excess of 10,500 patriotic citizen soldiers. These young men, all volunteers, come from every walk of life—the farms, the mills, stores, offices, businesses of every kind. They are your neighbors, your friends, citizens of your community, your State, giving of their time to train in order to be ready to defend you, your loved ones, your communities and your country in the event of an attack or any emergency or national catastrophe.

They meet once a week to train. They sacrifice their annual vacations with their families in order to attend the summer field training periods—not to become seasoned soldiers with the urge to fight or kill, but citizen soldiers, able to protect themselves and to help preserve the peace. Furthermore, the lessons they learn in obedience, loyalty, preservation, protection of life and property, all add up to the development of better citizens and the creation of a keener sense of duty and responsibility to both State and Nation.

The existence of these military forces in this State is a highly important security factor. They are instantly available for either of their missions and yet due to the Federal support of arms, pay and equipment, they place a very small tax burden on the State.

The equipment which our guard units in South Carolina have today with which to train range from jeeps to jets, from rifles to radars, from machineguns to missile-firing artillery, with a total value in excess of $50 million. We receive each year in Federal funds to support our guard units over $8 million, of which better than 85 percent is spent within our State borders. This unit alone here in Belton brings into your community about $60,000 per year, a right sizable monthly payroll.

Where do all the funds come from? They come from the taxes you pay the Federal Government, but every tax dollar spent on the National Guard does double duty—it buys two vital bodies of organized manpower for the price of one. The military organization trained to defend our country in time of emergency and a local organization ready for immediate action if and when a disaster should strike.

The history of the National Guard is an integral part of the history of this great country in peace and in war. The National Guard, or militia as it was called then, was active when America was merely a series of small, struggling colonies. It has been utilized during every period of national emergency and has provided a State security force during the intervals between wars.

Let me briefly touch on the role of these citizen-soldiers since the founding of our country. Dressed in buckskins and armed with the old flintlock, they drove the Indians and Spaniards from our doorsteps in the Colonial Wars of 1670.

During the Revolutionary War, our militiamen, gallant sons of Carolina fought under the able leadership of other noble Carolinians, such as Christopher Gadsden, William Moultrie, Thomas Sumter and others. Of course, you all remember the deeds of Sergeant Jasper and Francis Marion of this period. During this era there came into being such militia units as the Beaufort Artillery, Charleston Light Infantry, Kershaw Guards, Volunteer Grenadiers, Charleston Artillery, German Fusilliers, and Irish Volunteers.

In the War of 1812 they responded to the call in resisting the English and French aggressions. It was during this early period that we find the beginning of other militia units such as the Volunteer Cadet Infantry, Independent Greens, Washington Rangers, Washington Light Infantry, and the Jackson Guards, later renamed the Sumter Guards.

It was the Mexican War of 1846-48 that gave birth to our famous Palmetto Regiment, the crest of which is worn honorably by guardsmen in our infantry units today, a regiment composed of the citizen soldiers of our State led by a distinguished South Carolinian, Pierce Mason Butler. It was this regiment that so ably and gallantly distinguished itself in several severe engagements in Mexico, and in particular at the gates of Mexico City itself. It was a lieutenant from this very regiment who scaled the walls of the city to place the Palmetto Flag thereon, thus this flag became the first American flag to fly over any part of Mexico City.

Then there are those chivalrous sons of Carolina who participated in that great struggle, the War Between the States, which centennial we celebrate this year. Time will not permit, nor is it necessary for me to dwell on the exploits of the South Carolina citizen soldiers of this period, for the pages of history are filled with deeds of valor and patriotism displayed by the noble sons of this great State.

Our citizen-soldiers again responded to the call in the Spanish-American War with such units as the Darlington Guards, Sumter Light Infantry, Edistor Rifles, Manning Guards and many others furnished elements during this short period.

Two regiments of infantry and a troop of cavalry from our Guard were sent to the Mexican border to protect our borders from the depredations of Mexican bandits in 1916.

This campaign was followed almost immediately by the first great war for democracy, the war that was intended to end all wars—World War I. It was during this great struggle that all our guardsmen experienced the hardships and perils of combat, many of them distinguishing themselves and thus bringing great honor and glory to our State.

Then, unfortunately came World War II wherein the guard was again called to defend our Nation's liberty and freedoms. Many men who served are still active in our guard today.

On the placque to the left of the entrance to this building are nine figures depicting these citizen-soldiers that I have referred to, dressed in the authentic uniform of each period.

So you see, our guardsmen, young men like we have here today and 10,000 others throughout our Palmetto State, have the responsibility to uphold and carry on in these established traditions—a heritage of shining examples of sacrifice and courage established by other patriotic sons of South Carolina in the cause of liberty, freedom and justice.

I have tried to point out the importance of maintaining a strong National Guard and the major role it occupies today as a part of our Nation's defense team, part of our power in being the great deterrent force that is so necessary to maintain in order to protect our freedoms, and too, the ideals and examples of patriotic service established by other citizen soldiers of our great State.

I would be amiss, though, in my remarks this afternoon if I failed to leave a word of caution to everyone present within this hall. I sincerely trust that you too will carry this message to your friends and your associates, for ladies and gentlemen, we are faced with a serious situation. We are engaged in a mortal conflict with communism. This conflict is an economic, political, spiritual, power struggle against crafty conniving, ruthless conspirators, proponents of world communism. This insidious enemy of ours, and of the balance of the free world, is employing a strategy of intrigue, infiltration and subversion never before practiced upon the human race. It endangers every segment of our society and threatens the complete annihilation of all the Christian principles upon which this Nation was founded. Call it the cold war, if you please, but hot or cold, the stakes are just as great, for the loss of this war would result in the loss of our freedoms, our liberties, and all that democracy represents, with the only alternative—slavery, dominated by communism.

Time is running out on our side. The next 10 years may prove to be the most momentous in human history. The Communists will try to exploit this period to disarm and divide the West by continuing their undermining and deceptive practices of subterfuge, with the accomplishment of this objective, then their entire effort will be directed towards the subjugation of America.

Yes, indeed, time is running out. It is not too late, though, provided that we all roll up our sleeves and get to work. We must develop the individual will to fight, to win, and to survive in this struggle if we expect to preserve and protect our freedoms and assure the future safety of our children.

Remember, freedom is taken too lightly by too many people. It is not inherent that we continue to enjoy freedom without some effort to maintain it on our part. Freedom must be loved, lived, sacrificed for, fought for, and sometimes died for.

During the past 60 years the insidious atheistic disciples of Communist principles and ideologies have seized one-quarter of the land area of the world and dominate nearly 1 billion people—approximately one-third of the world's population. They have taken over country after country in Europe and in Asia. They are causing the unrest in Africa; they have completely dominated Cuba and today are infiltrating into Central and South American countries, all getting closer and closer to the encirclement of America.

Despite these continuing Communist encroachments and the many articles appearing in our daily papers and magazines warning of these threats, there is unfortunately a disinclination to face up to the harsh reality that the basic aims and objectives of the Communist powers, which are to dominate the entire world, have not changed in the least degree.

People are prone to disregard the fact that we are faced today by an enemy, with agents in our midst, employing the same undermining methods and strategy which they have employed in other countries prior to their enslavement into the Communist orbit. They are without conscience or scruples, ardently intent upon the destruction of our democracy and the enslavement of our people.

The Communist would lead you to believe that the issue is between communism and capitalism, but ladies and gentlemen, the basic issue is between slavery or freedom. America is at the crossroads. If the expansion of communism continues unabated, not only must we face the cold hard fact that we will lose our freedoms but our children and their children will live or die in slavery.

We must be on the alert at all times. These Communists are smooth operators. They are crafty in the arts of conspiracy and deceit. They operate under many false fronts and participate in all phases of American life, duping unsuspecting and easily led individuals, so as to sway American public opinion in favor of Russian propaganda policies, thus softening our resistance.

Let me emphasize this point. Their main target today is the youth of our country—repeat—they are concentrating a major effort in attracting youth to the party and in warping their minds into believing that communism offers the world peace and security, while we are an aggressive, warlike nation, and capitalism cannot survive.

We, therefore, must not only awaken our people to the seriousness of the situation facing our country, but we must expose the fallacies and the nature of communism, while at the same time instill the values, traditions, and ideals of democracy and the American way of life.

These young guardsmen here and over 500,000 others throughout our land of the free and home of the brave are today's up-to-the-minute men, carrying on in the same tradition as the minutemen of 1776 when other periods of danger threatened our freedoms and our liberties. They are doing their part in helping to provide the defense forces so essential in this period of extraordinary danger, but maintaining a powerful military force, a strong National Guard, will not alone save us. The Communist termites are constantly at work trying to undermine our Government, our leaders, our society, our minds, our resistance, and thus we are faced with the grave danger of losing this conflict without a shot or a missile ever being fired. This is the Communist scheme, design, and strategy in which they have conquered country after country.

The threat with which we are faced today requires the combined effort, immediate attention, and urgent action of every able-bodied, red-blooded, patriotic American if we are to survive and preserve for our children the same opportunities, heritage, and true Christian principles of democracy which we inherited. There is a job for everyone. Think it over seriously, be always on the alert, and assume your share of these responsibilities, if you expect to continue enjoying your freedom.

Trained Men, National Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Scott Tribune of April 17, 1961. This excellent and outstanding editorial is most challenging, and I respectfully call it to the attention of my colleagues—trusting that the thoughts presented in it will receive their most careful consideration:

TRAINED MEN, NATIONAL RESOURCE

The social scientists have been telling us for a long time that ours is an aging population, that even as our total numbers boom upward the proportion of elderly people among them is rising more sharply.

As has been well and often noted, this trend has many important effects on current and future American life, not the least being its impact on the makeup of the country's work force.

With the gradual coming of age of the persons born in the great baby boom of World War II and its aftermath, the expectation is there will be a flood of job demands.

Young people entering the labor market want not only jobs, but opportunities for advancement. For the most talented, the prospect of going all the way to the top must be held out. Without that, many companies and other enterprises could not hope to attract the needed people of ability.

To hold out that prospect, however, businesses often are compelled to institute automatic retirement plans for older workers, otherwise there would be no room for the rising new generation of employees.

Yet, while this has obvious fairness from the viewpoint of the younger people, it frequently works hardship on the older workers. To the extent that they must thereafter be supported by private or public pension, they are also an increasing burden on the economy and the National Treasury.

In many instances there is no escape from this, nor perhaps should there be. But it is tragic that in all too many cases the greatest cost is not in money but in the loss of a man's talent and experience.

All kinds of enterprises—and the country taken as a whole—build vast investments, in the broad sense of that term, in the individuals who comprise the work force. As they advance through life, many become virtual storehouses of skill and knowledge.

To cast them aside, to end their working days automatically and arbitrarily, is to create great waste both ecoonmically and spiritually.

For all its growing numbers, this Nation is not so heavily endowed for the colossal struggle with communism that it can afford to toss away its investment in trained, able people.

We should be trying to do everything imaginable to enlarge, not diminish our reservoir of skills and knowledge. We may need every drop in the great pool.

Reds Will Be Hard Bargainers in Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in Laos, the Reds are stalling on cease-fire negotiations. Basically, why?

To get an iron grip on as much land as possible—to enable them to be tough bargainers at any conference table.

Recently, I was privileged to review major aspects of the Lao situation in a broadcast over radio station WGN, Chicago.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

SENATOR WILEY WARNS REDS WILL BE HARD BARGAINERS IN LAOS

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, senior Republican, Foreign Relations Committee, in a weekend broadcast over radio station WGN, Chicago, stressed the need for a "global alert" to halt the many-pronged offensive of the Communists. There follows the text of Senator WILEY's address:

"Today, the free world is faced with an ever-growing threat to its survival; namely, communism.

"Around the globe, an estimated 36 million Reds—operating in about 86 countries—are attempting to: (1) get a firmer grip on people under their domination; and (2) thrust forward to gain control of more lands and people.

"Tactically, they attempt to penetrate new lands through trade, student exchange, or other channels; agitate for rebellion; arm and train Communist forces to gain control of the country; and then establish it as a subsidiary branch of the world conspiracy.

"The ultimate objective—stated again and again from Lenin to Khrushchev—is world domination.

"Unfortunately, the Red offensive already has expanded to control of nearly 1 billion people and vast land, natural, military, industrial, human, and other resources.

"To combat these expansionist efforts, we need a more effective counteroffensive. In my judgment, this should include efforts to maintain a strong military deterrent to massive attack; strengthen our deterrent to war forces; challenge the Reds more quickly in areas where it is obvious they are committing aggression; improve and strengthen the U.N. and other international machinery for dealing with aggression; concentrate more on development of an effective program for penetrating the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. For example, we can no longer allow the Reds to contest for lands outside their orbit, but maintain Red-controlled areas as sacred territory.

"Also, we need to crystallize more effective plans for the triumph of freedom—both in Communist and non-Communist nations—and then devise techniques for accomplishing this objective.

"In the face of this gargantuan menace to freedom, the time has come to challenge the Reds for every foot of Communist-held territory—as well as to protect non-Communist lands from aggression. Unless we do this, the Reds—nibble by nibble—may ultimately gobble up the world.

"IS LAOS LOST?

"Regrettably, Laos stands as a dark example of Red aggression that threatens world peace. Again, we have witnessed Red strategy involving infiltration, agitation for rebellion, creation of a rebel force, supplying of arms and equipment by the Soviet Union, and attempts to take over the country.

"By military action, the Pathet Lao, supported by North Vietnamese troops and armed and equipped by the Soviet Union, have already taken over too much of the country.

"Mr. Khrushchev and his cohorts—by deliberately delaying negotiations—have enabled the Communist-supported rebels to gain and solidify control of more territory.

"Even though the Reds may negotiate, we can expect: That they are not likely to give up any territory under their control, and that they will demand greater voice in the overall policies in the country.

"As in Korea, Red China also has threatened to send troops—if the Western Powers deem it advisable to take military action to halt aggression. This is a dangerous thing. In limited warfare, the Red Chinese present a particular tough enemy. Why? With no respect for human life, they have no qualms about using military manpower—from a population of 650 million people—as cannon fodder in the cause of communism.

"Even if peace talks are carried out, negotiations with the Reds—firmly implanted by military action and backed by the Red Chinese and Soviet Governments—will be difficult.

"MAINTAINING A GLOBAL ALERT

"Although Laos is now a 'hot spot,' we also need to maintain a global alert.

"Tactically, the Reds conduct multipronged offensives. By stirring up trouble in one area, they attempt to divert attention away from other efforts to establish new beachheads on free world territory. Today, the critical areas include—in addition to Laos—the Congo, Cuba, Berlin, Latin America.

"Tomorrow, long-planned subversive efforts to plant the seeds of communism in other countries may explode into revolution—aided and abetted by the Reds.

"This, then, is the great challenge of our times.

"At no time in history has freedom faced such a grave, dangerous, powerful threat to its survival. By experience, we have learned the Communists are fanatically dedicated to world domination.

"The battle for freedom will not be won by wishful thinking—hoping that ultimately the Red ogre will 'go away.' Our task, then, is to mobilize the manpower and resources to defeat the enemy. The battlegrounds will be economic, social, ideological, as well as military. The great hope of the free world is that it possesses the ideas, ideals, respect for human dignity and promise of liberty—common aspirations of almost all of humanity—to enlist the majority of mankind on its side in the struggle.

"Only by a strong, dedicated effort, however, can we hope to win the struggle for survival and, ultimately, peace," Senator WILEY concluded.

United States Still Leads in Sponsoring the Dignity of Individual Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, before we are ready to sink completely into the depths of despair at the scientific progress of the Soviet Union, it may be well for us to ponder upon the thought expressed in the following article by William H. Stringer in Saturday's edition of the Christian Science Monitor. In the race to be the first in space, I hope we may never lose sight of the great strength in the moral concepts upon which this Nation was founded, the dignity and the freedom of man. In the final accounting this is the concept which will be victorious. No nation, nor group of nations, failing to recognize man's fundamental mission as a creature of God, can long endure:

LAUNCHING INDIVIDUAL MAN

(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON.—The Soviet Union has successfully launched an astronaut into orbit. It hasn't done much yet about according individual man his proper place in the universe.

This is said in no sense of disparagement at a tremendous feat. The Soviet achievement in placing a man in orbit, and bringing him back safely to earth in 108 minutes, is the result of brilliant progress in a direct line. The United States won't achieve the same for many months.

But it does no harm occasionally to ponder what is the ultimate aim and end of mankind's forward endeavors. If the object is to permit individual man to attain his fullest potential and promise in creation, then the Soviets are only at the launching pad of this soaring into the limitless.

To be sure, Soviet mankind has progressed far from the peasant stage in terms of limited opportunity, limited modest creature comforts, and special favors for the opportunist and sometimes the gifted, in the past 40-odd years. But the space yet to be traveled is evident in the fact that people in some of the newest-freed countries of Asia-Africa enjoy more individual liberty than do citizens of the Soviet Union.

The very conspiracy of silence—the heavy hand of secrecy—which brooded over the Soviet man-in-orbit achievement discloses the Soviet sense of limitation. Three days before the actual Moscow announcement, rumors flew about: that a man was in space—had been brought back—was mentally disturbed.

In a democracy, however fumbling, the facts and the explanation would be out in a few hours. In the case of the Soviet Union we do not know yet whether there was an abortive attempt—the Soviets usually have more than one rocket on the ready in case of failure—or whether the early leak was simply a malfunctioning of the massive Soviet publicity apparatus.

For weeks the new series of nuclear-test-ban negotiations has dragged on at Geneva. The Soviets have done little but insist on a stymying, stalemating veto. They are still fearful about admitting international inspection teams freely into their closed society.

On his American tour, Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev was surprised at the numerous automobiles, hastening home at night to the housing developments. He said the Soviets soon would have lots of automobiles too, but—they would be for hire, like taxis. Obviously if the state rents out the car it can even control the citizen's joy riding.

Still, the Soviet people have achieved some widening of horizon. Their desire for the better things of life, including housing and consumer goods, has risen rapidly. The next generation of leadership beyond Mr. Khrushchev may have an intellect somewhat pried open by events. The West's policy should be to inject as many freedom-seeking ideas into the Soviet consciousness as possible, through cultural exchange and contacts.

But except in dialogs with some Soviet scientists, one seldom sees evidence that the Soviets are given to pondering such deep concerns as "man's duty to God and to his neighbor," though Britain's Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, when I interviewed him 2 years ago, stated his belief that "in 2 or 3 generations the people of the Soviet Union will be asking themselves these fundamental questions."

The U.S. performance in moving toward launching a man into space has not always been superb. It has been fragmented and delayed. The Soviets have shown how to mobilize all resources for a great state-directed enterprise, as President Kennedy told his press conference.

This is not the whole of life. A Warsaw Marxist philosopher recently remarked that communism stands to lose "the struggle for the mind of man" unless its philosophy faces the problem of the human individual and his destiny.

Indeed, what a commotion in Kremlin circles would be occasioned if Pravda should print, with approval, such a simple yet profound statement as this from the Rockefeller panel reports:

"The power of the democratic idea rests in the belief that only freemen can ever really understand this complex world. Only freemen can manage its complexity, and only freemen can have the opportunity for the spiritual, moral, and intellectual growth that our times require."

There is a shining rocket that Moscow hasn't launched yet.

Bolstering U.S. Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. WILEY, Mr. President, the economy of the Nation—despite serious prob-

lems, including too high unemployment—is now showing signs of an upturn.

Full recovery, however, cannot be accomplished by wishful thinking; rather, it requires effective, creative action.

Recently, the Milwaukee Sentinel published an informative article outlining some recommendations by Elmer L. Winter. The recommendations include a 10-point program by which businessmen can undertake action to combat the recession.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, supplemented by a statement by myself on ways and means to bolster the economy, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

CITES TEN-POINT PLAN FOR ATTACK ON DIP

Businessmen were offered a 10-point antirecession program Wednesday by Elmer L. Winter, president of Manpower, Inc., Milwaukee-headquartered business service firm.

Winter declared businessmen can apply this program of stepped-up activity on a do-it-yourself basis, and that his own company will put it into effect immediately.

The program, which will be sent to over 5,000 major business leaders, was developed as the result of discussions at Manpower's recent 4-day sales convention here.

"Businessmen can, if they take individual initiative, materially aid in bringing about improved economic conditions which they desire," the Manpower president declared. "We should not rely solely on Government action to help bring us out of the recession.

"To prove that the company means to 'take its own medicine,' we are announcing a substantial budget increase in expenditures for advertising, sales promotion, and public relations; a plan for home office and branch office modernization, and the opening of three new offices a month."

Winter's 10-point program for business:

Expand all sales efforts, abandoning a wait-and-see attitude.

Expand research and development.

Step up advertising, public relations, and sales promotion.

Diversify product and service lines.

"Prepone" capital expenditures. Where plant modernization or equipment replacement is planned, but was postponed due to economic pressures, start these projects now, when availability of labor and money is more favorable.

Accelerate long-range investment and expansion.

Invest in educating tomorrow's experts. Supply scholarship and other financial needs of our institutions of higher learning.

Get into the export market.

Combat waste and extravagance.

Talk about positive factors and plans for action. Help spread attitudes that favor confidence. Back up your confidence with action which will help create employment and confidence.

SENATOR WILEY OUTLINES PROGRAM FOR BOLSTERING ECONOMY

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, today outlined recommendations for bolstering the economy:

"Regrettably, the Nation and Wisconsin are still suffering the plagues of unemployment and business and industrial slowdowns.

"Nationally, the unemployed totals about 5½ million. In Wisconsin, also, there are still too many jobless—amounting to about 117,000, or over 7 percent of the total labor force.

"Throughout the economy, there are serious repercussions, including: severe hardships for the unemployed and their families; economic progress generally is retarded; entire communities of especially high unemployment suffer because of lack of buying power of the jobless; Uncle Sam, too, feels the pinch in reduced revenue, both from the unemployed, and the diminished income of business and industries.

"A successful effort to attain full economic recovery will require local, State, and national cooperation.

"What is being done in Congress?

"Currently, a number of measures are being considered to give a 'shot-in-the-arm' to the economy. These include: stepping up highway construction; expanding housing and home building; extension of unemployment compensation benefits for the jobless whose benefits have expired; special legislation for chronically depressed areas, and other measures.

"In addition, steps have been taken to advance payments to veterans of 1961 dividends on national life insurance policies, and speed up procurement and construction of our Federal agencies.

"The State and local governments, also, could well speed up timetables for procurement and construction of public projects.

"What else can be done?

"Business and industry—as economically feasible—could well move up plans for plants and operational expansion.

"Communities can undertake self-help 'bootstrap' operations to revaluate potential human and natural resources and better utilize these to bolster the economy to meet the needs of the people.

"The creation of multicommunity cooperative programs—for pooling of manpower and natural resources—also can help to resolve problems and improve the economic outlook. The potentials of an area may be neither local nor State, but rather intercommunity or interstate. Pooling such manpower or resources on an area or regional basis often can result in more effective programs.

"We can establish a higher priority for "Buy American" policy in times of national economic distress.

"We can encourage wise investments of private business and public funds and job-creating enterprises. The purpose would be to promote further economic recovery, as well as to 'pay off' economically. Today, there are about $12 billion in financial savings by individuals; $33 billion in corporate pension funds; the total assets of life insurance companies amount to about $114 billion. One of the problems is to encourage the use of such funds in more productive investments; we need a reexamination of our tax system also to provide encouragement and incentive for expansion of job-creating enterprises.

"Can we successfully meet the challenge?

"Yes. Historically, our free enterprise system—a product of American ingenuity—has proved successful in dealing with these and other problems. I believe that we can do it again.

"Today, however, we are faced not only with the task of providing economic health for our people in the country, but also of competing with a powerful Communist bloc which threatens to bury us—this means economically, as well as militarily.

"In the face of this threat, a strong, sound economy is essential, not only for domestic progress, but also for survival," Seneator WILEY concluded.

Clarence F. Pautzke, Commissioner of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, an appointment of importance to Alaska and to the Nation was made recently by this administration when Mr. Clarence F. Pautzke was designated as Commissioner of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

The resources of my State are many but historically its fishery and wildlife resources have been the backbone of our economy. Throughout the years Alaska was an incorporated territory of the United States. Administration of these resources vested in the Federal Government—a procedure without parallel in the history of the country. We in Alaska pleaded and petitioned that this be changed; we felt there was insufficient action at the Federal level with respect to conservation measures. Our cries fell on deaf ears. We watched our magnificent resources, particularly the fishery, dwindle at an alarming rate year by year. Finally with the coming of statehood administration of these resources was turned over to us and we are now faced with the task of restoration.

So we in Alaska are, indeed, fortunate in having Mr. Pautzke placed in a position with the Federal Government which will have the most to do in assisting us in our rehabilitation job. Mr. Pautzke has served for the past few months with our State department of fish and game and has had opportunity to learn and observe right on the scene that which needs to be done. Prior to coming to Alaska Mr. Pautzke was associated for many years with the Washington State Department of Game and Fisheries.

Alaskans would have been happy to have had Mr. Pautzke remain with the State government but we realize his Washington assignment will be even more rewarding.

The Pacific Fisherman noted its enthusiastic endorsement of Mr. Pautzke's new assignment in its lead editorial in the April 1961 issue. The editorial points out so clearly many of the qualifications which Mr. Pautzke brings to his new task that I ask that the editorial in full text be reproduced here.

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

[From the Pacific Fisherman, April 1961]

PAUTZKE APPOINTMENT SEEN AS U.S. PLEDGE TO ALASKA

National interest in the fishery and wildlife resources of Alaska was confirmed late in March with the appointment of Clarence

F. Pautzke to the position of Commissioner of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

No action of the White House could more plainly demonstrate the Federal Government's intent to recognize its obligation to Alaska to continue its support of and participation in the rehabilitation of the fisheries which, through the territorial period of Alaska's history, were the responsibility of the U.S. Department of the Interior.

Now, to head its Fish and Wildlife Service, the Department of the Interior reaches out to Alaska and appoints the man who for a year has been Assistant Director of its Department of Fish and Game.

Far better than any other of the several competent individuals who were considered for the FAWS commissionership, Mr. Pautzke will bring to the office firsthand knowledge of the problems of Alaska's fisheries, of the State's needs in coping with those problems, and—most significant of all—an understanding of the value of Alaska's resources to the economy and future not only of the State but of the United States as a whole.

Again, Mr. Pautzke stands high above all others who were under consideration in the balance of his experience and background between commercial fisheries on the one hand and sport fisheries and wildlife on the other. The Federal Service has these two basic departments—and he is well qualified to have both under his supervision.

To his duties he brings approximately 25 years of background as chief fisheries biologist of the Washington Department of Game, where he became nationally known for his work in upbuilding steelhead runs and improving sport fishing by the eradication of coarse fish competitors and predators from sport fishing waters which they had ruined.

To this experience with game fish, and as a naturalist, he added 4 years of service as assistant director of the Washington Department of Fisheries; and then his service in Alaska.

Last summer, during the extraordinary run of red salmon to Bristol Bay, Mr. Pautzke was continuously in the field working with the ADF management team whose handling of the run won, and deserved, the highest praise. It was characteristic of the man that he was in fact only a member of the team, and saw to it that the prime credit went to those with whom he worked.

Mr. Pautzke can be counted upon to meet fully all the requirements of his high office, representing well the United States in matters pertaining to its fisheries and wildlife resources, whether they be in the direct authority of the States, in the national field, or in the international regions of sea and air.

In selecting Clarence Pautzke, an Alaskan, for this responsibility, the National Government would appear to be assuring Alaska that the United States recognizes its responsibilities to Alaskan fish and wildlife resources and will continue to support efforts at their rehabilitation, through the State itself, as well as on the high seas.

Dr. Thomas Dooley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER H. DOMINICK
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, there are now pending before the Congress at least three bills to authorize the awarding of the Congressional Medal of Honor to the late Dr. Thomas Dooley in recognition of his unselfish devotion to human service. Four pending resolutions also would authorize the striking of a gold medal in lasting memory of Dr. Dooley's service to humanity. I wish to state that I, too, support these worthwhile proposals. The memory of Dr. Dooley carved in the hearts of people everywhere is well stated in a letter I recently received, and which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SISTERS OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE,
New York, N.Y., April 14, 1961.

Hon. PETER H. DOMINICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the last and present sessions of Congress, bills were introduced to commemorate the gallant and courageous young physician recently lost to us, Dr. Thomas Dooley. His magnificant accomplishments were the result of a challenge willingly accepted, when during naval duty he witnessed the plight of so many refugees fleeing the Communist aggressor. In answer to this challenge, he imposed upon himself a ruthless program of self-dedication to his fellow man. No one who learned of his tireless labors in the Far East, on the very threshhold of the Communist-infested world, could help but marvel at his determination, zeal, initiative, mercy, and compassion. He gave of himself with the recklessness of infatuation, even later when the prospect of an early death by cancer dogged his footsteps. We cannot afford to forget heroism of this kind.

I beg you to do what is in your power to bring these bills to an early acceptance, so that our Nation may pay tribute to one of its heroic and outstanding citizens.

May I hear favorably from you?

Thanking you.

Very sincerely,

SISTER M. LUCILLA.

Curb Is Needed on Rifle Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Springfield Union, Springfield, Mass., of April 18, 1961. The editorial urges hastening of a decision by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization on the problem of the importing of surplus military rifles which are rejuvenated and sold in competition with American-made small arms. I have joined with other Congressmen from Massachusetts, New York, and Connecticut in urging a decision on this matter.

The editorial follows:

[From the Springfield Union, Apr. 18, 1961]

CURB IS NEEDED ON RIFLE IMPORTS

New England has long been the center of the American small firearms industry. Now, this industry, which plays a vital role in the region's economy, is threatened by an increasing number of imported surplus military rifles which are "sporterized" to sell for far less than the fine sporting guns manufactured by New England companies.

Over the past decade, hundreds of jobs have been lost because of this competition. Unless action is taken immediately to curb these imports, more workers will be laid off and another blow dealt to a suffering New England economy.

There is another important factor to consider. The arms manufacturers, particularly in Massachusetts and Connecticut, have been one of the mainstays of the Nation's defense. In every national emergency, the industry has provided the nucleus of manpower and engineering skill that made it possible for other industries to mass-produce rifles on a crash basis. The workers laid off by the industry because of the imports are workers with special skills in rifle-making.

For almost 2 years a petition for relief against such imports has been pending at the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. Imports numbered 232,000 in 1959. Since then they have increased to 360,000 a year—40 times the rate of 1955. At the same time, domestic production of small arms has dropped 32 percent.

The seriousness of the situation has led a bipartisan group of 15 Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York to petition the OCDM to put a limitation on these imports. Among the petitioners were Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, Representative SILVIO O. CONTE, Republican, Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND, Democrat, and Senator BENJAMIN A. SMITH II, Democrat, all of Massachusetts.

The lawmakers assert that surplus imports make no defense contribution, have no defense capacity, contribute nothing to the economies of the exporting nations, and are not important in the nations' balance of payments. Moreover, they argue, surplus military rifles are not part of the normal channel of international trade.

We feel that the only contribution the imports make is to give people an opportunity to buy rifles for a few dollars. This contribution is far outweighed by the threat the imports pose to the New England economy.

One of the companies affected by the imports is Savage Arms Corp. of Westfield. Company officials have become so concerned they have asked employees to write letters supporting their Senators and Congressmen in the petition move.

The OCDM has delayed long enough. It should act immediately to control the flow of these imported rifles into this country.

Criticism of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Adm. Hyman G. Rickover remains one of the most stimulating and challenging figures on the American education scene. His forthright criticism of the state of our education has unquestionably served a great purpose by bringing the entire issue to the forefront of public discussion.

A searching article on Admiral Rickover, written by James D. Koerner, appeared in the Saturday Review of April 15. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

MOVERS AND SHAPERS OF EDUCATION—ADMIRAL RICKOVER: GADFLY

(By James D. Koerner)

Professional educators may not have shared the general enthusiasm accorded the recent action of the Secretary of the Navy—taken at the personal instigation, it is said, of President Kennedy—in retaining Admiral Rickover on active duty beyond the Navy's normal retirement age. For in recent years Vice Adm. Hyman George Rickover, by virtue of his speeches and writings on education, has clearly dislodged Arthur Bestor as the most unloved figure in the eyes of America's educational administrators. They doubtless would like nothing better than to retire him to an obscure island served twice a year by a packet boat.

Even those inured to educational quarrels are often surprised by the venom with which professional educators are apt to deal with Rickover, whose role in education is now so charged with controversy and adhominem argument as to preclude anything like a dispassionate appraisal of him by schoolmen. Take, for example, the public labeling of Rickover, by a Columbia University Teachers College professor, as "a jackass." To many Americans, as well as to visitors from abroad, where Rickover is widely known and highly regarded, there is something more than incongruous in such "professional" behavior.

All this is regrettable. Rickover's ideas, though hardly infallible, are interesting and substantial. They are also influential. While he may be anathema to many professionals, his book, "Education and Freedom," which has recently gone into a paperback edition, as well as his other writings, have attracted a large following among the public, the press, and teachers.

If to be a mover and a shaper of education is to bring a first-class mind to the study of this subject for a period of many years, to bring forth viable and original ideas for public discussion, to command a large national audience, to testify before congressional committees considering educational legislation, to create a large and unique educational operation of one's own (which Rickover has done in the schools of the naval reactor program, now enrolling nearly 2,000 students), and to recognize the exigencies of our national welfare and their total dependence upon education—and to speak without compromise to this point, knowing that misinterpretations, distortions, and personal calumnies will follow—if to do these things is to be a mover of American education, Rickover qualifies, whether or not one approves of him.

When asked about his reaction to the professionals' criticisms, Rickover replies: "I never try to answer these people or set the record straight. It's useless, and I haven't time."

It is plain enough that Rickover's manner of writing and speaking invites much of the hostility he encounters. His prose is forthright, blunt, exaggerated on occasions, even inflammatory. It reflects the nature of Rickover and of the job he thinks must be done in education. It may also reflect the fact that he has lived a long time with what one of his closest friends call "a pack of snarling wolves" harassing his every move.

Rickover's hands would seem to be rather full already (10 to 12 hours a day, 7 days a week) with his main job of directing the naval reactor program, the joint enterprise of the Navy and the Atomic Energy Commission that has been so magnificently successful. Why, then, did he embroil himself in the educational controversy?

To Rickover the answer is obvious: It is his duty, as it is that of every American in a position of leadership, to bring the facts of our critical situation to public attention; and that leads inexorably to education.

Central to everything Rickover feels about contemporary education is a passionate conviction that the West is only dimly aware, even after 15 cold war years, of the mortal challenge that confronts it from communism. The response of the free world must, in Rickover's view, be a total one. Thus he sees most problems, especially education, in relation to this ultimate one. Yet the response he sees us offering is chiefly one of apathy. The body politic seems to him fatally corpulent, awash in its own lard, consumer-conscious, pleasure-bent, sharing few worthy purposes, oblivious alike to its own sloth and to approaching disaster.

From this paramount theme, Rickover moves on to others, but always to return to the same concern: education. With an intensity that would warm the heart of Teddy Roosevelt or Gifford Pinchot, he points to the outrageous waste of our nonrenewable natural resources, and to the fact that when they are gone in only a few more years, a jaded consumer public will have to look to its scientists, perhaps with no luck, for substitutes; it will have to look, that is, to education. He points to the dangerously long lead times characteristic of American technology and to the highly unfavorable way in which they compare, and will compare, with Russia's; the only answer for the United States is education. He points to a myriad of ignoramuses that festoon our bureaucracies, that disguise stupidity with pomposity, and that hamstring vital enterprises in numberless ways because they are men without vision or appropriate training, because they are men who do not know, and do not know that they do not know; again, what other answer than education? He points to the conspicuous lack of leadership in high places, to the general fear of the innovator, the outsider, the nonconformist, to the absence of creative energy and original thought in major areas of our national life; the answer is education.

But not just any education. The education Rickover is talking about is as tough-minded and astringent as he himself is. Believing that men now use only a fraction of their intellectual capacities, he wants them trained to make far greater demands upon themselves. His is an education that would subordinate all other functions to the central one of developing the student's mind. It would do this, not by working comfortably within the student's presumed limitations and thus assuring him of success—a pedagogical principle that seems to Rickover as absurd as it is universal—but by a curriculum of basic subjects that goes well beyond the student's grasp, that he can never wholly master, that keeps him stretching and stretching, but that has a built-in system of incentives and rewards for partial success.

He would permit nothing to stand in the way of this kind of education for everybody, except the mentally defective, for it is only by this means that we can hope to raise the level of our national life in every area; and this is the job Rickover believes we must do if we are to survive as a free people. "The business of the school," he says, "can no longer be with social adjustment, emotional security, entertainment, or even with character. Such matters, if they are teachable, belong to the home, the church, or the family doctor. The school has the child only one-sixth of his waking hours in any calendar year. Therefore, let it concentrate on the job it alone can do: develop the intellectual equipment of every child to its maximum point, and let it never underestimate that point."

But what if the home and church and other agencies do not take on these responsibilities? Who will do so if not the school? When asked such questions, Rickover replies: "What if I am born lame, or blind? Or grow up with any of a thousand other handicaps that might come my way merely by being alive? Some problems, in this imperfect world, are still unsolved. The problem of ignorant or irresponsible parents, most of whom, by the way, have now been through our public schools themselves, may be one of them."

Rickover's own education began in Chicago, to which his father, a tailor, had immigrated early in the century. He graduated from the public schools with a decent, though far from ideal, educational foundation, and went to the Naval Academy in 1918, because it afforded him an education he could not otherwise have had. He did 2 years of graduate engineering work in 1927–28, earning a master's degree from Columbia. Between then and the Second World War, he served in various assignments as engineering officer and qualified submariner. During the war he rode herd—rather roughly, so they say—on civilian contractors of naval electronic equipment. In 1946 he spent a year in graduate work in nuclear physics and reactor engineering at Oak Ridge. He was instrumental in setting up the Oak Ridge School of Reactor Technology and in organizing the first course in nuclear engineering at MIT.

Rickover's interest in educational reform dates from about 1947, when he began the long search for technical personnel to join the reactor program. It was a frustrating search, not because he failed to find people with a thorough knowledge of the new fields in which he was working, which was only to be expected, but because of the far more serious failure to find men whose fundamental education and cast of mind were such as to allow them to contribute productively to a new and vital engineering adventure. He was looking for men equipped with what he believes a good educational system ought to provide the Nation in quantity: a restless, probing, critical intelligence of considerable precision operating from a base of solid knowledge of the fundamental fields. Finding few such minds among the thousands of young men he considered for the program, Rickover began to ask questions about our schools, and began a study of them that has occupied most of his spare time for the last dozen years.

In his analysis of American education and how it got where it is, Rickover puts the primary responsibility for its deficiencies where the professional educator is also wont to put it, squarely on the American public. Preoccupied with their creature comforts—so much at conflict with the vein of asceticism that runs through Rickover's make-up—being blessed with an incredibly rich continent to ravish and exploit, and finding that, unlike people in the Old World, they could make money and acquire prestige and power without much formal education, Americans naturally developed a culture based on these values. Where the professional educator failed, and continues to fail, is in offering the public nothing better, in having no more wisdom than the ordinary layman and exhibiting no intellectual leadership, in actively sharing and even encouraging the slovenliness of the public mind. The inevitable result, Rickover feels, is a pervasive educational hedonism that we wallow in today.

In constructing specific proposals for reform, Rickover often gets ideas from his study of European education. He believes we have no choice but to take cognizance of what other advanced nations, particularly Russia, are able to achieve in the basic fields (such as Russia's ability to get half its students through the ten-year school), and either match or surpass it. This is as obvious to Rickover as it is odious to professional educators, who, in his opinion, have deliberately enshrouded the whole subject

of European education in a fog of meaningless verbiage. "Again," he says heatedly, "they quibble and fulminate over trifles while refusing to face the main facts about where we stand in the international marketplace of brains."

On other important questions, Rickover feels, for example, that the greatest barrier to improvement now, aside from the professionals themselves, is the lack of national scholastic standards, which he would like to see established, even if only for voluntary use, in all the basic subjects and for two or three clearly defined levels of high school diplomas. With respect to the recommendations of James Bryant Conant, he feels that, although Conant has possibly done some good for the superior student, he is dead wrong on the comprehensive high school; for Rickover is convinced that its leveling influence socially, which Conant makes much of, is only superficial, while its leveling influence academically is deep and inescapable. On the question of humanistic education in relation to technical, his position is not as one-sided as is widely assumed. He would place great stress on English history, and foreign languages, and even, if possible, on classical studies, though he knows this would be hard to sell. "I have had much experience," he says, "with the narrow specialist that we often produce through our present system of education and am hardly interested in aggravating the situation. Besides, these are not two different kinds of education. The need is not for more of one or less of the other, at least not at the public school level, since together they make up the educational foundation needed by everyone in the present age; the need is for raising the level of every basic subject all along the line."

Everything that Rickover feels we must do in education depends ultimately on the teacher. He knows that the level of teacher candidates, of teacher education, and teacher performance in the classroom would have to go up almost vertically to bring into view the goals he is talking about. Knowing that such improvements are a matter of many years' work, he would make a start in this direction now by pegging the financial incentives of teaching so high, for demonstrated ability, that the ablest people could not afford not to teach. If this turned out to mean paying them more than truckdrivers, rock-'n'-roll singers, or bank presidents, so be it; he would take the money from almost anywhere, especially from the nonacademic expenditures of school systems, but even from the Defense Establishment if necessary.

Moreover, teachers, not administrators, would run education. Rickover reserves his greatest scorn for the ill-educated nonteaching school administrator, whom he finds both endemic and ubiquitous. Having studied the administrative mind in many settings, Rickover believes that its disabilities in education are inherent. It suffers by nature from all the inertia of entrenched orthodoxy and fear of change, is generally insulated from matters upon which it makes crucial decisions, is richly encrusted with many kinds of ignorance, and withal is perhaps the most expendable item in education. One feels that, if he could, Rickover would hitch school administrators to the *Nautilus* and tow them all out to sea, but he contents himself with recommending their displacement by practicing teachers.

In assessing Rickover's opinions on all these matters, one should not confuse vigor with dogmatism, for without a good deal of the former and little of the latter, Rickover could never have achieved what everyone assured him could never be achieved in nuclear power. He insists on his right to make educational judgments, to judge American schools by their results, and to criticize schoolmen, who are public officials paid out of taxes, when they botch their job. He will go right on making judgments, of course, and propounding ideas, for it is a duty he could not well put aside if he would. And it seems clear that an increasing audience, both public and professional, will listen to this rather austere and hopelessly inner-directed man, this Jeremiah whose lamentations preach greater personal responsibility, worthier aims, higher performance at every level, this unadjusted moralist who doesn't own a car, whose sartorial habits would be the despair of any Ivy League haberdasher, who isn't interested in money, who, in directing a crucial defense enterprise spending hundreds of millions of dollars, travels economy fare to save taxpayer dollars, who never accepts money for personal use from his speeches or writings but always assigns it to charities, usually those for children; who in short is a commanding if somewhat raucous voice of urgency and conscience in the land.

The University Presidency in Modern Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most tantalizing and challenging speeches to cross the academic horizon recently was given by Dr. Fred M. Hechinger, distinguished education editor of the New York Times. The occasion was the Founders' Day banquet in Boston honoring Dr. Harold C. Case on his 10th anniversary as president of Boston University.

Dr. Hechinger's address is well worth sharing with my colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert it in the RECORD:

THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENCY IN MODERN SOCIETY

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

"This may be one of the most important decades of the century. In it, the future trend of mankind on this planet may be determined. The decision is now being made, and the issue is whether the democratic societies have the will and the self-discipline, the creativity and the energy, necessary to do the things required to win for the world a full triumph of the way of independence and freedom."

Ladies and gentlemen, these are not my words, though I wish they were. These are the words of the man I am privileged to help honor tonight. President Case wrote them last year after his return from Africa. Their question and their challenge stand as urgently today, and we must find the answers and the strength to give the answers.

The time we live in is—gloriously perhaps, or perhaps tragically—a time of terrible decisions. Will we be strong enough? Perhaps, if we were less well off materially, perhaps if our society were less affluent and our lives less comfortable, it might in many ways be easier for us to rise to the occasion. It is easy, when you are well off, to think that a little charity is enough when sacrifice is really needed.

And yet—whether we admit it or not—hard and harsh demands confront us. If we fail, everything we cherish, including our comforts, will vanish. And so—it was never more obvious that today that our fate will in large measure be determined by the forcefulness and the honesty of our leadership.

Having said this, I have plainly stated tonight's theme: "The University Presidency in Modern Society." What is the university today, if not the heart and the brain of our efforts? If this had not been clear before last November, it ought to be self-evident now—even to the man in the street who has heard and told the jokes about (if you will pardon the reference) President Pusey's difficulty of competing with the job offers sent out by one of the members of his board of overseers.

Let's not make any mistake about it: the role of the universities in the life of our Nation is no joking matter—and if you look down the whole long roster, it is easy to see that this is not a Harvard monopoly. Perhaps the fact alone that the U.S. Government at present employs more Ph. D's than the 10 leading universities combined tells the most significant story.

Only a few years ago, it was still legitimate to argue whether or not the university ought to be part of the Nation's action programs. There were many who wanted to preserve and protect the academic oasis, or the ivory tower. There were some who thought that the small, preferably secluded ivy-covered campuses, by educating a privileged few, could give the country all the brainpower it needed, all the leadership it sought.

We know today that these are no longer even questions for debate. We know that the commitment of the universities to the Nation's and mankind's future is not an option but a duty. We know that all over the country the skyscrappers of learning will rise as, under President Case's stewardship, they are rising here in Boston.

And we are beginning to realize that, in order to mobilize our academic communities, we must look to academic leadership—and that means the college presidents.

The American people are rediscovering the meaning of, and the need for, leadership. The spectacle of leadership abused, first, by fascism and, then, by communism has misled the American public and even many of the politicians into believing that leadership itself is a dirty word. We have drifted, both in Government and in much of our institutional life, including the universities, into a substitution of Government by committee for Government through genuine leadership.

Recently and rightfully, there has been much criticism of so-called nonbooks, nonplays and, I might add, nonspeeches. These are the books, plays, and speeches which are written, not by authors but by reflectors of public demand. They are not art but artificial. They are not written but pasted up. To them we might add, in the same category but far more dangerous to our future, the nonleaders. Like the nonbooks, they are pasteups. Instead of having their eyes on the future, they have their ear to the ground.

"Committees can do a valuable job to provide facts and evidence—both essential to leadership. The democratic process of voting approval or disapproval needs no defense. But the essentials of leadership are in the courage and decisiveness to use the committees' facts, without hiding behind them, and to take action, without waiting for a vote. The leader worthy of the name acts bodly, with the mandate the voters have given him, and faces the voters boldly, on the basis of his action when his term is up.

"These rules apply to academic leadership as much as they do to politics. It is a misinterpretation of academic realities and of academic freedom to picture the college president as nothing more than a high-class beggar whose job it is to bring home the money while his faculty runs the show. He

is, or ought to be, the institution's leader both to the outside world and on his campus.

"Does that mean the college president tells his faculty what to teach, or how? This is as absurd a deduction as it would be to imply that the political leader tells people how to live or what to say and think. Quite to the contrary, one of the prime functions of the academic leader is to defend his teachers against any intrusion of their freedom to teach, to think, to write and to research. It was during the shameful period of McCarthyism that the academic leaders were put most effectively to the test—the test that separated the leaders from the nonleaders.

"But this does not imply that the college president should only be taken out of the mothballs when there is an attack from the outside to be fought off. The campus is constantly in need of leadership. It is a ludicrously sentimentalized picture that shows the academic community as a harmonious example of idyllic democracy. In fact, the groves of academe more often resemble nothing quite as much as the rank-conscious, backbiting, and protocol-minded life on any army post. One of the priorities of true academic leadership is to transform the atmosphere and the objectives from one of an intellectual barracks into a community of scholars."

Today, as never before, the college president must shape the future of the university. The demands and the offers come from many directions. The Government—from the Pentagon to the Treasury—needs the active cooperation of the universities. The foundations could not hope to accomplish their many vital missions, if they could not call on the researchers, the consultants, the teams, and the laboratories of the universities. Industry would be doomed to obsolescence, if the scholars could not feed the machines—in fact, give birth to them in the first place.

Amid all those demands, what could be more mistaken than the view of the college president as the beggar, hat-in-hand. In modern society, if the universities are to rise to the challenge, the presidential leadership must make it clear that society depends far more on the favors to be bestowed by the universities than vice versa. Today, the Federal Government spends well over a billion dollars in direct contracts—not grants—with the universities.

I repeat—these are not grants, even though they are often so misnamed. They are contracts for indispensable service rendered, and I am willing to guarantee that any industrial or profit-making organization (if it could carry out any of those contracts at all) would charge many times as much for its services. Can you imagine what an industrial organization would get for, say, a Los Alamos or the work produced by a university center of African studies?

It is time for the university presidents to make this unmistakably clear. It is time for them to leave no doubt in anyone's mind that their institutions are giving service, not asking for charity. It is time, too, that they stop giving the impression of being ready to grab whatever dollars might come their way. One of the basic functions of leadership is to make absolutely certain that the image of the institution it leads is enhanced, not cheapened.

This applies to the university presidents' relationship with foundations as much as it applies to Government contracts. In the past, there has been far too much groveling and bootlicking. One of the curses of weak leadership is lack of self-respect and lack of reliance in the strength of the institution. Naturally, that strength must be real. In the negotiations with foundations, the same principle applies as the one made famous, in diplomacy, by Dean Acheson: the negotiating must be done from "positions of strength."

This is not to imply that the foundations are the enemy camp. On the contrary: the foundations—to defend their own purposes and live up to their commitments—must rely heavily on the true quality of the universities with whom they deal. Their money is only as good as the use the university leadership makes of it. And this is why it is more vital than ever for that leadership to approach the foundations proudly, with bold plans and independent proposals.

The charge is often repeated that foundations frequently support insignificant schemes. If this is so, then the fault is with university leadership at least as much as with the foundations. It is the duty of the academic world to map out the roads to the future, not to dream up projects to get around foundation vice presidents. And it is the inescapable duty of college presidents to make certain that their departments and faculties are kept from being kept. Integrity must be both inspired and enforced by the man on top.

At the risk of sounding trite and conventional, I want to say that the university president's task is to be a "spokesman." By this I do not mean to say that he ought to be the kind of creature which modern society too often pictures as a "spokesman." Not the press agent. Not the man who reads a testimonial from a teleprompter. Not the booster nor the apologist. We have too much of all of those, and we have too many academic representatives who are not far from telling us that their college teaches good like a college should.

No—when I ask the college president to be a spokesman, I want him to speak for higher education—not for his institutional interest. I want him to help tell the country what, specifically, must be done if 10 years from now we must educate 6 million college students annually, instead of 3½ million now. I want him to debate the question of how to increase the annual production of only 9,000 Ph. D.'s—without lowering standards, indeed, probably by, at the same time, raising them. I want him to come to grips with the vital educational debates and controversies and not wait until they sneak up on an unsuspecting public.

It is almost impossible today to listen to an academic discussion without some reference to the great and fundamental problem of C. P. Snow's "Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution." My question is: Why was it necessary to rediscover Sir Charles—very late in the game, indeed—in order to get this devastatingly vital question on the national agenda? Where were the college presidents? This is the kind of question, this is the kind of search for solutions for which we should be able to look to the university presidents.

More than ever before, we must in the future look to the presidents to represent all of higher education, not fragments of it; not special interests but the future of mankind. They must not hide behind the excuse of institutional diversity; they must instead bring into focus the many facets of higher education to make it shine like a diamond rather than splinter into fragments like tinted glass.

These are harsh demands. I would not make them, if I did not hold the importance of the university presidency in high esteem. I would not dare to list these demands here tonight, were we not assembled to honor a man who has, in action, demonstrated what the presidency can be made to mean.

And with everything I have said so far, I have not even hinted at that new and terribly urgent dimension of the presidency: the university's relationship with the rest of the world.

The task of the university president is, or should be, clear. To begin with—before we even look at the active work to be accomplished abroad—here is a terribly urgent example of the need of leadership beyond the individual institutions. How can we stave off defeat and avoid self-destruction, unless the university presidents—as spokesmen of reason and enlightenment, yes, of simple self-preservation, too—will rally all their own colleagues across the Nation to wipe out that madness of racism at home which is certain to haunt and defeat us abroad. I am sufficiently aware of folly and ignorance in all of us to forgive the uneducated for their prejudice and bigotry. I cannot forgive, however, academic leaders, not even in the deepest South, for such ignorance. And I consider it the duty of the academic leadership, everywhere to make it their business to educate not only their own undergraduates but also their distant colleagues.

Only if they do so, will they have the hope to fulfill effectively the vast commitments which American universities now face all over the world. With nearly 40 countries now the recipients of American aid, directly with the International Cooperation Administration, the demand for excellence, service, and devotion has become a worldwide rather than a national challenge for American higher education. This makes the university presidency an office of supreme international importance and responsibility.

I prefaced what I tried to say tonight with President Case's own eloquent words. I should like now to let President Case supply the closing words as well. He wrote them after he saw the desperate need for compassion, understanding, and action on another continent last year. They tell what needs to be told—for the university presidency and for all of us who look to leadership:

"If we can discipline ourselves to do hard work in behalf of mankind's future, to act from principle, not out of the demands of expediency; if we can become known because of our absorption with people, not payola; with issues, not filibusters; then we can make an unprecedented contribution to the underdeveloped countries, and in the process, find our own quality of freedom."

The Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the eighth grade students of Our Lady of Sorrows School in South Orange, N.J., have decided not to wait until they are old enough to enlist in the Peace Corps. They are forming one of their own right now.

A United Press article in the April 17 issue of the Record (Hackensack, N.J.) describes this effort and the part that Representative HUGH ADDONIZIO has had in transmitting the good wishes of the President of the United States to this group.

Representative ADDONIZIO and the good students of Our Lady of Sorrows School are to be congratulated for their direct and immediate response to a people-to-people challenge. I ask unanimous consent to have the article entitled "South Orange Eighth Graders Form a Junior

Peace Corps" inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also ask, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD a portion of a television transcript of April 2. Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, had at that time some very interesting comments about a peace corps on the homefront, too.

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

SOUTH ORANGE EIGHTH GRADERS FORM A JUNIOR PEACE CORPS—PAROCHIAL STUDENTS' PLAN HAS WON THE APPROVAL OF PRESIDENT

SOUTH ORANGE, April 17.—The eighth grade students of Our Lady of Sorrows School have come up with their own version of President Kennedy's Peace Corps—they plan to exchange correspondence with foreign students.

PRESIDENT'S BEST WISHES

The project, which they've tabbed a Junior Peace Corps, has already won the approval of the President himself. Representative HUGH ADDONIZIO Democrat, of New Jersey, this weekend relayed to the students and their faculty President Kennedy's best wishes.

"The President has asked me to thank you for your letter suggesting creation of a Junior Peace Corps composed of American schoolchildren who would exchange correspondence with students in other countries," the Congressman wrote.

"The President was very glad to hear of the interest expressed by your young constituents in furthering good relations abroad and sends his best wishes for the success of their project."

ADDONIZIO said the students, their teacher, Sister Martina, and their principal, Sister Eileen Cecilia, had submitted the letters to his office to be relayed to pen pals of similar age overseas.

ADDONIZIO said he had turned the letters over to Mrs. Martha Archer, chairman of the letterwriting committee of the people-to-people program at the World Affairs Center, University of Minnesota. The program is under the direction of the U.S. Information Agency.

The Congressman said Mrs. Archer will be glad to advise the students and help them get their project under way.

"The students and faculty of Our Lady of Sorrows School have performed an important service in helping focus attention on this means by which American schoolchildren may express goodwill to the other peoples of the world and increase mutual understanding in the Nation's efforts to establish an honorable, just and lasting peace," he added.

Senator WILLIAMS. Len Detlor, do you have a question?

LEN DETLOR. Yes, sir. Up to this point we've been considering the young people working abroad, and I was wondering if you could foresee any possibility of the Peace Corps people being used domestically, perhaps in a problem such as migrant labor.

Senator WILLIAMS. The President has suggested that this program of people-to-people assistance with knowledge, information on helping those who need help, could be adapted to some of our domestic problems and some of our domestic hardship. I can see it in the area of migrant labor particularly in the creation of social centers in areas where these folks come in—they're not accepted in the community, they live isolated lives in their very wretched camp towns, you see. There is nothing for them of a wholesome nature to enjoy. I could think of this as a real possibility. I believe Mr. Shriver has addressed himself to this suggesting however that it was not part of this Peace Corps. It is not your program, I mean, it's not being considered in your division, your department—is it?

Mr. SHRIVER. Not at this time. But the idea, I agree with Senator WILLIAMS, is a good idea and it is under study, I know. Perhaps something good will come out of it, and a definite plan. One thing is, and it would help to answer your question in a sense, because anybody who is willing to do that kind of work here, would be a very good person for the Peace Corps overseas. It would be a very good proof of the sincerity of their purpose.

Senator WILLIAMS. I wonder if I could ask a general question of our students. The first reaction as I saw it in about five or six college campuses to which I went after the President advanced this program, was magnificent. Young people responded. I know at Princeton, 230 seniors were recently asked about the Peace Corps. Eighty-four percent thought it was a fine idea and 20 percent indicated an interest in applying as volunteers in the Peace Corps. What has been the reaction at George Washington and at Smith and at American?

LEN DETLOR. I can answer for my school. I know that there are a great many students who are giving serious and detailed study to this program. They realize, I think, because of the great number of foreign students there that they have contact with, that this is not going to be a vacation and they have showed a real and serious consideration and almost a dedication to this idea.

Teenage Crime Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an important editorial which appeared in the Lawrence Sunday Sun, Lawrence, Mass., on April 16, 1961:

TEENAGE CRIME INCREASES

"Today, youthful criminality poses a critical threat to the future of our Nation. The destiny of America lies in the hands of our young people." These are the solemn words of the one man who should know this threat of serious danger, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover.

Speaking before the National Forum on Youth Crime, attended by Federal and State police from all over the Nation at New York City a few days ago, the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation further revealed the startling information that teenagers account for one-half of the burglary and larceny arrests in the United States and nearly two-thirds for auto thefts. And their rate of participation in more serious crimes—assault, robbery, rape, and murder—is steadily rising.

Preoccupied with the pursuit of wealth and pleasures, parents seem to have lost touch with our basic traditions—work, discipline, duty, honor, and faith.

"If this Nation is to survive," warns Hoover, "we must enlighten and train our youngsters to revere more the spiritual concepts which are the real sinews of greatness."

Youths who participated in a panel discussion, following the talks, cited neighborhood environment and bad companionship as two major reasons for youth crime.

In Lawrence, as practically everywhere else, teenage vandalism and more serious crimes such as stealing cars, breaking and entering and robbery have increased greatly in recent years. The willful disregard for public property, damaging school and municipal buildings, city swimming pools, has been demonstrated many times by fractious, errant, irresponsible youngsters.

These acts later lead to more flagrant violations showing an avowed disregard for respect for the law and authority. This is what has been generally classified today as juvenile delinquency. Hoover says: "This is youthful criminality, refer to the gangs in larger cities who commit vicious acts of vandalism, wanton brutality and mounting savagery, which typify today's arrogant teenage gangs."

It presents a serious problem for parents, teachers, clergymen, and citizens in general how to combat this wave of crime and vandalism. Some say, more clubs like youth service centers, boys' clubs, promotion of more sports for youths all season around to get them off the streets * * * to absorb and liquidate their youthful enthusiasm and unbridled energies. This is the matter for service clubs and other agencies to consider and promote. Something must be done to curb the continuing growing teenage crime wave.

National Conference on State Parks Endorses President Kennedy's National Resources Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, during a recent meeting here in Washington, the officers and board of directors of the National Conference of State Parks approved President Kennedy's objectives as outlined to the Congress in his special message concerning "Our Natural Resources."

Mr. Frank D. Quinn, of Austin, who is chairman of the board of the National Conference on State Parks, and an official of the Texas State Parks Board, has called to my attention an excellent report on this group's meeting. It was written by Dora A. Padgett, executive secretary of the National Conference on State Parks, and was published in the March 1961 issue of Park Maintenance magazine. It is an excellent report on the work of this group and its interest and work in coordination with the national conservation efforts.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The National Conference on State Parks: Its History and Its Future," by Dora A. Padgett.

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

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STATE PARKS: ITS HISTORY, ITS FUTURE

(By Dora A. Padgett)

The National Conference on State Parks is the only national organization devoted exclusively to the promotion of State parks. Its purpose is to foster a broad, bold, nation-

wide movement for proper research, planning, acquistion, development, conservation, and use of State parks and related types of open spaces and nonurban recreation resources—both land and water.

These are accomplished by (1) cooperating with government and private agencies, (2) serving as a clearinghouse for information through publications, conferences, and other educational means, (3) developing professional leadership in the administration of State parks and related areas, and (4) encouraging interpretation of the country's scenic, scientific, and historical features—all to the end that every citizen shall appreciate the value of State parks, recreation areas, and open spaces.

The National Conference on State Parks was organized as a result of a meeting of conservation leaders at Des Moines, Iowa, called at the suggestion of Stephen T. Mather, then Director of the National Park Service. Mather recognized that national parks should be supplemented by State parks and he pledged the cooperation of the National Park Service in a variety of ways.

From the outset Mather, Judge John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior, and Col. Richard Lieber, director of the Indiana Department of Conservation, were in accord on the principal objectives of the conference. They guided the conference ship of state through the early years, on the principle that each State should preserve typical State scenery in reservations large enough to provide for their enjoyment by visitors without destruction of the features they were created to protect. To this, Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., in his California State park survey of 1929, added that they should be sufficiently distinctive and notable to interest people from comparatively distant parts of the State to visit and use them; not merely good enough to attract people from the region in which they are situated and merely because of the absence of more interesting areas within easy reach.

Through the years the annual conferences have reflected the broadening vision of those engaged in State park work. The founders had set a goal above all others in the State park program of conserving natural scenery. However, the growing pressure for outdoor recreation was recognized and the conference has urged that there was a place also for large recreation areas under State management. This objective was recognized in Mr. Olmsted's 1950 report to the California State Park Commission recommending provision of State recreation facilities in relation to needs of the population.

The growth of State park areas is illustrated by statistics over the years. No State parks were reported in 1921 when the conference was established in 29 States. In 1959 there were more than 2,400 State parks, monuments, historic sites and other types of recreation areas throughout all States and used by more than 255 million visitors. Of course the conference is not solely responsible for this great expansion, but the men who have developed the state park systems have been the same men who have directed and supported the conference. It has been almost an interlocking directorate through which the State park officials in the several States have placed their ideas and experience in a common hopper from which State park practices and principles grew.

Officers and members of the board of directors throughout the years have been drawn from outstanding and distinguished park leaders from all over the United States. Judge John Barton Payne first headed the new organization and he was later succeeded by such outstanding conservationists as Stephen Mather, Maj. William A. Welch, Howard B. Bloomer, Col. Richard Lieber, Tom Wallace, Harold S. Wagner, Harold W. Lathrop, James F. Evans, Thomas W. Morse, Frank D. Quinn, Victor W. Flickinger, Charles A. DeTurk, Kenneth R. Cougill, William G. Wells, and currently, Arthur C. Elmer.

The conference established the office of chairman of the board to carry on with the president and other officers. Present officers are: Frank D. Quinn, chairman of the board; Arthur Elmer, president; Earl P. Hanson and John Vanderzicht, vice presidents; Ben H. Thompson, treasurer; and Mrs. Dora A. Padget, executive secretary. Those who have served as chairmen of the board are Colonel Lieber, Tom Wallace and Horace M. Albright.

During the first 7 years of the conference, Miss Beatrice M. Ward, later Mrs. Wilbur Nelson, served as executive secretary. Herbert Evison was executive secretary from 1929 to 1933. In 1935 the National Conference on State Parks asked the American Planning and Civic Association to act as a secretariat under a plan to share publications and simplify administration; however, to maintain its separate board of directors and hold separate annual meetings. The two organizations share headquarters at 901 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C. Miss Harlean James served as executive secretary under this cooperative arrangement until her retirement in 1959. Since 1959 Mrs. Dora A. Padgett has served as executive secretary under the same administrative setup.

The quarterly, Planning and Civic Comment, is the joint publication of the conference and the American Planning and Civic Association. It presents in each issue articles on State park subjects and general information concerning developments in the State park field.

Over the years the conference has issued a succession of valuable publications. In 1926 it issued a volume on "State Parks and Recreational Uses of State Forests in the United States," by Raymond Torrey; in 1928, a 448-page book on "State Recreation, Parks, Forests, and Game Preserves," by Beatrice Ward Nelson; and in 1930, a "State Park Anthology," edited by Herbert Evison. From 1927 to 1933 a magazine called State Recreation was issued. In 1935 Planning and Civic Comment became successor to that publication, combined with Civic Comment and City Planning. In 1942 the conference took over from the National Park Service the "Year Book on Park and Recreation Progress," issued every 2 or 3 years. The last issue was in 1955.

The chief publication of the conference at the present time is Park Practice, which has an international list of subscribers. This was first suggested at the annual meeting of the national conference on state parks held in Bastrop State Park, Tex., in 1950. The primary purpose was to furnish a means of exchanging information on design and construction of parks and recreation facilities at all levels of Government.

The program was initiated the following year under a Park Practice committee. At the biennial National Park Service conference held in Great Smoky Mountains National Park in 1955, Director Conrad L. Wirth entertained recommendations made by two working committees that some means be provided for making the benefits of experiences of park personnel available to all units of the national park system. The following week he concluded an agreement with the board of directors of the national conference on state park at its annual meeting held in Stowe, Vt., to cooperate in an expanded and enlarged Park Practice program.

In March 1956 National Park Service participation was effected by establishing a park practice section with Ira B. Lykes serving as chief. Under the new program, material is issued under three categories: design, drawings and photographs of park structures and facilities that have been constructed and proven successful; Guideline, material in text form on a variety of subjects such as policy and planning, administration, protection, development, interpretation, maintenance, and concessions; and Grist, an eight-page illustrated bi-monthly information letter aimed primarily at the field operating level and presenting proven labor and money-saving devices, tricks of the trade, and other appropriate information. Park Practice is a nonprofit, mutual program operated by park and recreation-area people for the benefit of park and recreation-area people.

Periodically special publications have been issued such as "Digest of Laws Relating to State Parks," $3; "Revenue Bonds for State Park and Recreation Area Development," $1; "Suggested Policy Statements for State Parks," 10 cents; and "Suggested Criteria for Evaluating Areas Proposed for Inclusion in the State Park Systems," 10 cents.

The proceedings of the 40 annual meetings have been published over the years, later incorporated in the "American Planning and Civic Annual" and sometimes as separate issues. For the past two years, the proceedings have been issued as a supplement to the December issue of the quarterly, "Planning and Civic Comment." These proceedings constitute a body of reference material on the subject and pending problems which have been important in conference activities, such as park standards of acquisition, State park methods of dealing with legislation, appropriations, maintenance, development and use, and the far-reaching results of committee research into the fields of policy statements relating to the development, use and operation of State parks.

Last year a special committee of the conference took a serious look at the job ahead for both the conference and the challenge to State parks growing out of the intense interest in outdoor recreation. As a result of deliberations, a new statement of object and objectives for the conference was adopted in 1960. The State park programs have a growing responsibility and opportunity to serve the recreational needs of the people of the United States. The conference, through its annual conferences and program, has conducted over the years an examination of State park methods and procedures which has had far-reaching results.

As the organization looks to the future, it proposes to enlarge its program. It will foster a broad national movement for research, planning, acquisition and development of State parks and related areas, with a strong program of public education through a central clearing house of information. The future role of the conference will emphasize the continued expansion of its program for a well-balanced organization of citizen and professional members to carry out its aims and to constantly reappraise its leadership and activities to keep pace with the rapid changes of the changing era in which we live.

Business Week's Bell Finds Excessive Taxes, Government Spending To Get Money in Circulation Ridiculous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Elliott V. Bell, editor and publisher of Business Week, spoke recently before the Wine and Spirits Wholesalers' annual meeting in Honolulu, calling for a

reformation of America's tax system to meet the problems of unemployment and sustaining economic growth in America. I believe that Mr. Bell's remarks deserve the very close attention and study of every member of the Congress. They are not necessarily the final answer in that which is discussed, but they are the well presented thoughts of a man interested and knowing in the field of the American economy. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Bell's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK ON THE NEW FRONTIER

(An address by Elliott V. Bell, editor and publisher, Business Week magazine, before Wine and Spirits Wholesalers of America, Inc., Honolulu, Hawaii, April 19, 1961)

My purpose today is to examine with you the current state of business, the Kennedy administration as revealed in its first 3 months in office, and some of the major economic problems that will confront our Nation in the years immediately ahead.

We need not spend too much time on the current recession. It has been in progress for about a year. It has been exceedingly mild. It has followed, to a remarkable degree, the precise pattern that most experts foresaw from the start. It is now clear that we are already at, or very close to, the bottom of the downturn.

Signs of recovery are multiplying. Business has begun to reduce the rate at which inventories are being liquidated. Spending on new plant and equipment, which had been cut back $2½ billion in the past 12 months, is scheduled for at least a moderate improvement later this year.

Expenditures by Federal, State, and local governments are rising. All Government spending on goods and services, incidentally, this year will exceed $100 billion, which is equal to one-fifth of the value of all we produce. Construction is feeling the lift of spring. Good weather, after a rough winter, is bringing cheer to the hearts of auto dealers and producers of durable goods. The stock market, fulfilling its classic role of harbinger of things to come, has been forecasting, ever since the election, either a dramatic business recovery or a great inflation or both.

There are, of course, still many soft spots, but the plus signs exceed the minuses.

I think we can safely say the turn has come; recovery is underway. The big question, of course, is how vigorous and sustained a recovery it will be. On this point there is considerable difference of opinion.

At the first meeting, last month, of the President's Labor-Management Committee, President Kennedy told us he would not be surprised to see a recovery of business this summer but a continuation of 6 or 7 percent unemployment in the fall.

On the other hand some business and university economists—probably a minority at this point—think the recovery will be sharp, vigorous and sustained.

My own view is the recession will have clearly passed its turning point within the next month. By June the forces of recovery will be obvious to all; and by late autumn the revival will be vigorous with gross national product running at a rate of $520 billion or better, compared with a scant $500 billion in the first quarter. On the record, 1962 will almost certainly be the most prosperous year in our history thus far. For the moment let's leave it there, while we have a happy thought to hold.

But before we throw our hats in the air, it should be noted that the recession of 1960–61, even when it has ended, will leave behind a haunting legacy of doubt and worry.

The thing that has been really disturbing about this recession is that it followed so soon after the 1957–58 decline. We are apt to think of the business cycle as comprising a complete wave—from a peak of prosperity to a pit of recession and back to a new and even higher peak of prosperity. Indeed, our earlier postwar business cycles did have this neat, orderly and rather reassuring appearance. Not so the recessions of 1957–58 and 1960–61. These two were not only closely bunched together but were actually interdependent.

The fact is we never really achieved full recovery from the recession of 1958. Even in the most prosperous period of 1959 unemployment remained substantial. It is possible that we should think of the entire period extending from the middle of 1957 to the present as a period of quasi-depression analogous to, though happily much less severe than, the great depression of the 1930's when we had several up and down oscillations of the business curve but could not escape from the curse of massive unemployment.

The haunting question is: Do these recent years reflect merely the ending of the postwar era with its pent-up demands, inflated credit and inadequate productive capacity; or, are we witnessing a return of the dilemma of the prewar years when chronic unemployment persisted right up to the onset of war?

I want to return to this subject after a bit but first I should like you to look with me briefly at life on the New Frontier under the leadership of our young President from Harvard.

Mr. Kennedy has brought to Washington a surprisingly mixed, but on the whole, admirable team. He has put together a sort of coalition Cabinet, with the sensitive posts of Treasury and Defense going to Republicans. For Secretary of State, he picked Dean Rusk, a Rhodes scholar, quiet, scholarly, greatly respected by those who know him. Then he has bracketed the Secretary by two eminent Democratic politicians—Adlai Stevenson and Chester Bowles—each of whom was thought to have coveted the top job. Is this genius or expediency? For Secretary of Labor he picked the smartest labor lawyer in the country, Arthur Goldberg, whose pronouncements and actions since taking office have left some labor leaders a trifle baffled and caused others to call him the "Mr. Republican" of this administration.

Moving with the drive and energy of youth—in obvious contrast to the measured, energy-saving pace of his predecessor—Mr. Kennedy has made a strongly favorable impression on most people. In the course of a brief, highly unscientific taxicab poll I took in Washington recently, I learned that "everyone feels much better." "They feel like a lot of things that need to be done are going to get done."

That may not be very precise but it's important. Mr. Kennedy has had a salutary effect on public sentiment.

The remarkable thing is that thus far there is very little of a tangible character to support the widespread impression of bold, new action.

In fact, young President Kennedy has met the recession of 1961 almost precisely the way old President Eisenhower met the recession of 1958. There have been no dramatic or drastic measures. On both occasions the White House has turned a deaf ear to recommendations for a temporary tax cut. On both occasions the response was identical. Like Eisenhower, Kennedy said: "We'll wait until April to see whether things improve."

On both occasions April brought the wellnigh inevitable improvement, and a tax cut, whether or not it would have been a good idea earlier, had clearly become outdated by April. Meantime, the prospects are that spending will increase and deficits will rise, although there is as yet no sign that Mr. Kennedy will achieve in fiscal 1962 a deficit as large as the nearly $13 billion-one Mr. Eisenhower piled up in fiscal 1959.

Actually, Mr. Kennedy has turned out thus far to be very much of a conservative. He is obviously aware that the label of big spending and the threat of inflation are political liabilities especially dangerous to Democrats. So he has talked boldly but moved cautiously.

Here's how a Washington wit summed up the administration's performance thus far. He said it reminded him of that dazzling basketball team—the Harlem Globetrotters. The New Frontier team has been passing the ball forward, behind, sidewise and underneath—a brilliant display—but thus far nobody has scored a basket.

The cautious course the President has steered reflects, no doubt, his own normal inclination. It reflects also his appreciation of the fiscal conservatism of Congress, and a recognition that the narrow margin of his election gave him no sweeping or unchallengeable mandate.

Not all of his advisers have been quite happy with Mr. Kennedy's moves to stimulate recovery. One of the most distinguished of them, Prof. Paul Samuelson of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has called the President's recovery program a "placebo program"—a pill that makes the patient think he is being treated although in fact the pill has nothing but a little sugar in it.

For the coming fiscal year, Mr. Kennedy has budgeted for only about $3 billion more than Mr. Eisenhower had planned. He is budgeting a deficit of only $2¾ billion.

Some of the President's brilliant young braintrusters are concerned whether deficit spending of such modest proportions will give the economy the forward lift they think it needs.

Certainly thus far, and prospectively for 1962, the President's program for stimulating recovery and growth is more modest and conservative than most people realize—a good deal more conservative than the stock market's ebullience would suggest.

Now, it may well be that the President, proceeding by political intuition, may turn out to have been a better—or at least a luckier—economist than his advisers. If this recovery should indeed prove vigorous, if it should carry the economy back to reasonably full employment faster than is now anticipated, then, of course, it will be all for the best not to have overstimulated the economy by rapid and massive increases in Government spending on the one hand, or sizable tax reductions on the other. Either course would tend to revive the inflationary pressures that are now suspended, and a renewal of inflation, or even fear of inflation, would aggravate our dangerous balance of payments position.

This brings me in one easy motion to the third phase of my talk—the interlocking complex of major economic problems which confront our Nation and for which thus far we have found no workable solution.

I have already mentioned one of these problems—the failure of our economy, even at the peak of the last recovery period, to provide enough jobs to employ our full labor force.

You know, there has been a fascinating paradox about the latest recession. Every month for the past year or more the total of employed persons has reached a record high for that month. Thus employment in January was the highest for any January in our history. The same was true of February, and March, and will, I have no doubt, be true for April, May, and June, and so on.

Yet, in each of these months of record high employment, unemployment also rose. The total by February had reached 5,700,000 workers, largest in number for almost 20 years. Moreover, many of these unemployed had been out of work for a long time and had exhausted their unemployment benefits.

Now, of course, some of this unemployment has been due to cyclical factors—the circumstance that we have been in a recession. But a good part appears to be due to what economists call "structural" factors.

Structural unemployment is just another name for what we used to call technological unemployment, except that it has a broader meaning. It means not merely the unemployment that results when, for example, a textile plant is fitted out with laborsaving machinery, and handworkers are displaced by automation. It also means what happens when the old textile plant in New England is abandoned, and the new automated plant is erected in North Carolina. It means what happens when homes and factories switch from coal to oil. Coal miners in West Virginia or Pennsylvania lose their jobs. Even if there are unfilled jobs elsewhere, the miners may not be able or willing to move away and learn new skills.

Several easy answers have been suggested for this problem. Certain labor leaders say: Just cut the working week from 40 hours to 30 hours—this will create more jobs overnight. Certain management men have an equally easy answer. Business, they say, has been forced to automate because of high labor costs. Just let labor agree to take a pay cut and there will be more jobs. Well you don't have to be a politician to figure that these "solutions" are not as simple as they sound.

This particular problem of structural unemployment is inextricably interlocked with others. There is, for example, the broad question of economic growth. There is also the question of whether American goods can remain competitive in the world market. Can we hold our own against the rebuilt, modern industry of Western Europe and Japan with their relatively cheap labor?

This brings us again to the tough nut of our balance of payments. For some years now the total payments that we make abroad—for goods and services, for travel, for investment, for military operations, and for foreign aid—have exceeded the payments foreigners make to us. In the years 1958, 1959, and 1960, we paid out $11 billion more than we took in. This situation became so alarming last year that people began to talk about possible devaluation of the dollar, and gold flowed out of the country in large amounts.

President Kennedy, it should be said, has shown himself acutely aware of the balance of payments problem. He gets high marks for making it perfectly clear both during the campaign and after taking office that he means to defend the integrity of the dollar at its present exchange rate with all the resources at his command.

Those resources are still very considerable. Including our gold stock and our rights to draw credit from the International Monetary Fund, they amount to some $22 billion.

The President's strong statements had an immediate effect in stopping the run on the dollar that had started last fall. Losses of gold diminished, and last month we began to regain a little gold.

We have a breathing spell—but we have as yet not solved the problem. We have merely gained a little time to try to find a way out of this and related problems—including technological change, structural unemployment, economic growth, high production costs, and inflation.

It is for this reason that the President has established the Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy on which I am privileged to serve.

It is, of course, too early to say whether the 21 members of this Committee will be able to make any important or practical contributions to the solution of this complex web of problems to which the President has asked us to address ourselves.

All of us will bring with us a certain freight of ideas, some of which I am sure we will have to throw into the sea before the long voyage is over. Accordingly, I should like the views I am about to give you to be regarded as preliminary and tentative, rather than hard and fast.

The President has set as his target a reduction in unemployment to not more than 4 percent of the labor force. This seems to me reasonable. It is a goal that should not put undue strain on the labor market, or tend to generate new inflationary wage-price spirals. It is also a rate that should permit some flexibility in our system and leave incentive for productive effort on the job. Reasonable as this goal is, we have not achieved it except momentarily since 1953.

The question of how much our unemployment is due to structural factors versus cyclical factors is fundamental to the problem of policy formulation and in no sense a merely academic question. The lag in job formation is, I believe, a consequence of both slow overall growth and rapid technological change. To deal with it we shall need several kinds of weapons in our arsenal.

I would be disposed to put primary emphasis on fiscal and monetary policies to insure that we have sufficient demand to keep our existing resources employed at relatively high rates. Because the balance-of-payments problem hampers the use of monetary policy on which we formerly relied as our main instrument, this means that more reliance must be put on fiscal policy in insuring that the economy operates at high and stable levels of employment—a condition that is essential to regaining a more rapid rate of growth.

"Fiscal policy" is a term that is often used and seldom defined. By it I mean all of the taxing, spending, and borrowing operations that the Government conducts—all of the ways in which the Federal establishment puts money into the national economy or takes money out of it.

I am impressed by the arguments advanced by a number of economists to show that the fiscal policy we have been following has created a "deflationary gap" that represents a constant drag on the economy. What this means in plain English is that our tax system is taking such a heavy bite out of total demand that economic recovery loses its drive before a condition of full employment can be achieved. It is estimated that if the country should achieve full production and employment the tax system would generate a surplus of something like $12 billion over present levels of expenditures. But the tax system is so oppressive that it keeps us from achieving full production. It nips off recovery short of the peak, as happened in 1960, and slows down the Nation's rate of growth.

In theory, there are two ways that this "deflationary gap" could be closed. One would be to cut taxes. The other would be to increase spending.

Some spending increases obviously are on the way. And this fact seems to have restrained President Kennedy from asking for any reduction in taxes at this time. I am inclined to agree that it is too late now for a temporary tax cut to aid recovery, but I hope this will not mean indefinite postponement of long-range tax legislation.

To achieve longrun growth and maximum utilization of our economic resources, I believe it is essential to undertake a thoroughgoing reform of our tax system, coupled with some reduction in the level of tax rates. And I believe that this task should be commenced at once, without waiting for the economy to go through another frustrating cycle of partial recovery, aborted boom, and recession.

It seems clear to me that it would be both unnecessary and unwise to try to close the deflationary gap by thrusting bigger and bigger spending programs at Congress. Let us spend what we must. But let us not put ourselves in the ridiculous position of spending simply to get back into circulation money that an unduly severe tax system has taken away from consumers and investors.

The problem of tax reform is not a new one. But it is an increasingly urgent one. It was a matter of much disappointment to me as a Republican that during 8 years in office my party did not even attempt such an overhaul. Now with the Democrats in control of both the executive and legislative branches, the task ought not to be shirked.

I realize that it is already too late in the current session to expect the Congress to produce a major reform bill (although I regret that this job was not given a high priority at the start of the new administration). Possibly we will have full recovery without action on the tax front. Frankly, I doubt it. I am concerned that without a tax cut and tax reform, we may see a repetition of the 1959–60 performance of the economy. And I believe that we can avoid it if the President and Congress will turn their most serious attention to this major national economic task. I believe it should have an absolutely top priority in the next session of Congress.

Aside from fiscal and monetary measures, there are a number of other things that we can do to promote economic growth and stability.

Consideration should be given, I think, to programs for increasing the mobility of the economy—that would lead available workers to the jobs that are opening up, and out of the job or industries or regions that are contracting.

The prime weapon in any such program must, of course, be education. Better education in our elementary and high schools, our colleges and universities, can spread the knowledge and skills that increase employment opportunities. Through education also the young people entering the labor market each year can be encouraged to seek employment in the service industries and elsewhere, where demand is increasing, instead of looking for work in a declining sector. Existing programs of on-the-job training in industry, apprentice training to give workers new skills, and graduate study programs both for training top new professionals and specialists, and for upgrading people who completed their academic work years ago are needed.

One thing is certain—we must not allow ourselves to get into the way of thinking of technological change as a hazard, or even as merely a problem to be coped with. On the contrary, paradoxical as it may seem, we need more, rather than less, of this accelerated scientific and technological progress in order to produce the faster economic growth we must have.

The discovery of new ideas, and the diffusion of those ideas throughout our system, is the most important source of growth we have. In this area lies the strength of our system. It is on our scientific, intellectual, and technological prowess and progress that the survival of our free political economy now depends.

I have been talking about our major problems largely from a domestic view, but implicit in all we say or do today is the struggle in which we are so deeply engaged between communism and the free world.

The capacity of any country to safeguard its own destiny and to influence nations and

events is dependent upon that country's strength and vigor. Only a country with a vigorous, growing political economy can be independent and give leadership to other countries.

In the affairs of nations as of men, there comes a time of supreme testing where failure can only lead on to ultimate decline and fall. We are facing such a test today and the outcome is by no means certain. Can free man working together in a free system successfully meet the challenge of a system just as tough, resourceful and scientifically skilled as our own, that is closely planned, disciplined and directed with the precise purpose of surpassing us?

If the confident "yes" we give to that question is to be achieved we shall have to improve our ways of working together and still competing with each other, of managing our affairs for the national good without sacrificing the individual's rights. We shall need to bring to these years of troubled peace the same dedication and resolve we achieved in war. For the truth is, of course, we are still at war—a war to assure the survival of all that makes life for us worthwhile.

Mass Transportation Vital to Our Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the transit facilities of our Nation are dwindling at precisely the time when we should be making plans for great increases in such facilities. At recent hearings, it was stated that more than 300 municipalities in the United States are now without transit facilities of any kind.

I am impressed, therefore, with the increasing interest now being displayed in this question, and I am gratified by the testimony given for the mass transit bill I introduced earlier this year. Two recent editorials give some indication of reaction in my home State. One is from the Camden Courier Post of April 10. The other is from the Paterson Morning Call of March 29. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorials printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Camden Courier Post, Apr. 10, 1961]

CONSIDERATION FOR MASS TRANSIT

Three days of hearings in Washington on a mass transit bill have, as New Jersey's Senator WILLIAMS observed, "conclusively documented" the need for action in this field.

What is being urged is a broader vision for long-range improvements in mass transportation, which would be coordinated with urban renewal, housing, and community facilities under a Department of Urban Affairs.

There is no question that urban and metropolitan regions of the country are becoming vastly more complicated. The transit bill sponsored by the Democratic Senator is directed, as he claims, as much toward searching for ways to avoid unnecessary transportation as for a search for more efficient rapid mass transportation.

In seeking to place the problem under a single department, WILLIAMS insists that for too long we have been dishing out Federal aid with a dozen different hands and "not a single hand knows what the other 11 hands are doing." This, naturally, leads to waste in public expenditures at all levels of government. Even encouragement of suburban development can compound the mass transportation problem, as WILLIAMS has noted. Coordination of programs seems necessary.

The transit bill, which provides a low-cost revolving loan fund of $250 million for facilities and equipment, as well as a $75-million matching grant program for demonstration projects and comprehensive mass transportation development, was given almost unanimous support during the 3 days of hearings.

In the case of Philadelphia, the bill could make Federal loans available for the purchase of cars and other equipment on commuter lines serving the city. It could make possible the building of the midcity underground hookup between the suburban lines of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Reading Co.

Mayor Dilworth and James M. Symes, board chairman of the Pennsylvania, have argued Federal aid to mass transportation would spur more than $500 million in new construction in Philadelphia in the next decade, create hundreds of jobs and save a billion-dollar investment in railroad commuter service that is threatened with extinction.

How the proposed transit aid would affect the Camden and surrounding areas of south Jersey directly has not been made clear. Delaware River Port Authority officials proceeding with their plans for a high-speed rail link to Stratford, apparently feel the Federal plan would not materially alter that proposal.

Federal aid to transit could hold vast importance for the future, however. Dilworth already has declared that south Jersey counties must join with Philadelphia and its Pennsylvania suburbs in a regional transportation plan.

Dilworth warns that Philadelphia's transportation system will go downhill unless the city gets help from four surrounding Pennsylvania counties, plus Camden, Gloucester, and Burlington Counties.

The future role of bus companies in the transit picture also is unclear, but they, too, are proceeding with current plans. Public Service has added 10 new deluxe buses on its Haddon Avenue run through Collingswood, Haddon Township, and Haddonfield where the bus versus rail transit dispute still rages, but there probably isn't a chance in a hundred that the buses were added just to gain a talking point against the high-speed plan.

Regional thinking is the coming thing in planning to meet the transit crisis. For example, regional planning experts say now that the chronic ills of commuter rail service in the New Jersey-New York-Connecticut metropolitan region could be cured only by a tristate agency with Federal help. Metropolitan commuter railroads otherwise will continue to deteriorate, they say.

The Port of New York Authority, too, has come around to the point of agreeing to involve itself financially in commuter rail projects after having operated 40 years without doing so.

The projects would be over and above the proposed acquisition of the Hudson and Manhattan Railroad and its properties. The interstate agency, in bills prepared for the New Jersey and New York Legislatures, agrees to devote up to 10 percent of its $70 million general reserve fund annually hereafter to commuter rail improvements.

As the hearings in Washington have indicated clearly, the crying need is not for "panic solutions" but for new thinking about the very nature of transportation in our highly populated areas.

It becomes obvious that we can't superimpose a transit system on an obsolete city and its environs. We can't destroy and rebuild without taking mass transit into basic consideration, and we can't merely preserve what we have or modify old facilities if we have any hope at all of meeting the demands of the future in our metropolitan areas. Urban development must take into consideration the key role that transportation has in that development.

[From the Paterson Morning Call, Mar. 29, 1961]

SENATOR WILLIAMS' BILL—MASS TRANSPORTATION VITAL TO OUR FUTURE

We fully endorse the mass transportation bill which was introduced this year by U.S. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, together with 18 of his Senate colleagues.

The subject of this vitally needed legislation, in the words of Senator WILLIAMS, "touches upon one of the most important nerve centers of our national, social, and economic life—the movement of people and goods in and around our urban and metropolitan areas."

Action is demanded in this session to keep alive dwindling transit facilities. Without assurance that commuter and goods transportation will continue, not only will this New York-New Jersey region face serious economic loss, but the Nation as a whole will suffer traffic strangulation and all the inconveniences flowing from want of means of adequate transit by bus or train.

To quote Gov. David Lawrence of Pennsylvania "Those of us who have public responsibility have a duty to be extra-sensitive to possible breakdown. We cannot let automobiles be built and sold without providing roads and parking spaces for them. We cannot let these same roads and parking spaces choke our urban areas. We cannot let our cities succumb to urban blight and crumble beneath the burden of overcrowding. We need a strong, firm, national program to get transportation in our cities moving again. We must have Federal legislation of the type now before you. We need the Williams urban mass transportation bill, and I urge that it be passed by Congress without delay."

It is noteworthy that Senator Williams sees the importance of enactment of his mass transportation bill to the many urban renewal programs throughout the country in the development of cities whose residents have opportunity of moving goods and commuting to their places of employment.

On this subject, the following observation is from a report of a series of discussions at a 3-week meeting of leading transportation experts sponsored last year by the National Academy of Sciences:

"The growth of metropolitan areas by irregular spreading of industries and homes from cities into the countryside—often at a rapid pace—makes the provision of adequate transportation for the newcomers as well as the older residents extremely difficult. On the other hand, the pattern of transportation facilities within the metropolitan area and its environs is itself a powerful level determining the form that urban expansion and change will take. Transportation then not only serves but helps to shape urban development."

The Williams bill has as its objective remedying the fast-worsening urban transportation crisis. It looks ahead. It recognizes that it is imperative to bring about an economic solution to a serious problem. It is must legislation and should receive every priority of action in Congress.

Federal Participation in the Encouragement of Performing and Visual Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the urgency of Federal participation in the encouragement of American culture is emphasized in the correspondence I have received from many parts of the country. Outside of the large metropolitan centers, a cultural desert often exists which is relieved only by a few small private cooperative and university groups. We are about the only major power whose Government makes no substantial effort to help the Nation's cultural treasure in the performing and visual arts.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD letters from the noted opera singer, Mimi Benzell; from Robert Ackart, member of the board of governors of the American Guild of Musical Artists; and from Delmar E. Solem, chairman, Department of Drama, University of Miami; also a report on Government aid for the theater in West Germany which appeared in the theater publication Back Stage, April 14.

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

[From Back Stage, Apr. 14, 1961]

FORTY MILLION DOLLARS GOVERNMENT SUBSIDY BUILDS 100 NEW THEATERS IN GERMANY

The theater is flourishing in West Germany, where municipalities annually contribute the equivalent of $40 million in subsidies to help maintain their theaters. There are now 200 theaters in 100 West German cities.

While Senator JAVITS is unable to push through a bill in Congress calling for a measly $5 million to encourage culture throughout the 50 States, West Germany, using some of the billions in American aid poured into the country during the past 15 years, has built over 100 new theaters in the last 10 years.

While the Government spends billions subsidizing various industries, from airlines to steamships (it cost the U.S. taxpayer $150 million a year to subsidize the latter) it still refuses to acknowledge that American culture is worthy of support.

West Germany, however, recognizes the value of live theater and has embarked on a huge building campaign. The theater has always occupied a special place in Germany. The human condition, wherever it finds meaningful expression on the stage, is ultimately seen by a vast German audience (20 million in 1959) of all income levels.

Civic pride and the public's support maintain theaters. They play to full houses every evening 10 months in the year. Many of them have permanent acting groups which frequently visit each other's base for guest performances. Each theater alternates nightly the 10 to 12 different plays produced during the year.

Almost anyone in Germany is within 50 miles of a stage with the choice of the world's best dramatic literature. Admission prices are 15 cents (standees) to $2.40. Even the small city audience can expect to see a repertory ranging from the Greek playwrights to Shakespeare, Goethe to Pirandello, Lope de Vega to Sartre, Samuel Beckett to Brecht, O'Neill and Arthur Miller.

ROLE OF THEATERS INTENDANT

The 130 city and state theaters (apart from 70-odd stages operated privately) are autonomous. Each is under the direction of a generalintendant hired by the city or state on a 5-year contract. As executive producer, he selects the plays and retains complete freedom of artistic direction. His staff includes designers, directors, conductor, composer, and musicians, costumers, singers, ballet dancers, lighting experts, a play-reader and adapter, stage crews and theater employees—all of whom are in civil service.

BERLIN THEATERS

Of the 27 theaters in Berlin before the war only 3 came through unscathed. In West Berlin today (population 2,300,000) 8 theaters are playing again and a new opera house will open shortly.

MUENSTER THEATER

The 960-seat Municipal Theater in Muenster, completed in 1956, serves an urban area of 150,000. A university town with some light industry, it was 60 percent destroyed in the war. The theater was built around a remaining wall of the ancient, bombed-out Roemberger Hof. U.S. architect C. E. Kidder-Smith describes the theater as "one of Europe's very finest and unquestionably the most imaginative. The capacious and handsome public circulation areas, ideal for social promenading, are ablaze with light in the evening, producing a lively atmosphere to all who pass by outside." The theater accommodates opera, ballet, concerts, and drama.

GELSENKIRCHEN THEATERS

Pictured on the front page is one of the best examples of the importance of theaters in Germany. In Gelsenkirchen, a coal and steel city of 400,000 in the Ruhr Valley, the city completed its new theater late in 1959. The city contributed the $5 million construction cost. One-fourth of the annual $1,400,000 budget is recovered at the box office. The rest—$1 million—is paid by the city, the equivalent of 2½ percent of the entire city budget.

The threater has 2 stages, a 1,050-seat auditorium for drama, opera, and concerts, and a 450-seat studio for plays demanding more intimate milieu. Sixteen thousand regular subscribers, largely members of civic groups and cultural societies, patronize both theaters during the 10½-month season. Each entertainment has 20 performances. There is rarely an empty seat. Prices average 75 cents for plays.

The architects (Ruhnau, Rave, Deilmann & Von Hausen) have incorporated sculpture and paintings of British, French, and German artists into interiors and exteriors of the theaters.

Gelsenkirchen Theater is planned as integral part of landscape. Set in heart of industrial city, it is core of what eventually will be expansive cultural promenade with open-air cafes in forum style. Architecturally, it is built in a cube 225 feet wide, 60 feet high and 240 feet in depth. In dark night lighting it gives airy diaphonous quality. A six-story annex in rear, houses administration, staff and artistic direction. A twin six-story addition houses costume shops, rehearsal rooms. Carpentry and machine shops are under stage. Large rehearsal stage for drama and ballet is on top floor.

Abstract concrete relief in front measuring 65 by 10 feet, is work of British sculptor Robert Adams. Architect Ruhnau sees it as lending solid base to building, at same time serving as counterweight to all-glass facade.

The Gelsenkirchen Theater seats 1,050 on three levels in amphitheater style. Architects sought here to unify stage, proscenium and audience areas into one whole, bringing audience and performer into close contact with one another. Mobile stage dollies insure extremely rapid scenery changes. Main stage is 60 by 75 feet with wings each 50 by 50.

Flexibility is key concept of stage in Gelsenkirchen's little theater. As conventional proscenium, or peep-show theater, actor faces audience. As arena theater, stage is pushed forward and audience surrounds actors. In third phase, or total-theater, entire orchestra seating area becomes stage, with audience looking on from balconies.

While America continues to talk about the shrinking theater and the "Fabulous Invalid," in Germany, the legitimate theater is thriving, experimenting, forging ahead.

MANHASSET, N.Y., *April 5, 1961.*
Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I wish to congratulate you once again on your unfailing support of a greater participation by the Federal Government in the performing arts. As a performing artist who is actively engaged in bringing music and other form of culture to the people throughout the country and the world, I know I speak for many when I say that we are hopeful that your plan to establish a U.S. Arts Foundation will meet with the success that it deserves.

I, for one, shall be most happy to lend my support in whatever manner I can.

Most sincerely,

MIMI BENZELL.

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI,
Coral Gables, Fla., April 17, 1961.
The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Thank you for sending me the copy of Senate bill 1250. After a cursory reading of the bill I want to express my satisfaction and the wholehearted endorsement for the U.S. Arts Foundation.

I am certain that this bill will mean a great deal to the welfare of the arts in the United States. I am also certain after having experienced a series of frustrations dealing with Latin American requests for visiting artists, that this bill will ultimately prove itself of international value.

My congratulations and my sincere hopes that S. 1250 be passed by the Senate and House and signed by the President.

If there is anything that I can do to assist you in this worthy enterprise feel free to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

DELMAR E. SOLEM,
Chairman, Department of Drama.

AMERICAN GUILD OF MUSICAL ARTISTS,
New York, N.Y., March 30, 1961.
Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: The direction being taken by the present administration in Washington is indeed heartening to those of us concerned with the position of the American artist and the place of the performing arts in American life.

As a member of the Board of Governors of AGMA, I would like to congratulate you on your support of various arts bills, and particularly on your own bill to establish a U.S. Arts Foundation (S. 936).

I would like here to express my personal gratitude for the steps you are taking toward the enrichment of American cultural life.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT ACKART.

How To Catch Pneumonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of April 19, 1961:

HOW TO CATCH PNEUMONIA

In a good many families about the country, the past winter is likely to go down as the year of the deceptive cold. The pattern has been sick abed for a couple of days, back to the office with the cheerful feeling that all is over—and then suddenly the relapse.

As we can testify, a warning from the doctor doesn't do much good. We'll all do what he orders when the cough is heavy and the temperature high, but it's just plain human nature that the minute the aches seem less acute we lose patience with sage advice. Hospitals are populated by people whose downfall was, to put it simply, "up too soon."

This is a human foible not limited to the winter season or the personal sniffles. In fact, it can be seen cropping up this spring among those who have been worriedly watching the pulse of our economic ailments abroad.

Last fall and through the winter this country suffered something very near a crisis in its gold outflow. Officials of the incoming administration, as well as the departing one, went about with haggard faces. The President-elect was worried enough to issue a strong statement about our determination to take care of the ailing dollar, and once in office to propose strong prescriptions to cure it.

But the visitor who these days goes wandering about the corridors of Washington finds a different mood. To be sure, everybody agrees we still have a problem with our balance of payments. Yet the air now is one of almost cheery unconcern. After all, hasn't the gold outflow stopped? Hasn't the speculative fever on the world money markets subsided? The good old dollar is sound as a nut. So now we can relax, return to our accustomed ways and not be so hasty with unpleasant tasting medicines.

Thus there is renewed talk about easing money rates again, there is less restraint than a few months ago in plans for foreign governmental spending, and so on. Chairman Heller of the Council of Economic Advisers, for example, has noted that the absence of a net outflow of gold in the past few weeks now gives us a "cushion"; and elsewhere there are officials who will tell you that "the problem" is just about resolved.

Well, perhaps so. It is certainly true that the dollar is less ailing than it was. The strong assurances against devaluation by President Kennedy, the expressed willingness of the Germans to help us out, the fact that some other currencies (notably the pound sterling) have had their own troubles, all these things have contributed to easing the dollar's immediate pains.

But at the risk of being a killjoy, we think it worth noting that so far only the symptoms have been alleviated. The basic difficulty we face with the dollar is our unfavorable balance of payments; we are simply pouring out of the country more money than we take in.

This is a longstanding situation. The recent crisis that everyone speaks of did not come out of the blue; it flared up because in addition to the chronic drain on the dollar we suffered a speculative fever brought on by the drain of short-term money seeking higher interest rates abroad and by the uneasiness over how the new administration would act.

It is this extra pressure that has been relieved, and that relief has made the immediate aches subside. We are now in the position where we can see recovery ahead for the dollar if we will just practice a little healthy fiscal living.

We only delude ourselves, however, if we think the basic ailment is yet cured, and that we can resume again the regime that laid the dollar low in the first place. The Government itself has got to curb its own huge outpourings of dollars abroad; it has got to avoid the temptations of deficit-financed inflation, of an easy money policy, here at home. It has got to continue to recognize in all its economic policies that the international restraints are still operative.

To forget that is a sure way to worse trouble. For as any doctor can tell you, the relapse from a relatively mild case of the ague can be a whopping case of pneumonia.

War, Peace, or Armistice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the February 1961 issue of the Sudeten Bulletin, a central European review published monthly by the Sudeten German Archive, in Munich, Germany, contains an article entitled "War, Peace, or Armistice," which should be of interest to the Congress. This article was written by Dr. Hans-Christoph Seebohm, German Federal Minister of Transportation and president of the Sudeten German Expellee Association, Bonn, Germany. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

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

WAR, PEACE, OR ARMISTICE

(By Dr. Hans-Christoph Seebohm)

Until well into the current century people were convinced that the political climate in which they were living was either war or peace, and that between the two—at best for a brief span—an armistice was possible which allowed time for negotiations for peace, i.e., a period of fluctuation with temporary occupation of certain areas and limitation of self-determination, all of which could at no time become permanent. For the end of each war meant, conjointly, that one of the participants was so severely smitten or even subjugated, that for the period of armistice, at least, and only for said period he was fully at the mercy of his opponent.

Seldom were negotiations for peace conducted while war was still in progress, as happened during the Thirty Years War or after the Russo-Japanese War, when the United States (1905) first successfully assumed its intercessory role among other nations of the world. As late as 1914 war was still solemnly declared. Since then wars have grown out of local conflicts so that their beginning can hardly be associated with a given date.

The Sino-Japanese War that touched off the Second World War in east Asia, began with the disputes over Manchuria many years before the battles of 1938 and 1939 in Europe. The military proceedings at the time of the Anschluss of Austria, before and during the annexation of the Sudetenland, during the establishment of the Protectorate, and with the Anschluss of Memelland, might just as well have unleashed World War II as the annexation of Danzig or Eastern Upper Silesia. The whole affair was the unraveling of a logical chain of events, at every link of which the outbreak of full-scale warfare had to be expected and feared. Finally, and without any conceivable need it exploded on the solution of the Danzig question, inconceivable because here an attempt was made by force, to attain a goal that could have been arrived at on the strength of sound legal claims, had there been but a measure of patience and restraint employed. Actually it triggered World War II which deprived the Czech people of its right of self-determination and forcibly imposed upon them a solution which they would have never chosen of their own free will. The same applies to Slovakia and the resulting territorial measures for Hungary, in the Balkans and the Baltic States: everywhere changes were dictated without regard for the international right of self-determination, creating situations by force instead of justice, even where large segments of the population were prepared to welcome these new conditions.

After World War I periods of armistice followed. These periods, due to the very lax attitude of the victorious powers, permitted in the areas of the conquered peoples, biased solutions of territorial problems motivated solely by force. An example is the founding of Czechoslovakia. The result was that subsequent peace treaties were actually unable to do more than recognize the situation created during the period of armistice. As a matter of fact the Paris peace treaties are, for that reason, not real treaties in the sense of those of Münster and Osnabrück in 1648 or the Peace of Rastatt in 1714, but primarily a crystallization of a situation, for the most part illegally created during the period of armistice. Even if they denied the human right of domicile in but limited areas, and even if, for individual border districts, they acknowledged the right of self-determination, by popular plebiscite, in vast regions of Europe they blacked out the right of self-determination by solutions based on force. In carrying out the treaties, the right of self-determination, promised in various plebiscites, Upper Silesia, for example, was once again perverted by force and replaced by the surrogate of the Geneva minority rights regulations. The fact that the Geneva minority rights provisions were constantly violated by coercion and thus made ineffectual, lay not only with political forces prone to solutions by violence but primarily in the fact, that within those measures the right of the individual to his homeland was inextricably bound up with the community right of the self-determination of peoples and ethnic groups, forming a ball of confusion incapable of being unraveled.

Hence the Paris treaties lack the attributes of genuine peace treaties but assume those of politically expanded, originally militarily conditioned armistice agreements. They could not make peace but only a status quo, i.e., finalize a situation, which purely coercive acts had established at the end of hostilities. They disregarded the right of self-determination just as it was disregarded in 1939, thus creating those imponderable but mighty impulses that led to a new explosion, because nothing had been settled justly, either

by the Paris treaties or by later decisions of the League of Nations or by the coercive solutions as manifested in the Polish treatment of Lithuania (Vilna) prior to 1938 and toward the free city of Danzig (Westerplatte) and above all in the Manchurian conflict.

WAR BUT NOT BY DECLARATION

Between the two World Wars, then, there was no real peace in the sense of the Treaty of Portsmouth (1906) between Japan and Russia. Thus in 1938–39 there was no old style declaration of war, of the kind that ended the peace in Europe in 1914. The declarations of 1939 made by the Western Powers to Germany did not start World War II but were simply the outcome of the war started against Poland, to the outbreak of which Russia's consent—given on August 23, 1939—decisively contributed and for which Germany paid with the surrender of the Baltic States and the right of self-determination of three peoples, the Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians. Even America's entrance came after the attack on Pearl Harbor and without a declaration of war by the attacker, even as England's and France's entry after the attack on Poland.

It is no more than logical that this Second World War also ended by armistice. Whereas 40 years ago, however, there was still outward semblance of a peace treaty signed by both parties, and lasting on into the future, in 1945 the political finalization of the solutions forcibly created at the close of war and thereafter (e.g., Berlin) was effected by the biased treaty of Potsdam agreed on solely by the victorious powers. The Potsdam Agreement differs from the Paris treaties also by the fact that it not only denies the previously affirmed right of self-determination altogether, but tramples on the right to the homeland, a right grounded by international law in the treaties of Munster and Osnabruck in 1648, and sanctions expulsion from one's native soil.

Like St. Germain, Versailles, and Trianon, it accepted the status quo of settlement by coercion that took place during the period between the cessation of hostilities, over and beyond that, however, it made possible additional solutions by force, characterized by ruthless brutality, by an expansion of the forcibly attained status quo in east and central Europe.

It looks, then, as if it were our destiny, not to have to accept war and peace, but only a state of armistice as a condition of our political life. The 1959 Soviet draft of a so-called peace treaty contains nothing more than the desire to finalize the wrong done by and after the Potsdam Agreement, to retain as accepted the Soviet colonial realm in east and central Europe, created in part against the spirit of the Potsdam Agreement, and thereby to cement the status quo in central and east Europe so that any attempt to change it by negotiation can be branded as a form of aggression.

REAL SOVIET MOTIVES

The consequences of the Paris treaties in no way frighten the Soviets, for at the moment they feel quite secure, believing themselves capable of nipping in the bud any impulse of freedom and justice, not by recourse to an instrument like the Geneva League of Nations but with instruments of force that have been pushed to indescribable limits by means of technical developments. Whether they will always be able to do so, seems not too certain even in their own minds. For that reason they want a period in which to work out their power potential in order to conduct a fight on several fronts: in Europe, against China, and in the Arctic Sea. They also want to offer everything in the way of material aid to attract the underdeveloped countries in Asia and Africa and fully isolate the Anglo-Saxon bloc. Berlin, a symbol of freedom and justice which pricks their conscience and weakens their prestige in the eyes of the conquered peoples, is supposed, according to Soviet desires, to be absorbed by them before the other process begins. That is the only change in the status quo in their favor which they admitted before its finalization.

The West not only has to assume its moral responsibility toward Berlin in this struggle and seek a tolerable but certainly not lasting compromise for the Berliners. It should far rather remain aware that even the slightest weakening of its position in Europe will lower its prestige in the eyes of the underdeveloped countries, further buttress the Soviet position there, thus enabling a future defeat of the West in these decisive areas outside of Europe that are so important to us for the future.

The political forces of the West, still so fully influenced by the mental climate of the Paris treaties, are eagely grasping for a chance to assure further periods of armistice by acceptance of the unjust conditions in central and eastern Europe induced by and after Potsdam. They obviously are blind to coming dangers. They fail to recognize, too, that they are about to betray for a second time the right of self-determination of the peoples of central and east Europe, including the Germans, as the Germans did in 1939. Such a move can only cause them untold moral harm in their relationships with the underdeveloped countries.

Danny Kaye's Remarks Before the Annual Dinner Meeting of the USO National Council, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., March 14, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last month I had the privilege of attending the annual dinner of the National USO Council here in Washington, at which the internationally famous comedian and motion picture star, Danny Kaye, was the principal speaker.

Just this week I received a copy of his remarks, and since I remember them so vividly, I wanted to bring them to the attention of the Members.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that Danny Kaye's speech at the USO dinner appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

DANNY KAYE'S REMARKS BEFORE THE ANNUAL DINNER MEETING OF THE USO NATIONAL COUNCIL, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 14, 1961

Ladies and gentlemen, lest you labor under the misapprehension that I am a man of extraordinary courage because I performed for the troops under a shelter of protecting aircraft, let me hasten to assure you that I would much rather face 18,000 soldiers—hostile or friendly—than be standing up here to talk for even 5 minutes.

I must say I am feeling an enormous range of emotions here this evening. I am torn. I am both delighted to be here, and at the same time I suffer from an enormous amount of discouragement. Because suddenly I have come to realize that all that glittered in the dim past, all the envy of youth and the resilience of youth, has suddenly disappeared.

There I was in the lobby today and a gentleman came over to me—he looked about 67—and he said, "Hi."

I said hello and he said, "We were together in Korea." He said, "I remember you were over there and you were entertaining the 7th Marine Division of the Marine Corps, and there were all these fellows on a hill, and the crowds, and boy I sure am glad to see you again. Well, if you'll excuse me now my ambulance is outside and I've gotta go."

Another man came by with a hearing aid and he said, "Weren't you the fellow who came to Japan in 1945?" I said yes, and suddenly the naked, bald truth assailed me with violent force.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are all a "hell-uva" lot older!

Well, maybe you're older, not me.

I am quite loath to assume the role of spokesman for the entertainment industry here tonight. It's usually a job that requires considerably more eloquence than I can represent. But I must say that in the last 20 years a tremendous contribution by people from all walks of life has been made to America in this very strange world of ours, and particularly in those areas of interest which your organization represents.

Some of us receive the kudos and the blessings because we have seen fit to travel overseas to afford some entertainment for our Armed Forces. I would merely like to tell you that the situation should be reversed. We receive acclaim and good wishes and heartfelt sympathy because we leave our families and our homes to travel in God-forsaken places to bring moments of pleasure to the Armed Forces overseas. I can only tell you that what people like myself have given has been returned a thousandfold. I can only tell you that the sympathy which we received should go to the thousands upon thousands of people who, although far less known than some of the stars that you have, have devoted their lives and their energies and their emotions to the USO cause. They are the ones who have shown much more dedication than some of us who get a great deal in return.

Twenty years have gone by since USO came into being, and memories become rosy in 20 years, rather faulty. The things we like to think about that have afforded us so much pleasure and joy and a feeling of great contribution have dimmed somewhat.

The USO used to be a great sign of people all banded together to make life easier for the boys overseas. It was a beacon—a light that reached all of us, you in your way, me in mine, thousands upon thousands of other people in theirs.

Twenty years have gone by and we run a terrible risk. We run the terrible risk in this so-called peace we are living in now of overlooking the boy who has been torn from his family and of rationalizing that "Isn't it a wonderful thing for a young man to be sent overseas at the age of 18 or 19?

"Isn't it great for him to go over now when he can learn and see the whole world unfold before him? Isn't it wonderful that nobody is shooting at him now? If I had a boy, by George, I would want him to go overseas because that's the place where a boy will really develop."

All true.

But how many of you are mothers and fathers who have taken your boy to the train—not because he's going overseas, but because he is going away to college? He is going perhaps to some northern corner of your State or the southern corner of your State, but there is the usual tearful farewell.

"My boy, my boy. Only yesterday I cradled him in my arms. Now he's a grown man and he's leaving me."

He's only going to be gone for a week, you know; he's coming home for the weekend.

With all the eagerness of a young man who might be leaving for an oversea duty station, your boy climbs on the train and heads for a strange new school only 40 or so miles from home. But suddenly, even that brief leavetaking assumes a heartrending kind of loneliness.

Now magnify that feeling a hundred times over and imagine a boy from Kansas or Georgia or Wisconsin who is sent to Korea or Japan or the Philippines. Not 40 miles away, but thousands of miles away. And suddenly, despite the so-called advantages of oversea service in developing mature adults, you realize that he is still being deprived of his family, that is, still saying goodbye to his home. Under much better circumstances than if he had to go out and engage in a hot war, true, but the same emotional insecurities exist. He is leaving his home, and he won't be coming back for a visit next weekend.

Over a period of 20 years, the USO has done an incredible job of remembering. Remembering that these boys have to be looked after, thought about, and taken care of. Not from the standpoint of any great physical need—the military takes care of their bodies very well—but rather from the point of view that it's vitally important that their links with home are always strong and secure.

Leo Durocher and I traveled together in a number of areas overseas. Boys there were delighted simply to see somebody they could discuss baseball with. They were delighted to see somebody they had seen on their movie screens back home. They were delighted to be able to sit down and talk about the weather in Texas, or speculate about the Dodgers and the fact they were having a tough year.

It could have been me who went, it could have been you, it could have been anybody—so long as that person represented the very vital link with home that is such an important factor in any boy's maturation.

Twenty years is a long time and I implore all of you now to remember that in time of crisis spirits run high of their own accord and sacrifices are made without stopping to think about oneself. But the moment the hostilities cease, in spite of the fact that, in order to continue to defend our country boys must be stationed throughout the world, there is suddenly a remarkable lack of that patriotic fire which is so evident in wartime.

And this is one thing you have to do in order to demonstrate what USO has done, is doing, will do—ever, ever continuing to remember. You have to keep on rekindling the fire.

Twenty years is a long time to remember, and I am justifiably proud of members of my profession who have stood by every single day, every single month, every single year. It's true that you continue to hear of Mr. Hope and Mr. Benny and Mr. Skelton—all the people whose names are familiar to you. But I would like you to remember also that there are thousands upon thousands of people who are not well known, and who have continued this work for 20 years.

I was talking to somebody at a press conference this afternoon and a newspaperwoman said to me, "Well, how do we go about getting people to remember?"

And I said you and others like you can do our country a great service through your newspapers and magazines and radio broadcasts by constantly reminding people that the USO is still functioning just as powerfully as it ever did before—that there are people ever ready, standing by to go and do their bit.

And I would like to say to you, ladies and gentlemen, that you have earned a great deal of respect and admiration because it is you who have kept the spirit of USO alive. I take a deep bow to you, because without the organizational spirit of people like you, who are really interested, we in the entertainment industry cannot properly do our part. And I say to you now—all you have to do is to designate where and how you need us, and I pledge to you—for my profession—we will respond to any command with a salute.

USO is a remarkable organization to keep alive.

So, why don't we grow old together? Continue this work together until we can't any more.

Wouldn't that be fun.

United States-China Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following speech was delivered before the Chinese Student Service Club of Washington, D.C. a few weeks ago by Dr. Stanley K. Hornbeck.

Dr. Hornbeck speaks as one having authority, especially on the question of the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. As this matter is extremely timely at the present juncture in world affairs I am calling it to the attention of the Members of House.

UNITED STATES-CHINA POLICY

(Speech by Hon. Stanley K. Hornbeck, U.S. top specialist and veteran diplomat on Far Eastern Affairs, before the Chinese Student Service Club of Greater Washington, Washington, D.C.)

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I gave a talk in Cincinnati a few days ago. I covered a lot of ground and I talked on no less than 20 subjects. I am going to talk today about only three subjects and to focus on one. I am going to ask of you, when I finish, to ask questions.

I have been thinking about the fundamentals, when it comes to policy, particularly when it comes to foreign policy. What is the framework in which, the background against which and the foundation on which, the people and the Government of the United States make foreign policy? I shall say some things rather categorically, because there isn't time to elaborate.

I've come to the conclusion that to understand and usefully evaluate U.S. policy in regard to any given foreign countries or to any particular situations abroad, one should first take into account certain fundamentals in the political organization of the United States and the political feelings, believings and reasonings of most of our people, and then the overall and abiding problems with which this country has been and is confronted in the formulation and implementation of its overall foreign policy.

The United States is essentially and comparatively speaking a democracy. The people of this country have believed in and have tried to have freedom, liberty, self-determination and security. Our overall foreign policy has been and is a policy of defense. Our attitude was well expressed in the Monroe Doctrine. There we gave a warning against aggression and we declared that we ourselves would not engage in aggression. We addressed that to European powers; but it has applied in reference to the whole world. The concept was "live and let live." During the decade since 1914, we have been forced to enlarge upon the principle of live and let live and our efforts now include measures to help live; but our posture and our policy remains defensive. In terms of safeguarding our own security we realize that now to make ourselves secure, we must help toward making other peoples secure. So, objecting to procedures of aggression and now menace by aggressors, we support resistance to perpetrators of aggression. However, our thought is still "live and let live."

Lincoln spoke of freedom and of its survival. Wilson spoke of democracy and of making the world safe for it. Now in our overall policy, our first and greatest concern is that freedom and democracy not be destroyed. The essence of the conflict between the United States and the Communist world is that the Communists intend to conquer and toward that end, they are making war; we intend that we shall not be conquered and, along with us that other people shall not be conquered. The Communists are on the offensive and we are on the defensive.

I am constantly surprised at finding people who should know better who fail to discern the pitfalls of the current Soviet campaign of "coexistence," "competitive coexistence," and in particular "peaceful coexistence." Coexistence of course we have. Competitive coexistence we have. But peaceful coexistence we cannot have as long as Moscow and Peking persevere in their policy of conquering and we in ours of opposition and resistance. Moscow's talk of peaceful coexistence is a political opium. The purpose is to tranquilize us while they proceed with their plan and effort to conquer. The Communists need time. They need accumulation of weapons, including economic; and Chairman Khrushchev is playing for time. Peking is impatient. Both Mao and Khrushchev may be having troubles at home. In fact, we know they have some troubles, each of them, at home. But the Peking contention is more honest than the Moscow profession. Both Khrushchev and Mao know that to make the world safe for themselves and their systems, they must persevere in a common effort to enlarge the Communist domain. In other words, they have to go on trying to conquer. They know that communism has achieved its conquest so far, and that it exists, by procedures of aggression, and that for it and them to survive, they must work toward universal prevalence of their system. Both of them intend to bury their opponents. Their difference is that Mr. K. is affirming that big guns, big threats and cold war will suffice, whereas Mao contends these are not and will not be enough and there will have to be a hot war. Neither of them believes in peaceful coexistence. Their ideas, and in fact their definitions, of peace and peacefulness are different from our definitions. When they say "peace," they do not mean what we connote by that term, and in their concept coexistence cannot be permanent. For, when you bury an intended victim, you no longer coexist with him.

The Communists, since 1917, have buried politically one-third of the people of the world. The greatest of their victories is that which they have achieved in the conquest of the Chinese mainland. There, they have buried politically 600 million Chinese. There, they have declared most resoundingly their hostility to us and their intention to do us in. There, more than anywhere else except in Berlin, they show their purpose and ours to be in obvious conflict.

For 10 years now, there have been conflicts between Communist China and the

United States over various issues—among which, diplomatic recognition, seating in the United Nations, Korea, Formosa and the offshore islands. That one of those to which attention was drawn, unfortunately, in the course of our recent presidential campaign is that of Quemoy and Matsu, and the question of our interest and our policy regarding defense of those islands keeps bobbing up.

In that context we come upon the error in believing or affirming, or both, that the offshore islands are indefensible and worthless and that support by the United States of the Nationalist defense of those islands is of no use to us and is a disservice to the course of peace.

Those islands, the Quemoy and Matsu, are indeed small islands territorially and they have small populations. But they lie across the entrances to the harbor of Amoy and the harbor of Foochow. Amoy and Foochow are among the most important strategically and economically of China's ports. And they are the nearest to Formosa.

Whatever else, all of these offshore islands are part of the actual domain—legal, political and physical—of the National Government. Historically, they have been a part of China. The National Government's jurisdiction over them was gained by inheritance and has been continuous. That Government has not taken them away from the Communist domain on the mainland. It simply has held and defended them as part of what remains of its own erstwhile nationwide domain.

All of the Nationalist-held islands need to be considered in terms not of geography (place where) or of arithmetic (that is, size, number of population and economic values) but far more to the point, of their place in the struggle in China and in the global struggle in which freemen and men wishing to be free, are, along with us, on the defensive.

In all cases of testimony, the time when and the circumstances under which an affirmation has been or is made need to be taken into account. Capability is a matter of will plus military commitment. Value is a matter of tangibles plus intangibles. In the eyes of both of the Nationalists and the Communists, Quemoy and Matsu do have substantial values. In major part, possession of them weighs heavily in the calculations of the Nationalists for defending Formosa and those of the Communists for an attack on Formosa.

The purpose of the Communists to take Formosa can no longer be doubted, and in that context, the offshore islands serve, in the hands of the Nationalists, as an obstacle to the launching of an attack. Capture of them or transfer of them to the Communists would remove that obstacle, would enlarge the capabilities of their Amoy and Foochow bases and would serve for them as a staging point or forward bases for the attack. To the Nationalists, the loss of Quemoy and Matsu, whether by force of arms or by diplomatic pressure would be a terrific blow. In combination, it would bring the Communists nearer physically to Formosa and, far more important, it would be destructive to the morale of the defending armed forces on Formosa and the supporters overseas and around the world of the Nationalist cause. To the Communists, acquisition of Quemoy and Matsu would be highly encouraging. It would be helpful to them in connection with consolidating their position among the people who now live on the mainland and it would greatly facilitate carrying out their plans for conquest of Formosa and points further east, north, south, and west.

The offshore islands are thus important tangibly in terms of military strategy and they are very important intangibly in terms of psychological warfare.

By 1954, American policymaking opinion had arrived at a conclusion that support by the United States of China's National Government in the defense of Formosa was appropriate. This based on calculation of our own interest in the western Pacific, the idea being that we could not afford to let Formosa fall into the hands of the Communists. Prompted in part by a renewed assault by the Communist regime on the offshore islands, the U.S. Government negotiated in 1954 and concluded in early 1955, a treaty with the National Government, a mutual defense treaty, in which the United States became formally committed to support of the Nationalists in defense expressly of Formosa and the Pescadores. Then, in connection with this, the Congress expressly authorized the President in the event of an attack on the offshore islands and that a conclusion on his part the attack was preliminary to an attack on Formosa, to include support of the Nationalists in defense of the offshore islands.

When, in 1958, the Communists subjected the offshore islands to heavy bombardment, the United States gave the Nationalists defense substantial support. The Communists did not see fit to attempt an assault or make war on the United States. Since then the Communists have continued their bombarding of the islands and their loud proclaiming of their intention to take Formosa, and the Nationalists and the United States have continued their cooperation in measures for the strengthening of the defense establishments both on Formosa and on the offshore islands.

Let it not be the thought or be said that the support of defense of Formosa and the support of defense of Matsu are separate problems, or that they differ greatly as regards risk of war by the Communists on the United States. Let it rather be realized that the issue between the Communist China and the United States is more than a local issue, is in broad dimension that of Communist expansion by procedures of conquest and subjugation.

Fundamentally, we believe in the right of nations to self-determination and the right of law-abiding man and nations to freedom and security. Throughout our history, the people of the United States have been opposed in principles to policies and practices which have involved in effect denials of those rights and indulgence in procedures of aggression. Generally speaking, we have been opposed to imperialism because its practices have involved such denials and such results. In the Far East, we have opposed practices of aggression when directed against China, when directed against Japan, when manifested by relations between Japan and China and when manifested in Korea and in Indochina. In the World Wars and in the operations in Korea, our participation came of German, of Japanese, and of Russian imperialism and our opposition thereto.

Now, war between the United States and Communist China, if it were to come, would come not because of support by us of China's Nationalists' defense of Quemoy and Matsu or of Formosa, but because of, on the one hand, Communist perseverance in its policy and programs of expansion by procedures of aggression and, on the other hand, our perseverance and our opposition to such procedures. It would come perhaps in the guise of a local conflict but because of conflicting major purposes in a global struggle. The choice, then, for the United States, in regard to the defense of the offshore islands is not between a course involving risk of a Communist attack on us and a course not involving such risk. Risk of such attack is actual. We already have it.

None of us without warrant can predict that the Communist Chinese rulers will or will not sooner or later attack the United States. But all observers and discussants should make note of the fact that thus far, in their course of conquest, communism's strategists have chosen not to attack at points where there are both substantial defensive strength and obviously firm purpose to resist. Communists attack at points of weakness, not at points of strength.

What may be their next move can only be conjectured and what the United States may do if and when confronted with a new development can be surmised only in the light of what has been thought, said and done, first under the Truman administration and since then under the Eisenhower administration. It was President Truman who first declared, "I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free people who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressure." It was President Truman, in a Democratic administration, who 10 years ago placed the 7th Fleet in the Strait of Formosa.

They who think that there should be or will be a sudden change in the attitude and the policy that have developed as those of the United States in relation to the problem of keeping Formosa out of Communist hands may well be asked to consider the advice of Robert Frost: "Do not take down a fence without first knowing why it was put up."

I thank you.

The Occasion of the 60th Anniversary of the Washington County Free Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the free public library is a uniquely American institution. I say this not only because it was originated in America by Benjamin Franklin, but because of its entirely voluntary character. We may go to a library or we may stay home. When we go, we may browse until we find some book that fills our need for enlightenment or entertainment.

In this second half of the 20th century we are often preoccupied by that portion of organized knowledge which we call science. When we are daily confronted by either the military, diplomatic or propaganda effect of the scientific success of a powerful competitor, we naturally concentrate much of our intellectual effort on science. Aside from any competitive aspect, we know that we must excel in both pure and applied science if we are to attain the goals that we have set for ourselves.

The free public libraries of America can, however, fill a peculiarly valuable function in this highly charged atmosphere. They can, of course, be a tool for the continuing education of those who dedicate themselves to science.

But equally important, the free public library can provide a balance in our intellectual life. The people of America have access here to all the wealth and mellow splendor of the humanities. We

read history, biography, geography, the arts and the languages of the globe. And these are the areas of knowledge that are necessary to the wisdom and maturity to exploit and enjoy the victories of science.

The Washington County Free Library merits the praise that is being conferred upon it tonight. It has played and will continue to play a role in the community which is more significant than might be recognized by the casual observer.

For all that the Washington County Free Library offered the people that it serves, I wish it well upon the occasion of commencing its 70th year of service.

Let Us Not Fear Obstacles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein some recent excerpts from Andre Maurois which contain an interesting and realistic philosophy quite pertinent to some phases of contemporary American life.

Beset as we are these days by problems of all kinds, it is well for us to recognize that it is through work, faith, and hope that we will be able to solve the great problems of the present and the future, and we must never take a pessimistic attitude toward them, nor should we lack faith in our ability to do everything possible that has to be done to safeguard our precious liberties.

The article follows:

ANDRE MAUROIS SAYS: THERE IS NO EARTHLY PARADISE

There are people who naively believe they would be happier if they had lived in a Garden of Eden, free from all trouble. What an illusion. Trouble and struggle are an essential part of life. You could no more live without trouble of some kind than you could live without food.

If you bring up an animal in an asceptic atmosphere, you make it susceptible to all diseases. Should it be later sent into the wide world around, it would be unable to defend himself. To live is to fight. Who forgets that soon perishes. Laboratory rats can no more live outside the laboratory. A tame lion would die of starvation.

The same is true of men. Those who were brought up the hard way are the successful ones in later life. They develop a resistance to hardship of all sorts and a thick skin that will protect them.

A child who has been accustomed to think that everything will be done for him by indulgent parents and that pocket money is one of the rights of man, will become soft as butter. The day he will have to earn his life in the jungle of a large town, he will lack toughness and courage.

Alexander Fleming, the great scientist, inventor of penicillin, was a farmer's son, born in Scotland, who as a child used to walk every morning four miles to school under rain and snow. He used to say in later life that those early years had given him health and tenacity. Comfort softens men; strife strengthens them.

That does not mean children should be treated harshly; it means they should not be taught life is the Garden of Eden because that is not true. Tomorrow as yesterday, in spite of automation, nobody will succeed without work. And so much the better. For if, by some incredible miracle, the lives of men suddenly were easy and leisurely, then boredom would become unbearable and mental diseases would creep in from all sides.

Of course, there is a limit to the difficulties man can put up with, but a reasonable dose of worries does no harm to anyone. On the contrary. Let us not complain if we have a boss hard to please, an exacting husband or wife. Small quarrels, if not too frequent, are beneficial. They wake us up and compel us to reconsider the situation. To mount a fiery horse is more amusing than to drive a hack.

So let us not fear obstacles. Let us face them and jump them gaily. For human life is not the Garden of Eden; nor is it the valley of despondency; it is the sanctuary of work.

Resolution Honoring Kyle Palmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the California State Assembly on April 14 paid a richly deserved tribute to Mr. Kyle Palmer, who retired several months ago as political editor of the Los Angeles Times.

The Assembly honored Mr. Palmer through adopting by unanimous vote a resolution citing him as "deserving the highest commendation and congratulations for his truly significant contributions to public affairs." The measure had 68 coauthors from both political parties.

Kyle Palmer has won respect and admiration not only in Los Angeles and the State of California but throughout the Nation for his many years of conscientious public service. I heartily concur in the action taken by the State Assembly.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the resolution for inclusion in the RECORD:

Whereas, after many years as a correspondent and political writer with and since 1939 as political editor of the Los Angeles Times, Kyle Dulaney Palmer has retired from this active career; and

Whereas he has played a highly significant role in helping to mold public opinion through his writing and thus contributing to the policies of Government; and

Whereas, while a person who genuinely liked politics, Kyle Palmer has been on numerous occasions a no-holds-barred critic of the policies and performances of both major political parties and their leaders; and

Whereas his talents have been utilized for varying periods of time in such capacities as a public-relations adviser to the Motion Picture Producers' Association, as a war correspondent in World War II, and as a special escort for Japan's Crown Prince Akihito; and

Whereas Kyle Palmer's national stature as an influence and expert on the political scene is evidenced by his many articles appearing in nationally circulated magazines and as an editorial consultant for newspapers other than the Times: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That Kyle Dulaney Palmer is deserving the highest commendation and congratulations for his truly significant contributions to public affairs, and it is deemed most fitting that such recognition should come to such a man from the Assembly of the State of California, whose activities have long been one of the major sources of Kyle Palmer's interest.

Quiet Disciple of Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, Young Americans for Freedom, a national nonpartisan conservative youth organization, was founded in September of 1960. Since then it has quickly expanded and now represents more than 21,000 students and young people in 250 college and other chapters.

One of the founders of Young Americans for Freedom, who also serves on the board of directors, is George W. Gaines, 22, of New Iberia, La. George has served as a page in the 85th Congress and graduated from the Capitol Page School. Since then he has been active in politics and has studied at Tulane University.

In the April edition of New Guard, the official publication of Young Americans for Freedom, George has written an article concerning my colleague from Louisiana, Hon. HAROLD B. MCSWEEN. I would like to call this to the attention of the Members of the House.

The article follows:

QUIET DISCIPLE OF PRINCIPLE

(By George Gaines)

To farm-State Representatives the bill was most attractive. It breezed through Congress according to schedule: 60–27 in the Senate, 254–131 in the House. Ike promptly vetoed it, exercising that right for the first time in the Democratic 86th Congress.

With the help of 6 farm-bloc-minded Republicans, the Senate overrode the veto 64–29 with 2 votes to spare. By the time the burning issue reached the floor of the House, the pressure was enough to crack the House Chamber walls. HAROLD MCSWEEN, a member of the Agriculture Committee and a Congressman from a predominantly rural district, felt that pressure as much as, if not more than, anyone else.

As the House vote was tallied it became apparent it was going to be a real cliffhanger. At the end, the two-thirds needed to override the veto was short by 4 votes, 146–280. Among four Democrats who voted to sustain President Eisenhower's veto was freshman MCSWEEN.

"No," admitted the Louisiana legislator, "I didn't know how close it was going to be. And I had no idea that I would receive as much publicity as I did on the basis of that one vote. I certainly didn't vote 'Nay' to make the front pages. I just voted that way because the REA had been doing a good job under the present setup and I didn't see any reason why its administration should be changed."

McSWEEN attended Louisiana State University and received a LL.B. from that same university in 1950. Always interested in politics, he first ran for State office in 1956 for a post on the Louisiana State Board of Election. His opponent: Earl Long's sister. He won.

"I think I'm making progress," the young Democrat mused. "I'm picking up support as I go along, but frankly I don't know whether the trend of civilization is sympathetic to free government."

The Congressman, however, leaves little doubt where he stands. He has declared his intention to oppose Federal aid to education, the use of social security funds for aid to the aged, and the common situs picketing bill. Last year he publicly supported the Connally reservation.

His attention was called to a recent editorial in the New Orleans Times-Picayune which stated: "The real hope for maintaining conservative principles in the Nation lies mainly in congressional and State legislative contests and not necessarily in who fills the executive department."

"Yes," McSWEEN replied, "I agree with that generally. But the whole problem would be so much easier if conservatives would learn how to translate their theories into political power. Too much energy is wasted on unrealistic causes—like abolishing the U.N., or fluoridation, or impeaching Earl Warren. Too many conservatives don't want to talk about the minimum wage or social security.

"As for the 'coalition'," remarked the young Democrat, "I don't worry about it. The 'conservative coalition' in Congress reflects the people and nobody ever has to apologize for representing the people."

Intelligent, educated, purposeful, HAROLD B. McSWEEN goes quitely about his business of building support for his political philosophy. He is young and unperturbed about the possibility of defeat. There are many like him in the U.S. House of Representatives.

What's Wrong With Our Critics?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, since the quiz show scandal of 1958 there has been a clamor on the part of some Members of Congress and spokesmen of some special interest groups to impose controls and regulations over radio and television programing. As a former member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee I have conscientiously studied all proposals and proported justification for such control. The reasoning behind such proposals is that the airwaves are a part of the public domain and since the use of the airwaves can be obtained only by consent from the Federal Government, it logically follows that the program broadcast over these same airwaves are subject to regulation.

Every knowledgeable person concedes that the broad guidelines set out in the Federal Communications Commission Act of 1934 are in the public interest. Namely, that obscene language should not be broadcast, lotteries or games of chance not permitted, and that if broadcast facilities or time are made available to a political candidate the same consideration should also be made available to his opponent. Beyond this basic framework, the scheduling of daily and weekly programs has been historically left to the licensee and I have felt very strongly that the responsibility for this programing should remain with the licensee and not be controlled directly or indirectly by any Federal agency. This philosophy seemed to be generally accepted until recently. Since then there has been an increasing tendency on the part of the Federal Communications Commission to intervene into radio and television programing. I do not believe this intervention by the Federal Communications Commission is a result of pressure or influence from the viewing public. Rather, I believe it is a result of pressure from special interest groups and from some influence by a few Members of Congress both in the House and the Senate.

With the New Frontier came an increasing influence toward greater Federal control in every field of jurisdiction of the Federal Government. Nearly every proposal that has come to Capitol Hill from President Kennedy has reflected his philosophy that there should be increasing control by the Federal Government in virtually every field of our economy as well as public welfare. This philosophy has been further evidenced in this instance through statements made by the new Chairman of the Federal Communications, the Honorable Newton N. Minow. He frankly states, and I admire him for his frankness, that it is his belief that the Federal Communications Commission should become increasingly concerned with programing for broadcasts.

I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House an article by Max Wylie which appeared in a recent issue of Television Age. The introduction of Mr. Wylie that follows was also taken from the same publication. I hope every Member who is concerned over the control of programing for broadcasts will read the comment by Mr. Wylie. Although I am not in complete agreement with every position and statement contained in the article, I think he persuasively points out the absurdity of attempting to define what is in good taste, what is in the public interest, and what objectives should be established by any agency, committee or administrator attempting such regulation:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH OUR CRITICS?

(By Max Wylie)

(Mr. Wylie, novelist, playwright, scriptwriter, teacher, and lecturer, is perhaps best known in the television business for his book, "Clear Channels," which was, in his words, "a deliberate effort to answer all the misinformed criticism about television that has been circulated." A supervisor of TV programs, New York, for Lennen & Newell, Inc., he continues to feel that TV critics, "obliged to criticize stuff that wasn't intended to entertain them, miss the whole point: people who are looking at 'Gunslinger' never even heard of John Crosby." On these pages Television Age publishes excerpts from a rather lengthy lecture Mr. Wylie made on this very point at Pasadena City College early this year. The author is in a position to know the rights and wrongs of TV and of TV criticism. With CBS for many years, he was a writer, producer, script director and executive editor. A cofounder of the Columbia Workshop, Mr. Wylie has been associated with such programs as "Wide Wide World" and "Omnibus." Mr. Wylie began his career teaching the history of the English novel at India's Punjab University. After his first novel was published he moved to the writing staff of Time magazine and then to CBS. A new novel, "Never the Twain," based on his experiences in India, will be published next month.)

For educated people, Americans in the mass are quite uninformed.

If you were presented, for example, with an outline map that had these countries appearing on it—Austria, Bulgaria, England, France, Poland, Roumania, Spain, and Yugoslavia—could you put your finger correctly on each one? If you could, you're a very special person. The average is three out of eight. College graduates get only four out of eight. Twenty-three percent of us cannot get one single country right in an outline map. This is bad. But what is worse, for some years now our chief ally in the cold war with Russia has been, as you know, England. One American in every three does not know where England is and cannot point to where it is on an outline map.

This survey was made by the editor-in-chief of the Des Moines Register and Tribune.

I have some other revealing and depressing statistics before we get into the good news. What and how much do we read? We number 105 million adults, two-thirds of us have attended high school or college. In England those who have had formal schooling after the age of 15 are less than three percent. Now, if you rang a doorbell and asked an American if he were reading a book, any book at all, 21 percent of the Americans would say yes. If you did the same in England, 35 percent would be reading a book. Vance Packard, who doesn't seem to like anything that's going on, has reported that 30 percent can't remember reading any book ever.

Just in passing, I'm going to list the names of four books that we all read, books that we grew up on: "Heidi," "Black Beauty," "The Scarlet Pimpernel," "Swiss Family Robinson." No one can name the authors of any of those books.

Only 14 percent of our adult population can identify the following quote: "The world must be made safe for democracy." But 61 percent can remember who said, "Come up and see me sometime."

EVEN WORSE NEWS

I have worse news than this. Sixty-four percent of American adults do not know what Marconi invented; 75 percent cannot tell you what country the Parthenon is in. The above findings have recently been released by the Institute of Public Opinion, Princeton, N.J.

As we go on, it will be more and more apparent that television does not address itself to an audience that has seen, heard, and cherished all that is permanent and beautiful, or significant.

At the same time, to keep the discussion fair, are there not serious faults within the structure of the industry? And if there are, what are they and what are the remedies, if there are such?

I believe there are some faults. I have been an official of a network. I'm employed by an advertising agency. I don't feel that anyone is looking over my shoulder as I write this; I don't have any sense of editorial abridgement. I think that the following evils of television exist and are important. And that they should be acknowledged.

1. I believe top executives should see more of the finished product.

2. I believe top executives should read more of the finished product.

3. I believe that there are too many packagers who don't create anything.

4. I believe that lawyers who believe they are producers are an evil.

5. I believe that there is a problem of the independent producer, making good money but with a poor product, with no way to force him to improve it and himself unwilling to try.

6. Networks carry too much that they cannot sufficiently control or modify in terms of quality.

7. There is no effective machinery to stop poor stories at the source.

8. Advertising agencies can reject material only on grounds of taste or policy. They can never reject material because of its poverty of inspiration.

9. The subordinate position of the editor is calamitous. The fact that a script is a dreadful bore cannot keep it off the air if some producer wants it to go on. Sponsors, from time to time, find themselves paying heavily for entertainment of which they strongly disapproved.

The misunderstanding and mishandling of writers and writing—the average television executive's inability to understand writing, the basic materials upon which his whole empire stands—this, to me, is the most serious weakness in television today and the biggest waste.

In the same season when Fred Coe gave us the unforgettable excitement of "A Plot to Kill Stalin," and J. P. Miller's great story on alcoholism, "Days of Wine and Roses"; in the same season when Herb Brodkin gave us "In Lonely Expectation" and the unforgettable "Child of Our Time," and when John Houseman gave us Henry James' "Wings of the Dove," and Howard Brown's exciting "Seven Against the Wall," it's enough to make a sensitive man weep to think that for a lack of editorial control these "Playhouse 90" beauties and those impassioned human experiences are no more.

At the same time, you can't ram culture at people. You can't change anybody's background. Beauty can never be forced. It must be wooed like a woman. Yet critics assume that television can create a cultural epidemic that would, in fact, turn every American into a college graduate, poetry lover of art-gallery habitué overnight. Critics say that television should do this. Here is my answer:

RIGHT FOR RIGHT NOW

What television is doing right now is about right for right now. Television is changing all the tme. That's because we are changing all the time. Television will always be (as I feel radio was before it): an honest projection of what America is like, is interested in, is doing; what America wants to hear about, or object to, or support.

Here is an interesting illumination of American culture for those who insist that television is downgrading America's taste:

In the 66 years from 1895 to now, the top 15 bestsellers included 3 inspirational books, 2 cookbooks, 1 book on baby care, and 9 novels. The baby book, of course, is the one that you know, "Dr. Spock." You're familiar with two of the inspirational books. Dale Carnegie's "How To Win Friends" and Charles Sheldon's "In His Steps." Of the novels, "God's Little Acre" by Erskine Caldwell was a dirty book. "Peyton Place" was a dirty book. Those are two of the nine. The remaining seven novels among the bestsellers of the past 66 years were all written by the same man—and his name is Mickey Spillane.

Television critics hate to have to take this unhappy truth into account.

ENDLESS DIVERSIFICATION

Most of what will entertain a well-educated man can't be expected to entertain a poorly educated man. Most critics don't realize that there is an endless diversification between all of us—that most Americans fall between two extremes, and that, therefore, most of television's output and time is directed toward them.

There is nothing wrong with mediocrity if you are mediocre. Mediocrity is exactly right. Most TV critics never take this into account.

Moving now from the sociological to the practical and perhaps to the physical: most television is looked at when viewers have been active all day long and are tired. I don't believe this has ever been brought out before. Husbands who have been in offices and stores and garages; wives who have been banging around in a supermarket; kids who have been doing their homework or trying to avoid doing it. And when I say tired, I mean tired.

Why do television critics hate us so? Well, there are a good many reasons. Hating us makes better copy. They can't be caught. We can't retaliate. Hating television is fashionable. Destructive writing is a lot more fun to read. There's nothing dramatic about purity. There's nothing vivid about goodness. Most television critics, however, have to look at hundreds of hours of TV, very little of which was created for them. The critic doesn't react to it as a creation for the audience it is reaching. He wouldn't select it, yet he had to look at it and to comment on it. Of course he scorns it.

I'm going to quote a few things of John Crosby, a fellow I know well and like a great deal. He uncorked what I thought was his most absurd diatribe in McCall's magazine last November. An unthinking and irresponsible piece. Maybe he needed the money. At any rate, he said that the artistry of some of our best writers is smudged or blunted by interference from advertising agencies and sponsors. He has a solution for this. It is a program advisory board.

Who would be on the board? Herbert Hoover, Harry Truman, Pearl Buck, Mrs. Millicent McIntosh, Mary Lord, Walter Lippmann, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Nathan Pusey, Clare Booth Luce, William Benton, Leonard Bernstein, Adlai Stevenson, and Harry Sherman (chairman of the board of the Book-of-the-Month Club).

All I can say is that John Crosby has got to be kidding. If you ever got these people in the same room, some of them, and I can name them, would kill each other.

IMPRACTICAL ADVISERS

There is an almost militant piety about John Crosby that's beginning to amount to a psychiatric disorientation. There are other things the matter with his advisory board. Those people are too busy. They don't have 1,000 hours to spend—two or three hours a day for a full year—looking at television to see what the public is really getting. Mr. Crosby says they don't need it. How much time does he say they do need? "This matter can be taken care of two hours once a year," he says. And fix up television.

I would like to say that I think this is a little nutty.

Mr. Crosby is asking a lot of famous people who don't know anything about television programs to take charge of them. I know a few of these people. Just as an example, Leonard Bernstein would leave the room if Harry Truman ever approached the piano. Yet this is the very way Mr. Crosby would impose culture on us. His culture.

There have been a couple of published opinions as to what happens to a crash program in culture. I like the colloquial theory of Stanley Edgar Hyman, who has formulated what he calls the Law of Raspberry Jam: the wider you spread it, the thinner it gets.

Walter Lippmann, so continuously and flatteringly referred to by John Crosby as to suggest that the latter is getting a cut of his pay, has offered something as noble as Mr. Crosby's board of antiseptic celebrities. Instead of a board, Mr. Lippmann envisions (and I quote him) "one network for public service with a criterion not of what is popular but what is good."

That is a very devout sentence. Then he admits this would not attract the largest mass audience. However, he goes on, and I am again quoting him, "If it enlisted the great talents which are available in the industry but that are now throttled and frustrated by present policies, it might well attract an audience that would make up in influence what it lacked in numbers."

I'm interested in those "great talents" to which Mr. Lippmann refers—talents available in the industry but now "throttled and frustrated by present policy."

IMAGINARY TALENT POOL

I formally charge that Walter Lippmann in this matter of television does not know what he is talking about. And this is a very unfamiliar posture for him. I challenge him to name those talents now immobilized by these present policies. I will tell you what I I think. That he will never answer this, not because I am an unimportant person but because Walter Lippmann's talent pool is imaginary.

Mr. Crosby likes the idea of Mr. Lippmann's network. The present networks have "lost the Nation's top 5 percent on a cultural level," Mr. Crosby says, and these are the 5 percent of the people "who write all the books and plays that are worthwhile, who publish and edit all the newspapers, own most of the banks and industry, and largely run the country." The loss of this 5 percent, he says, "is a terrible one."

Now that is a very dangerous piece of journalism. His own copy would have benefited by some of the editing he claims is stifling television.

If it is true that television has lost all the men who own the banks, run American industry and largely run the country, how does Mr. Crosby reconcile that idiot sentence with the fact that these are the same men who sponsor television? These are the men who foot the bill for television and make it possible for people to get it for free.

EGGHEADED BUT CHEAP

This eggheaded network of Mr. Crosby's isn't to cost anything either. Because "it would take very little money," Mr. Crosby said that. This is his exact sentence. What does he propose specifically? "We would take the 47 existing educational stations and tie them together into a national network where 'Don Giovanni' the Mozart opera, could be heard without being interrupted by Mother's Day commercials," and again he says, "this would cost very little." One production of "Don Giovanni" would cost television $250,000 minimum. Does John Crosby know that? No. Does he care? No. Why not? Money's no problem. Why isn't it? Because it isn't his money. It's your money. For this national network will be subsidized. That means you will pay for it out of your income tax.

Now, may I comment on Mr. Crosby's charge that TV is creating juvenile delinquents? Violence of the most extreme kind, tortures of the most diabolical have the instant endorsement of Mr. Crosby's purity league the instant these villainies are committed by a sweating tenor in a pair of tight pants singing in French. That's quite all right because it's opera. But it's all wrong for these villainies to be committed in a pair of tight levis and in English because then it's a western.

Opera doesn't kid around with small, uninspired collisions like saloon fights and shoot-outs. Opera audiences are so used to violence they can sit through almost any suicide or stabbing and yawn or leave. Do you remember what happens in "Andrea

Chenier"? The guillotine? Or the floods and the collapsing buildings in "Gotterdaemmerung," or the boiling in oil in "La Juive," or being suffocated in "Othello," or entombed while still living in "Aida"? Do you remember how Rigoletto found his daughter? The condition she was in? Well, she had been stabbed a good deal and sewn up in a sack, and when Rigoletto found her, ready to be dumped in the river, she was still breathing. This little girl was almost as hard to kill as Rasputin.

Here is the point: A small percentage of the population of Europe and America enormously enjoys this kind of story, especially when it's embellished by great singing and a large orchestra. And it's called grand opera. Most people can't afford it in that form. Yet most people like that kind of story. On television the story of Don Giovanni will appear in such a series as "The Untouchables" or "Peter Gunn." "The Untouchables" and "Peter Gunn" will have a jazz background instead of a symphony orchestra. One is an opera, another is a western. Both belong in television. Any man who claims that the extent of his culture or the empyrean level he has attained makes it impossible for him to enjoy anything in television is either a hypocrite or an eccentric.

FOGGY CELESTIAL PLACES

One usually finds that these celestial attitudes are pretty foggy places, chilly too, with practically nobody around but Sacheverel Sitwell, Mr. Crosby himself peeking in at the window, Mr. Lippmann shuddering by the radiator, Robert Maynard Hutchens blowing on his fingers.

Madison Avenue is accused every day of violence. I'd like to spend a few minutes on violence. I want to set up a hypothetical person. Try to set aside your prejudice and remember your childhood. Let us set up an average man of 1920; let us say he was 20 in 1920. And let's see what he's read, heard, looked at, been required to memorize, in the course of a normal education.

Before he could read, he could recite 30 or 40 Mother Goose rhymes, in which he found an old man who wouldn't say his prayers, and, being a well-brought-up young fellow, he did the only thing that was possible—he took that old man by the left leg and threw him down the stairs. He saw a spider frighten Miss Muffet off her tuffet. He saw some babes who were lost in the woods. They sobbed and they cried and they lay down and died.

THE WORLD OF ALARMS

Learning to read fiction does not introduce our young fellow to the world that exists. It introduces him to the world of Poe and Hawthorne, Thomas Hardy, Ambrose Bierce, Jack London, Joseph Conrad, Wells, Kipling, Scott, and Dickens. The world of alarms and shipwreck, murder in the dark, of beheadings, trials, insanity, of grave-robbing, infidelity and cannibalism, war, thirst, and suicide.

When only 16, our young friend is obliged to memorize great sections of a story which, rephrased in today's vernacular, might read like this:

"Joe's girl, a gun moll, suspects that he's too soft for the killing he's got to undertake. So the next night she pours liquor into the victim's bodyguards and gets them drunk, takes their guns, gives them to Joe and tells him to go in and do the killings. Which he does. But the next night there's good reason to kill the gang leader's lieutenant. Joe is so scared that he pays a couple of local boys to do the job with clubs. By this time Joe keeps seeing the lieutenant in a hallucination. His nerves are shot. He decides that if he doesn't kill everybody in his way, they'll kill him. But the mob turns on him, kills him and, just to make sure, cuts off his entire head."

Now I paraphrase the story because I wish to conceal its authorship. Many of you already know what the story is. I consider it a story of violence. A yarn not far removed, in its main features, from the kind of thing for which we are being lambasted all over the networks. Nobody knows who wrote the story that I paraphrased. Some say Hollinshead, some say George Buchanan. It doesn't matter at all. What does matter is that an extremely versatile, busy-minded Englishman stumbled on it, was fascinated by it, rewrote it—and called it "Macbeth."

May I take a stage direction from something else? "She takes the staff in her mouth and guides it with her stumps and writes." Now who was she, and why did she do this? Well, she was Lavinia, and she couldn't speak because the men who had raped her didn't want the fact to be known, so they cut out her tongue. Just to make sure she couldn't write a report of what they had done, they chopped off her hands. This is "Titus Andronicus," of course. The date of this composition: 1592.

VIOLENCE FOREVERMORE

I want to mention an interesting note by George Lyman Kittridge. At the bottom of the page of the Shakespeare that I have, Kittridge notes that some readers feel "Titus Andronicus" was really too horrible even for Shakespeare. And he has written this: "Shakespeare was always prone to try experiments, and it would be strange if he had not written one out-and-out tragedy of blood when Thomas Kydd had shown him how powerfully such things appeal to playgoers." May I repeat those seven words: "how powerfully such things appeal to playgoers."

Here is television's point: violence, at all levels, has been with us a long time. And will continue. And should. There is no drama without it.

Blueprint for the Sixties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the New York Times of April 10, 1961. This expansion program planned on the part of the Yeshiva University is highly commendable and illustrates the initiative that is necessary for our people to raise the educational standards of America:

BLUEPRINT FOR THE SIXTIES

Private institutions of learning, especially in urban centers, are faced with difficult problems in meeting the expected doubling of college enrollment by 1970. For them, both the expansion of teaching staffs and the increasing of physical facilities are musts. In addition, considerable rebuilding will be required for existing facilities that soon will be outdated.

Because of this situation it is a pleasure to endorse the dynamic "Blueprint for the Sixties." of Yeshiva University, Amsterdam Avenue and 186th Street, New York 33. This is an ambitious development program which will seek to raise $30 million in the next 10 years for Yeshiva University and $27 million in the same period for Yeshiva's Albert Einstein College of Medicine.

Under one phase of the university's $30 million program there will be an expansion of facilities at the institution's main center on Washington Heights. A second phase calls for developing an entirely new campus as part of the Riverside-Amsterdam slum clearance project on the West Side. Generous gifts will enable Yeshiva University to carry out its ambitious plans to continue and expand its great service to the community.

The Pulse of a Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Miss Janet McHale, a student at Marymount High School in Arlington, Va., is one of our younger citizens. It will be several years before she is eligible to vote. Yet her eloquent appraisal of that American ideal which is at once an illusion and a reality is most inspiring.

In these days when it seems to be fashionable to ridicule America and Americans; when we, ourselves, seek some tangible image of perfection to display to the world, this young lady's clear faith in our history is reassuring indeed.

Miss McHale's trust in the principles of our particularly American democracy is unshakable. Her trust is based on the profound fact that our system has evolved by incorporating the very best of each of our ethnic groups, combining them, and calling them American. Miss McHale feels that a better political philosophy exists nowhere else on the face of the earth and she has the strength of character to say so.

I trust my colleagues will find, after reading this essay, that the slings and arrows of America's would-be detractors are not always reasons for wholesale despair. Our Founding Fathers had complete faith in the generations which would follow them. We owe them the serious obligation to have faith in ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, Miss McHale's essay follows. It is at once a tribute to her deep sense of patriotism and a reassuring reflection on the high academic standards pursued by the nuns and lay teachers at Marymount High School.

THE PULSE OF A NATION

(By Miss Janet McHale)

A fearful silence prevails. Some call it the silence before the storm. The day is July 4, the place, the emergency room of a metropolitan hospital. Sam Smith is on the operating table. The white-shrouded surgeon bowed in concentration is laboring in the silence to prevent a disastrous storm, one that will silence the dying man forever. The heads and hearts of the doctors and nurses are pounding in the deathlike vacuum, but their hands are skilled and steady. Their ears are tuned to but two sounds, the faint heartbeat of the critical patient and the force of his breath on the small plastic bag. Then comes the silence. No longer is heard the faint heartbeat or the pressure of warm breath. Panic begins to write its story on the faces of the people

working feverishly to save Sam's life. After a moment's hesitation, the surgeon opens the patient's chest and massages his heart until its reassuring beat slowly resumes. Due to his knowledge the storm after the silence does not destroy life and property but rather restores them.

On another July 4, another man named Sam was also in critical condition on a white table in Philadelphia. His name was Uncle Sam. The skilled men who were trained to save his life stood by anxiously and expectantly. They knew that the lives of millions depended upon the skill with which they used their instruments. Before that turning point of history came a silence, a silence that rocked the world. And the storm was kind. It showered its blessings on millions who felt and have felt the drops of freedom. The dying man and faint heartbeat were revived. Those statesmen and learned men, gathered in 1776, used their pens to write a declaration which gave a new life to America. The heart of this country began to pulse with life on that day and for 185 years its pulse beat has shaken the world.

But America has become more than just a declaration of freedom. In five generations, it has grown in body, spirit, and strength. America has produced a certain kind of human being and a certain type of mind. It has raised a nation of freedom loving individuals who never tire of boring the world with their praise of democracy. It has welcomed millions who have searched to find a land of real opportunity and chance and found that land on our shores. It has infused its ideals, spirit, and imagination into a world which in 1800 believed that the height of progress had already been reached. It has drawn masses who have broken away from old ties and old races to make a new world and a new race.

And what actually is the pulse of this Nation, America? It is its people. It is a combination of all religions, races, and nationalities which have contributed some of their heritage to the national product. In contributing, our ancestors have strengthened America for they realized this thought of Robert Frost, "Something we were withholding made us weak, until we found it was ourselves we were withholding from the land of living, and forthwith found salvation in surrender."

America is not a melting pot of lost identities. It is a mural made up of Americans who have kept their identities while contributing to their homeland. That mural of old, new, white, brown, and yellow pieces, built by people with a dream, is a picture of life in the United States. It is a picture of Hollywood glamor, of a small New England village, of the bustling streets of New York, and the ageless majesty of snow-covered Rockies. In it you can find Eskimos driving their dogs through a blizzard or Hawaiian native girls dancing under a palm tree at a luau. You can see a Georgia farmer looking with pride at his tobacco crop, a lumberjack in Oregon chopping down a giant redwood, or a model posing for the front cover of Vogue. There are the small-town grocery shops and the million-dollar shopping centers. You'll see a university with 15,000 students and the Humpty Dumpty Kindergarten around the corner from your house. You can find just about anything because this is a land where you can dare to be different. You can campaign for the candidate you wish to win an election and you can spend your lifetime studying butterflies. Because that decision is up to the individual, not the state or a dictator. America has grown into a land where there is initiative and imagination, the forces which have sustained the pulse of people and brought countless souls to our land.

You live in a country which is not something negative. It is positive. America is not a region, a locality, or a place. America is an atmosphere, an ideal, a vision. As our forefathers worked to give life to that vision, we must work to keep that pulse beat strong and steady. From day to day, our lives should keep on strengthening the ideal of democracy and reshaping it if the ideal is ever distorted. In the words of President John F. Kennedy:

"We dare not forget that we are heirs of that first revolution. Let the word go forth from this time and place that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans, unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed today, at home and around the world."

If we meet this challenge, it will be not only America for Americans, but Americans for America and America for the world. The pulse and heart of America will be signs of its surging life carrying hope and opportunity. It is a beat that must not stop, for if it stops there will be silence. And perhaps after the storm, none will be left to rekindle the life of our America.

An Eye for 6 Million Eyes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial on the trial of Adolf Eichmann, which appeared in the Boston Herald on April 18, 1961:

AN EYE FOR 6 MILLION EYES

The special court set up to try Adolf Eichmann has now solemnly affirmed its own competence, and the trial can proceed.

The court's ruling was a foregone conclusion, of course. This is not a judicial proceeding in the ordinary sense. It is a political trial. The prisoner's terrible guilt has already been proved out of his own mouth, out of the history of the ghastly era he helped to make. So what follows will be only a show.

Yet we cannot help feeling that the court would have done Israel and justice a good turn if it had had the fortitude to accept the defense's challenge and end the trial before it began.

Not that Eichmann should go free. He should, of course, be tried and punished for the monstrous things he has done. But he should be tried by an international tribunal, or by Argentina, where he was captured, or by Germany, where he committed his crimes. He should be tried anywhere, in fact, except in Israel, which claims that it alone has the right.

For Israel is conducting the Eichmann trial as an act of national and racial piety. The trial is a conscious and deliberate vindication of the 6 million Jewish people who died in Eichmann's extermination camps. It is both a demonstration that the Jewish people have not forgotten and a plea that the world should not forget. This is worthy. But is it wise?

Is it wise for a young nation, which is hopefully building a new life, to throw itself suddenly back into the past, to open old wounds, to live again the agonizing days when bitterness and hatred were the chief sustenance of Jewry in much of the world? Can Israel mount a posthumous attack on nazism without rousing general anti-German feelings which are harmful to relations with a democratic Germany now trying to make amends?

Israel, in little more than a decade of statehood, has won the admiration of the world for its progressiveness, its modernity, its forward look. The Eichmann case is at best a full stop, at worst a step backward.

What a magnificent gesture it would have been, if the Israelis, having discovered Eichmann's hiding place, had simply announced to the world, "Here is the hangman. We have found him for you. Let the proper authorities take over. We are busy with more important matters." Eichmann would have been tried. Germany, for one, would certainly have accepted the responsibility. And Tel Aviv need not have dirtied its hands.

It would still have been a magnificent gesture, if the Israeli court, having examined the pertinent law, had declined jurisdiction this week.

But it hasn't happened that way, and, human nature being what it is, probably couldn't have happened that way. Too many Israeli citizens suffered too many indignities, either personally or through their families, at the hands of Eichmann and his kind. They will have at least one eye for the many that have been destroyed.

We can only hope that Adolf Eichmann, in facing judgment at last, will not inflict another grievous wound on the Jewish people.

The Price You Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to an editorial which appeared in the Indianapolis News concerning the income tax.

At a time when most of us have just completed filing our Federal taxes, this editorial, entitled "The Price You Pay" takes on special meaning.

Therefore, I wish to insert it in the RECORD today. It expresses my feelings quite well on the matter of confiscatory taxes. I am sure it also expresses the sentiments of the vast majority of my constituents in the 11th District of Indiana.

THE PRICE YOU PAY

Monday midnight is the deadline for paying your 1960 income tax. Chances are that you are just finishing a complicated wrangle with your tax form, and are groaning over the huge bite the Federal Government takes from your annual salary.

No matter where you stand in the income scale, the bite is substantial. In fact, unless your pay has skyrocketed in recent years, the Government's take may have left you worse off this year than ever before. Since 1939, Government's encroachment on personal income—through taxes and inflation—has more than doubled across the board.

For example, if you earned $3,000 a year in 1939, you would have to earn $7,270 a year now—just to have the same purchasing power.

If you made $5,000, your income now would have to be $12,510. And to equal the purchasing power of $10,000 in 1939 coin, you would have to be making $26,476.

In the past 20 years, Federal tax rates have shot out of sight. The average citizen now has to work more than 11 hours out of every week just to pay his taxes. And while the tax collector has taken more and more of your dollars, the upsurge in prices has reduced the buying power of those you have left. The dollar is now worth less than half of its 1939 value.

What is the reason for all this? The answer is simple: Government in the United States has become too big. It is engaging in wasteful spending at a rate of $80 billion a year; it is disbursing billions annually in foreign aid, and in vast programs of Federal handouts. It now proposes to subsidize whole cities and industries, under a so-called "depressed areas" bill.

All of this is advertised as coming from the "public sector." Proponents of big spending speak of their projects as if they were to be paid for out of some mythical checkbook in Washington, and will therefore cost nothing. What they ignore, and what is painfully apparent on income tax day, is that the "public sector" is you. There can be no spending on farms, depressed areas, Federal aid, foreign aid, or on anything else, unless the money is taken away from you, the taxpayer, first.

Take, as an example, the national debt, amounting to $285 billion. This obligation has been incurred by deficit spending. The Government had to borrow money because it was spending more than it took in. The spenders tell us not to worry about the debt, because we owe it to ourselves. But what are the facts? First of all, the debt has helped increase the volume of money and credit in the economy, without increasing the supply of goods. That is the cause of inflation. This obligation we owe to ourselves" is responsible for slicing in half the value of your dollars.

It is also responsible for increasing your tax burden. The interest on the debt amounts to $9 billion a year. This involves an annual tax bite of approximately $50 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. If you are an average wage earner, married with two children, you are paying $200 a year just for interest on this debt we owe to ourselves.

That is a sample of where the taxes you are paying are going. And if further spending programs are launched, and further deficits incurred, the problem is going to get worse instead of better.

Having paid your 1960 income tax, this would be a good time to make up your mind to correct this situation. If you are tired of turning over 20 percent, 30 percent, or more of your income to the bureaucracy in Washington, now is the time to do something about it. Why not throw your weight behind the effort to curtail new Federal spending programs? And, beyond that, why not enlist in the campaign to cut back, and ultimately to abolish, the Federal income tax? After all, it's your money they're spending.

The Hadassah and Henrietta Szold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, in the 327 years since the founding of Maryland, we of the Free State have been proud of the contributions to the development of the Nation which our sons and daughters have made.

The first colonists gave to the New World the basic principle of religious freedom. Charles Carroll, Samuel Chase, William Paca, and Thomas Stone are Marylanders whose names are forever hallowed as signators to the immortal Declaration of Independence. From the hills of Frederick County to the harbor of Baltimore came young Francis Scott Key, there to write the ballad of freedom, now heard all around the world, "The Star-Spangled Banner." To American jurisprudence, Maryland has presented Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney, to education, Johns Hopkins and to the arts, George Peabody.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Marylanders have always been dedicated to the establishment and development of those spiritual and material causes which make for a better world. However, we of the State from whence came the blue and the gray to fight for that which both considered just, are marking not only the centennary of that tragic struggle between the States.

Also, quite appropriately, the year 1961 marks the 100th anniversary of the ordination as a priest, of James Gibbons of Baltimore, commemorating in addition, the seventh anniversary of the elevation of this world famous Maryland churchman to the exalted position of becoming the first Roman Catholic Cardinal in the United States.

In that same year—1861, there was born in Baltimore, Henrietta Szold, daughter of Benjamin Szold, first Rabbi of the Oheb Shalom Congregation. It was 50 years ago, that the tremendous heart and brilliant mind of Henrietta Szold first recognized the need for the establishment of a program of health for all, regardless of race or religion, who resided in the then barren land of Palestine and contiguous territories.

This dedicated woman appealed to her fellow American women of Jewish faith for their personal as well as financial aid. Slowly but surely, her noble plan took root and more and more American Jewish women gave of their time in raising money and accumulating other materials needed to alleviate human suffering and disease among both Arabs and Jews in the Middle East.

The ideals and vision of Miss Szold resulted in the establishment of an organization of American Jewish women, known as Hadassah. Its sole purpose was to raise the standards of health and sanitation in Palestine.

Today, as it celebrates its golden jubilee, Hadassah has a membership of over 320,000 women, scattered throughout the 50 States of our Union. Under the leadership of Henrietta Szold and through the untiring, unceasing financial and other assistance of the American Hadassah organization, there arose in Palestine infant welfare centers, a nurses' training school, clinics, and eventually the first Hadassah hospital and medical center, which was built atop Mount Scopus, overlooking ancient Jerusalem. Some years ago, due to the vicissitudes of war and politics, the women of Hadassah were forced to abandon this center. Undaunted by this loss, they built a still greater project. In fact, the new hospital and medical center will start operations officially this year on June 6. This latest achievement by these noble women to the cause of international peace and understanding will probably become one of the greatest undertakings of its kind in all the world. Yes; this symbolic pillar of American good will in the ancient Holy Land of Israel may well be likened to our own great Statue of Liberty. Both offer the key of health and happiness to those who enter their sacred portals.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I point out that while these words present only a thumbnail sketch of Henrietta Szold and her living monument, Hadassah, the surface has not even been scratched. Nevertheless, the complete story of this organization of American Jewish women will not go unrecorded.

I am proud and privileged to announce that another outstanding Marylander, the nationally famous author, lecturer, and commentator, Ian Ross MacFarlane, of Baltimore, is now in the process of compiling an intimate history down to the most minute detail of the 50 years of sacrifice and progress by the women of Hadassah. No one is better qualified to prepare this manuscript than Mr. MacFarlane, for he was the first non-Jew to live and work as an actual member of the original Jewish agricultural colonies in Palestine. He has also lived long and intimately among the peoples and problems which have confronted the political, educational, and spiritual metamorphosis of the Jewish people from their days as colonists under the Palestine mandate to that of free citizens of the great new Republic of Israel.

We of Maryland welcome to our State's honor roll the ever-to-be-lamented and honored Henrietta Szold, and one of our modern contemporaries, Ian Ross MacFarlane.

Address of the Prime Minister of Greece, Constantine G. Caramanlis, National Press Club, April 19, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as the first native American of Greek origin elected to the Congress of the United States, I felt a particular sense of pride on Tuesday, April 18, when the distinguished Prime Minister of Greece, the Honorable Constantine G. Caramanlis, addressed Members of the House of Representatives during his visit to our country this week.

Prime Minister Caramanlis was accompanied to the House by his lovely wife; by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Greece, the Honorable Evanghelos Averoff; by the distinguished Ambassador of Greece to the United States, the Honorable Alexis S. Liatis and Mrs. Liatis, as well as by other high officials of the Government of Greece.

Mr. Speaker, Greece, which gave the idea of democracy to the world, is today a valiant ally of the United States in maintaining democracy in the world.

I believe that the splendid address which I was privileged to hear Prime Minister Caramanlis deliver on April 19 to the National Press Club in Washington describes eloquently the contribution which the people of Greece are making to the security of free nations and the strength of free political institutions.

I am pleased at this point in the RECORD to insert the text of the Prime Minister's address:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF GREECE, CONSTANTINE G. CARAMANLIS, AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, APRIL 19, 1961

Mr. President and gentlemen, let me first thank you, Mr. President, for your warm words in introducing me.

I would like, gentlemen, to seize this opportunity to express through you my deepest gratitude to the American press and the American people for the feelings of sincere friendship and sympathy which, on the occasion of my visit, they have shown to Greece. I wish to assure you that the spontaneous response which I have met everywhere, and especially during my talks with your young and dynamic President, has been for me a source of inspiration and faith in the future of Greek-American relations.

The role of Greece has been decisive for the destinies of the free world. Lying, as she does, at the extreme southeastern point of Europe, at the crossroads of two worlds and three continents, Greece has always been a responsible factor of control of the great spiritual and military currents of history, whether from the West or the East.

VICTIM OF TOTALITARIANISM

In these circumstances it is natural that she should have sustained the full impact of the political and ideological conflict which has rocked and is still rocking our age. Greece, which had fought for freedom against fascism and nazism, became right after the war the object of repeated cruel armed attacks from still another totalitarian ideology—communism.

It is not perhaps a mere matter of chance that both these forms of totalitarianism were inflicted in that land where for the first time grew the concept of freedom and democracy. History repeats itself. It has been the historic fate of the people who first conceived the notions of balance and measure to find themselves always in the vanguard of the defense of democracy against all forms of extremism.

On the significance and consequences of the victorious Greek resistance I would like you to judge for yourselves. Imagine for a moment Greece under the heel of communism. Turkey would have been cut off, Italy outflanked. The independence of Yugoslavia would be at stake as she would have been submitted on three sides to Soviet influence. Finally, Soviet presence and dynamic intrusion into the eastern Mediterranean would have sealed off the fate of the entire vital area of the Middle East.

Instead of this, Greece is today a factor of peace and stability in the Balkans. Her membership in the North Atlantic Alliance insures the continuity of Western defense from the shores of the Atlantic to the shores of the Caucasus.

A GOOD NEIGHBOR

Our relations with Turkey—since the solution of the Cyprus problem—are excellent. In close and fruitful collaboration with Yugoslavia, Greece is showing in practice that the difference of social regimes is not an overwhelming obstacle to the peaceful relations between peoples.

Greece is showing that she regards peace in a positive sense and, that free of prejudice, she aims at maintaining good relations with all, subject to international law and obligations, the mutual respect of internal order and the independence of each country.

All this, naturally, has not been attained without a heavy toll of blood and property. At a time when more fortunate countries were actively tending the wounds of war, Greece alone was forced to carry out the fight. The cost has indeed been huge. I want to mention only that the losses of Greece in repelling Communist aggression exceeded the losses of the American Army in Korea, and that the material damage left in the wake of the Communist typhoon was larger even than the terrible devastation in my country during World War II.

GRATEFUL FOR AMERICAN AID

At this point I wish to stress how valuable and decisive was the help given by your great country. The Greek people are well aware of it and keep a sense of gratitude for the timely proclamation of the Truman doctrine and its effective application. Nevertheless, the Greek people also feel pride and satisfaction at having blocked the expansionist plans of communism. The Greek people know that although material help was received they had to fight it out. Unlike other parts of the world, in Greece the solution was definitive and victory complete. Greek blood alone paid the cost for such achievement.

It is easy to imagine the internal political and economic situation that confronted Greece when, in 1950, at the end of an almost uninterrupted 10-year war, she was finally able to direct her undivided attention to the work of peace. In an atmosphere of political instability and passion, with a shattered administrative machine, no means of communication, no funds, Greece not only had to tackle the tough job of actual survival but also had to create conditions for a normal development of the country in the future and for the prosperity of her people. It is to her credit that, equal to the circumstances, she applied herself wholeheartedly to the task of peaceful development and progress with the same enthusiasm and determination that she showed throughout the war. Thanks to a successful use of the economic and technical aid of the United States, and the untiring labor and the political sense of her people, Greece was able to overcome the difficulties of the first moment and enter for good on the road to economic development. The political stability of the last years, which Greece has known for the first time, permits us to envisage creatively and plan for the future of the country's economy. I do not wish to tire you with figures. However, I would omit an elementary duty if I did not mention some of the data illustrating the progress achieved.

ECONOMY IMPROVING

Thus, in the last 5 years, the per capita income of the population rose from $214 to $295. The merchant marine, which was almost wiped out during the war, now exceeds 5 million tons, while Greek ownership as a whole rates third in the world, right after the American and the British. Industrial production, including electric power, has increased by 41 percent as compared to 1955. Thanks to the policy of monetary stability, to which we unswervingly abide, trust in Greek currency was restored, deposits in banks increased, and conditions now prevail for more easy financing of the national economy.

Does all this mean that our economic problem is solved, or that there is no need of further international economic aid to Greece? The answer is that today, more than ever before, the continuation of such aid is necessary. There is no doubt that the economic situation has greatly improved. But this is an improvement as compared to the chaos inherited after the war, the occupation of the country, and the Communist-guerrilla war. Much has been achieved, but there is still much more to be done. What we have achieved must be made secure, the overall job must be completed. Were we not to finish the task, there would be the risk of endangering what has been so far achieved.

PROBLEMS AHEAD

We do not underestimate the existing difficulties. Nor do we overlook our lack in professional and technical development. For this reason precisely, my Government has drawn up and since last year has been applying a 5-year plan for economic development. Such planning is being attempted for the first time in Greece. It, therefore, has at the same time the value of a new start. The central idea of the plan is, through combined public and private investment, to insure conditions whereby the national income will reach a point beyond which a further rise can develop independently ($400 approximately per capita is our first objective), to eliminate unemployment and underemployment, and to make the Greek economy sound and internationally competitive. We aim at this result without deviating from the modern healthy principles of a liberal economy. The contribution of the State is limited to the essential sectors and our own and foreign spirit of enterprise is encouraged.

Many might perhaps think that the large goal set for ourselves is ambitious. We know that this does not lie outside reality. We are convinced that we shall not be left alone in our efforts, because we must not be alone.

Financing of our plan depends, to a considerable extent, on various foreign sources: regular air, loans, transfers of capital, etc. If these sources were to be cut off, our efforts would be endangered, and along with them, the fruits we have reaped so far with so much blood and toil.

Gentlemen, I would like you to know that in Greece at this time an experiment is being carried out, the results of which will have immediate repercussions in the whole area of the eastern Mediterranean and the Balkans.

If it is true that peace is a contest with peaceful arms, if we accept that international communism has not abandoned its aims but merely changed its methods, if finally we are convinced that it is the ardent desire of all people to be free, by whatever means, of the specter of poverty and privation, if all this is true, then we shall have to recognize that it is of the utmost political importance to prove that totalitarianism is not indispensable for the development of a poor economy. From the example of Greece will depend, in a large measure, the answer to the question of whether or not it is possible to seek prosperity in freedom and dignity.

I am sure that with the help of God and all of you the reply will be affirmative.

Did Yuri Do It—Or Is It a Hoax?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I suggested that the House Committee on Science and Astronautics

conduct an exhaustive investigation into Soviet Russia's claim that it launched a man into space.

My own investigation of this entire subject begins to indicate more and more that much remains to be disclosed by the Soviet Union before the world can accept the veracity of the Communists' assertion.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article written by Peter Reich, aviation editor of Chicago's American, which I think makes a significant contribution to this entire subject.

Mr. Reich's rich experience in the entire field of space exploration is reflected in this article, in which he raises some pertinent questions which indeed justify the investigation which I proposed.

Mr. Reich's article follows:

DID YURI DO IT—OR IS IT A HOAX?

(By Peter Reich)

A week after the Soviets say Yuri Gagarin became history's first man in space, certain vital questions remain unanswered.

In some quarters this lack is interpreted as an indication that the "orbital flight" may have been the greatest hoax in history.

Yuri, say these quarters, never may have entered space.

You can make up your mind after considering apparent contradictions cited by space experts.

Report: Yuri said he could see the earth "very well" from orbit—"The shores on the continents, islands, important rivers, great water surfaces, wrinkles and localities were clearly distinguishable. I saw perfectly great squares of collective farms. It was possible to distinguish between plowed and grassland."

Fact 1: Photographs taken at great altitude indicate that very little can be determined on earth from the altitude (109 to 187 miles) at which Yuri supposedly rode.

Fact 2: A. A. Blagonravov of the Soviet Academy of Science, told newsmen in Florence, Italy, that Yuri's spacecraft had no windows or portholes. (Later at a news conference, Soviet scientists said some Soviet spaceships have windows.) When Blagonravov was pressed as to how Yuri could see from a windowless ship, the scientist said, "by radio."

Report: Yuri said he "floated" inside the spaceship due to zero gravity and that other objects floated around him. Yet he said he "ate and drank, and everything was like on earth."

Fact: Eating and drinking in the weightless state, American experts have demonstrated, are difficult. Liquids vaporize. Even when squeezed into the mouth from sealed containers, liquids tend to balloon, making swallowing difficult. Solids tend to float above one's soft palate, making one choke.

Report: Yuri was said to have been blasted off at nearly 25,000 miles per hour, then settled into orbit under 18,000 miles per hour.

Fact 1: An object shot into orbit enters orbit at close to its top speed.

Fact 2: The stresses of acceleration on a body attaining 25,000 miles per hour within 187 miles up and the few minutes that Yuri had, are tremendous. Yet Yuri made no mention of these awesome forces in his report. Not a word about how he was flattened, had difficulty breathing, or the like.

Report: Yuri said he sang the song "The Homeland Hears, the Homeland Knows" as he was coming down.

Fact: During the terrible period of reentry, when the deceleration forces are as bad (if not worse) that the acceleration forces on the upward flight, a human being would have a hard time singing. This writer experienced about 5½ g.'s (forces of gravity) in a jet fighter, and my chest felt as though it were caving in. Estimates are that during reentry, a spaceman coming back from orbit will experience from 10 to 20 g.'s—hardly a state in which to sing.

Report: Yuri said everything in the weightless state became easier to do.

Fact: All the American astronauts in training have reported that tasks in the weightless state become more difficult to perform. Humans tend to lose a frame of reference under zero g., scientists have determined.

Report: Tass, the official Soviet news agency, said "the cosmonaut landed by parachute." Tass did not say his vehicle returned by parachute, it said he landed this way.

Fact: Ejecting from a space capsule does not seem a reasonable way of returning from orbit, scientists believe. However, the Tass report may have been incomplete or garbled in translation.

These are the major discrepancies in the Soviet reports. To them must be added these curious facts:

The Soviets announced that their astronaut was in orbit at the time he was aloft. Why would they take this unnecessary chance? The hardest part of the flight—reentry and recovery—still was ahead.

The Russians hadn't told newsmen about the launching in advance. Why, then, would they risk the biggest fiasco in news history—a nonreturned, or dead, astronaut—with a premature announcement? It doesn't make sense.

Again, our administration in Washington has withheld usually available details on our tracking of a Soviet spacecraft this time. Why? Did we really track their manned satellite—or was there nothing to track?

BUILDUP AND LETDOWN

The big buildup preceding the Soviet announcement of their man in orbit was unusual, too. As was the subsequent letdown. The London Daily Worker, you'll recall, finally broke a story—which it attributed to private sources in Russia—to the effect that the son of a prominent Russian airplane designer had been shot into orbit.

Yet, when the astronaut finally was identified—a full day after the Worker broke its story—he turned out to be an unknown air force officer.

Is it possible that the son of the famed designer—a logical choice for history's first man in space—had been lost in space? Or that he had landed with his brains scrambled from the terrible stresses he had had to endure?

Is it possible that Yuri was palmed off as the first cosmonaut without ever having gone aloft?

Nor have any pictures of Yuri's space capsule been released. Nor any of Yuri inside the space capsule.

MONKEY'S FATE

Is it reasonable to assume that the real astronaut the Russians sent up suffered brain damage? Yes, indeed.

It is a well-kept secret that the first monkey—Gordo—that we sent into space in 1958 in the nose cone of a Jupiter missile was not simply lost at sea as reported.

And the monkey was dead long before the nose cone burned up, killed by the horrible strain imposed by the wild gyrations of his vehicle. He was, literally, shaken to death.

Something similar may have happened to a real Russian astronaut.

Why would the Russians—masters of propaganda—risk such a giant hoax?

They would have ample reason to take the chance.

Putting the first man in space is a tremendous propaganda victory.

The Russians are well aware that the United States stands on the threshold of putting a man in space—not into orbit, just 115 miles up, and back down. But, still, space.

The Russians desperately wanted their own cosmonaut up first. A first by the United States would have meant our country would have regained all the prestige we lost when the Russians put up the first manned satellite, Sputnik I.

The Soviets could not permit this to happen.

Did they gamble? Did they shoot a man up before they were really ready to do so? Did they fail to bring him back, or was he terribly hurt—and did word of a man-in-space launch leak out, so that the Russians had to produce a hale and hearty cosmonaut, even one who never had been in space, in order to cover their attempt?

We can't prove this is what happened.

But to those who know space flight and its problems, the hypothesis makes sense.

An American astronaut may yet be the first man to return safely from space.

H.R. 10, Voluntary Pension Plan for the Self-Employed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by J. E. McMahon, distinguished financial reporter for the New York Times and which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, February 19, 1961:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 19, 1961]

PENSION BILL BACKED FOR SELF-EMPLOYED

(By J. E. McMahon)

Self-employed persons, who for many years have sought to obtain from Congress tax benefits for setting up their retirement programs similar to those extended to corporate employees, seem to have a better chance of attaining their goal this year, proponents of such legislation believe.

The latest bill for that purpose, H.R. 10, introduced in the House by Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, of Brooklyn, on January 3, is a much modified version of older bills. And it has been fashioned to meet some of the objections that proved stumbling blocks to the passage of such measures in previous years. It is because of these modifications and the more widespread support for self-employed pensioning, even by President Kennedy last year as a Senator, that backers of such legislation feel more confident of success this year.

The fact that the administration expects a budget deficit of $1 billion for the fiscal year ending on June 30 and possibly a $2 billion deficit in the next fiscal year could have a bearing on the outlook for the legislation. The loss of tax revenues has been one of the big obstacles to passage of such bills in other years.

On this matter, Representative KEOGH said last week that instead of an estimated loss of $365 million a year in revenues that the 1959 bill would have entailed, the new measure might result in a loss of $100 million to $150 million a year. Furthermore, he added, provisions of the new bill will cover some 17 million persons, instead of 9 million under the older measure.

While the 10 percent of earnings formula is retained in the 1961 bill, the amount that can be set aside by the self-employed for pensions is limited to $2,500 a year, compared with $7,500 under previous bills. Moreover, while the older bills were designed to cover only the employer, the new bill would cover also his employes, if "they are more than three in number."

A résumé of the new bill said that the "newest version of the Keogh bill—officially titled the Self-Employed Individuals Retirement Act—embraces a somewhat different approach than in prior Congresses. Instead of allowing the self-employed a limited tax deduction for amounts voluntarily set aside for their retirement either in restricted trusts or insurance or annuity policies, the present H.R. 10 adopts the general form of the Senate Finance Committee bill of the 86th Congress, which would have brought self-employed persons under existing legislation relating to non-discriminatory, tax-favored private retirement plans by allowing them to be treated as their own employers and employes."

It also was said that many important changes had been made in the new bill as compared with a Senate version. Among these were:

The elimination of all proposed restrictions on corporate pension plans covering so-called owner-employes.

The bill does not require a self-employed person to include his employes under the plan unless they are more than three in number, excluding part-time or seasonal employes.

The bill modifies the severe limitations of the Senate bill on the amount of contributions that can be made on behalf of owner-employes, that is, sole proprietors and partners having more than a 10 percent interest in the business.

The bill bases the self-employed individual's contribution on the amount of his "self-employment earnings" rather than on his "earned income" from the business.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Since the opening of the 87th Congress, seven bills have been introduced in the House to aid the self-employed with their pension problems. Three bills have been introduced in the Senate, with one by Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, receiving considerable attention. It differs significantly from the bills introduced in the House.

In reviewing the long history of such proposed legislation, Mr. KEOGH said last week that the first discussions on the subject took place in 1945 by a group of New York lawyers. Five years later the American Bar Association appointed a committee to look into the problem. The New York State Bar Association played a prominent role in this study, he said. In 1951, Mr. Keogh added, he introduced the first bill on the subject, with Daniel Reed, Republican, of New York, a cosponsor, Representative Thomas Jenkins, Republican, of Ohio, in later years was a cosponsor of the legislation with Mr. Keogh until 1958, when Representative Richard M. Simpson, Republican, of Pennsylvania, was cosponsor of the H.R. 10 bill.

In January 1960, in answer to an inquiry as to his position on the then Simpson-Keogh bill Senator John F. Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts, said:

"I am myself disposed to support the type of provisions which are contained in the Simpson-Keogh bill. I personally feel that there has been ample testimony from many sources over a long period of time in both Houses and that it is time to take floor action on this legislation. * * * I hope that it will be acted upon favorably during this Congress."

When the self-employed pension bill was being considered by the House Ways and Means Committee in 1959, David A. Lindsay, Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, wrote that "the Treasury Department recognizes that present law does not give self-employed people tax treatment for their retirement savings comparable to that now accorded to employees covered by employer-financed pension plans * * *."

Representative KEOGH said last week that the present bill was much better than those introduced in the past and that he was encouraged by support in Congress from some of those who had opposed such legislation in the past.

Constitutional Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, this week an incisive speech, entitled "Constitutional Money," was made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. It was made on the occasion of the 70th Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution. The full text of the speech follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL MONEY

(An address by WRIGHT PATMAN, First Congressional District of Texas, before the 70th Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, at Constitution Hall, Washington, D.C., April 19, 1961)

It is a solemn honor to address the 70th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution. I know of no organization more dedicated to the principles of our Constitution than the Daughters of the American Revolution. Next to the Supreme Court of the United States, I know of no group which concerns itself more with these principles.

It is also a great pleasure, and a great challenge, to talk to women about money. You handle most of it; you control most of it; and you should know most about it.

What is money?

Different societies have at different times used many different things as money. These include: Sea shells, whales' teeth, boars' tusks, stones, feathers, bricks, coconuts, cocoa beans, iron rings, salt, beaver pelts, blankets, bronze axes, and wheels.

At one time, the natives of some of the islands of the South Pacific used great stone wheels as money; and in Ireland, during St. Patrick's time, they used slave girls as money.

Of course those were the days when the men handled all the money. It took a man to handle those great stone wheels.

In our own country, we have used such things as wampum, woodpecker scalps, beaver pelts, blankets, tobacco, whiskey, pepper, all kinds of script, and a variety of other things, real and imaginary.

Wampum, you know, was strings of beads made of clam shells. A Massachusetts law, enacted in 1637, fixed the value of black clam shells at twice the value of white clam shells, and it also fixed the exchange value with English money.

Wampum was, of course, the money of the native Indians and the first settlers adopted it because it was most convenient for trading with the Indians.

Wampum continued to be the chief currency of New York until as late as 1672. And as late as 1693, the ferry fare between New York and Brooklyn was still payable in wampum.

Since the Constitution was adopted, however, our principal money has been essentially the same as that in use today. This is a form of credit money. A small part of this is created by the Federal Government, but most of it is created by the private commercial banks. This form of money is both old and new. It is old in the sense that we inherited the method of money creation—by private bankers—from the goldsmith bankers who operated in western Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries. It is new in the sense that bitter experiences have from time to time forced the Nation to adopt improvements and safeguards, through new laws and banking regulations. To realize that the money system is in almost constant state of change, we need only note that the Federal Reserve Act, passed in 1913, has been amended at an average rate of two amendments per year.

The human experience with money suggests that no particular substance has been divinely chosen to be money; and no natural order designs and regulates money. Money is, in short, not wealth, but claims to wealth. Money is not a substance, but a social system sanctioned by tribal custom, law, or constitution.

A good money system is not only a mark of highly advanced and a highly productive society, a good money system is also essential to the development of such a society. Money functions as a free society's bookkeeping system—a system wherein each individual is credited for what he contributes to the society, and is debited for what he receives from the society. A good money system permits a free society to organize its economic efforts efficiently, and to devote a large part of its current efforts to building tools, plants, and know-how for production in the future.

You see, under a barter system we could not have any taxes, to speak of, so you can imagine how horrible that would be. People in my line of work would receive their pay in copies of speeches, old laws, and so on.

Since money is a social system, a nation must either design, improve, and manage its money system wisely or risk the consequences of disaster. The graveyard of history is littered with the bones of nations that neglected their money systems, or confused money with the nation's wealth.

You perhaps know that one of the theories as to what happened to the Roman Empire is that the Empire ran out of money. The Empire depended heavily on silver for money, and the belief is that certain of the Spanish mines which had supplied the silver ran dry. In any case, the record indicates that the Roman money system tended to break down, and there was a decline in trade and a general deterioration of both economic organization and political unity which paved the way for the ultimate fall.

It would be distressing to think that Western civilization entered into the dark ages—to emerge only after a thousand years—merely because a highly intelligent society mistook a particular metal, silver, as essential to producing and dividing wealth.

Despite the clear importance of our own money system and the public's stake in the way the Federal Government manages our money system, it appears that these are subjects on which the general public has been peculiarly ignorant or misinformed.

In 1787, John Adams wrote to Thomas Jefferson saying:

"All the perplexities, confusions, and distresses in America arise, not from defects in the Constitution or confederation, not from want of honor or virtue, so much as from downright ignorance of the nature of coin, credit, and circulation." [1]

Thomas Jefferson, of course, expressed some rather harsh views on the nature of the confusion, and he had a number of suggestions to make for improving the money system. I would hesitate to quote him, however, for fear some of our contemporary bankers might think I was applying some unflattering epithets to them. Jefferson would have placed what he called a Constitutional veto [2] on private banks creating money; and he was given to saying such things as "banking establishments are more dangerous than standing armies." [3]

Few of us would agree today that the banking system, as presently organized, is more dangerous than standing armies. On the other hand, a reasonably close examination of the Government's present way of managing the system discloses several practices which are very peculiar, and very costly to the taxpayers. There are also one or two aspects of this management which are such that prudent citizens would call them dangerous to our national survival.

The Articles of Confederation failed, as we know, largely for the reason that they gave the Continental Congress no money powers. Of course, the Continental Congress issued paper notes, called continentals. But in time these came not to be worth a continental, because the Continental Congress had no power to declare its money legal tender—that is, make it good for the payment of debts and taxes.

The continentals had to circulate in competition with the money of the individual States, which did have this power, as well as the power to tax, and the continental became worthless.

In drafting the Constitution, the Founding Fathers corrected this fatal deficiency. They placed all of the money powers and duties in the Federal Government and—specifically—in the Congress. I must observe that, although I am myself jealous of States' rights, the Constitution leaves no States' rights whatever in matters of issuing money, regulating the value of money, or in determining what shall be legal-tender money. These are all powers and duties of the Congress.

True, the Constitution speaks of Congress' having the power "to coin money" and regulate the value thereof. But it has long since been settled that our Founding Fathers were not so un-astute as to think that they could create a national sovereignty by giving the Federal Government control merely over the nickels, dimes, and quarters. This was settled by the Supreme Court in the Legal Tender cases of the 1870's and again in the Gold Clause cases of the 1930's.

What, then, has Congress done with its money powers?

The answer is that Congress has delegated these powers, in one way or another, and it has not always been vigilant to learn how these powers were being used after delegating them.

In the period between President Jackson's successful fight on the Second Bank of the United States and President Lincoln's administration, these powers were delegated, in effect, to the States. In truth, the money powers were used exclusively by private commercial banks, under such laws and regulations as the States care to impose. In this period, State banks issued bank notes, or what we call currency, or "folding" money. They also created money in the form of bank deposits, just as the commercial banks do today. But bank deposits, or "checkbook" money, was not then nearly so popular as it is today.

Before Jackson's time, the money powers were officially delegated, for the most part, to the exclusive use of a single, privately-owned bank. There were, however, a number of State banks operating then and issuing notes. Jackson's fight on the Second Bank of the United States was, of course, a fight against what he expected to become a private monopoly control of the money powers; and, as he saw the matter, it was better to have the money in the hands of free-wheeling, uncoordinated State banks than in the hands of a private monopoly.

President Lincoln's problems were of a different kind, and a much more difficult kind. By the time he took office the country was in need of a national currency—a system under which a dollar issued in one part of the country would be accepted as a dollar in any other part of the country. In order to have such a currency, it was necesary to have a single, national authority to regulate and safeguard the banks issuing the currency. More than this, President Lincoln took office at a time when the country was suffering from an acute money shortage. With the beginning of the war, hard money was moved to Europe, and the banks had to suspend specie payment. Added to all this, there was the tremendous problem of providing money to fight the war.

It was for these reasons that the national bank system was established. National banks are, of course, privately owned banks, but they are chartered by the Federal Government, and are under Federal law and regulation.

President Lincoln knew more about monetary principles of any President up until his time—and probably since. He had been a lifelong student of the subject and had made profound speeches on the matter as early as 1832, in his first race for the Illinois Legislature.

But, as you perhaps know, President Lincoln's views on money were quite similar to those of Thomas Jefferson, and these were not, I am afraid, very popular with the bankers of his day. He had some sort of idea that if the private banks could issue non-interest-bearing notes, so could the Federal Government.

In fact, early in his first term he did have the Government issue some non-interest-bearing notes—then called "greenbacks"—thus setting off one of the greatest furors of all times. Some $347 million of these greenbacks were issued before Congress was persuaded to put a stop to the matter.

Incidentally, some $305 million of these Lincoln notes are still in circulation today. If you happen to have in your pocket a bill which is labeled "United States Note," this is one of them.

Last year I wrote to the Treasury and asked them to tell me what the accrued interest cost to the taxpayers would have been if this $305 million had been issued in the usual way, as interest-bearing notes, paying interest at 5 percent. The Treasury wrote me that the accrued interest charge, at a rate of 5 percent, compounded semi-annually, would have been approximately $44 billion by last year. In other words, the accrued interest to date would have been 127 times the amount of the money which was issued.

President Lincoln succeeded in getting the National Bank Act passed, but it was on some terms not to his liking. The arrangement was this: The Government issued a special series of interest-bearing bonds which the national banks could acquire and use as the basis for issuing non-interest-bearing banknotes. In other words, the privately owned national banks received interest from the Government for the money they issued; and they also received interest on the loans and investments, including other Government bonds, which they acquired in exchange for the money they issued.

This system whereby the Government paid interest to the banks on bank reserves was dropped, however, with the passage of the Federal Reserve Act in 1913.

Under the new arrangement, the Federal Reserve creates whatever amount of reserves it wishes the private banks to have, without any interest-cost to the Government. In fact, in this process, the Federal Reserve itself acquires, from the open market, an amount of Government bonds equal to the amount of bank reserves it creates, and the interest payments on these bonds are returned to the Federal Treasury. The Federal Reserve pays its salaries and other operating expenses out of this interest income first, but most of the income goes back to the Treasury.

This does not mean that the private banks are no longer privileged to create any money. On the contrary, they still create most of the money. In the Federal Reserve Act, Congress delegated its money-creating powers in part to the Federal Reserve and in part to the private commercial banks. It also delegated to the Federal Reserve the responsibility for determining how the parts are divided—within wide limits specified in the law. At the present time, the Federal Reserve permits the member banks of the System to create about $10 for each dollar which the Federal Reserve creates in the form of bank reserves. The private banks may create money at this rate of 10 to 1 to make loans to business and consumers, or to invest in securities, including corporate securities and the securities of the Federal, State, and local governments.

As of George Washington's last birthday, the Federal Reserve had issued and outstanding $44 billion of money, $27 billion of which was in currency and $17 billion in bank reserves. In the process of issuing $44 billion in money, and also from interest on its investments, the Federal Reserve had acquired $49 billion of assets, including $27 billion of interest-paying U.S. Government securities.

The amount of money which the private commercial banks had created and outstanding was more than four times as large. Specifically, it was $204 billion, as compared to the Federal Reserve's $46 billion. And as compared to the Federal Reserve's ownership of $27 billion of U.S. Government securities, the private commercial banks owned $62 billion.

In one case, the interest paid on these securities goes back into the Federal Treasury, and in the other case the interest payments go into bank profits and thus come out of the taxpayers' pockets. In both cases, the securities have been acquired with money created for the purpose.

If any of you are not familiar with the way commercial banks create money, let me amplify a bit. Certainly you must have wondered where money comes from. We know it was not here when the first settlers arrived, and we know that the amount of money in existence increases almost every year. In fact, the money supply has increased over the years at approximately the same rate at which the production of goods and services has increased.

Today, only about 10 percent of the money available to business and consumers is in the form of coins and currency. The other 90 percent is in the form of deposits in the commercial banks—sometimes called "checkbook" money—which the commercial banks have created.

This is the way it is done:

When a commercial bank on Main Street or on Wall Street makes John Jones a loan

---

Footnote at end of speech.

of, say, $1,000, it does not take the thousand dollars out of my checking account or out of your checking account. It simply creates a credit of $1,000 in John Jones' checking account. This means that the money supply of the country is increased by $1,000. An additional $1,000 of money is available for spending—simply by writing of checks. When a private commercial bank buys a $1,000 Government bond, the same thing happens. The bank simply creates the money to buy the Government bond.

The fact that money is created in this way will come as a surprise to some people, particularly those who imagine that in the "good old days" every dollar was backed by a dollar's worth of gold. Yet this method of creating money is essentially the same as private bankers in the Western World have been using for several centuries. And at no time have these bankers, or those nations in which they have operated, had enough gold—or enough of any other single commodity—to redeem more than a small fraction of the money in circulation at the time.

In truth, in all these centuries, money has never been created against just gold. It has been created against pledges of all kinds of valuable assets. And we must agree, I think, that on the whole this has been a pretty good system. Certainly if we judge the system by the economic accomplishments—the production of real wealth in the Western nations—we cannot find another system which has performed as well. While we sometimes think that money should represent claims to an equal amount of gold, the fact is it must represent claims to all kinds of real wealth, which, in fact, our money does.

We still cling, however, to certain ancient ideas about gold, which it seems to me, are likely to get us into trouble. So far, there are no signs that the space age will make any very heavy requirements on gold. Yet, despite the fact that the governments of the Western nations have vast quantities of this metal stored away in underground vaults, they continue to buy up billions more, each year, and at a tremendously high price which we ourselves fix and maintain at an artificial level. In this process, the governments of the Western nations are buying Russian gold, which means that we are sending into Russia and Red China vast quantities of food and machinery which the slave world desperately needs, and cannot produce in sufficient quantities, in exchange for a metal which we do not need.

The indiscriminate way in which the Western World now handles its monetary reserves makes it inevitable that these reserves will be contaminated by Communist gold. The Communists feed this gold into the gray markets of Europe, and from there it infiltrates our banking system. I think we ought to reexamine this matter very thoughtfully and ask ourselves whether it is really wise policy for the Western World to continue subsidizing a buildup of Russia's and Red China's industrial and military capabilities. It may be that we and our allies ought to consider some step to sterilize our monetary gold, such as putting it in the safekeeping of the International Monetary Fund here in Washington. If this were done, then at least we would know we would have the gold in case some scientific or industrial need for it ever develops.

I hope, also, that here at home we can give some careful attention to our money system and continue to make improvements. Tremendous improvements have, of course, been made. In the so-called good old days of the 19th century, when some of us imagine we had a gold dollar, the money system was, in reality, a source of chronic disorder in the economic system. In those days there were periodic money panics, bank crises, wholesale bank failures, widespread bankruptcies, and severe depressions, all arising from malfunctioning of the money system. Fortunately, the American people have been intelligent enough to learn from experience and make improvements.

The establishment of the Federal Reserve System in 1914 has been, no doubt, our greatest single achievement in providing a good money system. But other improvements can be made, and there have been some backward steps in the years since the Federal Reserve Act was passed. New practices have grown up in the Federal Reserve and in the private banking system which were not intended by the Federal Reserve Act. Furthermore, Congress has amended this act a number of times, particularly in the early New Deal period, without, I am afraid, always fully understanding what was being done. If I might suggest for your consideration improvements which now might be made they would be these:

First, a change in the assignment of responsibility for determining what interest rates business and consumers must pay for the use of money.

When the Federal Reserve Act was passed, in 1913, the responsibility for determining interest rates was placed in the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The Board members are what we might call the public members. They are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They are appointed for long terms—14 years—and to keep his job a Board member is not dependent upon the wishes of the private bankers.

At the time the Federal Reserve Act was being worked out, some of the bankers felt that they should be on whatever board or committee was to determine interest rates. Carter Glass took a delegation of such bankers to see President Wilson on this very question. Carter Glass reports that President Wilson said to them that private bankers have no more right to be on a board or committee to help fix interest rates than the railroad owners have a right to be on the ICC, to help fix freight rates.

In the early 1930's, however, the act was amended in a way which shifted the practical powers of determining interest rates to a committee within the Federal Reserve System. This is the so-called Federal Open Market Committee and its membership includes not only the members of the Board, but also the Federal Reserve bank presidents. The Federal Reserve bank presidents are not selected by the President or the Congress or the general public. They are selected by the directors of the Federal Reserve banks, and these directors are elected by the private banks. In other words, the private banks now have representatives on the committee which determines interest rates, precisely contrary to President Wilson's intention and the intention of the original law. This seems to me a bad principle, although I say this without disrespect to any individual who has served as a Federal Reserve bank president.

Second, the original Federal Reserve Act was founded on the principle of an elastic money supply, to be automatically regulated. In other words, the money supply was to increase and decrease automatically with increases and decreases in economic activity. The amount of economic activity taking place was thus to determine the money supply. In recent years, however, Federal Reserve officials have been deliberately and consciously fixing and changing the money supply, in an effort to control the amount of economic activity taking place. It is my considered view that money used for this purpose is unconstitutional money. The Congress has never delegated to the Federal Reserve any authority to restrict or limit the volume of economic activity which may take place in this country.

Third, I would not go so far as Jefferson and Lincoln are said to have wanted to go, which was to have the Government create all the money. I believe that money created for private borrowers can best be created by private banks. A private lender, operating on profitmaking standards, is the best agency for discriminating between those persons who are to have credit and those who are not to have credit. On the other hand, I have great difficulty understanding why the Government should let the banks use its money-creating power, free of charge, to create money for the purpose of lending it to the Government at an interest charge.

This much seems clear: Since both the Federal Reserve and the private banks can create money with which to buy Government bonds, the Federal Reserve ought to buy a great deal more of these bonds and thus permit the private banks to buy correspondingly less of these bonds. The Federal Reserve can do this and still maintain the same money supply it would maintain anyway. In other words, the question of inflation does not enter into this suggestion one way or the other. The only question is whether or not billions of dollars of interest payments are taken out of the taxpayers' pockets each year and put into bank profits.

Fourth, the original Federal Reserve Act provided eligible paper as the means by which the private banks could obtain credit from the Federal Reserve. This meant that a private bank could obtain such credit only after it had used up its lending powers in extending credit to business, farmers, and other borrowers in the local community. But the act has also been amended on this point, also, so that now the banks can obtain Federal Reserve credit on Government bonds. The result, it seems to me, is that too many banks have become little more than Government bondholders and bond brokers. These banks are not using the privileges they have been given to help their local communities, which is the purpose for which the privileges were given.

Fifth, there is now taking place a tremendous wave of bank mergers and consolidations, and a tendency for banking to become monopolized. This is a dangerous trend. If the banking system becomes monopolized, this will surely lead to socialism or fascism.

Sixth, the Federal Reserve bank stock should be retired. The Federal Reserve is, I believe, the only Government agency in which private persons are permitted to own stock. In this case, the stock cannot be owned by just any private person; it is owned only by private banks. The banks do not own the Federal Reserve System; and they have no proprietary interest in the system whatever. They are, however, paid a yearly 6 percent interest on the money they have invested in the system; and this means that the system is paying out to the banks about $27 million a year in funds which would otherwise be returned to the Federal Treasury. This is a completely unnecessary expense to the taxpayers.

Finally, may I suggest, there should be more public interest in the money system and better understanding of what the Federal Government is doing in this field.

You know, it has long been popular for a Member of Congress to say that all he knows about money is that he doesn't have enough of it.

I have no doubt that if such a tremendously influential and public-spirited organization as the Daughters of the American Revolution should think well of the idea of more public interest and understanding, the result would, indeed, be more public interest and understanding, both in and out of Congress. I have no doubt that Congress would be willing to make a thorough study of the ways in which its constitutional powers and responsibilities are being used, and how these uses might be improved. The Federal Government spends billions investigating

the ocean floors, probing outer space, and so on. But it has been more than 50 years since we have had an official public study of our money system. Private corporations and foundations occasionally find it worthwhile to spend millions of dollars for monetary commissions set up to make private studies of this subject, which leads me to think the subject must be worthy of study in public bodies.

[1] Adams, Charles Francis, "The Works of John Adams," vol. 8, p. 447.

[2] Washington, H. A., "The Writings of Thomas Jefferson," vol. 7, pp. 64–65, Taylor & Maury, Washington, D.C., 1854.

[3] Ford, Paul I., "The Writings of Thomas Jefferson," vol. 10, p. 31.

Historic Remarks by Chief Justice Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Legal Journal:

REMARKS OF CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN

On the occasion of the luncheon of Chancellor and Mrs. Edward H. Litchfield at the University of Pittsburgh on Wednesday afternoon, April 5, 1961, following the honors convocation, presentation of honor students, and the conferring of the honorary degree of doctor of civil laws upon the Chief Justice.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—We are indebted to Congressman JAMES G. FULTON for granting our request for a copy of the following notes which he made while attending the luncheon referred to above. Mr. FULTON, a member of the bar of Allegheny County and a newspaper publisher, told this editor that "The remarks of Chief Justice Warren are historic—and we living today in our rush and pressures often fail to realize history is being made now, just as it always has been made.")

The remarks of the Chief Justice were made in response to the introductory questions of Chancellor Edward H. Litchfield, inquiring on the point of bravery or courage in the preparing of decisions that profoundly affect basic rights under the U.S. Constitution. Chancellor Litchfield referred particularly to far-reaching questions of emotional content and human interest as well as prejudice, such as the segregation issue, which Chancellor Litchfield stated in the future could be referred to by historians as "the basic decision of the 20th century."

Chief Justice Warren responded: "That is the kind of question that any way you answer it, it is wrong. But that is our lot on the Supreme Court.

"Look at these young fine people today in what they are doing. These young people have no weaknesses that cannot be traced to us in the older generation.

"It takes less courage to make decisions upon issues that are emotional the farther the person making the decision gets away from the public itself.

"I have had personal experience in community responsibilities of many levels, district attorney, State attorney general, and Governor of California. I know how hard these necessary community decisions are to make when you are right at home, living among the people in the community.

"I want to say out of the depth of my heart, the greatest courage is necessary when issues are right on your doorstep, in the towns and communities where you live and work. As you remove yourself from those pressures, it takes less and less courage to make basic decisions on principles, even momentous as they might be.

"Our Court thought about the issue of desegregation a long time. Our Court was most conscious of the responsibility that was placed on the trial courts and the courts of appeal in this country, who had the original jurisdiction.

"When we on the U.S. Supreme Court made the decision in segregation cases that local courts should decide all the issues before these cases came to us—that put a great burden on the district judges, because of the localities where the cases arose and the community pressures upon these judges. As an example of this situation, a district judge in New Orleans had to meet a great responsibility under local and community pressures.

"Decision by the U.S. Supreme Court requires not one ounce more courage for decision than is required of any judge on any level in this land.

"We Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court are entitled to no sympathy for making final decisions on major issues. All we are entitled to is that we be given credit that we are doing the best we can to keep our American jurisprudence in the kind of order that the American people will know the law from one end of the land to the other, and that they will respect our decisions."

Foreign Textile Imports

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my beloved and distinguished colleague from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON, for his statement on the need for restrictions on foreign textile imports at this time. He has proposed a quota system, by country and category, and has explained why the President would be justified in using his powers under the national security provisions of the Trade Agreements Act to establish such a system.

It is significant that this proposal comes from one who has supported reciprocal trade legislation and is aware of the impact of our trade policy on foreign countries like Japan, which must export to live. I also have favored the reciprocal trade program and hope that it will be continued. But I agree with the gentleman from Georgia that if America is to foster the free world's economic growth, it is essential that American industries be healthy and growing, in order that we may aid the orderly industrial development of other free people.

It would be most ill advised to allow foreign textile imports to bring ruin to more of our own producers and thus worsen the present unfavorable trade balance in textiles, increase the drain on our gold, and hurt our economy when already it is showing certain structural weaknesses. My hope is for a strong, vigorous American economy enabling us not only to be good neighbors in the world trade community but to continue helping emerging nations find a better life for their people.

Justice Department Policies on Merger Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an Iron Age interview with Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, which appeared in the Iron Age magazine, April 13, 1961. In this interview the Attorney General presents his views on the enforcement of antimerger and antitrust laws. The article follows:

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT POLICIES ON MERGER LAWS

(Few matters are more vital to metalworking companies planning to merge, buy, or sell out than the attitude of the Justice Department toward such moves.

(In this straightforward interview, Attorney General Kennedy presents his views on the enforcement of antimerger and antitrust laws.)

(By E. C. Beaudet)

Question. Mr. Kennedy, the recent convictions involving the electrical manufacturing companies have focused attention on antitrust laws. Of course, prosecution of these cases originated under the previous administration. Will the present administration be less tough, or tougher on antitrust violations?

Answer. We expect to be extremely interested in merger, as well as price-fixing, violations of antitrust laws. The Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act will be enforced vigorously. I don't care to compare administrations. I prefer to let the record speak for itself.

Question. More recently, you asked the Federal Trade Commission to find out if companies previously convicted of antitrust violations were living up to court orders. You also expressed hope of a new era of Justice Department-FTC cooperation. Can this be regarded as a warning to business of your intention to pursue a vigorous antitrust policy?

Answer. Yes. There are indications which lead us to believe that as many as 50 past defendants have not taken sufficient action to comply with court orders.

Question. Does this include past convictions in the merger area?

Answer. It does. We believe some companies may have retained stock interests in other companies which they were ordered to give up. We believe there is a need for a thorough reinvestigation of these and other past cases.

Question. What is the Justice Department's objective in enforcing antimerger laws?

Answer. Our purpose is to make sure that no enterprise has the chance to dominate or control an industry, or to start on a course that might lead in that direction. We plan

to prevent monopoly and, where necessary, undo monopoly control. Our main objective is to protect the American system of free enterprise.

We look upon our antitrust enforcement policies as being probusiness—to protect the businessman as well as the consumer.

Question. Do you view the steadily growing number of mergers as a threat to free enterprise?

Answer. Mergers in themselves do not represent a danger to free enterprise. We aim to protect the small and middle businessmen who, I believe, are the backbone of our economy. In some cases, mergers can help competition rather than affect it adversely.

Question. In what kind of cases?

Answer. Well, for example, take the case of two weak companies within an industry. They may not be able to make it alone against stronger competitors. By joining together they may become stronger themselves and bring about more competition in the industry.

Question. But what about the consumer? Might not mergers of large companies bring about more efficiency and as a result, lower prices?

Answer. Yes. Heavy concentration of economic power might be of temporary assistance to consumers. But there is no assurance that this would continue. If competition were not present, there's nothing to say that prices would not be raised arbitrarily in the future. This would then work against the consumer. Our job is to see that this is not allowed to happen.

Question. Do you plan to put more emphasis on opposing mergers whose chief aim is diversification?

Answer. Each case must be looked at individually. Any type of merger that lessens competition and tends to create monopolies will be scrutinized. In all aspects of antimerger enforcement, the Department of Justice will do what it is legally authorized to do.

Question. There have been many mergers in the metalworking industry and, undoubtedly, more will take place. Briefly how can companies best obtain clearances for proposed mergers?

Answer. By submitting, along with a clearance request to the Antitrust Division, as much pertinent information about the merger as possible. Also, by giving prompt and complete answers to questions the Antitrust Division might ask about the proposed merger.

Question. How long might companies expect to wait for approval or disapproval of the Antitrust Division?

Answer. This depends on how long it takes to secure all the information the Antitrust Division feels necessary to grant a clearance. After all the desired information is in, some expression of its view can be expected within 2 to 4 weeks. This, of course, depends on the workload of the Division at the time.

Question. It has been said that competitive information contained in premerger notifications has been leaked. Are greater safeguards needed?

Answer. As you know, the Department of Justice through its investigations receives a good deal of confidential information of all kinds. Most of it concerns individuals. We have much less adverse information about companies. But as best as we can tell, no confidential information regarding individuals, mergers, or anything else has been leaked from the Justice Department. Information like this occasionally does reach the public press from other sources.

Our attitude concerning the premerger notifications is that they are no one's business but the Justice Department's and the companies involved. This information will not be furnished to a company's competitor, or anyone else. I would terminate the employment of any Justice Department employee who gave out confidential information.

Question. What are some of the factors the Department of Justice considers in approving or disapproving premerger notifications?

Answer. There can be no fixed set of standards which would bring automatic approval or disapproval from the Antitrust Division. We are guided exclusively by antitrust laws. Generally, the main legal points revolve around the relative market positions of merging companies and, as far as can be seen, the probable effect of a proposed merger upon competition.

Question. What is your viewpoint on Senator KEFAUVER's bill making premerger notifications, under certain conditions, a matter of law?

Answer. In principle, I support it. However, I am not thoroughly familiar with all of its provisions.

Question. Suppose one company acquires another without first clearing the merger with the Department of Justice? Is there a time period after which the company can feel the acquisition won't be challenged?

Answer. Regardless of the time elapsed, there is no statute of limitations which bars the Justice Department from challenging a merger. Mergers will be challenged whenever we believe such action is in the public interest in line with the principles of the Celler-Kefauver Act.

Question. If a merger is found to be illegal, are the selling companies and their stockholders subject to any penalty?

Answer. Not ordinarily. The remedy for violation of the Celler-Kefauver Act is divestiture of stock and assets acquired illegally. The Du Pont-General Motors case now before the U.S. Supreme Court may bring forth some principles which point the way to potential remedies in these situations.

Question. How do you view the formation by competing companies of a new corporation to engage in activities related to those of the competitors?

Answer. Again, this depends on the particular case. I would like to point out, however, that by forming a common subsidiary, competing companies cannot do indirectly what they are forbidden by law to do directly. We are likely to inquire into such matters.

Certain special considerations, though, are involved with respect to foreign commerce. For example, under the Webb-Pomerene Act, competing companies can form an export association as long as they abide by the provisions of the act.

Question. Are American corporations bound by U.S. antitrust laws when they buy or merge with foreign companies?

Answer. Generally speaking American corporations are bound by U.S. antitrust laws regardless of the nationality of the companies they buy or merge with.

But the question is far more complex than this. Foreign mergers differ from domestic mergers because of their possible effect on the national welfare. Foreign trade and international policies must come first. Each case, however, is decided on its own merits.

Question. In the above two questions, does it make any difference if underdeveloped nations are involved?

Answer. That would be one of the factors that would have to be taken into consideration.

Question. We've heard a lot about the "failing company doctrine" which is said to permit mergers which otherwise might violate antitrust laws. Will you please explain what this means?

Answer. The failing company doctrine is a popular term for the principle which holds that a company, because of financial losses, might go out of business if it did not merge. In such a case the merger would not appear to have anticompetitive effects.

Keep in mind, however, that, just because a company is or has been losing money, this does not necessarily mean that it is a failing company, unless it is in bankruptcy or able to prove it is on the verge of it. Remember, also, that even though a company is a failing one, if the merger has anticompetitive effects, it cannot take place legally if another purchaser is available.

Question. Does the Department of Justice contemplate future antitrust actions against labor unions?

Answer. Where unions and management join together to kill competition or fix prices, we will prosecute. Action would be taken against both. We are looking into several cases of this kind right now.

Question. Presently, could action be taken against unions alone?

Answer. No. Under the law and court decisions there has to be a conspiracy between the two.

Question. Do you believe there is a need for legislation to curb monopolistic practices of labor unions and safeguard rights of union members?

Answer. Not at this time. The Landrum-Griffin bill was passed only in 1959. There should be more time to determine how effective its provisions will be.

Question. What about trade association memberships? Need companies be concerned about the risk of possible antitrust prosecution because of membership?

Answer. There's nothing wrong with companies within an industry getting together to promote the best interests of the industry and themselves. If they don't take part in illegal activities, there's nothing to be concerned about. If they meet to fix prices, or otherwise violate antitrust laws, that is another matter.

Question. But what about those companies which are unaware of or don't join in illegal activities within a trade association?

Answer. I doubt if there are many situations like this. Regardless, it is important that each company makes sure it knows what it is getting into.

Question. Mr. Kennedy, earlier, you said you looked upon antitrust enforcement policies as being probusiness. How might business help in carrying out these policies?

Answer. If business realizes that the Justice Department truly wants to be of assistance, there are several things it can do.

First of all, it must recognize that nothing hurts business competitors more than other competitors who get together to thwart competition, fix prices, or engage in other illegal activities.

Secondly, business should be more willing to assist the Justice Department in carrying out antitrust enforcement policies. We are here to help, but we have had little help from business.

When I was a member of the Senate subcommittee investigating rackets in the labor-management field, I was amazed at the unwillingness of business to help us and come forward with information. Businessmen seem willing to complain about unjust union practices but don't seem willing to do anything about them. Nor have I noticed that business groups, to any great degree, have expressed disapproval publicly of the recent price-fixing scandals.

This may come from the idea of minding one's own business. All too often, business' attitude is to let well enough alone if profits are good. However, business should make the Government aware of those instances where mergers are stifling an industry, where there is reason to suspect price fixing, or where management is joining with unions to freeze our competition.

I feel that business has a responsibility to its community, to its State and to its country. It should be willing to help its Government. If it's not going to help it, then business should stop complaining about it.

The Osteopathic Profession Celebrates a Notable Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 10, Mrs. Robert F. Wagner, wife of the mayor of the city of New York, will be host at a reception at Gracie Mansion honoring the New York State Osteopathic Society and the Osteopathic Society of the City of New York, two respected professional groups which have made notable contributions in easing suffering and combating disease.

I am privileged to serve as an honorary chairman of this significant event, which will be a highlight in the 52d anniversary celebration of the OSCNY. In this regard, I wish to express my personal felicitation to the society and its officials, Dr. Elias Kaggen, president; Dr. Max L. Kamen, president-elect; Dr. D. Leonard Vigderman, vice president; Dr. Harold E. Klinger, secretary; Dr. Viola Kruener, treasurer; Dr. John F. Conlon, sergeant at arms, and Dr. William D. Miller, Dr. David Bachrach and Dr. Aaron Weintraub, the board of directors.

In directing the activities of the OSCNY, these dedicated osteopathic physicians are performing a valuable service to the community. Through a series of public health forums, and related events, the society seeks to dramatically demonstrate the pressing need for proper health care.

The New York State Osteopathic Society, numbering hundreds of osteopathic physicians and surgeons throughout the State, has also devoted its energies in an effort to create widespread awareness of the need to maintain good health practices.

I should like to pay special tribute to the officials of the State society; Dr. William E. Kaufmann, of Syracuse, president; Dr. Francis J. Beall, Jr. of Syracuse, vice president; Dr. C. Fred Peckham, of Oswego, secretary; and Dr. C. Gorham Beckwith, of Hudson, treasurer; and its board of directors, comprised of Dr. Wendell F. Bizzozero, of Niagara Falls; Dr. Philip E. Greenman, of Kenmore, Dr. Alexander Levitt, of Brooklyn; Dr. Jacob G. Sheetz, of Brooklyn, and Dr. Hewett W. Strever, of Rochester.

I believe it is significant to note that the officials of these two societies, and the entire membership are firm in their belief that a physician's duty to the community does not end at his front door.

Countless osteopathic physicians and surgeons play a vigorous role in community activities, participating in the work of local clinics, serving as school physicians, and directing their talents in a variety of ways.

Serving with me as honorary chairmen of the May 10 reception at Gracie Mansion are a distinguished group of Americans, including Dr. Herman E. Hilleboe, New York State Health Commissioner, Congressmen Abraham J. Multer, Emanuel Celler, John J. Rooney, and Brooklyn Borough President John Cashmore. Also, New York State Assemblymen Alfred A. Lama, Max M. Turshen, Alfred D. Lerner, Irwin Brownstein, Aileen B. Ryan, State Senator Frank J. Pino, New York City Tax Commissioner Ross J. DiLorenzo, and New York State Comptroller Arthur Levitt.

In light of the important milestone being celebrated by the OSCNY, I would like to commend the following article, which appeared in the American Journal of Nursing, to my colleagues:

OSTEOPATHY
(By Dr. True B. Eveleth)

By establishing high educational standards, enforcing its strict code of ethics, and producing well-trained, dedicated physicians, the osteopathic profession has not only gained the acceptance of the American people but it has won the respect of individuals, groups, and agencies whose primary concern is quality health care.

Today osteopathic physicians work with and maintain representation in the Nation's major health agencies including the U.S. Public Health Service and the National Health Council. Under Federal laws, doctors of osteopathy and doctors of medicine have almost an identical status. Doctors of osteopathy, D.O.'s, serve as medical officers in the U.S. Public Health Service and the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration. They are eligible (by Federal law) for commission as medical officers in the Armed Forces. However, no such appointments have yet been made.

A goodly number also serve as examiners for insurance plans, as coroners, school and county physicians, on boards of medical examiners, State hospital licensing boards, and on State, county, and city boards of health.

Doctors of osteopathy are licensed to practice in all States. In most States and the District of Columbia, D.O.'s have unlimited privileges to practice medicine and surgery in all its branches.

However, 92 percent of the doctors of osteopathy practice in unlimited license States and many of those residing and practicing in limited license States hold an unlimited license in States other than where they are located.

Licensing boards, created by State legislatures, are composed of various types of practitioners. For example in Delaware, M.D.'s make up the entire board; in Ohio the board is a combination of D.O.'s and M.D.'s and in Kansas there are D.O.'s, M.D.'s, and chiropractors in the examining group.

The American Osteopathic Hospital Association is the official national membership organization of the hospitals, but the registration or approval program for these hospitals is maintained by the AOA through its committee on hospitals which is the osteopathic counterpart of the hospitals' and the medical profession's joint commission on hospital accreditation.

Approximately 400 osteopathic hospitals located in 22 States provide an estimated 14,000 hospital beds.

These hospitals are expanding rapidly through additions to existing facilities or through new construction. In 1954, Los Angeles County voters approved a bond issue of more than $9 million for a new 500-bed osteopathic hospital—a unit of Los Angeles County General Hospital dedicated last December. Numerous osteopathic hospitals have received large Federal grants-in-aid to assist in their construction.

Osteopathy continues as on of the only two recognized schools of medicine—not as a contestant and not as a separatist—but as a contributor of a valid medical concept. The profession's most important contribution to the health sciences is the recognition of the role of the musculoskeletal system as a factor in health and disease.

The osteopathic physician finds this recognition of the musculoskeletal system entirely consistent with other scientific approaches he learns as part of osteopathic education. Along with drugs, radiation, and surgery, he adds to the arsenal of medicine the use of manipulative therapy.

Independence implies responsibility. The osteopathic profession is quite aware of this basic fact. It knows it has a responsibility for high standards of accreditation of its hospitals and schools of osteopathic medicine, a responsibility for the ethical practices of its physicians and surgeons, and a continuous responsibility for the public health.

The profession has demonstrated its willingness to serve on the health team. It asks nothing more than equal recognition for its services and contributions to the American people and medical science.

A Tribute to the Cuban Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues in the House will join with me in paying tribute to the small but gallant band of beleaguered Cuban patriots who seek the restoration of freedom for themselves and their fellow countrymen.

That the present effort has apparently failed in no way diminishes the gallantry of the attempt. Sometimes, unfortunately and understandably, impatience overrules sound military judgment, in this case resulting in precipitating the invasion effort prematurely.

However, let it be noted by freedom-loving people everywhere that the bell has tolled for the Bearded Butcher of the Caribbean and his ruthless Communists cohorts. The string is indeed running out for Fidel Castro and his atheistic pro-Communist totalitarian government.

Let this modern-day buccaneer take warning—the American people cannot and will not longer tolerate the establishment of this first Communist beachhead on the American Continent.

Speaking as one Member of the U.S. House of Representatives to the Cuban freedom defenders, let me say: Be not discouraged and be not of faint heart. The cause for which many of you have already given "the last full measure of devotion" is not lost and I promise you the people of the United States, in the American tradition, cannot forsake you. Freedom never dies; it lives forever in the hearts of God-fearing men of good faith.

Paraphrasing the words of the martyred Lincoln, "Your honored dead have not died in vain" and from these dead you will rededicate yourselves to

the cause of freedom until the last fanatical adherent of the Communist ideology is driven from your shores. Again I say, be of stout heart and by your courage you will shame those among us of faint heart, whose overly cautious counsel again recommends the policy of "too little and too late."

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this House to support positive action by the President, directed toward the overthrow of Fidel Castro and all he represents. Let us not again selfishly betray our Founding Fathers by denying aid to enslaved people, which to our everlasting shame was done in Hungary. We cannot afford to longer speak softly and carry a swagger stick. Fifty years ago American lives and property were sacred everywhere in the world and by our action in this crisis we can again alert the world that this Nation will not tolerate oppression and to all nations on earth let us say "We hope you will like us, but respect us you must."

Tenth Anniversary of Boston University's President, Harold C. Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, as an alumnus of Boston University and as a former law instructor at this great school, it is with a glow of affection and pride that I insert the following statement, issued by the university on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the presidency of Dr. Harold C. Case, who has contributed so mightily to my alma mater:

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT HAROLD C. CASE AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Dr. Harold C. Case is now celebrating his 10th anniversary as president of Boston University. On March 1, 1951, he took charge of New England's largest institution for higher learning and accepted the inheritance, as well as the challenges, of the dynamic Daniel L. Marsh expansion era of university history.

Since then, his influence has accelerated the consolidation of the university's 15 schools and colleges on the centralized Charles River campus, has projected the imaginative $60 million long-range development program, and, most important, has raised Boston University's academic standards to new levels of excellence.

The greatest guarantee that President Case could never be forgotten at Boston University or for his impact upon higher education generally is not in the impressive array of new buildings, including the unfolding high-rise structures, that now or in the future will dominate the Charles. Rather it lies in the president's ability to attract first-class faculty and administrative talent to the fold. Salaries have risen to new high levels at Boston University and compare favorably to those on the most highly sought after campuses. Few faculties anywhere can boast the combination of talent, diversity and adventurous spirit that exists among the professors at Boston University.

Students are the principal beneficiaries of this but they, too, nurtured by improving and now rigorous admissions policies, are establishing their own brand of high standards.

In 1951, Boston University's scattered schools still sprawled throughout Back Bay and reached into Cambridge. Then moves came for the pioneer school of public relations and communications, the school of fine and applied arts, Sargent College, and the college of industrial technology into splendid quarters on the campus.

Twelve of the university's fifteen colleges are now located there, with two others scheduled to join them in the near future. One, the school of medicine, will remain between its affiliated hospitals, the Massachusetts Memorial Hospital and Boston City Hospital, in Boston's South End where a great medical center is rapidly being shaped. New and some beautifully renovated dormitories have arisen. Others are planned for the future.

Internally, the university has also been reorganized. The college of practical arts and letters was incorporated for business education into the college of business administration and for art education into the school of fine and applied arts. The college of general education became a division of the college of liberal arts, and the junior college, an impressive educational experiment, is now known as the college of basic studies.

Other significant achievements under Dr. Case were the establishment of the university's African studies program, the human relations center, and the pioneer law-medicine research institute. Recognizing the vital future of Africa, the African studies program was created in 1953 to contribute more profoundly to the knowledge of this fast-developing continent. It is recognized internationally for its accomplishments.

This coming September, a 6-year program for the training of physicians will be initiated jointly by the school of medicine and the college of liberal arts. The unified program will eliminate 2 full years from the traditional 8-year undergraduate and graduate education of the M.D. In addition to educating more doctors in less time, it will improve the quality of their education through the extensive use of personal and small group instruction, and other means.

The university acquired Boston University Field (formerly Braves Field), which is utilized as the center of its intercollegiate and intramural athletic program. The field is in the process of modernization, with a new stadium now completed. A full-sized, professional theater, serving as a workshop for dramatic arts students and a stage for their productions, was also established opposite Symphony Hall.

In another significant project, the university equipped a 20,000-watt student operated radio station, WBUR-FM, with a 50-mile broadcast radius.

Today Boston University is actually composed of 15 small to middle-sized colleges, with full-time enrollments in each college ranging from 100 to 2,160 students. The average full-time enrollment in each college is approximately 700, although there are more than 10,000 full-time students in the university and double that number on a part-time basis. In these schools and colleges more New England students are educated than in any other university. Furthermore, more than 800 foreign students from some 80 countries are receiving their education at Boston University. Every State in the Union is represented in the student body.

In 1958, for the first time, more new names of Boston University graduates appeared in "Who's Who" than the names of graduates from any other New England university or college.

The pace of development under Dr. Case is quickening. This coming spring groundbreaking is scheduled on the Charles River campus for a new $4,400,000 university union building. Then the new law center-education building, first of five highrise towers, will be built. A great central library is also in the planning stages. Scientific centers are being improved and rebuilt. Improved parking facilities, including a garage which will be constructed shortly, are also priority items on the university's agenda.

It is hard to divorce the institution from the man. Yet much must be added about Dr. Case himself in moments when he can break away from his laborious daily tasks at the university.

Last winter the president toured many countries in Africa in the interests of higher education, and today he pleads eloquently across the land for better educational exchanges and understanding between America and Africa. His voice has been influential and constant. Before this, as one of three New Englanders on President Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, Dr. Case was able to assist in alerting the Nation to the impending educational crisis, when the number of competently prepared students desiring to enter our colleges will more than double within the decade in the face of woefully inadequate funds, resources, and facilities.

Dr. Case is also chairman of the Massachusetts State advisory committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Last spring, Dr. Case went to Denver as a delegate to the Methodist Church's quadrennial general conference, and there he received national attention when he launched a strenuous drive, as the Associated Press reported it, to abolish segregation in the church wherever it still existed.

At the age of 58, President Case has many miles to go before he can close his desk at the university. As a result, the 10th anniversary of the Case era at Boston University has a happy connotation, both retrospectively and prospectively.

Relieve Impact of Cheap Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, not long ago I communicated with President Kennedy and his Cabinet Committee asking for relief for the textile industry and other industries feeling the impact of cheaply produced foreign goods.

I am pleased indeed that in response to these intercessions I have been advised by the White House that the President has directed his Cabinet Committee, appointed to look into these questions and report back to the President, to submit its recommendations as quickly as possible so that action can be taken, and I am very hopeful that favorable action may soon be taken.

In addition, the distinguished Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther A. Hodges, Chairman of the Cabinet Committee to whom I also appealed, has assured me that his Committee must make its report to the President in the near future and in the interim will study

all measures of relief as thoroughly as possible.

As I have pointed out many times, cheaply produced foreign goods are undermining American industrial prosperity in many industries and causing widespread unemployment and depressed conditions.

This exceedingly dangerous situation has been allowed to drift altogether too long. Congress, as well as the executive branch, must accept full responsibility for the most unfortunate, deplorable conditions that have developed in our economy as the result of cheap, low-standard institutions of many kinds affecting many American industries. Some of our industries, like textiles, are truly facing extreme alternatives, indeed many textile mills have been forced to close their doors; more of them are facing liquidation.

This affliction has been spreading rapidly to many other industries, the list of which is very extensive and includes, steel, its fabricated products, rubber, shoes, plastics, woodworking and electronics to mention but a few. I am firmly convinced that unless this situation is dealt with soon by Congress, or by the executive department, or by both legislative and executive departments working together, that further, more aggravated, dire results will ensue.

Certainly there is no time to lose in pressing for remedial action, and I urge that nothing be left undone by every branch of Government involved to tackle this vexing and most serious problem with real vigor and a full determination to take action that will prevent the further depression and liquidation of American industries and unemployment of our fellow citizens.

U.S. Constitution, Connally Amendment, World Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with a great deal of pride the continuing efforts by members of the legal profession to uphold the basic tenets of our U.S. Constitution. Mr. E. F. W. Wildermuth, of the Queens County Bar Association, is deserving of commendation for his work in this direction. I am pleased to include in the RECORD at this time the text of an article written by Mr. Wildermuth and published in the April 1961 edition of the Queens Bar Bulletin. The article is entitled "Shall the United States of America Surrender to the World Court?"

Mr. Wildermuth has performed a distinct public service by alerting us to the real and imminent dangers of international infringement upon the sovereign powers of the United States.

Mr. Wildermuth is to be commended for his clear analysis of the dangers of submission to the World Court. The content of his critique is a powerful antidote for the forces who seek to weaken, stultify, and eventually destroy the noble purposes of the U.S. Constitution.

The text of the article follows:

SHALL THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA SURRENDER TO THE WORLD COURT?

(By E. F. W. Wildermuth)

In September 1796, George Washington, America's No. 1 patriot, implored Americans as follows:

"In one word, be a nation, be Americans, and be true to yourselves."

One hundred and thirty-one years later, on February 18, 1927, the joint conference of the commanders in chief of the five large veterans organizations, meeting in Washington, D.C., undoubtedly inspired by our first President's dedication to this Nation, expressed Americanism as follows:

"Americanism is an unfailing love of country; loyalty to its institutions and ideals; eagerness to defend it against all enemies; undivided allegiance to the flag; and a desire to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity."

About one-third of a century later, at a recent conclave of American ecclesiastics, it was proclaimed, as reported by the Associated Press:

"The United States may soon have to subordinate its will to that of the United Nations. Citizens must be prepared to take it."

In further pursuit of the subordination of all Americans to the will of the U.N., it was admonished:

"We believe citizens should prepare themselves for such eventuality. It would not then be an undue shock to public opinion, since people would have a more mature view, better able to interpret democracy at work on a world scale, with the benefit as well as the risk that the extension of democracy always entails."

If these exhortations by clerics are not sheer euphemistic evasions, then the Ten Commandments already have been offered upon the sacrificial altar of international crucifixion. By the same token and for the same reason, it becomes crystal clear that a large segment of the American clergy is in dire need of guidance and deliverance from the influence which inspired such exhortations, made obviously in difiance of the praxeological knowledge with which all Americans are endowed in varying degrees. However, these gentlemen are not out of step with other advocates of world government, who likewise are without shame in proposing that Americans sacrifice their rights and freedoms as guaranteed by the Constitution and subordinate themselves to the will of the U.N.

Such behavior is incomprehensible. It eloquently evidences an urgent need for schooling in the American system of government contemplated by the Founding Fathers.

The civilization of this world (at the moment it seems highly uncivilized) is precisely what the schools have made it. Little of the shocking truth is generally known about our schools and colleges. For instance, it is apparent that a conspiracy of worldwide magnitude has long been at work against thorough courses in our own history, and especially constitutional history * * * the history of liberty.

The manifest indifferences of Americans to the constitutional doctrines of their country is appalling. The indefensible proposals and practices against the plainest limitations on power contained in the Constitution do not appear to evoke objection from any quarter, not even from the organized bar.

Is it not shocking that for more than a quarter of a century, no great debate on a constitutional subject has been heard in either House of Congress?

The principles of constitutional government are not outmoded as is proclaimed by the proponents and advocates of world government and by the profusion of anti-American propaganda which fouls the very air we breathe. These principles are as immutable as those of mathematics.

The constitutional system of the United States is the first that fallible man was able to formulate for the one purpose of controlling those in power and every American should know it as he knows the alphabet.

For more than several generations we have failed and neglected to indoctrinate each new generation with a knowledge of the superiority of the philosophy of the American system. We have also failed and neglected to combat alien dogma and propaganda designed to destroy constitutional government in the United States. The net result is that many Americans have been "taken in" with the false promises made by proponents of world government and a large number of Americans have been misled into believing that public officials and sundry self-certified persons are endowed with superior wisdom and knowledge at Washington and at the U.N. and will solve all the problems of the world, as well as the personal problems of all Americans.

The underminers of the Constitution have long been plying their nefarious occupation, and it is pertinent to recall Daniel Webster's warning that the constitutional system of the United States "is the last hope of the world."

The problems of Americans would be much simpler if the United States were predominantly populated by citizens motivated by the ideas and ideals which inspired the Founding Fathers and the countless other patriots who, at great personal sacrifice, contributed to the making of this Nation, at one time, the envy of the world.

It is probable that the law schools of this Nation are in a large measure at fault for the deafening silence on the part of the organized Bar while alien ideas are introduced in government in violation of the Constitution. Some years ago, the American Bar Association made a survey of the law schools in 25 of the leading universities and found that only 8 of them made a knowledge of the Constitution a requisite to a degree. This dearth of knowledge with respect to constitutional government persists, and there are times when it appears that both Americanism and the American system of government have become unfashionable in the United States and throughout the world.

THE CONNALLY RESERVATION

On July 25, 1946, Senate Resolution 196 was adopted. It provided for the unconditional acceptance by the United States of compulsory jurisdiction by the International Court of Justice, better known as the World Court.

Before becoming effective on August 14, 1946, by reason of President Truman's declaration for the United States accepting compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, a reservation was adopted which provided that the acceptance by the United States of jurisdiction by the World Court "shall not apply to disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the jurisdiction of the United States, as determined by the United States of America."

Having been offered by the then Senator Connally, of Texas, this reservation became known as the Connally reservation.

The proponents and advocates of world government are most unhappy with this extremely important protective reservation. Accordingly, they propose its repeal and so great is their pressure in this regard that they succeeded in obtaining a plank in the 1960 Democratic platform pledging repeal of the Connally reservation. Similar pressure groups are effectively active in the other major political party.

Briefly, the repeal of the Connally reservation will subject the United States irrevocably to the jurisdiction of the World Court in every matter with respect to which the World Court decides that it has jurisdiction.

The World Court, unlike courts in the American system of jurisprudence, is a court of first and final jurisdiction. There can be no appeal to a higher court from its determination that it has acquired jurisdiction and there can be no appeal to a higher court from its adjudication on the merits, no matter how corrupt, illogical, unlawful, or unjust may be such adjudication.

It is not generally known that the World Court is in no way bound or guided by any definite rules or system of law, such as the common law or the American system of constitutional law. The World Court is free to improvise and to make up its own rules and render any judgment its members agree on, as influenced by each judge's own peculiar legal concepts * * * and, as influenced by his national pride or interest. There are no juries in the World Court.

We have witnessed our own lifetime-appointed Supreme Court exercise absolute and unrestrained power; nullify acts of Congress; usurp legislative powers and apply its legislation to past transactions, not to mention its having decreed itself to be the supreme law of the land, the Constitution of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding * * * all with absolute impunity.

It will be recalled that in 1952, Chief Justice Vinson and Associate Justices Minton and Reed, in a dissenting opinion, held that the U.N. Charter superseded the U.S. Constitution when they voted to uphold President Truman's seizure of the Nation's steel industry, on the ground that the U.N. Charter obligated the United States to resist aggression in Korea and therefore authorized him to take any steps he deemed necessary in the prosecution of the war.

In view of this strange behavior by the dissenters, what guarantee do Americans have that a majority of the Supreme Court may not one day succeed in subordinating our Constitution to the U.N. Charter or to any other treaty? Also, if the dissenting opinion in the Steel Seizure case had been the majority opinion, is it likely that anyone would be free to publish this article or that you would be free to read it?

If we are powerless and helpless, as apparently we are, to prevent our Supreme Court from decreeing itself to be the supreme law of the land in defiance of the Constitution and attempting to subordinate the Constitution to the U.N. Charter, how can we assume or believe that the World Court will not decree, even in the face of the prohibition contained in the Connally reservation, that our Constitution is subordinate to the U.N. Charter?

Precisely, what could Americans do, short of war, to restore the sovereignty of the United States if the World Court decreed that the U.N. Charter, to which it owes its sole allegiance, supplanted and superseded the Constitution of the United States?

What guarantee do Americans have that the World Court judges from nations in which the people are denied free government, are not biased and prejudiced against American constitutional government?

The present World Court is composed of 15 members, selected and elected for terms of 9 years each by the U.N. General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations. Only 3 jurists are from common law countries; 4 are Latin Americans; 2 are from Moslem countries; 2 are Communists; one Chinese; and one each from Greece, France, and Norway. None of the nominees is subject to our Presidential, Senatorial or State Department approval. It is not required that they be lawyers or have judicial experience.

Recently, Dr. Philip C. Jessup, an American, was elected to the World Court by the U.N., to succeed Hon. Green Haywood Hackworth, who urged that he not be considered for reappointment.

Hon. John R. Pillion of Buffalo, a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, sent telegrams to the President and the President-elect in an effort to bar Dr. Jessup's election, charging that his career "has consistently been one of appeasement, retreat and surrender to pro-Communist causes."

The New York Times expressed itself editorially on November 16, 1960, with respect to Dr. Jessup's selection for the World Court, as follows:

"It is hard to conceive of a better selection than that of Philip C. Jessup for the International Court of Justice at the Hague, made by vote of the United Nations General Assembly on Wednesday."

It will be recalled that Dr. Jessup testified as a character witness for Alger Hiss and that after Hiss was found guilty of perjury by a jury, in accordance with American jurisprudence, Dr. Jessup had "no reasons whatever to change his opinion about Hiss veracity, loyalty, and integrity."

Although other member nations of the U.N. have reservations similar to our Connally reservation, the promotors of world government have concentrated their attack on the United States and Americans. Quite obviously, those member nations are self-respecting sovereignties which refuse to permit meddling in their internal affairs by the World Court, and the advocates of world government consider it the better part of wisdom to refrain from attempting to stampede those nations into repealing their protective reservations.

No valid or substantial reason has been offered and none exists requiring the repeal of the Connally reservation. Its repeal would actually constitute an invitation to the World Court to meddle in our internal affairs and, having been invited, the invitation will be accepted at the first opportunity.

The repeal of the Connally reservation will vest the World Court with the sole power to finally determine that the United States is not blessed with domestic or internal matters and then it will be free to proceed with reckless abandon and malice to meddle in our internal affairs, at the whim and caprice of any member nation which chooses to hail the United States before the World Court under any pretext.

The World Court has no jurisdiction over the internal affairs of a member nation. Simple as this statement of fact sounds, it has no meaning until it is applied in a particular case. For example, France claims that shooting Algerians is solely an internal affair of France and Russia claims that shooting Hungarians is solely an internal affair of Russia. What is an internal affair? The answer, without the Connally reservation, would come only from the World Court. In 1950 our own State Department declared that there is no longer any real difference between domestic and foreign affairs.

The U.N. Charter fails to define "internal affairs" and the reason for this omission is manifest. No two nations can agree as to what constitutes "internal affairs." If there could be agreement, it is probable that the need for a World Court, as claimed by advocates of world government, would not exist.

In an apparent effort to coerce the United States into endowing the World Court with power and authority irrevocably to make those final decisions affecting Americans in all disputes or controversies with regard to matters pertaining to their domestic or internal interest and concern, the Connally reservation is damned as being "self-judging."

To so damn the Connally reservation is also unjustly to imply that evil self-interest prevents our performance of some inferred legal and moral duty to so empower the World Court.

If it be self-judging to take the precaution afforded by the Connally reservation, self-judging in this instance is a virtue to be preserved at all costs, as the last bastion of defense against those who would so use the Constitution as to make hostages of Americans.

Officials, sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution, but who fail to uphold their oaths of office by advocating and promoting the repeal of the Connally reservation or who, in any other manner, aid in the surrender of the United States to the irrevocable jurisdiction of the World Court, should be impeached and removed from their positions of public trust.

It is difficult to understand why any patriotic and loyal American would propose or advocate the irrevocable surrender of the United States to the unrestricted powers of the World Court, or even so much as suggest the repeal of the Connally reservation.

CONCLUSION

It appears that there is much room for the improvement of scholastic standards in the schools of the various States of this Nation and particularly with respect to education in matters pertaining to superiority of the philosophy of the American system of government.

Accordingly, it is proposed and urged that the organized bar, through the membership of its respective associations in the United States of America, promptly adopt resolutions urging the legislatures of their respective States to forthwith enact legislation requiring all schools from the seventh grade up, and all colleges and universities to give thorough courses in all subjects pertaining to constitutional government, and prohibiting a degree of graduation to all students until a rigid examination has been passed under appropriate and effective supervision; and urging Congress to retain the Connally reservation in its present form.

Last year the House adopted a joint resolution favoring repeal of the Connally reservation, which the author believes to be null and void and the House should be so informed.

If the organized bar in the United States of America does not promptly adopt and vigorously pursue its appropriate role of leadership in government, based upon constitutional principles, it will stand convicted by public opinion of having failed to justify its existence should the American system of government fail.

Gamble That May Pay Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, farmers in the livestock feed production areas of our Nation are demonstrating a constructive interest in the new feed

grains program that indicates the Congress took a big step in the right direction with its adoption.

In my home State of Iowa attendance at county and community meetings called for discussion of the program is reminiscent of the turnouts in early New Deal years. Long lines of producers, waiting their turns to sign up as participants, have become familiar sights at ASC offices.

The recognition that this program offers hope for the revival of the total economy in rural areas is evident from the fact that in some instances chambers of commerce are sponsoring explanation and question-and-answer sessions related to it.

While many newspaper and magazine articles on farmer reaction to the program emphasize its pocketbook appeal, my mail and conversations with farmers reveal other and perhaps even more significant reasons for participation intentions.

For example, some who see no immediate personal financial gain will participate because they are concerned by the regularly repeated assertions that "farmers really don't want a program" and wish to make it clear that continued cooperation of farmer and government is essential in bringing equality and stability to the agricultural economy. Still others will participate simply because they see the program as an avenue toward realistic, effective management of our abundant feed grain supplies.

Pointing out that "the Kennedy administration's first effort to crack the farm surplus problem is getting a lot of support from farmers," the April 24 issue of U.S. News & World Report carries the following on-the-scene report datelined Iowa Falls, Iowa:

GAMBLE THAT MAY PAY OFF—IN THE CORN BELT

(The Kennedy administration's first effort to crack the farm-surplus problem is getting a lot of support from farmers. They find it profitable to participate in the plan to retire some corn acreage from production and collect higher price supports on the rest. For Mr. Kennedy, a venture may be paying off.)

IOWA FALLS, IOWA.—Out here where the tall corn soon will be growing, Orville Freeman, President Kennedy's Secretary of Agriculture, is taking a big gamble.

Freeman and Kennedy are gambling on a new plan to get the Nation's increasing surplus of corn under control. The gamble is that they can induce at least half of the country's corngrowers to sign a contract to reduce the acreage planted to that crop.

The feel of the situation here in the Corn Belt is that the new administration has an excellent chance of winning its gamble. The reason for this outlook is that corn farmers are finding a strong pocketbook appeal in the Freeman-Kennedy proposal.

Not since the first years of the New Deal, back in the 1930's, have farmers shown as much interest in a Government program as in the one now presented. Hundreds turn out for meetings to discuss it. In almost every farm home, pencil and paper are out figuring the dollars-and-cents meaning—the result in terms of money in the bank—of what the Government is offering.

A staff member of U.S. News & World Report, on the ground, finds interest lively and growing throughout the Corn Belt States of Iowa, Illinois, and Indiana. A sample of what is happening elsewhere can be seen here in Hardin County in north-central Iowa.

THE SIGNUP

For days, the county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation office (ASC) in Iowa Falls has been jammed. Farmers stream in for information, or to sign up, or both.

Usually the office opens at 8 a.m., but officials have been arriving as early as 7:30. Even then, they find a knot of farmers waiting. On good days, the line stretches half a block up the street.

Hundreds have attended evening meetings in schoolhouses and elsewhere. At these sessions, as you see in the accompanying pictures [not printed in the RECORD], they listen intently when the new program is outlined. Usually farmers tend to doze at evening meetings. But not at these. Too much is involved.

At the ASC office in Hamilton County, the crowd of waiting farmers sometimes reaches such size that each is given a number and waits in a big basement room. While waiting, he is asked to draw a map of his farm, to expedite later discussion of his situation.

WHY THEY JOIN

Farmers and officials talk of various reasons for joining in the program.

"It took the votes of a lot of city Congressmen to pass this program, so let's show them we appreciate it," says one official.

Some farmers talk of the urgency of reducing the corn surplus. But there is general agreement, among officials and farmers alike, that the principal inducement is financial.

In terms of dollars and cents, here is what the plan would do:

A farmer who reduces his corn acreage by 20 percent—as compared with his average of the last 2 years—is assured a support price based on a national average of $1.20 a bushel. This price varies from county to county depending on the freight rates. In Hardin County it is $1.14 a bushel.

For acreage taken out of production, the farmer receives a payment based on 50 percent of the average yield of the land retired. In Hardin County the average per acre will be $42.13.

If the farmer wishes, he may retire up to an additional 20 percent of his corn acreage. For this he receives 60 percent of the estimated yield of the land in terms of support prices. At this rate, the county average is $50.55 per acre.

The farmer who "stays out" may grow as much corn or other feed grain as he wishes. But there are no price supports for his output. He is at the mercy of the free market.

And, where the free market is concerned, the plan gives Mr. Freeman a tool for holding the price down—selling corn from the Government-held surplus. He is expected to keep the free-market price at about a dollar a bushel, low enough to make it more attractive for the farmer to sign up.

So pencils and adding machines have been busy as each farmer figured out what the plan would mean to his operation.

ONE FARMER'S FIGURES

An example is that of Don Williams, who owns 160 acres southeast of Williams, Iowa. He figures it this way:

His basic, 2-year average in corn is 73 acres. Under the program he may retire 40 percent of this, or 29.2 acres. In return, he would receive a Government payment of $1,401.01. To this he adds estimated receipts from the corn to be grown and from other crops. Then he subtracts $562—the cost of seed and fertilizer.

The final calculation shows an expected crop income of about $7,300 for Mr. Williams and his 160 acres.

If he stayed out of the program, Mr. Williams calculates that he would gross about $400 less from his crops. Meanwhile his expenses would be some $500 higher, because he would be seeding and fertilizing a larger acreage.

Thus, there is about $900 more in it for him if he enters the plan than if he stays out. Mr. Williams is signing up.

CREDITOR URGINGS

Talk to the men in rural communities who do business with the farmers, especially those who extend them credit, and you find another reason for the size of the sign-up.

For the most part, these men agree that the program will put more money in their farmer-customer's pockets. So, naturally, they too, are for it. Typically, Leo C. Jorgensen, president of the Citizens State Bank of Iowa Falls, says:

"We are certainly trying to encourage people to go into this program. We feel our customers need the money. It will take some of the pressure off their demands for credit for operating funds this spring, because they will get a payment on the land taken out of production."

In another county, an ASC official reports a grain-elevator operator is urging clients to enter the plan.

"Grain storage is only a part of his business," the ASC man says. "He sells seed, fertilizer and other things to farmers. He's been having trouble collecting his accounts."

A surprising number of livestock feeders—farmers who feed all or most of the corn they grow to cattle and hogs—appear to be ready to join the program. They, too, have been busy with pencil and paper.

WINNING PROGRAM?

The feed-grain program is the Kennedy administration's first effort to crack the expensive, perennial, and politically touchy, farm problem.

At the outset, Mr. Freeman found the Government holding some 2.7 billion bushels valued at about $4 billion. Another big corn crop was in prospect for 1961.

Original estimates were that if 50 to 60 percent of the corn farmers entered the program, it would be a success, save the Government $500 to $700 million, and cut the production of surplus feed grains by something like 10 percent.

Now, informed officials are expecting a 75-percent participation in the program in Iowa and 70 to 75 percent in Illinois, with similar figures from other areas.

As you travel through the corn belt, you sense a feeling of apprehension among farmers and rural businessmen. It appears to stem from the fact that it's becoming harder and harder for farmers to meet bills and replace machinery. And over all hangs the shadow of great and growing corn surpluses, pushing prices down, threatening to break livestock markets.

The new feed-grain program, in the minds of both farmers and businessmen, holds a promise of reversing the trends of recent years. In the main, they seem willing to give it a whirl in numbers that are turning out to be a surprise to many people.

I had previously sent a questionnaire to 12,000 bona fide Iowa farmers. Following are the results of the parts that can be computed mathematically:

(a) Do you favor passage of this legislation? Yes, 89 percent.

Farm Bureau members: yes, 88 percent.

National Farmers Organization members: yes, 95 percent.

Farmers Union members: yes, 100 percent.

No organization: yes, 89 percent.

More than one organization: yes, 98 percent.

A few had views that were not really either for or against.

(b) If this program becomes law, do you intend to comply for a 20-percent reduction? Yes, 73 percent. An additional 20 perecnt? Yes, 23 percent.

I also asked their planting intentions if no bill was passed as compared to their intentions if the House bill was passed and soybean supports were increased to $2.30. The following are my conclusions as a result of these questions and some followup interviews which were necessary to clarify the reasons behind their positions:

First. They intended to increase acreage of soybeans in the neighborhood of 10 percent.

Second. Almost none of this acreage was to be shifted from corn to soybeans. Almost all of this acreage would have been in meadow or oat land under normal rotation practices. They would have increased soybean acreage even if prices were still bad because they are so pinched for money that they must shift to a crop that will bring more income.

Third. Almost the only farmer who was not going to put in more corn was the one who had his farm completely in corn last year. I think they intended an average increase of 10 percent and perhaps even more.

Fourth. Under the new law they intend about an 11-percent decrease in corn acreage although the 73 percent that comply will decrease their acreage an average total of about 25 percent. The ones who are not complying are going to increase acreage and reduce the effectiveness.

Sister Mary Annunciata, R.S.M.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Flood and I lost a very dear friend last week with the passing of Sister Mary Annunciata, R.S.M. When Mrs. Flood attended College Misericordia, at Dallas, Pa., Sister Annunciata was the dean of that fine institution and it was during this period that Mrs. Flood came to know Sister Annunciata well as a teacher, friend, administrator, and counselor. This close friendship continued through the years that have intervened and it was with a heavy heart and great regret that we received the news of her passing.

Sister Annunciata was a lady of enormous ability. She did many things, and all of them well. As the editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Saturday, April 15, 1961, states:

Thousands of young men and women, many now parents and grandparents, were influenced by the high standard of intellectual and cultural achievement she insisted on in the conscientious discharge of her duties. Her interest in the students was not limited to the periods they came under her supervision, but continued after graduation as they took their places in the professions, government service, business, and the home. Evidence of the appreciation of her former pupils and others for the practical assistance she gave them beyond the call of duty was provided during her illness when she received more than 1,000 messages and scores of floral tributes and gifts.

Mrs. Flood and I concur wholeheartedly with those fine sentiments which accurately reflect the life of such a wonderful person. We who knew her are greatly saddened by her passing but we take comfort in the knowledge that her everlasting reward will be a happy and joyous one.

As a further extension of my remarks, I include the excellent editorial previously referred to from the Times-Leader:

SISTER MARY ANNUNCIATA

To a religious, death is not an end, but a beginning; not a misfortune, but a reward; not a cause for distress, but an experience to be accepted with equanimity, based on sublime faith and full compliance with the divine will. A dedicated woman like Sister Mary Annunciata, R.S.M., daughter of Mr. and Mrs. James Merrick, of Avoca, and niece of Msgr. J. J. Curran, late pastor of St. Mary's Church of the Immaculate Conception, Wilkes-Barre, obviously was no exception to the rule.

For almost a half century, Sister Annunciata, a doctor of philosophy and a leading educator in the community, held such important posts as supervisor of schools conducted by the Sisters of Mercy in the Roman Catholic diocese of Scranton, dean of College Misericordia at Dallas, and principal of St. Mary's High School, city. It would be difficult to place an accurate estimate on the value of her contribution to education and to the area by virtue of her service and activities, but it was considerable.

Thousands of young men and women, many now parents and grandparents, were influenced by the high standard of intellectual and cultural achievement she insisted on in the conscientious discharge of her duties. Her interest in the students was not limited to the periods they came under her supervision, but continued after graduation as they took their places in the professions, Government service, business, and the home.

Evidence of the appreciation of her former pupils and others for the practical assistance she gave them beyond the call of duty was provided during her illness when she received more than 1,000 messages and scores of floral tributes and gifts.

Endowed with a brilliant mind, exceptional administrative ability, and a seemingly inexhaustible supply of energy, she not only met the challenges of the five hectic decades through which she labored so successfully, but she appeared to have her finger on the pulse of education, so she was able to anticipate trends and formulate her plans accordingly. The progress Misericordia made during her administration, spanning 12 years in an executive capacity and 11 years as a member of the faculty, was an indication of the scope of her talents.

Sister Annunciata enhanced a family tradition of service to God and man, not only meeting her obligations under her vows in full, but serving as a stimulating example of zeal and unselfishness.

Finland—Nation of Integrity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, because of the large number of persons of Finnish descent living within my district, it was of particular interest to me to see the splendid special section which the New York Times issued recently under the title, "Finland—Nation of Integrity." The pictures and articles do a magnificent job of bringing a meaningful message about the freedom-loving country of Finland to the people of America.

I feel that this magazine supplement reflects very accurately both the progressive attitude and industry of the Finnish people. All of the articles were excellent and three of them were of special interest to me. They are entitled "Finland's Expanding Industrial Production," "Wood: Finland's Richest Natural Resource," and "Helsinki Trade Center." I request unanimous consent to have these short articles printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FINLAND'S EXPANDING INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

Among the leading industries of Finland, the metalworking industry developed strongly during World War II, and during the postwar years. In the 1950's this industry continued to increase its exports. Finnish ships, paper machines, tractors, cables, and other metal products have become widely known both in the West and in the East. The metalworking industry has thus become Finland's biggest industrial employer. Of a total of approximately 380,000 regular industrial wage earners, the metalworking industry employs over 100,000.

Another expanding industrial branch is the textile industry which previously sold only to domestic consumers. Now Finnish textiles such as cotton, wool, and knitwear have conquered foreign markets and their high quality and beautiful design are well known in many countries and particularly in the United States.

Finland's vigorous industrialization and the consequent concentration of population in towns and densely populated areas has given an impetus to the rapid growth of the food industry. Today, Finland's big flour mills, bread, biscuits, macaroni, sweets, and other special food products come well up to modern international standards.

To complete the brief account of the present position of Finland's so-called home market industry it may be mentioned further that her glass and ceramic industries enjoy international fame especially in the fields of art glass and pottery, and in the last 15 years, her chemical industry has made great strides forward.

The future will call for greater efforts. Internally the question is to create employment for the age groups born after World War II. Another big task is to adapt modern methods to meet the severe external competition which is to be expected as the result of European economic integration.

Finland has taken her place among the industrial countries and her industry hopes that during the current decade it can go on increasing its contribution to domestic and international prosperity.

WOOD: FINLAND'S RICHEST NATURAL RESOURCE

Just as "beauty is in the eye of the beholder," the forest can conjure up a host of images for a variety of people. For the child, the forest will be the source of his next Christmas tree. A poet will see in it the cradle of his country's mythology; a soldier will view the forest as the place for military ambush; and a young married couple will go to the forest as the ideal site for a picnic.

But for the 4½ million people, who comprise the nation of Finland, the forest can have but one compelling and overriding meaning; it is the perennial and inexhaustible source of the nation's livelihood, their country's most versatile and useful natural resource. And, because over 70 percent of Finland's extensive terrain is heavily invested with growing forest land, Finns have grown accustomed to call it Finland's "green gold."

The "green gold" of Finland's forests is the single most important and enduring basis of the economy of the nation, otherwise deficient in some of the natural resources of modern industry. Three-quarters of the cash value of Finland's exports is based on forestry products, and these exports enable Finland to buy back from the rest of the world the raw goods, services, and materials which are needed for the full development of her highly diversified and modern economy. Thus, although the mechanical, engineering, industrial, textile, and other branches of Finnish economy are today making great strides, the wood processing industries continue to set the pace for the entire country.

Industrial exploitation of forest resources has followed two principal lines. Modern paper, pulp, and chemical production which today forms the principal export resources, is the junior industry and its antecedents run back only a century in Finnish development. Lumber production has a historical basis in the 16th century.

In both fields, Finland has achieved a world marketing position which is unique for a country which is physically remote from the highways of world trade. Finland's exports, at present, supply 12 percent of the world demand for coniferous sawn wood; 22 percent of world demand for plywood; 18 percent of world demand for newsprint and 9 percent of world demand for chemical wood pulp.

Since Europe is her principal market, Finland's forest products supply an even higher ratio of the total consumption of wood, paper, pulp in the European area.

By any accepted standard the Finnish industry is "big industry"—and is growing bigger. Within 3 years, the pulp and paper production capacity will increase by 45 percent. And expansion plans are already on the board for the ensuing decade. Finland's wood-processing industries have reached a level of technical development second to none in the world.

Consumption of paper products is continuously rising in the whole world but more particularly in western Europe. Because of ecological factors, high-quality Scandinavian production of these products, synchronized to western European demands, will ultimately become the major supplier of paper for Europe. But it is equally obvious that Finnish pulp and paper can also be exported to the United States, and to the Western Hemisphere, on the principle that a good product will always find a market.

HELSINKI TRADE FAIR CENTER

The Finnish Fair Association was founded in 1919, not long after Finland gained her independence, to promote trade by organizing fairs and exhibitions in this country. Since its first trade fair in 1920, the Finnish Fair has organized over 50 fairs and exhibitions, general as well as specialized ones. Prominent among the former are the quinquennial Finnish Industries Fairs, in which all branches of the country's industry participate. The latter include the smaller annual spring fairs, mainly devoted to certain branches of production, and several other special exhibitions.

Situated right in the center of Helsinki, the Finnish Fair has two permanent exhibition halls totalling 130,000 square feet in area, and makes use of a large outdoor site on which light temporary halls totalling up to 200,000 square feet in area can be erected when needed. Several foreign trade fairs, e.g. those of Western Germany, England, France, and Soviet Union, have also been held on the same premises. The first non-European country to exhibit here will be the United States of America, with its "America Today" exhibition scheduled for May 26–June 11, 1961.

A large number of Finnish industrial enterprises and organizations are themselves members of the Finnish Fair. For this reason it is natural that the Finnish Fair has also been entrusted with the arrangements for Finnish official participation in trade fairs and exhibitions abroad as well as for independent export exhibitions. Thus Finnish products have been exhibited in many countries throughout the world, such as the United States of America. This year's program includes Finland's participation in the Chicago International Trade Fair, for which some 4,000 square feet have been reserved.

The foreseen collaboration of Finland with the Outer Seven (EFTA) and especially the increasing interest that foreign countries have shown in Finnish markets has given rise to the question of organizing international exhibitions in Finland. In fact, the Finnish Fair is planning to hold the first event of this kind in 1962.

For What Avail—If Freedom Fail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, at the convocation of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Miss Sandra Smith, of Little Rock, Ark., the lovely daughter of Dr. and Mrs. John McCollough Smith, was named winner of the national essay contest sponsored by the DAR. As the winner, she received the National Good Citizen Award.

I commend her essay to the reading of Americans everywhere, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include this essay in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR WHAT AVAIL—IF FREEDOM FAIL

(By Sandra Smith)

"For what avail the plough or sail,
Or land or life, if freedom fail?"
—*Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Boston."*

Of what avail the strong wings of the eagle if he be not free to soar into the unknown? So be it with man. What matter if he have the heritage of Washington and Jefferson and a faultless democracy, if his individual freedoms disappear? What matter if ours be "the land of the free and the home of the brave" if our people witness the constant overpowering force of Government. Should this prevail, who would dare predict our Nation's future.

In order to preserve our freedoms, we should rededicate ourselves to the ideals for which our forefathers fought the Revolutionary War and about which Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence—the ideals which emphasize the importance of the individual. Many people today feel that the Government should underwrite everything we do, but when a government, which ultimately is the people themselves, overshadows the power of the individual, then freedoms disappear. If America is to be free, we must individually feel a personal responsibility for her freedoms. We must have greater incentives to do necessary tasks ourselves rather than letting them be undertaken for us by the Government. We must develop appreciation for the value of work and a sense of pride in a job well done.

It is true that communism is a challenge to America's freedoms, but with more emphasis placed on individual worth this threat will fade. I have confidence in the American people and believe they will work to protect the precious freedoms established by their forefathers. Individuals made America, and only individuals can insure our American heritage. Emerson gave a watchword to posterity when he wrote: "For what avail—if freedom fail?"

Letter Relating to Present Operation of Public Law 78 in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on March 30, of this year in connection with the introduction of my bill H.R. 6032, I stated that Public Law 78, originally enacted to meet Korean war needs, has created a program which feeds on poverty and unemployment in Mexico and increases poverty and unemployment at home. By means of this program approximately 316,000 Mexican braceros were imported for work on U.S. farms during 1960. In my study of the effects of this program I have uncovered case upon case of economic hardships in many of our rural areas which can be traced directly to the operation of this program.

At a time when the extension of Public Law 78 is again coming up for consideration, I introduced H.R. 6032, which if enacted would amend this law to provide, in connection with the employment of workers from Mexico, protection for the employment opportunities of agricultural workers in the United States. I believe that through the amendments contained in my bill there could be enacted into law a program which would go far toward the elimination of the serious moral, social, and economic conditions which hang over communities and entire counties like a shroud and grim reminder of the inexcusable neglect in this field of domestic policy. Mr. Speaker, I hope that all the Members take a few minutes of their time to read this letter to Secretary of Labor Goldberg from a small businessman which

tells of the disastrous impact the present operation of Public Law 78 has had in an agricultural community in California. The letter follows:

IMPERIAL BARGAIN STORE,
Brawley, Calif., April 1, 1961.

Mr. ARTHUR GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GOLDBERG: I am an independent owner of a small clothing store located at 934 East Main Street, Brawley, Calif. I have been in business here for about 16 years and have worked very hard to build my establishment. A few years ago I tried to expand to other towns in the Imperial Valley in hopes of maintaining a sufficient volume of business to protect my hard-earned investment in this farming area. In the process during these past 5 years I have lost $40,000 to $50,000.

The solution for this peculiar economic situation which has caused this seems nowhere in sight for the merchants whether they be small or large, whether they be independent or chain. The plight of many businesses, which exist here in Imperial Valley, is very grave and should receive prompt attention in order that a solution can be found while still a little time remains. Many businesses have closed their doors and many will close unless prompt action is taken to correct the serious blow to our economy.

The economy of Imperial Valley is dependent on agriculture. During the last several years there has been an exodus of people who are dependent directly or indirectly on agriculture for employment. Many jobs have been eliminated by mechanization—others have been eliminated by a few large farming interests becoming larger and absorbing small farmers. I reluctantly admit that some of this is unavoidable—but the extremely serious blow to us merchants of Imperial Valley is the bracero program as it now stands—Public Law 78. The original intent of importing Mexican nationals was a very necessary action—but it has outlived its need. It has created a situation which is benefiting a few greatly to the detriment of many—which will spell financial disaster to those struggling to stay in business.

Regardless of the general feeling among many of our farming interests—there is a great and very serious need for merchants of an area to be prosperous. The many conveniences and necessities provided for a community from which the farming interests also benefit are to a considerable degree attained as a result of taxes derived from commercial investments within the city. Commercial investments cannot be attractive unless they provide a reasonably good return on the investments. A reasonably good return is not possible unless the occupants, namely merchants, prosper. The number of vacant buildings in the Imperial Valley is mute evidence of this fact.

The use of braceros has displaced many local American citizens who are very much in need of employment. In turn, we merchants are deprived of the business which would result from the use of employees who are permanent residents. These permanent residents have their families here and the local business establishments would benefit from the purchases of the entire family. Farm interests argue that local citizens would not do the work braceros would do. There are arguments, pro and con, on this point. We, by all means, should give our people an opportunity to prove that they can do the work. At the same time one must consider that the importation of workers from other nations—who displace the local American workers—creates a steady flow of dollars to their home countries. These dollars are sorely needed in the areas which provide them with this income. A very small percentage of the money they earn is spent here. The problem is even greater here in the Imperial Valley because we are only within one-half hour drive from the border town of Mexicali, Baja California, Mexico. In addition to this braceros are housed and boarded in the camps and charged $1.75 per day. This is deducted from their paychecks whether they eat at the camps or not. In some cases the men choose to eat in town or buy their own food, but board of $1.75 per day is still deducted from their checks. One only has to converse with some of the braceros to find that they are being exploited. Greater numbers are usually brought into this area than there is work available. The camp owners thus benefit in that the hours each bracero receives is generally sufficient only to cover their weekly board.

We should first be concerned about our local American citizens having the employment the agricultural interests could provide them to support their families. If all efforts to remove their bracero program fail—the least that should be done is to require that the braceros should not be allowed to cross the border for the duration of their contract and that they should be provided with free housing and allowed to board as they choose. This would tend to curb the flow of a certain percentage of the dollars from here and this will aid limitedly the economy of this area.

In my opinion, this is one of the most neglected parts of our Nation. I am sure this view is shared by many others. An impartial investigation of each and every business in the Imperial Valley—whether a barbershop, clothing store—whether large or small—chain or independent will prove this to be so.

An aid to the merchants of the area which would be timely and extremely beneficial—at least until a solution can be worked out—is to have a representative of the Small Business Administration come to the Imperial Valley to extend loans to business establishments. Many are in need of financial assistance which at times local banks are reluctant to extend for other than short periods of time.

It is no secret that farming interests have powerful lobbyists—which represent them and which they can well afford. We merchants cannot afford lobbyist representation and I appeal to you to investigate this condition which exists here in Imperial Valley for it is extremely serious.

Very truly yours,

ANDRU ROSE,
Proprietor.

The State of the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal of April 19. It points out very clearly and truthfully the steady decline of the power and prestige of the Congress of the United States. This, of course, is true not only of the Congress here at home but of parliamentary governments all over the world. In fact, in the last 4 years six nations have had to withdraw, as members of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, for the very simple reason that they no longer had parliaments.

The executive branch of Government is taking over more and more, both at home and abroad, and the reason is simply because we of the legislative branch are giving up our responsibilities and duties. The fault is ours, not the Executive's. The article follows:

THE STATE OF THE CONGRESS—WITH EXECUTIVE STRONG, IT GROWS INCREASINGLY PAROCHIAL

(By Robert D. Novak)

WASHINGTON.—President John F. Kennedy undeniably has brought a sense of excitement and vitality to almost every official corner of this city with one notable exception—Capitol Hill.

By no means does the congressional lassitude stem from any unexpected turn of events. Rather, the Democratic majority is now tasting the bitter strain it well knew would accompany the sweet delight of once more dealing with a Democrat in the White House. For President Kennedy's emphatic desire to uplift the executive branch—as demonstrated by many of his early proposals and actions—is accentuating what has been a long-term erosion of legislative branch power, an erosion partially obscured during the past 6 years of Government divided between a Democratic Congress and Republican President.

As a result, the atmosphere hangs heavy in the halls of Congress. Lawmakers wade through Mr. Kennedy's avalanche of legislative proposals with lethargy and dreariness. Their top aides, who play such a large part in setting the tone of Congress, feel left out of the main stream of power.

To be sure, Congress is no Supreme Soviet serving as a handmaiden of the Kremlin's bureaucracy. Nor is it a British Parliament where legislative action is dictated by the Cabinet. Indeed, the lawmakers can be expected to constrict such key New Frontier leigslative proposals as Federal aid to education and minimum wage liberalization. Other measures, including Mr. Kennedy's priority request that medical care for the aged be financed via the social security system, may be rejected flatly. Congress is expected to slice away, as usual, at foreign aid spending requests. In fact, the casual reader of newspaper accounts reporting the fate of the Kennedy program on Capitol Hill might surmise that Congress is calling the tune in Washington today.

A NEGATIVE BASIS

Yet, this could be no further from the truth. For the congressional power, such as it is, evolves from the negative base of obstructionism rather than from a positive ability to initiate Government policy. During the Eisenhower era, the Democratic Congress set its own timetable for domestic legislation and generally kept its own counsel about what measures would be finally approved—although many of these measures eventually were scuttled by Presidential vetoes. Not so today; it is the White House that has the leading voice in determining the congressional program of action.

Mr. Kennedy's preference for executive branch dominance is reflected not only by his intrusion into day-to-day congressional processes on a scope never contemplated by Mr. Eisenhower, but, even more dramatically, in some of his legislative proposals. His recommendation that foreign economic aid be authorized on a long-term basis would strip from Congress its power of close annual review over much of the multibillion dollar program. The President's farm program would transfer the responsibility for writing agricultural legislation from Congress to the farmers themselves, working with the Agriculture Secretary.

Congress might well demur at such self-inflicted damage. But Mr. Kennedy can tear away at congressional authority in ways that do not require the sanction of Congress, most notably in his bid for White House suzerainty over the independent regulatory agencies.

The new administration's most significant impact on the balance of power between the executive and legislative branches, however, has not been so much a matter of accelerating congressional decline but of disclosing just how far the decline has progressed.

Although a few constitutional theorists still talk of coequal legislative and executive branches, the historical reality is that one branch almost always sits higher in its saddle than the other. Congressional supremacy was at its zenith from the end of the Civil War until the Cleveland administration; the executive ascendancy began around 1900 and a trio of dominant Presidents—the two Roosevelts and Woodrow Wilson—established precedents not easily wiped away.

But apart from personalities, the decline of congressional power has been roughly proportionate to greater U.S. involvement in world affairs and greater dangers of war. Not only does the Constitution vest primary responsibility for foreign affairs and defense in the Executive, but the complexities of present-day international politics and military preparedness have shrunk the secondary roles in these areas assigned to the lawmakers.

Now that the Presidency is back in Democratic hands, even the illusion of congressional power is fading. Mr. Kennedy's deft handling of news media means he can outshout Congress. And there isn't much shouting from the Democratic majority in Congress these days anyway—partly attributable to the honeymoon atmosphere usually prevailing at the outset of any administration, but a situation that Kennedy lieutenants hope can be extended through careful tending of cordial relations with Congress.

Mr. Eisenhower's cutback of B–70 bomber production brought screams of anguish from Capitol Hill; an almost identical position by Mr. Kennedy has generated only a few grumbles. Democratic civil rights champions who denounced Mr. Eisenhower for submitting inadequate civil rights legislation scarcely complain that Mr. Kennedy has drafted no bill at all. Many Democratic Congressmen are apprehensive over the President's forays into the regulatory agency field, but few say anything about it publicly.

WHITE HOUSE AGENTS

Lawmakers with carefully constructed reputations for independence now appear in the roles of White House agents. Oregon's Senator MORSE, who last year insisted that loans for parochial schools should be attached to any general aid-to-education program, has joined administration opposition to such a move. Senator MCNAMARA, of Michigan, who in the past opposed then-Senator Kennedy's tendency to compromise on labor legislation, has cooperated with the administration in twice watering down minimum-wage proposals this year and may agree to still more compromises.

When it comes to foreign relations, the growing inclination by Congress to leave decision making to the President even extends to the Republican minority. The most partisan GOP lawmaker, facing the confused tangle of contradictions that comprise Cuba and Laos, hesitates about challenging Mr. Kennedy's moves in an area that could mean war or peace—a sharp contrast to the Congress of 60 years ago.

Consider the current status of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, most prestigious of all committees. Senators still claw each other for a seat on the committee. But despite the efforts of its intellectually astute chairman, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, the impact of the committee on the Nation's foreign policy remains in a state of steady decline.

"Our problem is ignorance," laments one unusually candid member of the committee. Backing up this admission was the committee's recent approach to the treaty for U.S. participation in the 20-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; initial suspicions about the treaty existed within the committee primarily because most members didn't bother to read it.

Thus, the committee's principal significance now lies in its potentiality for obstructionism. It can eviscerate a foreign aid program, refuse to ratify treaties and decline to confirm ambassadorial appointments. And so State Department officials cannot be blamed if they look upon the committee as a band of possible saboteurs to be pampered rather than as trusted counselors.

A SEQUESTERED WORLD

While Mr. Kennedy is fostering further executive branch inroads into congressional power, the lawmakers seem to respond by sinking deeper into parochialism. Plagued by requests from constitutents, Congressmen often are more concerned about the fate of a voter's pension check than cold war issues. Moreover, they often seem to live in a sequestered world virtually unintelligible to outsiders. When the Laotian crisis burst during the first of the current congressional sessions, the Senate Democratic caucus was otherwise engaged in esoteric contemplation of the makeup of the Senate Democratic policy committee—a group who functions are cloudy and whose importance is debatable.

Liberal-inclined students of government do not lament the decline of Congress, pointing to the "bad" government prevailing during the post-Civil War years of congressional supremacy. But conservatives yearn for a return to the ascendancy of Congress—minus the corruption, of course—on the assumption that Congress tends to be more conservative than the White House.

At any rate, no real resurgence in the power of Congress, be it liberal or conservative, seems possible in the foreseeable future. Rather, the record of Mr. Kennedy is only likely to further entrench executive dominance.

James Alfred Whalley, Fine American of Windber, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a permanent record of the good citizenship and outstanding civic dedication of a friendly man, James Alfred Whalley, of Windber, Pa., brother of my good friend, Congressman IRVING WHALLEY of Pennsylvania:

[From the Windber Era, Apr. 13, 1961]

J. A. WHALLEY, WELL-KNOWN CITIZEN, DIES

James Alfred "Alf" Whalley, one of the most widely known men in this coal-producing area, died at 3:30 p.m. Thursday, April 6, in Temple University Hospital, Philadelphia. Mr. Whalley had been a surgical patient there for approximately 4 weeks.

Mr. Whalley, 55, a resident of 702 11th Street, was chief clerk and personnel manager of the Berwind-White Coal Mining Co. In addition to those posts, he was assistant to the general manager in public relations work for various Berwind-White enterprises. Mr. Whalley was treasurer of the Windber Era.

Active in community work, Mr. Whalley was an honorary member and former secretary of Windber No. 1 Fire Company and a charter member and one of the organizers of Windber Council, Holmes Safety Association. He served as council secretary for many years.

Mr. Whalley, a resident of Windber since 1914, was a native of Barnesboro, Cambria County, where he was born December 7, 1905, son of the late James and Isabella Whalley.

He was married to the former Miss Margaret Goodhart, who survives, along with a son, Scott, at home. Other survivors are a brother, Representative J. IRVING WHALLEY, of the 18th Congressional District, and two sisters, Miss Mary Whalley and Mrs. James Fyfe, all of Windber.

Mr. Whalley's career with Berwind-White began on October 28, 1925, as a clerk. He became payroll clerk at No. 36 Mine in 1926 and 2 years later was transferred to the personnel office as mine superintendent clerk.

On April 29, 1943, Mr. Whalley enlisted in the U.S. Navy and after undergoing indoctrination at Sampson (N.Y.) Training Center was promoted to a specialist first class in classification work. He then was assigned to the Navy personnel processing center in Hollywood, Fla., and later to Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

Upon his honorable discharge from the Navy on January 1, 1946, Mr. Whalley returned to Berwind-White and in 1951 was named chief clerk and personnel manager.

According to Robert H. Seese, general manager of Berwind-White, Mr. Whalley personally knew every man hired by the coal firm since 1925, practically every one of them on a first-name basis. This was true even when the company employed as many as 4,000 men.

Mr. Whalley was noted for his intense personal interest in the welfare and well-being of the men who worked for Berwind-White and made it a point to see that employees or former employees received all benefits to which each was entitled. He aided the men in securing every available benefit, whether it was unemployment compensation, social security, insurance or any other possible help.

Mr. Whalley's fraternal affiliations included membership in Cambria Lodge 278, Free and Accepted Masons, and in Williamsport Consistory. He attended Windber Presbyterian Church.

Friends were received at the Meek Funeral Home, where services were conducted at 11 a.m. Monday, April 10. Officiating were Rev. Ray D. Gearing, pastor of Windber Presbyterian Church, and Rev. Carl S. Fisher, pastor of First Presbyterian Church, Johnstown.

Interment was in Grandview Cemetery, Johnstown.

[From the Windber Era, Apr. 13, 1961]

JAMES ALFRED WHALLEY

The untimely passing last Thursday of "Alf" Whalley will leave a void which never again may be filled in our community.

Our hearts are saddened because we have lost a friend—a very true and valuable friend in every good sence of the word. A resident of Windber since 1909, "Alf" spent his youth and adult life in doing things for people; trying to make them happy; trying in his own quiet, unassuming way to ease their burdens as best he could.

From the time he first joined the Berwind-White Coal Mining Co., as a clerk on October 28, 1925, "Alf" made it a point to know every man in the organization. And he did, even when Berwind-White employed as many as 4,000 men in its local operations.

He could greet practically each one of them by their first names.

But that was not all, for "Alf" also knew of their joys and sorrows; rejoiced with "his men" and their families in the former; was sympathetic, understanding, and helpful in the latter. He watched hundreds of youths he hired grow into manhood, marry, rear children, and, in many cases, hire those children when they, in turn, grew to youth and manhood.

When "Alf" Whalley, in March 1951, after World War II service with the U.S. Navy, became chief clerk and personnel manager for Berwind-White, he was happy—not so much for himself and his own family, but because he felt he could be of greater service and greater help to his "company family."

Such was the unique personality of "Alf" Whalley, whose touch of quiet humor often helped someone to travel a little easier over a rough spot; whose smile brought a little light into the darkness of unexpected gloom.

Miners work hard, play hard and usually band together against outsiders. Thus, it will be an everlasting tribute to the life of "Alf" Whalley that he had the confidence of those men; that he had their respect and, most of all, their affection.

It was typical of "Alf" Whalley that although he suffered great pain during the last 6 months of his life, very few persons knew of that fact.

And when, about 4 weeks before his passing, "Alf" went to a Philadelphia hospital for what he hoped would be only a checkup, his concern was not for his own well-being. He felt that he should be in Windber Hospital, where "Pete" and "Joe" and "Mike" could drop by and say "Hello."

"Alf" felt he was needed here.

It is certain that "Alf" Whalley will stay in Windber, in the minds and memories of the thousands of men with whom he came into contact; with the hundreds for whom he would see to it that their unemployment compensation, their insurance or their social security benefits were forthcoming; with the thousands who knew "Alf" Whalley and his personal, individual interest in each one of them.

To "Alf" Whalley's family, we extend our deep and sincere sympathy. Perhaps it will ease her sorrow a little to know that "Alf" Whalley will "live" in Windber for many, many years to come.

Israeli Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tribute to Israel on the occasion of the 13th anniversary of its independence:

ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE DAY

On the 13th anniversary of its independence, Israel has proved that the experiment to create a national state has been a total success. For today Israel is truly a national state among the countries of the world. She has taken into her land the lost and homeless refugees of World War II. Her population has almost tripled since 1948, the year of her independence. Her land now supports over 2 million people. In order to build the land to meet the needs of her people, new social forms were developed and combined with the old. In addition to cultivation of private lands, communal agricultural villages were set up to meet the immediate needs of many families. There, the land is owned in common and the community provides for all the needs of its members. The moshav combines collective living with the capitalist system by providing small landholders with an economic community run by the state, the cooperative movement, and trade unions. Thus, there are various economic institutions to provide for the varied needs of the population.

Just as the Israeli people express their resourcefulness and originality in the development of economic institutions, so do they in their culture. Through books and 25 daily newspapers Israel seeks to explain itself and its purposes to the rest of the world. Through its renowned Philharmonic, its Hebrew University, its folk dances and music, and its archeological discoveries, such as the Dead Sea scrolls, we in the United States, and the other peoples of the world, have come to know and respect Israel and its accomplishments in these few years.

Importation of Foreign Textiles Into the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, it is well that the plight of our domestic textile industry, due to the growing amount of foreign textiles imported from low-wage countries, has been called to the attention of the membership of this body and of the entire Nation.

The problem is now in the hands of the President's Cabinet-level Textile Advisory Committee; and it is hoped that, when the Committee makes its report to the President, he will direct the effectuation of a plan which will result in the imposition of a fair level of quotas by country and by category. I sympathize with the President in his deliberation over this matter; and I am sure that whatever decision he makes it will, in his opinion, be for the best interest of this Nation. However, I feel sure, too, that if all the facts are before him, he will decide on the solution recommended by the Pastore subcommittee in the Senate; that is, that quotas be established by country and by category. Of all the solutions suggested, it seems that the implementation of this one offers the most satisfactory remedy for all concerned.

It would have been far easier several years ago to have made this decision; for since that time, imports have jumped and jumped because so many nations have found a dumping ground for their goods in the American markets. These nations will, therefore, be much more reluctant now to give up this profitable outlet. It is almost unbelievable that since the 1958 extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, cotton imports have increase by 1,400 percent to 14 million pounds; and cotton cloth imports have doubled just in the last year.

A few years ago we were concerned about the Japanese imports; and Japan, recognizing the serious problem created by its exports to this country, voluntarily limited them. However, seeing how easy it was to send in cheap goods, other nations have rushed in until today the condition has gone from bad to worse; and it is now imperative that remedial action be forthcoming. Either, action to control the amount of these imports must be taken; or textile plants over the Nation—I believe in 43 States—will have to close, thereby throwing countless men and women out of work, not to mention the drastic effects upon their families and indirectly our whole economy. One very direct and immediate effect will be more relief lines. The American worker does not want relief but wants a job through which he can earn a living for his family; neither does the American worker feel kind toward the situation when the job is denied him by reason of rapidly increasing imports.

My experience with this serious problem and its countless, adverse byproducts, so to speak, is a firsthand one. My district is composed of nine counties; and each county has one or more cotton mill or textile plant of one kind or another which manufactures pants, pajamas, underwear, shirts, gloves, and other wearing apparel. For several years now, these plants and mills have been suffering from these cheaply made imports, but more recently the pain has grown more acute. Every mail delivery to my office bring letters of deep concern—not only from the owners and employees of the plants and mills—but from businesses, civic organizations, and local citizens who are gravely concerned about the living standards of the employees and of the people who must depend on the purchasing power of such workers for the maintenance of their businesses. Yes, the repercussions are most damaging and are on an extensive scale. Not only is the problem of safeguarding the jobs and investments of Americans from these cheaply made foreign imports a problem in the South where it is true the textile industry plays such an important part in our economy, but as has been pointed out here on this floor by my colleagues from other sections of the country the problem is not a sectional one at all. It adversely affects almost every section of our great country. Of all the examples cited here of similar situations, it is more than obvious that a crisis has been created which threatens the heart of our national economy. In my own district, a continuation of this trend could have serious effects on local manufacturers, who would be forced to close their doors due to a lack of sales, some merchants would be forced out of business due to a lack of customers, people could lose their homes, and on and on go the drastic direct and indirect effects.

Considering the detriment to our national security standing and our national economy with its many victims due to the continued failure to restrict the sales of cheap, foreign-made imports in our country, it is high time for some hard and realistic decisions to be made.

Communism and the House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the Economic Council Papers recently had an excellent series of articles concerning communism and the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The first, volume XVI, No. 1, appeared February 15, 1961, and should be of interest to my colleagues:

[From the Economic Council Papers, Feb. 15, 1961]

COMMUNISM AND THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

(By Robert B. Dresser)

PETITION BY BROWN UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

It was reported in the Journal of January 14 that 87 Brown University professors had signed a petition asking Congress to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The Bulletin of January 20 contained a letter to the editor by Norman D. MacLeod, criticizing this action. Mr. MacLeod is one of our leading citizens and is unusually well informed on public issues.

An editorial in the Bulletin of January 24, headed "Congress overplays hunt for un-American activities," states: "In our opinion, the Un-American Activities Committee is provoking a lot of unnecessary shouting and, therefore, has run out of a useful purpose for existing."

On January 27 the Bulletin published a letter from Wade Thompson, one of the professors who signed the petition, defending his action and criticizing Mr. MacLeod. I quote from this letter as follows: "Frankly, I abhor the House Un-American Activities Committee, and I don't give a hang whether the Communists like it or not.

* * * * *

"If the HUAC ever pokes its nose in Providence, I personally will be glad to demonstrate against it. And I dare anybody to call me a you-know-what."

The Bulletin of February 1 carried a news report from which I quote as follows:

"The president of Brown University today criticized recent defenders of the House Un-American Activities Committee as 'probably more dangerous than the Communists.'

"Dr. Barnaby C. Keeney, the president, speaking at a university convocation at Sayles Hall, said that such persons 'attack the very fabric of our Constitution and erode mutual trust and freedom of discussion upon which our society depends.'"

Several other letters on this subject have appeared in the Journal or Bulletin, some attacking and some defending the committee.

What are the merits of the controversy?

In my opinion, the House Un-American Activities Committee, from its inception in 1938, has performed a most valuable service and should be continued. It has conducted a great many investigations of communism, and has published numerous reports exposing to public view the subversive activities of Communists and fellow-travelers. It has published lists of subversive organizations and publications running into the hundreds. These reports have been invaluable in the fight against communism.

These subversive organizations, manned principally by non-Communists, who are unwittingly aiding the Communist cause, are commonly referred to as "Communist fronts."

STATEMENTS BY J. EDGAR HOOVER

Let me quote from J. Edgar Hoover's book, "Masters of Deceit" (pp. 228–229):

"Fronts probably represent the party's [Communist] most successful tactic in capturing non-Communist support. Like mass agitation and infiltration, fronts espouse the deceptive party line (hence the term 'front') while actually advancing the real party line. In this way the party is able to influence thousands of non-Communists, collect large sums of money, and reach the minds, pens, and tongues of many high-ranking and distinguished individuals. Moreover, fronts are excellent fields for party recruitment.

"A front is an organization which the Communists openly or secretly control.

* * * * *

"The party has operated hundreds of major fronts in practically every field of party agitation; 'peace,' civil rights, protection of the foreign-born, support for Smith Act 'victims,' abolition of H-bomb tests, exploitation of nationality and minority groups. Some are based on specific appeal, to teachers, writers, lawyers, labor, women, youth."

Quoting further from Mr. Hoover's book (pp. 194–195):

"A primary tactic of the Communist Party is to preserve the legal status of the party. Thus, any organization which has the duty to investigate or expose Communist activity is singled out for attack. For years the party has campaigned against the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and the Senate Investigating Committee. The Department of Justice and the FBI have not been spared, and we have come to judge our effectiveness by the intensity of Communist attacks.

* * * * *

"Above the surface a gigantic propaganda and agitation campaign is in progress, a campaign that depends for success upon the support of non-Communists. Basic Communist strategy dictates that non-Communist hands, knowingly or unknowingly, under Communist guidance, must further the influence of the Communist world."

Quoting still further from Mr. Hoover's book (p. 93): "A tragedy of the past generation in the United States is that so many persons, including high-ranking statesmen, public officials, educators, ministers of the gospel, professional men, have been duped into helping communism. Communist leaders have proclaimed that communism must be partly built with non-Communist hands, and this, to a large extent, is true."

STATEMENT BY GEORGI DIMITROV

Georgi Dimitrov gave the following advice to the Lenin School of Political Warfare:

"As Soviet power grows, there will be a greater aversion to Communist parties everywhere. So we must practice the techniques of withdrawal. Never appear in the foreground; let our friends do the work. We must always remember that one sympathizer is generally worth more than a dozen militant Communists. A university professor, who without being a party member lends himself to the interests of the Soviet Union, is worth more than a hundred men with party cards. A writer of reputation, or a retired general, are worth more than 500 poor devils who don't know any better than to get themselves beaten up by the police. Every man has his value, his merit. The writer who, without being a party member, defends the Soviet Union, the union leader who is outside our ranks but defends Soviet international policy, is worth more than a thousand party members."

RECOGNITION OF RUSSIA IN 1933 AND ITS EFFECT

On November 17, 1933, President Franklin D. Roosevelt resumed diplomatic relations with Russia, ending a policy of nonrecognition which had prevailed since the overthrow of the Kerensky government in 1917.

This enabled Russia to bring into this country thousands of agents devoted to the job of undermining our government and our system of society, and enabling Russia to conquer the United States by peaceful means, if possible; otherwise by force of arms.

This has been but a part of a movement by Communist Russia to conquer the world.

STATEMENT FROM AMERICAN OPINION SCOREBOARD

Quoting from the magazine, American Opinion, for July-August and September 1960 (p. 2 of "The Scoreboard"): "Basic Communist strategy for conquest of the world, as laid out 35 years ago and relentlessly followed ever since, consisted of three steps: (1) Take eastern Europe; (2) next take the masses of Asia; (3) then take the rest of the world, including the United States. The Communists completed their first step in 1950; the second step is now at least three-fourths accomplished; and they have gone more than one-fourth of the way toward carrying out their third step. Which means that the Communists have now covered well over two-thirds of the total distance to their final goal of worldwide dominion. And the momentum and the speed of their progress ared steadily increasing."

AMERICAN PEOPLE UNAWARE OF COMMUNIST PERIL

Subjugation by Communist Russia is horrifying to contemplate. The great tragedy of the day is the fact that the great mass of the American people appear to be wholly unaware of the peril that confronts them. "Business as usual" is the rule, and little or no heed is given to the warnings of danger.

WARNINGS

Many warnings have been given the American people.

Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States since 1954, and a wise and loyal friend of this country, has uttered such a warning. In an article in the November issue of Reader's Digest, entitled "America, Wake Up!," an article which everyone should read, he says (pp. 49 and 55):

"America, wake up. Shake off the course of inaction that is giving the forces of evil the right of way in this world. Face up to the blunt fact that you are now engaged in a real war and that it must be fought and won. This is the only alternative to defeat by default.

* * * * *

"At its rate of growth since World War II, the universal Communist police state could come into being in our own lifetime.

* * * * *

"The only possible solution is to wage this protracted conflict twice as hard, twice as effectively, as the Communists are now waging it. We must embark on a massive offensive, turning every Communist trick and stratagem—from propaganda to infiltration—against our mortal enemy. This is the one and only way to win the struggle for survival."

Numerous other warnings have been given, including among others of recent date, warnings by (1) Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, in the Reader's Digest of December 1960, (2) Charles Stevenson in the Reader's Digest of February 1961, (3) Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, Democratic vice chairman of the Senate's Internal Security Subcommittee, (4) the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and

Objectives, (5) the House Un-American Activities Committee, (6) the Senate's Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DODD

"The horrible thing is that there is a complete failure to comprehend the menace of communism even among many Members of Congress" (Reader's Digest of February 1961, p. 43).

REPORT OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION'S COMMITTEE

The American Bar Association's Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives, in its report submitted to the House of Delegates in February 1959, said: "International communism will enslave the peoples of every nation of the free world—including the United States—unless they: Awaken from their apathy and their indifference to the dangers that exist and threaten.

* * * * *

"Remember that subversion—aided by treason and treachery of domestic citizens—has been the most successful tool and tactic of international communism in gaining control of now-enslaved nations or in weakening or dulling the resistance by those nations which remain free.

* * * * *

"Most persons who are informed on communism think our country now faces its greatest danger. The thesis of J. Edgar Hoover's new book, 'Masters of Deceit,' is: 'Communism is the major menace of our time. Today it threatens the very existence of our Western civilization.'

"In his speech to the 1957 National Convention of the American Legion, Mr. Hoover warned: 'To dismiss lightly the existence of the subversive threat in the United States is to deliberately commit national suicide. In some quarters we are surely doing just that.'

* * * * *

"The lawyer-author of the Gaither report to the President on national security recently told our Association: 'Our security is in unprecedented peril. * * * The ultimate objective of international communism is world domination, and the Soviet Union will pursue this objective ruthlessly and relentlessly, employing every possible political, economic, subversive, and military stratagem and tactic.'

* * * * *

"It is now an established fact that every institution, every force and every person actively engaged in the forefront of the defense of our country against the rising menace of communism becomes the target of attack and villification by Communists, Crypto-Communists, fellow-travelers, their stooges and innocent but beguiled persons.

* * * * *

"Notwithstanding some mistakes—fewer than generally charged—the service to our country by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Un-American Activities Committee has been incalculable and worthy of far greater praise than has been accorded to them. The Communist and radical propaganda against these committees has never subsided.

* * * * *

"A substantial strength of communism in the United States is the number of non-Communist organizations and individuals who will collaborate with the Communists. For every Communist Party member, there may be 10 non-Communists who will do the work of the Communists.

"The Communists have had hundreds of fronts. In addition, they have 'fronts in front of the fronts.' Making use of their fellow travelers and dupes, plus their 'united front tactic,' the Communists boast they can have 50,000 letters on any issue sent to Capitol Hill or the White House inside of 72 hours.

"The greatest asset the Communists have at the present time is not the hydrogen bomb, certainly not Soviet satellites, but world ignorance of their tactics, strategy and objectives."

STUDENT RIOTS

The success of the Communist movement throughout the world is illustrated by the many student riots which they have been able to stage, including Bogota, Colombia, in 1948, Caracas, Venezuela, in 1958, LaPaz, Bolivia, in 1959, and finally Tokyo in May-June 1960. These were all anti-American.

Besides these there have been the student riots against the Government in Turkey, Havana, and elsewhere.

SAN FRANCISCO STUDENT RIOT

And despite the common belief that "It can't happen here," the Communists staged a student riot in San Francisco in May 1960 against the House Un-American Activities Committee, which was holding a hearing in the San Francisco City Hall. This is one of the most disgraceful episodes in American history.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, has prepared a report on the riot, which everyone should read. I quote from it the following:

"The successful Communist exploitation and manipulation of youth and student groups throughout the world today are a major challenge which free world forces must meet and defeat. Recent world events clearly reveal that world communism has launched a massive campaign to capture and maneuver youth and student groups.

"The vigor and vitality of such groups constitute an explosive force of immense proportions. Channeled into proper outlets, this force can accomplish immeasurable good for a peace-loving world. Manipulated into destructive channels, this force can create chaos.

* * * * *

"It has long been a basic tenet of Communist strategy to control for its own evil purposes the explosive force which youth represents. In the relentless struggle for world domination being waged by them, Communists are dedicated to the Leninist principle that 'youth will decide the issue of the entire struggle—both the student youth and, still more, the working-class youth.'

* * * * *

"The Communist attack on the HCUA (House Committee on Un-American Activities) in San Francisco was in line with a longstanding party aim to destroy not only the HCUA, but also the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and every other 'enemy' seeking to expose the threat which Communist activities represent to the internal security of this Nation. The party reaffirmed its dedication to this aim at its 17th national convention, held in New York City, December 1959, when it passed a so-called political resolution calling for activity to abolish the 'witch-hunting' HCUA and Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

"Thus, when the decision of the HCUA to hold hearings May 12–14, 1960, in San Francisco was announced, it was mandatory for Communists to implement the convention resolution by doing everything possible to disrupt the hearings as part of the overall aim to destroy the HCUA.

* * * * *

"The Communist Party, U.S.A., is elated with the success it enjoyed in attempting to make a fiasco of the HCUA San Francisco hearings, which, notwithstanding these attempts at disruption, did develop valuable and needed information concerning the strategy, tactics, and activities of the party in northern California.

* * * * *

"In short, the consensus in the Communist Party was that the riot was the best thing for the party that had occurred in years. Party leaders expressed the opinion that it was especially significant that the party had been able to enlist the support of so many people in all walks of life when the party, itself, was publicly under attack by the HCUA. The feeling was that not only had the party taken a major step toward its goal of abolishing the HCUA, but also it had taken a major step toward playing a greater role on the American scene.

* * * * *

"Throughout the world today, governments are toppling with stunning rapidity. Whether large or small, the role Communists are playing in these events must not be discounted. The growing strength of our Nation over the years has not proven a deterrent to relentless efforts on the part of the Communist Party, U.S.A., to destroy our security and prepare our Nation for a similar fate.

"Looking at the riots and chaos Communists have created in other countries, many Americans point to the strength of our Nation and say 'It can't happen here.' The Communist success in San Francisco in May, 1960, proves that it can happen here.

* * * * *

"It is the duty of all Americans to fully understand the true import of this threat to our heritage, to expose it, and to combat it with every weapon at our command."

MOVING PICTURE OF SAN FRANCISCO RIOT

Fortunately a moving picture of the San Francisco riot was taken.

The Associated Industries of Rhode Island has purchased a copy of the film, and is showing it throughout the State as a public service without charge. It has created such a sensation that there is a great demand for it on the part of various organizations and schools. The association has ordered another copy of the film.

It is an amazing and distressing spectacle.

COMMUNISTS' ATTEMPT TO DISCREDIT FILM

The Communists have been thoroughly frightened by the feeling that is being aroused against them throughout the country by the showing of this film, and they have tried in every way possible to discount the film and to get people to believe that it is not a true picture of what occurred. In this they have been to some extent successful. Various newspapers along the eastern seaboard have accepted this view and widely publicized it.

STATEMENT BY MAYOR OF SAN FRANCISCO

In order to meet this attempt by the Communists to deceive the public, a statement was obtained from the mayor of San Francisco, George Christopher. His office is located directly across the hall from the room in which the hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee were being held and he was an eyewitness to what occurred.

I quote from his statement as follows: "There has been quite some controversy as to the authenticity of the film of the House Un-American Activities Committee meeting in our city. While I believe the pictures of the demonstrators speak for themselves, perhaps a further explanation will be enlightening.

* * * * *

"If these people had not disrupted these meetings—if they had not challenged the police—if they had not violated the law, there would have been no need for police action. Known Communists—and I repeat this emphatically—known Communists were in the lead of this demonstration. The students were dupes who join some of these causes of agitation, believing it is an innocent and harmless expression of civil liberties, not realizing that while they are doing this they are at the same time violating

every precept of the liberties they profess to cherish.

* * * * *

"The pictures, I believe, speak for themselves. They are true. They are authentic. They tell the real story * * *."

HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE SHOULD BE CONTINUED

I submit that the evidence establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that the House Un-American Activities Committee has been, and still is, performing a most valuable service to the people of the United States, and that it should be continued, its activities expanded, and the funds needed for this purpose provided by Congress.

CONCLUSION

We are engaged today in the most serious war we have ever fought—a cold war though it may be—and we are losing the war. It is a struggle for our survival as a free Nation. In these circumstances, instead of attacking those who are trying to protect the country, all possible aid should be given to them.

It is no time for captious or petty criticism. It is no time "to fiddle while Rome is burning."

It is no time for people to stand on the sidelines and leave the job to a few. Every man, woman and child should be in this fight to the finish. The American people must wake up and take some part in this battle before it is too late.

What, it may be asked, can one do? There are two things, and only two: (1) work for the cause, and/or (2) contribute money, no matter how small the amount, to some organization that is fighting the battle for you. One should not be deterred by the belief that he can do very little. Each person should do what he can, however small. The power of such collective action would be irresistible.

Remember, this is your fight, and if it is lost it is your fault.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y.*
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N.J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N.C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4501 Conn. Ave.
Anderson, John B., *Ill.*
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N.Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N.J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N.Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N.H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Battin, James F., *Mont.* 9 Dearborn Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Becker, Frank J., *N.Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Beermann, Ralph F., *Nebr.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bell, Alphonzo E., Jr., *Calif.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Bromwell, James E., *Iowa.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Bruce, Donald C., *Ind.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N.Y.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N.J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.* 5540 Colfax Ave., Alexandria, Va.
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Corman, James C., *Calif.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Davis, John W., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N.Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio.* 800 4th St. SW.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo.*
Dole, Robert, *Kans.* 2816 N. Jefferson Arlington, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N.Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y.* 319 Third St., SE.
Durno, Edwin R., *Oreg.*
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Findley, Paul, *Ill.*
Finnegan, Edward R., *Ill.*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I.* 1133 House Office Building
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* The Congressional
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N.J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garland, Peter A., *Maine.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.*
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.* The Congressional
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N.J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y.* 3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa.*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George, *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y.*
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Harding, Ralph R., *Idaho.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*
Harsha, William H., Jr., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich.*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Dr. Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N.Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S.C.*
Henderson, David N., *N.C.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N.Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J.*
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.* Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.* 5906 Harwick Rd.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N.Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Carleton J., *N.Y.*
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N.C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Kyl, John, *Iowa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Appendix

The House Rules Committee Schedules Hearing on Kearns Gold Resolution for Tuesday, April 25, 1961, After 12-Year Wait—The Governments of Western Nations Are Buying Russian Gold, Which Means We Are Sending Into Russia and Red China Vast Quantities of Food and Machinery, According to Representative Wright Patman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the House Rules Committee, after a 12-year wait, has finally scheduled hearings on my House resolution creating a select committee to inspect the gold reserves at Fort Knox and in other Federal depositories.

I introduced this measure, House Resolution 21, in accordance with the views of numerous patriotic organizations, such as the Daughters of the American Revolution, which for a number of years has adopted resolutions on this subject.

The point I have been making is that the only officials who ever see our gold are appointed officials, and even some top appointed officials never see our actual gold reserves.

Former Treasury Secretary John Snyder once told me that he never had seen the gold supply at Fort Knox.

Under article 1, section 7 of the Constitution of the United States all revenue bills must originate in the House of Representatives.

The exact language is as follows:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

It is high time that the House of Representatives, which originates revenue bills, should have some responsibility in connection with our gold reserves on which our entire monetary system rests.

A select committee of the House of Representatives could very properly conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the monetary system of the United States, including the balance of payments, and the gold reserves of the United States in the Federal depositories at Fort Knox, Philadelphia, Denver, and elsewhere as they affect every citizen of the United States, and report its findings and recommendations to the House of Representatives. I shall amend my resolution to provide this study of our monetary system, and our balance of payments.

In an incisive speech last week before the 70th Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] declared that:

We still cling, however, to certain ancient ideas about gold, which it seems to me, are likely to get us into trouble. So far, there are no signs that the spage age will make any very heavy requirements on gold. Yet despite the fact that the governments of the Western nations have vast quantities of this metal stored away in underground vaults, they continue to buy up billions more, each year, and at a tremendously high price which we ourselves fix and maintain at an artificial level. In this process, the governments of the Western nations are buying Russian gold, which means that we are sending into Russia and Red China vast quantities of food and machinery which the slave world desperately needs, and cannot produce in sufficient quantities, in exchange for a metal which we do not need.

The indiscriminate way in which the Western World now handles its monetary reserves makes it inevitable that these reserves will be contaminated by Communist gold. The Communists feed this gold into the grey markets of Europe, and from there it infiltrates our banking system. I think we ought to reexamine this matter very thoughtfully and ask ourselves whether it is really wise policy for the Western World to continue subsdizing a buildup of Russia's and Red China's industrial and military capabilities. It may be that we and our allies ought to consider some step to sterilize our monetary gold, such as putting it in the safekeeping of the International Monetary Fund here in Washington. If this were done, then at least we would know we would have the gold in case some scientific or industrial need for it ever develops.

Finally, may I suggest there should be more public interest in the money system and better understanding of what the Federal Government is doing in this field.

You know, it has long been popular for a Member of Congress to say that all he knows about money is that he doesn't have enough of it.

I have no doubt that if such a tremendously influential and public-spirited organization as the Daughters of the American Revolution should think well of the idea of more public interest and understanding, the result would, indeed, be more public interest and understanding, both in and out of Congress. I have no doubt that Congress would be willing to make a thorough study of the ways in which its constitutional powers and responsibilities are being used, and how these uses might be improved. The Federal Government spends billions in investigating the ocean floors, probing outer space, and so on. But it has been more than 50 years since we have had an official public study of our money system. Private corporations and foundations occasionally find it worthwhile to spend millions of dollars for monetary commissions set up to make private studies of this subject, which leads me to think the subject must be worthy of study in public bodies.

I am pleased to be able to say at this time that a resolution was adopted by the 70th Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in support of the study of the monetary system of the United States which was proposed by the able and distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in his speech before them last week.

I include as part of my remarks the text of my measure, House Resolution 21, together with an amendment which I will offer to it at the hearings to be held by the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, April 25, 1961.

I also include as part of my remarks the texts of letters I have received from Maurice Stans, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, and from George M. Humphrey, former Secretary of the Treasury:

H. RES. 21

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives appoint a committee consisting of seven members of the majority and minority of the House of Representatives, one of which shall be chosen as chairman, to visit the Fort Knox gold reserve and any other places designated where gold deposits are held, to inspect and report to the Congress and the people of the United States their accurate findings on their visitation as to the actual amount of gold bullion, bars, and so forth, held in keeping there by the United States Government, pursuant to article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States.

AMENDMENT TO H. RES 21

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following: "That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the monetary system of the United States, including the balance of payments, and the gold reserves of the United States in the Federal depositories at Fort Knox, Philadelphia, Denver and elsewhere, as they affect every citizen of the United States.

"For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the com-

mittee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

"The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House."

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., January 16, 1961.

MY DEAR CARROLL: In your letter of January 7, 1961, you ask my evaluation of the two legislative proposals which you introduced in the House of Representatives on January 3, 1961.

H.R. 26 proposes the coinage of not less than $25 million in $10 gold pieces and not less than $25 million in $5 gold pieces, which would not constitute legal tender, and would establish limitations on personal holdings and penalties for exceeding those limitations. As you know, under our present international gold bullion standard, the dollar is maintained at a parity with gold. Reserves of gold are centralized and are available for use in the national interest. It is the general practice of leading countries to utilize their gold reserves for the settlement of international transactions and not to reduce the funds available for this purpose by releasing gold to their private citizens in exchange for money. A limited number of gold pieces, it has been argued, could lead to hoarding and possibly to speculation in so-called black markets.

House Resolution 21 proposes that a committee consisting of Members of the House of Representatives be appointed to visit Fort Knox and other gold depositories and report on the actual amount of gold held by the U.S. Government. No objection is apparent to such an undertaking if the Congress so desires. However, to determine and verify the amount of gold bullion would require the opening of vaults, removal of several thousands of tons of gold bullion, weighing each bar, drilling each bar for an assay sample to prove the degree of purity, and replacing the bars in the vault under seal. Such a process would be very arduous and time consuming.

You may recall that shortly after the present administration assumed office a quite similar audit was undertaken, on a sample basis, by representatives of the various agencies concerned. At Fort Knox, for example, 3 of 22 sealed gold compartments were opened, 88,000 gold bars were counted, about 9,000 bars were weighed, and 26 bars were assayed to determine the degree of fineness of the metal. The committee reported the contents of the three vaults to be as represented and expressed the opinion that an examination of the remaining vaults would result in a similar report with respect to their contents.

I am sure you will want also to get the views of the Treasury Department on these matters. My own personal views are that there is not sufficient reason to enact H.R. 26, but that if the Congress would feel more secure by the enactment of House Resolution 21, it would certainly not be objectionable.

Thank you for the good wishes conveyed in your letter. My best wishes to you, as well.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE STANS, *Director.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., May 6, 1953.

Hon. CARROLL D. KEARNS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KEARNS: I have before me your letter of April 29, concerning the recent inventory of the gold in the various mint institutions. At the outset let me state that the gold was counted not only at Fort Knox, but at the other depositories as well.

After I was designated by President-elect Eisenhower to become Secretary of the Treasury, I met with Secretary Snyder, and one of the problems I discussed with him was the transfer of assets to the incoming administration. It was decided that a committee be appointed to review the procedures relative to safeguarding the assets and that such committee should prescribe the manner in which the inventory should be taken. This committee was composed of W. L. Hemingway, chairman of the executive committee of the Mercantile Trust Co., St. Louis; William Fulton Kutz, chairman of the board, the Pennsylvania Co., Philadelphia; Sidney B. Congdon, president, National City Bank of Cleveland, Cleveland; James L. Robertson, member, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, Washington.

The committee met in Washington and spent several days questioning officials relative to the procedures employed in accounting for and protection of the Government's gold, silver, and other assets. The committee then recommended that 10 percent of the compartments in all mint institutions be selected at random for a count of the gold assets and that 10 percent of the gold counted be weighed. Also, bars were to be selected at random for assaying. The committee recommended that this work be done under the supervision of a continuing committee consisting of four members: one to represent me, one to represent Secretary Snyder, and one to represent Mrs. Priest, the Treasurer, and one to represent the General Accounting Office. The General Accounting Office declined the committee arrangement for their representative because they wished to maintain their independent status. Therefore, during the inventorying process the General Accounting Office had representatives present, but they were acting on their own behalf and submitted separate reports on their observations.

Under the supervision of the continuing committee and with the General Accounting Office observing the inventory, the count was carried out and reports submitted stating that the assets were as stated in the Treasury accounts. Upon the basis of this inventory, I am satisfied that all the gold assets are as reported.

You asked to be informed of the amount of gold the Treasury has in its depositories throughout the Nation. Attached is a list of the depositories and the gold that they held on March 31, 1953. All the gold held in such depositories belongs to the U.S. Government. None of it belongs to foreign countries. Any gold held in the United States for foreign countries is held on earmarked account at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and statistics covering such holdings are reported in total by the Federal Reserve Board in its monthly bulletin.

You speak of the routine check that was made at Fort Knox. From the above you can readily see that the inventory recently made was not in any manner routine. In this connection, I attach copies of three press releases dated January 9, January 31, and April 12, which go into more detail.

I appreciate very much your statement that I am doing an outstanding job. I also appreciate your offer of cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in an unprecedented action the National Congress of Parents and Teachers gave full support to S. 1021.

As pointed out in a press release, this is the first time the organization has endorsed specific proposed legislation for Federal support of education.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire press release be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL CONGRESS URGES PTA'S TO BACK ADMINISTRATION BILLS ON EDUCATION AID

CHICAGO, ILL., April 18.—The National Congress of Parents and Teachers has called on its 47,000 local PTA's to urge their "full support" of the Kennedy administration's proposals for Federal aid to schools.

A special legislative memorandum to local PTA's cited H.R. 4970 and S. 1021, identical bills, as "moderate in both expense and approach" and noted that they would "give protection against Federal interference in the schools, provide additional aid to low-income States, and allow each State to decide for itself how the money will be spent." And they meet other policy requirements of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. The memo also stresses the need for changes in titles II and III of the bills to provide more adequate funds for federally impacted areas. The memorandum was released by Mrs. Fred L. Bull, of Baltimore, Md., chairman of the National Congress committee on legislation.

As chairman of legislation, Mrs. Bull has also written President Kennedy and the Members of the U.S. Congress pointing out: "Our members, as taxpayers, are willing to pay their fair share of the cost of quality education for their children. They are truly concerned not so much about the high cost of providing a program of excellence as about the tremendously greater cost of not providing it."

Speaking today at national headquarters in Chicago, Mrs. James C. Parker, president of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, called attention to the plea for decisive action contained in her message in the April issue of the PTA magazine. She reiterated, "Probably no action we take in coming months will have more important consequences for our children and our country than our action on education legislation. It is incumbent upon each of us, as parents, teachers, and citizens to let our Senators and Representatives know our views."

In backing the administration's Federal aid bills, the legislative memorandum suggested that PTA members write to President Kennedy, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham A. Ribicoff, U.S. Commissioner of Education Sterling M. McMurrin, and their own U.S. Congressmen and Senators.

While the National Congress of Parents and Teachers has long advocated legislation in support of education, this is its first specific recommendation for Federal assistance in the current session of the U.S. Congress.

Bar Mitzvah

SPEECH
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, today is Israel's 13th birthday. Born in the midst of turbulence and war this tiny nation proved to itself and to the world that it possessed the strength and determination to win its struggle for existence. Not only did it survive but it continued to thrive and prosper so that today it holds a respected position in the family of nations.

Recent statistics indicate the rapid rate of growth and progress that has been achieved since 1948:

[In thousands]

	1948	1960
Populations	790	2,128
Industrial production	(1)	$1,070,000
Exports	29,680	265,000
Imports	253,120	520,000
Agricultural production	24,700	183,000
Cultivated area	412	1,100
Irrigation (in acres)	62	340
Afforestation	13	64.5
Water usage (in cubic meters)	250,000	1,400,000

[1] Negligible.

In 1948, Israel's 4 ships carried a total of 14,000 tons. In 1960, a fleet of 53 ships handled 445,000 tons of cargo.

Elementary school education increased from 108,844 to 600,000 in this period. Arab students now number 42,700; in 1948 only 6,780 were enrolled. And Israel's teachers grew in numbers from 5,964 in 1948, to 22,400 in 1960.

Israel can be justly proud of this fine record.

The early years of Israel's life were not easy ones. She was faced with the dual task of creating a strong government and a stable economy while at the same time being forced to expend money and manpower in combating the opposition of the countries surrounding her who were hostile to the idea of her very presence in their midst. However, the spirit, dedication, and sacrifice of a people who from the beginning of their history have always faced a threat to their survival, never failed and their country took shape and developed.

As a result Israel enters adulthood confident in the achievement and advancement of her youth yet acutely aware that in the future as in the past there are difficulties that must be met and problems that must be solved before she can enjoy complete peace.

We in the United States have special reason to rejoice with Israel in celebrating her birthday. We were the first nation to recognize her independence in 1948 and we have continued to encourage her development and growth. Our faith and support have been justified for today Israel stands as an oasis of democracy in an area of tumult and chaos.

Oregon Leads Nation in Percentage Completion of Federal Interstate Highway System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERBER. Mr. President, it is indeed a pleasure to report that my State of Oregon has a greater percentage of its mileage under the Federal Interstate and Defense Highways rated adequate for present traffic and opened to daily traffic than any other State in the Union.

In Oregon, 58 percent of the interstate mileage is rated adequate for present standards and open to daily traffic, while nationally slightly more than 25 percent is now open to traffic, according to the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce. Over 425 miles of interstate highways are open to daily use by motorists in Oregon, and another 132.5 miles are under construction, with work yet to come on the remaining 173.5 miles. Oregon also ranks fourth nationally in percentage of Interstate System completed to full interstate standards.

Oregon's lead in Interstate Highway completion has been done without toll roads.

I should like to invite the people of our Nation to come and visit Oregon, and use our modern highways and enjoy our scenic beauty, and our delightful summers. A friendly welcome is extended to all.

With a lead such as Oregon enjoys in its interstate highway system, I would like to pay special tribute to the Oregon State Highway Commission and its staff. Mr. M. K. McIver, of Portland, is the commission's able chairman, and the other members are Messrs. Kenneth N. Fridley, of Wasco, and Glenn L. Jackson, of Medford. Mr. W. C. Williams is the capable State highway engineer, who has done so much of the work and planning which has made possible Oregon's lead.

Mr. President, as I am sure everyone understands, good highways cost money, and the price tag for the interstate system as a whole, is $41 billion, and this figure is expected to increase. The system is financed on a sharing basis, with the Federal Government contributing 92 percent of the costs, and the States 8 percent. The Federal costs for the system will total $37 billion.

A special Federal highway trust fund has been established which is supported by special highway user taxes. Highway legislation, so far enacted, provides for about $25.5 billion of Federal funds. Additional funds are needed to make up the total contribution. This need can be met in several ways, by stretching out the entire program beyond the planned terminal date of 1972, increasing highway user taxes, direct appropriations from taxes, and borrowing, or by taking funds which now go into the general treasury from automotive excises, and applying them to the highway trust fund.

Mr. President, I am strongly opposed to stretching out the completion date of the Federal Interstate System beyond 1972. I believe that highway users should understand that the high taxes on gasoline, and other fuels, make possible our modern highway system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article by Mr. W. C. "Dutch" Williams, from the April 1961 issue of the Oregon Motorist, in which Oregon's able State highway engineer describes the interstate system and its planning and financing. The Oregon Motorist is the official publication of the Oregon State Motor Association, and its editor is Mr. Sidney A. King. I also ask unanimous consent that a table, showing how the various States stand in the interstate highway program, which appeared in connection with Mr. Williams' article, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

(By W. C. Williams)

Oregon's Interstate Highway System has a greater percentage of its mileage rated adequate for present traffic and opened to daily traffic than any other State in the Union, according to a recent U.S. Bureau of Public Roads report. In addition to this, Oregon ranks fourth nationally in the percentage of the system completed to full interstate standards, the report states.

A lead like this in the interstate program is not something that developed overnight, but actually had its beginnings in public and legislative foresight as early as 1950 in providing bonds for the building of modern freeways. When a 1956 act by Congress launched most States into building their first interstate highways, Oregon already had 71 miles of its system constructed to standards that were equal to interstate specifications. This was nearly 10 percent of the total mileage of the interstate system in the State.

PROGRAM WELL UNDERWAY

Due to financing provided by the 1956 act and subsequent highway acts, the end of 1960 saw 219 out of a total of 731 miles completed and found contractors at work on an additional 91 miles. It is anticipated that, during 1961, 48 of these 91 miles will be completed and opened to traffic.

It is estimated that new projects totaling $31,500,000 will be placed under contract this season. This will include work in the Grants Pass-Medford-Ashland areas, from Eugene to the Lane-Douglas County line, in the Portland area, east of The Dalles, between Celilo and Rufus, and between Baker and Huntington.

COMPLETION SET FOR 1972

Financially, Oregon had $21,800,000 in construction costs invested in the system at the time of the 1956 act and had upped this to $105 million at the end of 1960. Estimated costs of contracts to be let this year will raise this figure to $137 million, which, coupled with right-of-way costs of approximately $32 million, will find Oregon with $167 million worth of work completed out of a total of $634 million, which is the estimated cost of completing the entire system in this State.

Funds for interstate highways since 1956 have been shared between the State and Federal Government on a 92 percent Federal and 8 percent State basis. Based on funds being provided by Congress and barring unforeseen events such as strikes or serious cutbacks, the Interstate System should be completed by about 1972.

How States stand (adequate for present time)

State	Status	Percent open to traffic
Oregon	1	58.19
New York	2	54.44
Kansas	3	48.77
Connecticut	4	46.64
Arizona	5	44.30
Massachusetts	6	42.65
Washington	7	41.03
Pennsylvania	8	38.69
Oklahoma	9	38.19
Ohio	10	38.11
North Carolina	11	37.10
New Hampshire	12	36.76
Michigan	13	35.39
North Dakota	14	34.69
Maryland	15	34.01
Missouri	16	33.30
Maine	17	33.21
Wisconsin	18	32.27
Illinois	19	31.02
Iowa	20	30.08
Rhode Island	21	29.20
Texas	22	29.09
New Mexico	23	29.05
New Jersey	24	25.06
California	25	24.19
Colorado	26	24.12
Idaho	27	23.25
West Virginia	28	23.19
Indiana	29	22.10
South Carolina	30	18.55
South Dakota	31	17.09
Georgia	32	15.27
Virginia	33	15.01
Wyoming	34	13.02
Nevada	35	10.52
Kentucky	36	10.20
Hawaii	37	9.56
Minnesota	38	8.89
Delaware	39	8.64
Arkansas	40	8.40
Nebraska	41	8.40
Montana	42	7.85
Florida	43	7.75
Utah	44	7.42
Vermont	45	7.14
Alabama	46	6.81
Mississippi	47	6.37
Louisiana	48	6.12
District of Columbia	49	1.77
Tennessee	50	1.47

Private Peace Corps of the Paderewski Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, several days ago I mentioned the fine work that is already being done by many private organizations in the same area as the much-publicized Peace Corps. I believe that these programs deserve more attention than they have received in the past. They are already in operation, and, by all accounts, the work they are doing is of a high standard. I have already included in the RECORD material on the programs of the Creole Petroleum Co., Literacy village in India, Smith Kline & French Laboratories, and the American Association of Medical Colleges. Another group that has been active in this oversea work is the Paderewski Foundation of New York, which carries on educational and scientific work on four continents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include an article on the Paderewski Foundation and its peace corps in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

OUR PEACE CORPS

The cultural and educational work of our foundation extended during the Paderewski Centennial Year over four continents. For the first time Africa was included: the Arabic speaking scholar of Harvard University, Julius Szentendrey, was awarded a grant for study at the University of Cairo. East of Suez, Paderewski scholars are spread over a wide area, from the Irani, speaking Marek Antoni Wasilewski of Warsaw at the University of Teheran, to the Javanese speaking George Gomori of Oxford at the Gadjah Mada University of Jogjakarta, Indonesia. Other teachers and students on our foundation's fellowships and scholarships work in India, Burma, and Pakistan. Many of them have already mastered the local languages. Among the Paderewski scholars are citizens and residents of the United States, refugees from communism, and graduates of Polish universities. The last are now receiving special attention in view of the increased possibilty of cultural and educational exchanges with Poland. Several Polish scholars received grants for studies in Western Europe with emphasis on subjects neglected in Poland. Among them are Miss Halina Biedrzycka of Lublin Catholic University at St. Hilda's College, Oxford; Stanislaw Czuma of Cracow University and Miss Diana Pachlewska of Lublin Catholic University at the Sorbonne.

In the United States and Canada the Foundation continues its interest in the promotion of Polish and other Slavic studies, mainly through the University of Montreal. Students from Poland received educational travel grants within the United States to learn more about this country prior to their return home. In the field of music, Miss Camille Budarz of the Juilliard School received a travel grant to participate in the VI International Chopin Contest in Warsaw, and the winner of the V Contest, Mr. Adam Harasiewicz, performed at our Centennial Concert and was awarded our foundation's gold medal and financial grant.

Two new fellowships were already awarded this year. One went to Dr. Maria Dydynska of the University of Warshaw, now engaged in research work in the Department of Physiology, University College, London; the second went to Miss Krystyna Agnieszka Kowalska, also of the University of Warsaw. Miss Kowalska was an honor guest of the Government of India on the occasion of that country's tenth anniversary of independence in 1959, as the best oriental scholar in Poland. She has now been issued the Polish passport, and will soon be on her way to Visva Bharati University near Calcutta to participate in the Rabindranath Tagore Centennial observances.

The amount of $46,651 was spent by our foundation on educational and cultural assistance in 1960, as compared with $31,749.28 in 1959. We hope that this total will again be exceeded this year with the majority of grants for 1961, 1962 distributed in May and June.

Edward Zwolski of Lublin Catholic University wrote us as follows on August 30, 1960: "I am happy to inform you that I have just obtained the degree of doctor 'in Lettere' at the University of Rome after successfully defending my thesis entitled 'Remarks on the Political System of Argos' prepared under the guidance of Prof. M. Guarducci. My grade 110 with commendation is the highest attainable at this university. I take this opportunity to express my most cordial thanks to the Paderewski Foundation whose invaluable assistance enabled me to complete my studies."

Paderewski scholars in 15 countries and on 4 continents are performing a variety of useful functions in terms of their own education and future career, for the benefit of the less developed countries in which they teach and share their experience, and in promoting the idea of peace in freedom which is inseparably connected with every major aspect of our present-day life.

Ignacy Jan Paderewski was known and admired throughout the civilized world. Although born in Poland and particularly respected in the United States, his adopted country, he can never be associated exclusively with one nation. His life was spent in the service of great ideas and, following his inspiring example, the Paderewski Foundation devotes its entire energy and resources to the promotion of international understanding and cooperation.

Locations of Customshouses in the Large Coastal Cities of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the General Services Administration is planning to place a new customshouse for the twin ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach in the downtown Los Angeles Civic Center, 22 miles away from these ports. This proposal seems almost incredible. By way of comparison, here are the locations of the customshouses in the other large coastal cities of the United States:

Baltimore, Md.: Gay, Lombard, and Water Streets, about two blocks away from the basin and the municipal piers—in general vicinity of waterfront.

Boston, Mass.: 2 India Street, difficult to tell where it is located on this street, but India Street only runs a few blocks away from Boston Harbor—very near.

Bridgeport, Conn.: 120 Middle Street, up to two blocks from Pequonnock River, about seven-tenths of a mile from Long Island Sound.

Charleston, S.C.: 200 East Bay Street between Market and Gaillard Streets—on or one block from Cooper River—very near.

Galveston, Tex.: 17th Street and Avenue B, one or two blocks from Galveston Ship Channel—near.

Honolulu, Hawaii: 335 South King Street, two blocks from Honolulu Harbor.

Mobile, Ala.: St. Joseph and St. Louis Streets, four or five blocks—about one-fourth mile—from Mobile River. Blakely Island is between Mobile River and Mobile Bay—2 or 3 miles away, but relatively close.

New Orleans, La.: 423 Canal Street, about five or six blocks from the Mississippi River—pretty close.

New York, N.Y.: Bounded by Whitehall, Bridge, and State Streets, quite close Hudson River—about one-fifth mile—East River—about two blocks—and upper bay—about one-tenth mile—fairly close, but 6 or 8 miles from center of waterfront activity.

Norfolk, Va.: 101 East Main Street, street runs parallel about two blocks from Elizabeth River—Eastern Branch. Not on Chesapeake Bay.

Philadelphia, Pa.: Second and Chestnut Streets, about four blocks away from Delaware River—close to waterfront, but 7 or 8 miles from some centers of waterfront activity.

Portland, Maine: 312 Fore Street, runs parallel about one or two blocks from Portland Harbor.

Portland (Oreg.: 220 Northwest Eighth Avenue, five to eight blocks—less than three-tenths mile—away from Willamette River—downtown, probably 2 or 3 miles.

Providence, R.I.: 24 Weybosset Street; street no more than 3,000 feet from Providence River. If the customhouse is located at Weybosset and Custom House Streets, it is only about one block away.

San Diego, Calif.: State and F Streets, five or six blocks from San Diego Bay—downtown.

San Franciso, Calif.: Washington and Battery Streets, about three-tenths mile from San Francisco Bay—fairly close.

Savannah, Ga.: 1–3 East Bay Street. Bay Street runs parallel to Savannah River, about two to six blocks away—close to river.

Seattle, Wash.: Marion Street, First Avenue, and Madison Street, appears to be right on Elliott Bay, which is off Puget Sound.

Tampa, Fla.: Florida Avenue between Zack and Twiggs Streets, about four blocks from Hillsboro River, no more than about one-half mile from Hillsboro Bay, off Tampa Bay.

Wilmington, N.C.: Princess and Water Streets, on Cape Fear River—very close.

Israel's Birthday

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled to have the opportunity of joining with my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], and with my other colleagues in paying tribute to the brave State of Israel on the occasion of its 13th birthday.

No nation in all the long roll of the years that are recorded in history has accomplished as much and against such odds in the same period of time as has Israel. It has conquered nature itself. It has planted trees to bring back to arid land its fertility. It has developed even the smallest of resources to great potentialities. It has set a pattern to all the countries in the Near East and in Africa, a pattern of what can be done when man is dedicated to his task and makes that which he has meet the objective of his dreams.

Today, we in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States send to the Government and to the people of the brave State of Israel expression of our deepest affection, our sincerest good wishes and our pledge of a never diminishing, but ever increasing support.

I have said that Israel in the brief period of its national sovereignty has brought fertility to arid acres and literally has made the desert bloom. Let me be specific. I have before me some figures that should be known to the American public.

Cotton was first introduced in Israel on a commercial scale only 7 years ago. This followed 2 or 3 years of intense experimentation. Today the cotton crops of Israel amount to over 5,000 tons and the value of the Israel cotton crop is about $4 million annually, and this does not include the cottonseed used by the oil industry. Cotton picking provides jobs for over 10,000 workers during the 2-month picking season.

Another important industrial crop is that of sugar. In Israel the soil was studied and it was treated so that sugar beets might be grown. Today sugar beets are being supplied to two factories with a capacity of 12,000 and 8,000 tons of sugar a year respectively.

Within the last few years the cultivation of peanuts, of tobacco, and of potatoes has grown tremendously. About 6,000 tons of peanuts are exported annually, and tobacco is grown in quality and in quantity sufficient to maintain a healthy and growing cigarette industry.

So I could go on endlessly. Everywhere in Israel there is the will to do, and the record of accomplishment is written in an economy ever growing stronger and in a political stability that never will be shaken.

What has been the contribution of Israel in the development of the Near East and of Africa? When I visited Africa last December I found everywhere reflections of Israel's contribution. In Ethiopia and in other countries there were missions of help supported by Israel, aid given to help these lands to higher plateaus, aid given by Israel from her own slender treasury. Perhaps the finest hotel in Africa, certainly the hotel most gloriously situated and with the best service, is the new hotel at Monrovia, the capital of Liberia. This hotel was built by money from Israel and it is being run today by Israel nationals.

Liberia is the oldest independent nation in Africa. It was settled years ago by American Negroes. Most of its people today are the descendants of the early American settlers or the descendants of African families into which these early Americans had intermarried. Liberia is very close to the hearts of the people of the United States. It has a future second to that of no country in Africa. As a friend and admirer of the brave State of Israel I was thrilled to learn and to see with my own eyes the contribution that Israel has made to the onward march of the Liberia so close to American hearts and American interests.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to close on a spiritual note. I do not know that it makes too much difference what is a man's religion if that religion is his approach to understanding with the infinite. In Israel are lands holy to the Jew, the Christian, and the Moslem. Israel is a Jewish state, but in its respect for the spirit of religion it has given protection and access to the places that mean so much to men and women of varying religions. Israel is not only an inspiration to all nations in a political and an economic sense, but also it is a pattern in the practice of tolerance and the building of a brotherhood of man.

Let us rejoice today that to the world has been given the brave State of Israel, and let us solemnly pledge to ourselves and to each other that never when Israel needs a friend will the United States be found wanting.

All-Federal Transmission System for Colorado River Storage Project Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter and an attached resolution in regard to support for an all-Federal transmission system for the delivery of Colorado River storage project power.

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

ARKANSAS VALLEY G. & T., INC.,
Pueblo, Colo., April 17, 1961.

Senator JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution passed at the annual meeting of members of our association in support of the all-Federal transmission system for the delivery of Colorado River storage project power.

We are looking forward to working with you in achieving this objective.

Very truly yours,
ARKANSAS VALLEY G. & T., INC.,
EDWARD GAITHER, *Manager.*

"Whereas the marketing of power from the Colorado River storage project over an all-Federal transmission grid is of the utmost importance to Arkansas Valley G. & T., Inc.; and

"Whereas only a Federal transmission system as recommended by the Department of Interior for the project insures project repayment, including full assistance to participating irrigation projects, delivery of power to preference customers in the defined marketing area at reasonable rates, and the maximum gain from interconnection of

project units and the storage project system with other Federal power systems of the area; and

"Whereas there is a vital need for a continuing program of Federal transmission line construction which will insure adequate capacity in place as project generation becomes available: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That Arkansas Valley G. & T., Inc., urge the Colorado congressional delegation and the Department of the Interior to do all things possible in order to secure adequate appropriations for the construction of an all-Federal transmission system for the delivery of Colorado River storage project power."

Textile Industry and Related Industries

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, a very serious problem in the State of Georgia and in my district is the gradual strangling of the textile, garment, and apparel industries. In our section, without Federal aid, we have established many small industries which have kept our people from living in a depressed area.

Recently, one of the outstanding activities which has saved the economy of a large segment of people in Wilkes County, Ga., had a blow. This was rendered by the Tariff Commission when it declined to give escape clause relief for domestic plastic rainwear producers who have been overwhelmed with imports from Japan. This industry, started in Washington, Ga., by Mr. Alfred Moses, president of Almar Rainwear Corp., has afforded employment and other opportunities for people who had left agricultural pursuits or who would have left Wilkes County and proceeded to add themselves to already highly populated areas, who would have been dislocated from their home communities and might have caused employment problems elsewhere. Mr. Moses stated that only because of diversification in the total business and by going into more expensive fabrics was his plant able to continue to operate as a successful venture. If the actual volume loss in plastic raincoats to domestic manufacturers brought on by imports were totaled up, the figure would be something fantastic.

During my campaign for Congress last summer I ran across a number of startling facts in respect to the small industries that are now the life blood of my district.

Near Elberton, Ga., in a small community which had always been a prosperous farming community, I visited a small, country, general merchandise store. I asked the owner how things were going and he said that because of soil bank activities, acreage limitations on cotton and other factors reducing farming activities, he had lost some trade but that a sewing plant had been established in the neighborhood and it had been a source of local payrolls from which his business had drawn profit. He said the plant across the road had recently slowed down and offered employment for only about three days in a week. He reached up on the line over the counter and took down a small boy's white knit shirt and he said, "I have this shirt and can sell it for $1." He showed me the label was from a country outside of the United States. He then reached over on the counter and showed me another boy's shirt comparable to the one already demonstrated and he said, "I cannot sell this shirt for less than $1.50 and make the same profit as I do on the first one." Then he stated that, surprisingly enough, the more expensive shirt was made across the road from him. His conclusion was also revealing. He said that the same people who worked on the shirt across the road were no different from other people and when they came in to buy items of clothing or other merchandise they bought the one that cost the least.

There is a similar sewing plant in Taliaferro County, Ga., which heretofore was one of our most prosperous farming counties. With the decline in agricultural output and acreage, this county has lost almost half of its population in the last 10 years. It has only one real industry in its confines and that is a branch of a garment plant that operates some 25 miles away. Because of competition from cheap foreign goods, this plant is also, in its parent office and in its branch in Taliaferro County, operating only part time.

These examples can be multiplied over and over again in the 10th District and are commencing to create a serious employment problem.

We have talked in the Congress recently about assisting depressed areas by granting a Federal subsidy of $300 million. In our efforts to assist the textile industry, we are not asking for any Federal outlay of money but merely for a chance for free enterprise to survive because of competitive methods which Americans cannot afford to meet. The reasons advanced for the ability of foreign-made goods to come on American markets at a cheaper price is the low cost of human labor which goes into the cost of the production of these competitive commodities. I would not advocate the reduction of our high standard of living and our high rate of wages so as to compete with substandard conditions and almost slavery conditions in foreign countries.

Therefore, it seems to me that the only remedy is for the Government of the United States, in its executive and legislative branches, to take a hand and provide some regulation in a field which has always been acknowledged as a field in which the Government should operate. We must act before it is too late and thousands of people are put out of work or must move for job opportunities. This is better than to plead later for a subsidy as a depressed area.

Nineteen Hundred and Sixty-one Marks the 150th Anniversary of the Establishment of the Williamsburg, Pa., Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, "The post office, with its everlasting energy, I look upon as a first measure of civilization."—Ralph Waldo Emerson.

The U.S. post office at Williamsburg, Blair County, Pa., will celebrate its 150th birthday this fall having been established in 1811 while the community was part of Huntingdon County. In 1846 Williamsburg became a part of Blair County when the latter was formed from sections of Huntingdon and Bedford Counties. The Williamsburg Post Office is the second oldest in Blair County, the Hollidaysburg Post Office having been established in 1805.

Since the establishment of the Williamsburg Post Office in 1811 the following postmasters held office:

POSTMASTERS AND DATES OF APPOINTMENT

William W. Harris, October 1, 1811.[1]
William Spear, February 7, 1814.
Samuel Roger, March 28, 1821.
George Davis, March 31, 1825.
Adolphus Patterson, December 23, 1826.
Philip Rees, June 1, 1841.
Joseph S. P. Harris, May 12, 1843.
Philip Rees, February 9, 1844.
Alexander W. Kenny, March 25, 1845.
John Gorley, June 10, 1846.
Joseph Baldridge, April 11, 1849.
William G. Murray, May 13, 1853.
James I. Fay, April 16, 1861.
William J. Spencer, May 4, 1861.
William A. Fluke, August 21, 1866.
Albert J. Weaver, May 4, 1869.
Alexander Rutledge, January 18, 1871.
Joseph F. Rutledge, August 7, 1877.
James Roller, May 17, 1880.
William M. Eichholtz, September 8, 1885.
Alexander Rutledge, July 12, 1889.
Mrs. Sarah Rutledge, December 15, 1891.
Charles A. Patterson, January 20, 1896.
Levi Sparr, October 29, 1900.
Samuel Sparr, January 16, 1906.
T. Dean Ross, July 23, 1909.
J. R. Detwiler, October 30, 1913.
James T. Patterson, June 21, 1922.
James R. Detwiler, March 5, 1934.
James K. Morrison, January 19, 1937.
John G. Butler, June 30, 1956.
Grace E. Miller, acting, June 30, 1959.
Ruth D. Grassmyer, acting, January 17, 1961.

Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that we take for granted many of the rights and privileges enjoyed under the American heritage of liberty and freedom. In this category may be included our seeming lack of appreciation for the finest postal service in the world. As a matter of fact very often it requires a

[1] Date of first return from the Deputy Postmaster to the Postmaster General.

Source: National Archives and Records Service, Washington, D.C.

special occasion such as the dedication of a new post office or the celebration of an anniversary such as is being observed this year by the Williamsburg, Pa., Post Office, to remind us in a telling manner of the phenomenal growth of the U.S. postal service and the fidelity and efficiency displayed by over 500,000 dedicated postal employees.

The sesquicentennial celebration of the Williamsburg, Pa., Post Office affords the opportunity of refreshing our memories by recalling the glorious history of progress achieved by the U.S. postal service which is older than our Nation.

While the original purpose of the postal system was to provide "the best means of establishing posts for conveying letters and intelligence through this continent"—Journals of the Continental Congress, May 27, 1775—the Post Office Department was ultimately enlarged to include several services. Among the more important developments of the postal service, in the order of their establishment or authorization, were: 1775, Benjamin Franklin, first Postmaster General; 1780, Samuel Osgood, first Postmaster General under the Constitution; 1806, first national post road started; 1813, navigable waters declared post roads; 1819, mail carried by steamship; 1938, railroads declared post roads; 1847, adhesive postage stamps introduced; 1855, registered mail; 1858, first street letterboxes; 1861, small parcels of merchandise mailed; 1864, railway mail service; 1864, money-order service; 1867, international money-order service; 1873, postal cards introduced; 1885, special delivery service; 1896, rural free delivery service; 1911, postal-savings system; 1913, parcel post including insurance and collect-on-delivery services; 1918, Government airmail service; 1924, day and night transcontinental airmail service; 1941, highway post offices; 1943, postal delivery zone system; 1945, revised postal note service; and 1955, certified mail.

Benjamin Franklin was appointed postmaster at Philadelphia in 1737 and Co-Deputy Postmaster General of the British Colonies in North America in 1753, and on July 26, 1775, became the first Postmaster General under the Continental Congress at an annual salary of $1,000. He is credited with laying the foundation for the development of the present U.S. postal system.

On September 26, 1789, when Samuel Osgood was appointed the first Postmaster General under the Constitution there were only 75 post offices and the revenues of the Department were around $38,000 annually. From that small beginning the postal service has developed into what is now the largest business in the world. During the fiscal year 1959, according to the 1960–61 edition of the U.S. Government Organization Manual, "the postal service employed more than 500,000 workers and has gross receipts in excess of $3 billion. There are 35,750 post offices in the United States."

In reviewing the early history of the postal service in Pennsylvania it is recorded that during the colonial era, postal service, owing to inadequate transportation facilities, developed slowly. A limited postal service was established by William Penn in 1683 between Philadelphia, Chester, Newcastle, and Trenton. The rates varied from 5 to 9 pence according to the distance, the time of arrival and departure of the mail was posted on the meeting house door. In 1693 the assembly passed a law establishing in Philadelphia a general post office for transmitting letters and packages to all the Colonies, to Europe, and to the West Indies. Andrew Hamilton, who organized the postal service, was authorized to receive postage on all letters conveyed by post. The rates for letters between Philadelphia and New York were 4½ pence; between Philadelphia and Hartford, 9 pence; between Philadelphia and Providence 12 pence; and between Philadelphia and Boston 15 pence. To any place within 80 miles of Philadelphia the rate was 4½ pence. No charge was made for receiving and sending public letters, and the post paid no toll passing over ferries within the province. The rate for all foreign letters was 2 pence. The Moravians established a weekly post between Bethlehem and Philadelphia in 1742. Stage coaches carried mail after the stage lines were established, but previous to that time mail was carried by horseback. A post route was begun between Philadelphia and Boston in 1772. In 1775 the Continental Congress established at Philadelphia a general post office for the Colonies.

In the summer of 1804, 1 year before the establishment of the Hollidaysburg, Pa., post office and 7 years before Williamsburg acquired its post office, the first stage service across the Allegheny Mountains in Pennsylvania was established with Pittsburgh as its terminus. The line was subsidized by the Federal Government, and by December of this same year, the stages ran twice a week, the trip from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh taking from 6 to 7 days.

The Postmaster General wrote to the citizens along the line, that he was "fully disposed to give every reasonable aid to the extension of the line of stages to and beyond Pittsburgh." No other stage lines to, or in, western Pennsylvania, appear to have been established until after 1812.

More than 100 years ago, letters were delivered by carriers in the cities and the larger towns, and postage was collected when delivery was made. Letter carriers, employed at such post offices as the Postmaster General directed, received 2 cents from each person to whom the letter was addressed and delivered. The present free city delivery service was established by act of Congress on January 3, 1887.

The introduction of rural delivery service in 1896, was one of the outstanding improvements in the postal system affecting the farmer and rural residents and those persons residing outside the established delivery service area. In 1945 there were 17 rural routes in Blair County, Pa., Williamsburg having 2 of the 17 routes.

When Blair County was established in 1846, there were 13 post offices within the borders of the county, Williamsburg, established in 1811, being among the lucky 13.

As we survey the constant growth of the U.S. postal system we are reminded that its progress is a fulfillment of Benjamin Franklin's idea that a postal service would unify the New World and aid in its growth.

The history of the U.S. postal service is replete with the names of famous Americans. The list includes George Washington, who personally surveyed many of the original post roads; Paul Revere was one of the first post riders; while William Cody, known as Buffalo Bill, was one of the early riders for the pony express, which began operation April 3, 1860, between St. Joseph, Mo., and Sacramento, Calif., in an effort to give faster mail transportation to and from the Pacific coast. These pony express riders used a total of 75 ponies and that first mail took 10½ days. The fastest time recorded by the pony express was 7 days and 17 hours to deliver the inaugural address of President Lincoln in 1861. The pony express was operated by a private company and not the Federal Government. It charged $5 for each half ounce letter but later reduced the rate to a dollar. In October 1861 the pony express went out of existence, closing one of the most colorful chapters in American history. Truly the pony express riders faced dangerous yet exciting experiences in their role as pioneers in today's faster communications system.

Although the speed of transporting mail has increased tremendously since the days of the post riders many of our smaller post offices still use manual sorting and distributing methods which are virtually identical to those used in Benjamin Franklin's time.

The many new post offices and improved handling facilities which have been added to our postal system under the program inaugurated by former Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield exemplify the way the Post Office Department is maintaining the fine traditions founded by Benjamin Franklin.

The official motto for the Post Office, "Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night, stays these couriers from swift completion of their appointed rounds" is still the creed of the modern mail service and is proof that the ideals of Benjamin Franklin have been emulated by succeeding postal administrators. The official motto is paraphrased by over 500,000 dedicated postal employees in the well-known slogan—"the mail must go through."

An oversea soldier during World War II paid tribute to the efficiency of the U.S. postal system when he penned these lines—

I can't say where I'll be next, but there's one thing I know, no matter where they send me, I'll be greeted by "Hello." Like a magic carpet it follows me on land or sea. The bugle will sound mail call and they'll pass it on to me.

There have been countless words of praise for the over half million persons comprising the dedicated army of postal employees. Even the often maligned

post office pen and inkwell have been defended by none other than Christopher Morley in his ode:

TO A POST OFFICE INKWELL

How many humble hearts have dipped in you and scrawled their manuscript.
Have shared their secrets, told their cares, their curious and quaint affairs.
Your pools of ink, your scratchy pen, have moved the lives of unborn men.
And watched young people, breathing hard, put heaven on a postal card.

In conclusion the sesquicentennial celebration of the Williamsburg, Pa. Post Office serves to focus attention on the following inscriptions for East and West Parrlions, Post Office, Washington, D.C., composed by Charles Norton Eliot and edited by Woodrow Wilson since the inscriptions summarize in capsule form the extensive role of the U.S. Postal System in domestic and international affairs:

Messenger of sympathy and love
Servant of parted friends
Consoler of the lonely
Bond of the scattered family
Enlarger of the common life
Carrier of news and knowledge
Instrument of trade and industry
Promoter of mutual acquaintance
Of peace and of good will
Among men and Nations.

American Textile Industry

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROY A. TAYLOR
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make known my interests in the American textile industry and indicate my support of its fight to overcome a dangerous and burdening import situation.

I am reliably advised that cotton-cloth imports in the United States in 1960 were more than twice those in 1959. This is alarming, particularly when it appears that our domestic textile output is being so curtailed by import influences as to make it now appear that filling our military needs in an emergency situation would be extremely difficult.

I have received numerous letters and telegrams in recent weeks from genuinely concerned textile and garment manufacturers in my congressional district urging me to assist in placing strong restrictions on textile imports.

I have met and discussed this crisis with other Members of the House of Representatives, and we are in agreement that action in some form is necessary and should be undertaken at the earliest possible date.

I am sincerely convinced that textile imports have created an intolerable competitive situation for our own American producers. There has been no abatement in the sharply rising levels of textile imports from low-wage foreign manufacturers. The domestic result, as we are all now seeing, has been widespread textile shutdowns and layoffs.

This trend must be halted, and I have assured my constituents and other Members of the North Carolina congressional delegation of my anxiousness to help remedy this unfortunate situation.

The trend in the textile industry has been vividly unmistakable. Not only is the import level at a record high, but the rate of increase is such that, if it continues unchecked, foreign production will ultimately destroy our domestic industry.

No one can honestly blame foreign manufacturers for attempting to corner as much of the American market as possible. They are businessmen, too, and are anxious to sell the articles they manufacture.

However, the situation in the textile realm is now close to being out of hand. The Japanese industry is pushing for larger quotas of textile exports to the United States to keep Hong Kong producers from overtaking them in the American market.

Our textile workers deem it most unfair to suffer unemployment and shorter hours while their foreign competitors are supplying so much of the American market.

I therefore wish to make clear my desire to see the import balance improved substantially and rapidly. The solution, I believe, is the establishment of import quotas by country and by category.

Commission to Russia To Verify Claim of Man in Space Is Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, I read in the press and subsequently observed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a lengthy letter from my colleague, Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, of the 11th District of Illinois. Since that time, I have received the original letter through the mail from Mr. PUCINSKI. It urges the Committee on Science and Astronautics to call upon the President to send a commission to Russia to verify the claim of sending a man in orbit around the earth and returning him safely.

Mr. Speaker, I answered my colleague promptly. Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include my reply for the attention of the Members of Congress:

APRIL 18, 1961.

Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have read in the press that you have written a letter to me referring to the recent claims of the Russians that they have placed a man in orbit around the earth and have returned him safely to Soviet territory, as being a hoax. I have not yet received the letter. Pending its receipt, however, I invite you to give to me any and all information which you personally may have in reference to this alleged successful space flight, or to make accessible to the committee any information which you may have. I do not think, however, that we should rely on getting the cooperation of the Russians in this matter since they have denied us this cooperation in the past.

I do not know if the claims of the Soviets to have placed a man in orbit around the earth and to have returned him safely are true or are a hoax. It has been the judgment of many competent persons, however, that the Soviets have had this capability for some time. This ability has not been seriously questioned. Whether or not the alleged event was actually accomplished by the Soviets may be debatable. The important thing is that the Soviets have this capability and we do not have it.

Accordingly, I believe, therefore, that I should proceed on the assumption that the Russians' claim is correct, and try to fashion legislation which will place our country in the same position in the development of the art (or perhaps, superior, to it) as is Russia. Not to do so would tend to continue this country as other than a leader in space and could, in time, seriously jeopardize the security of this Nation.

Again, I suggest you give the Committee on Science and Astronautics, at the earliest possible instance, all available information you have, or have access to.

Sincerely yours,

OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman.

Eastern Orthodox Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, on February 16, I introduced, with Senators KEATING and PELL, Senate Resolution 88, which would grant Eastern Orthodoxy recognition as a major faith in the United States. I would like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I recently received from Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., in support of such recognition.

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

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 1, 1961.

The Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It was with great delight and satisfaction that we read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16 your sponsorship of Senate Resolution 88, which calls for the designatiton of the Eastern Orthodox Church as a major faith in the United States. We take this opportunity to express to you and also to your cosponsors, Senators KEATING, of New York, and PELL, of Rhode Island, our heartiest appreciation and thanks for taking the initiative in this important and long overdue matter.

The membership of this committee is heavily represented by Americans of the Eastern Orthodox faith. Many of them who were born in Ukraine enjoy the freedom of practicing this faith here, while their counterparts in Ukraine have suffered the genocide of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church

which Khrushchev has perpetuated to this day. For our members of the Orthodox faith your resolution cannot but sharpen the contrast of religious freedom and recognition that exists between our Nation and Khrushchev's totalitarian Russian Empire.

This committee fully supports Senate Resolution 88 and endorses without qualification the essential reasons and points of explanation which you have offered in behalf of the passage of this resolution. We shall be happy, indeed, to lend our services in any way to further its prompt passage.

With warmest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Georgetown University.

Notre Dame Club Names J. L. Rigali Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that the Italo-American community of metropolitan Chicago learned that one of its most distinguished citizens, Joseph L. Rigali, is being honored tonight by the Notre Dame Club of Chicago, as the Man of the Year. This most coveted award could not have been given to a more celebrated Chicagoan as alumnus of the university. Mr. Rigali represents one of the earliest pioneer families of the Chicago area. As an architect in the ecclesiastical adornments of art, both in plaster and stone—his work is expert and beautiful. His frescoes, arches, and pillared effects adorn hundreds of churches throughout the Nation. The sculpturing of statues, basins, religious pictures, and other objects, represent the finest art work in this field. The Rigali family, for generations, are renowned in their talents and masterful accomplishments in church architecture. They excel, also, in related fields of artistic objects and adornments.

We, the Congressmen of the Illinois delegation, congratulate our fellow Illinoisan, Joseph L. Rigali, and his family, in receiving this high award, and compliment the alumni of the Notre Dame Club of Chicago in his selection.

The Chicago Sun-Times, on Monday, April 24, noticed the event, as follows:

NOTRE DAME CLUB NAMES J. L. RIGALI MAN OF THE YEAR

Joseph L. Rigali of 120 Washington, Oak Park, has been named Man of the Year by the Notre Dame Club of Chicago.

He will receive the award at universal Notre Dame night Monday at the Ambassador West Hotel.

A 1926 architecture school graduate, Rigali played varsity end under Knute Rockne in the era of the Four Horsemen.

He is president of Daprato Studios, a church furnishings business at 766 West Adams.

He is a member of an all-Notre Dame family. His brother and three sons were graduated from the university and a fourth son is now a student.

Interdependence Key to Mutual Welfare of Canada and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall discusses the necessity for continued harmonious relations between the United States and Canada in an article appearing in the spring 1961 issue of Inco, published by the International Nickel Co., Inc. Secretary Udall stresses the interdependence of the two countries in the field of raw material mineral resources. He urges close cooperation in resource development and elimination of trade barriers between the two countries.

I commend the Secretary for his article, and the International Nickel Co. for its publication of the Secretary's views. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Interdependence Key to Mutual Welfare of Canada and the United States," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

INTERDEPENDENCE KEY TO MUTUAL WELFARE OF CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

(By Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior)

During the past several years there has been, on both sides of the border, a welcomed upsurge of concern with United States-Canadian relations. This reflects both some genuine problems and some misunderstandings. Even more important, however, it is an encouraging recognition that our complex interdependence is no longer being taken for granted.

In the United States, this recognition owes a great deal to the historic mission to Canada undertaken by Representatives Brooks Hays and Frank Coffin in 1957. This report of my colleagues made a deep impression in Congress, as well as in the executive branch of our Government.

In the succeeding years some notable steps have been taken. A joint group was formed of Canadian parliamentarians and U.S. Members of Congress, which meets periodically to discuss matters of common interest. A permanent Subcommittee on Canada has been established in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and two joint committees composed of top United States and Canadian officials in the executive branch, one dealing with economic affairs and one with defense, now hold regular consultations.

In addition, a new private organization, the Canadian-American Committee, has been formed by business groups of both countries and is contributing an important series of research studies on economic issues. In these and in other ways, Canadians and Americans are evolving out of shared experience the institutions and traditions of a special kind of community.

Thus, the revolution in military technology has confronted us with the common threat of transpolar war. The cold war has challenged our common cultural and political heritage. As a result, our national security programs are more closely linked than ever before in a system of continental defense. From another aspect, the development of regional markets in Europe, and the prospect of other such regional groupings elsewhere have given new importance to our already strong economic ties. It is clear that United States and Canadian economic interdependence must continue to grow The future holds a prospect of continuing and expanding benefits to both countries if we are wise in fostering the growth of our unique community of interests.

The magnitude of this community, in economic terms, is measured in some familiar figures. The United States and Canada are each other's best trade customers. Canada takes 23.6 percent of all U.S. exports and, in turn, sells 61.4 percent of its exports to this country. In 1959, Canadians purchased almost $4 billion (U.S. currency) worth of goods of all kinds from the United States, while U.S. imports totaled about $2.9 billion (Canadian currency) from our northern neighbor.

Underlying the pattern of trade and investment is an important reality—the practical and natural factors that make the economies of the two countries complementary. Anyone who works, as I do, in the area of natural resources, must be particularly aware of these factors. They have been impressively documented in a recent study by the Canadian-American Committee on the Future of Industrial Raw Materials in North America.

By 1980, according to this study, United States and Canadian requirements for raw materials will double. Of 28 key industrial materials, the United States will be deficient in 22, Canada in 8. However, if the resources of the two countries are available to each other—as they naturally and practically should be—the deficits of each country could be reduced substantially.

For both the United States and Canada, pooling of resources in which one or the other is deficient would substantially reduce dependence on other sources of supply, a factor of critical importance to our common national security. Thus Canada can provide the bulk of vital U.S. nickel requirements, and important quantities of lumber and wood products, for example, while herself becoming a valuable customer for American coal and phosphate. Such facts, as the committee pointed out, emphasize "that underlying economic forces are likely to be working powerfully in the direction of greater economic interdependence within North America." They document the assertion by the United States-Canadian Interparliamentary Group of the "intimate and important relations between United States and Canadian production and markets for such commodities as lead and zinc, aluminum, copper, nickel, and uranium."

However important these relations are, and however great their benefits, they will not come automatically and they cannot be taken for granted. Our mutual welfare depends on a spirit of reciprocity and flexibility in adapting to changing circumstances. Generally, this means we must continue to build the institutions within which negotiations and adjustments can take place—institutions like the parliamentary and executive joint groups now functioning, and the countless private relationships on which the substance of our interdependence is founded.

In the area of my own special concern, it is essential that our two countries maintain the closest cooperation in resource development and use. United States and Canadian interests are not always identical. Yet the natural logic of interdependence requires continual recognition of the compelling factors that dictate cooperation.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and the planned joint development of the Columbia River Basin are dramatic examples of such cooperation. It must extend likewise to elimi-

nation of needless tariffs and other trade barriers, to resource planning and development, and to the many other areas in which the future benefits of United States-Canadian cooperation depend.

House Resolution 211, Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee, pages 3286 to 3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel duty-bound to disclose the thoughts and feeling of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
WISCONSIN STATE CHAPTER,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 11, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Wisconsin Chapter of the Polish American Congress, representing a large segment of people of Polish descent living in Wisconsin, herewith wishes to congratulate you on your bold and farsighted move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. Needless to say, such a committee is long over due. One of the greatest problems confronting our Nation today is the Soviet Union, a prison house of many nations and peoples. These nations, ever eager and wanting to escape Soviet Russian slavery and despotism, constitute perennial weaknesses of the Soviet Union.

A Committee on the Captive Nations would serve as a reservoir of information and data on the various enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R., which information could be made available to the U.S. Government and its various agencies. Its main function, however, would be to inform the American people and the world at large on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain and assist the Government in formulating its policies with respect to the captive nations.

We are writing our Congressman CLEMENT ZABLOCKI asking him to support your resolution.

Respectfully yours,
EDMUND BANASIKOWSKI,
Chairman.
ROMAN KAMINSKI,
Chairman of Committee for Political Affairs.

ENGLEWOOD, N.J., *April 6, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: It has come to my attention that you have introduced a resolution creating a Special Committee on Captive Nations, including those within the Soviet Union itself. In my studies of Russian history, I have often wondered why more use was not made in our cold war and propaganda effort of the facts of the captive nations which are part of the Soviet Union. It seems to me that this area of historical fact, along with the Eastern European satellites, provides an opportunity for the United States to take some initiative in winning the cold war.

I would like to express my support for this measure as a constructive step in our struggle with communism.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES O. ROSSOTTI.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 12, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Congressman,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: On behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, a nationwide American patriotic organization representing over 2 million American citizens of Ukrainian descent and background, we wish to extend to you our heartiest congratulations for the all-important and timely resolution which you introduced in the House of Representatives on March 8, 1961. Your efforts to establish in the House of Representatives a permanent Committee on Captive Nations has met with the unqualified approval and support of all our membership throughout the United States. The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, since its establishment in 1940, has been a stanch supporter of all such measures of our Congress and our Government which would tend to strengthen the hope and resistance of the enslaved and captive nations behind the Iron Curtain, and thus weaken the force and drive of Communist Russia for world conquest.

It is our considered opinion that your resolution is based on a rational and proper study of the conditions in the U.S.S.R., and conclusively indicates a proper approach to the problem of the Soviet Union, a prison house of many subjugated nations. Such a Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would be permanently charged with the research and study of the problem of Soviet Russian colonialism and imperialism, and would be a veritable reservoir of unbiased data and information on the enslaved nations in the Soviet Russian prison house of nations. Such a committee would undoubtedly perform a unique task for the benefit of our Government and the free world at large.

We recall with regret that during the session of the XVth General Assembly of the United Nations last fall, our representatives missed many opportunities for tackling the problem of the captive nations held in slavery by Communist Russia, which could be attributed to the fact that our Government was not fully apprised of the situation behind the Iron Curtain. We are witnessing Communist Russia, the greatest colonial power in the world today, successfully hoodwinking the peoples of Africa and Asia by pursuing a spurious liberation policy. For that purpose the Russian Communists have organized the so-called Freedom University in Moscow, where they train hundreds of selected students from Africa, Asia, and Latin America in the art of sabotage, espionage, and Communist penetration.

The United States of America still remains the only hope of the enslaved nations and a true citadel of freedom, with adequate resources which enable it to establish such a committee. Your well-defined purpose and farsighted objective in having such a committee in the House of Representatives underscores a realistic approach to the problem of the Soviet Union. It gives assurance to the American people and to the peoples enslaved by Communist Russia that the United States is sincerely concerned about the captive nations, and the establishment of the Captive Nations Committee in our Congress would be undeniable proof that our desire to help the captive nations is not limited to verbal declarations only, but that we are doing something concrete to bring the liberation of our friends and allies behind the Iron Curtain a reality.

It is true that the Communist would violently denounce such a committee and would accuse you and the entire U.S. Congress of preparing an "aggressive war" against the U.S.S.R. This they are doing in the matter of the Taras Shevchenko statue bill, which was passed by the Congress last year. But the millions of ensalved Ukrainians are gratified and happy over the fact that the United States has recognized their greatest national poet and advocate of the freedom and independence of Ukraine. The same reaction will undoubtedly result from your resolution, and you could expect to be attacked and slandered by Moscow, but the millions of captive people will be eternally grateful for your farsighted and provident measure.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America which has 115 branches and member organizations in 38 States of the Union, pledges its full support to your noble initiative in the firm belief that such a Committee on Captive Nations would serve the best interests of the United States of America and the cause of universal freedom.

Respectfully yours,
MATTHEW STACHIW,
Secretary.
IGNATIUS BILLINSKY,
Secretary.

BOSTON, MASS., *April 8, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Recently it came to my attention that you're planning to sponsor a bill for the establishment of a permanent committee of the House dealing with the problems of the captive nations.

Such a proposal I congratulate you for, as the problems of the captive nations must be brought to the attention of all Americans.

Trusting I may have the pleasure of hearing from you I remain,

Very truly yours,
SAMUEL RYDER.

JACKSON, MISS., *March 22, 1961.*
Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I am exercising my privilege of writing you with regard to the resolution which you recently submitted advocating the establishment in the House of Representatives of a special committee on the Captive Nations. I first became aware of the plight of these nations following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959. The more I contemplated this idea the more certain I became that the exposition of the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of these peoples was definitely a step in the right direction.

The sooner the citizens of our Nation are brought to realize the importance of these captive nations in forestalling a hot war and advancing the cause of world freedom the closer this country will be to victory in our cold war with Russia. It is a definite step toward the safeguarding of our liberty that we undertake a tireless study into the prevailing conditions in all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new ideas and approaches for securing victory in the cold war.

I have been very much pleased with the reactions and enthusiasm of my fellow workers and friends who I have consulted about their feelings regarding the captive nations. They are all very much in favor of bringing the facts concerning these countries before the Nation and the world. I think the great spirit shown during the observance of Captive Nations Week this past year and the two proclamations made by President Eisenhower are a valuable indication of the wholehearted support such a committee as you have proposed would receive. I sincerely hope President Kennedy will further the progress of this movement by making a proclamation this year in favor of Captive Nations Week.

I am writing another letter at this same time to Representative JOHN BELL WILLIAMS who represents me in this Fourth District in Mississippi. I hope that he will cooperate with you to the fullest in seeing this resolution through Congress and the establishment of the special committee on the Captive Nations as an integral part of the House of Representatives.

Wishing you deepest personal regards and the very greatest success, I am,

Sincerely,

JOE Y. DEHMER, Jr.

BLOOMFIELD, CONN.,
March 20, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It was with a great interest and a sense of gratitude that I read about your resolution of March 8, 1961, on the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations.

Please allow me to commend you on this stand for only concrete actions like yours offer reasons for hope. So far our policy toward the Soviet Union was analogous to a police department negotiating with and attempting to talk bandits into a better behavior.

To solicit more support for your resolution I am sending a copy of this to Senator THOMAS J. DODD.

Very truly yours,

JOHN CHERNYHA.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *April 8, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: On behalf of the Hungarian Veterans' Fraternal Association, Milwaukee, Wis., group, I earnestly thank you for introducing your resolution in the House of Representatives for the establishment of a special permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the Congress. Your resolution, if enacted, would at last prove that the Congress has some interest in the fate of the captive nations, and not only in their Moscow-controlled puppet governments.

The Captive Nations Committee would greatly benefit the legislative and administrative bodies of the United States in providing accurate and readily accessible information in all related matters. It would benefit the whole Nation, too, by exposing the true nature of communism—both highly needed and desirable activities.

As the president of the Milwaukee group of the Hungarian Veterans' Fraternal Association, I thank you again for introducing your resolution.

Very truly yours,

ZOLTAN AGHY,
President, Hungarian Veterans' Fraternal Association, Milwaukee Group.

HACKENSACK, N.J., *April 4, 1961.*

The Honorable DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to give my wholehearted approval for your House Resolution 211 and the subsequent establishment of the Special Committee for Captive Nations.

I think that it is time that the American people rally to the cause of the subjugated nations and I see that your bill is the first giant step in the right direction.

I sincerely hope that it will pass through Congress.

Very truly yours,

J. C. DIETSCHE.

THE MOUNT HOLYOKE NEWS,
South Hadley, Mass., April 8, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I have read about the resolution to establish a special Committee on Captive Nations. I would like to express my support for this measure as a step toward improving our efforts in an area that has often been neglected, but one which should be exploited to the fullest in the cold war.

Very truly yours,

BARBARA JILL MARGULIES,
Editor.

MAYFIELD, PA., *April 9, 1961.*

The Honorable DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have found out that you are proposing a bill to establish a committee to aid the captive nations.

I would like to say that I am in full favor of this bill and sincerely hope that it will go into effect, for I have relations in one of the subjugated nations, namely Poland, and I know that they need the help of the United States before Russian domination takes the country over completely. It is therefore necessary that this Committee for Captive Nations becomes an actuality.

Yours very truly,

MRS. WALTER KONISH.

Congressman Harry Sheppard Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the allocation of defense contracts our respected colleague from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] has a theory they should be placed on the basis of ability of the contractor to do the best job with the least cost. In commending him for this commonsense attitude the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram recently editorialized as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE SHEPPARD'S REFRESHING VIEW ON MILITARY CONTRACTS

New York politicians recently declared war on California defense manufacturers and pledged an all-out effort to channel more defense contracts into New York's depressed areas.

It is refreshing to hear the comment of Congressman HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California, on the same subject. Representative SHEPPARD is chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

Although as sympathetic as anybody else with the problems of depressed areas, Congressman SHEPPARD stated that he thinks those areas should get relief, but that it should be handled as relief and plainly labeled as such. It should not be done at the possible sacrifice of efficient defense production.

Military productions must be allotted, not primarily on the basis of economic need in any particular area, he said, but on the basis of ability to do the most efficient job possible at the lowest cost to the public.

Naturally, if need and ability happen to coincide in a particular area, that area should get prime consideration for defense contracts.

However, the purpose of military production is not to relieve depressions or recessions, but to protect the national security.

Let's place the contracts where they can be filled swiftly and efficiently—in those areas that have the skilled manpower, the equipment, and the resources necessary to deliver the goods.

Congressman SHEPPARD is right. This is not a fit subject for regional squabbling. It is essentially a question of national survival.

The 13th Anniversary of the State of Israel

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my distinguished colleagues in commemorating the 13th anniversary of the State of Israel.

The birth of the State of Israel constituted the fulfillment of the aspirations of persons of Jewish faith and ancestry all over the world. They have dreamed of creating a state which would stand as a beacon of democracy, peace, and progress in an area of the world historically beset by strife and turmoil. In this sense, the establishment of the State of Israel marked the beginning of a new epoch in the history of the Middle East, the cradle of the spiritual heritage of the western civilization.

As we congratulate the State of Israel upon its 13th anniversary, we are mindful of the grave responsibilities and obligations which that country has assumed with its birth. By opening its doors to persons of Jewish faith and an-

cestry, by working hard with its limited resources and help provided by friends abroad, the State of Israel has achieved considerable material progress, and has provided the opportunity for a new life to many, many persons.

But in addition to converting the desert into a garden, the State of Israel has a larger responsibility to mankind itself—the responsibility to promote peace and amity in the Middle East, and to provide a living example of the vitality and endurance of free institutions. Herein lies its test and potentially its greatest contribution to the enlargement of the area of freedom and peace in our troubled world.

As we extend our best wishes to the State of Israel upon this important anniversary, we also wish to express our strong hope that the future may witness the resolution of the complex problems and attitudes which still divide the peoples of the Middle East, so that peace, progress, and freedom may continue to advance in that strategic and vital area of the world.

The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of the House of Representatives would be interested in an event I witnessed this past weekend, an event which demonstrated to me that Americanism, the free enterprise system and individual initiative are still very much alive in our country.

Stevens Point, Wis., is a city of 18,000 in the center of my congressional district and, incidentally, in the center of my State. One of the major business firms in Stevens Point is the Copps Co., a grocery wholesaler that sells to 70 retail grocery stores in the surrounding area who are members of the Independent Grocers' Alliance.

Several years ago the Copps Co. had severe growing pains. It had used all available space in its 50-year-old warehouse and office building in the center of the city. Financing a new and larger building offered many problems. The grocery business operates on a slender margin of profit, as you know. The company's financial needs of approximately three-quarters of a million dollars were too large for local bankers to meet, too small to interest the big lending institutions.

The Copps Co., led by President Gordon F. Copps and Executive Vice President Donald W. Copps, devised an imaginative and heartwarming way to raise the necessary capital. They offered long-term debentures, 10 years and 17 years, to their employees and families and even close friends. The debentures were attractive, since they paid 7 percent interest.

Within a few weeks, hundreds of men and women—very few of whom had ever bought a common stock or bond before—invested in the Copps Co. The two debenture offerings, totaling $500,000, were quickly subscribed.

And then an even more remarkable thing happened. The 70 customers of this grocery wholesaling firm, the retail food stores in 14 central and northern Wisconsin counties, heard about the debenture offers and asked if they could take part too.

Another offering was made, this time for $350,000. And it was subscribed within a very short time.

So this past weekend, the Copps Co. dedicated its new warehouse and held a grand opening for the general public, its employees and its customers.

Thousands of men, women and children visited this very modern food supply depot. First, they wanted to see the miracle of food distribution in action, because it is an exciting operation to watch. Second, they wanted to see what they had helped build—a warehouse and office that cost $650,000 to erect, another $200,000 to equip. This total of $850,000 was the amount of money that came out of savings accounts and sugar bowls to invest in the Copps Co.'s future.

The significance to me of this employee, customer, family and friend money-raising is that these people still believe in personal effort, in not going to the State or Federal Government to satisfy every need.

The management of this company, and its employees and customers, are self-reliant people. The company needed money not to survive but to grow. Its own people provided the funds. Its own people will share in the profits realized from this new warehouse and office.

This is the true and treasured American free enterprise system at work. I was very proud of the people in my district and I returned to Washington anxious to share this satisfying experience with you, Mr. Speaker, and with the Members of the House.

The Fryingpan-Arkansas Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter, addressed to me, and an attached resolution. Both are in support of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

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

ARKANSAS VALLEY G. & T., INC.,
Pueblo, Colo., April 17, 1961.

Senator JOHN A. CARROLL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution passed by the members of our association at annual meeting held March 29, 1961, in support of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

We know you agree that this is a worthwhile and needed project, and are looking forward to working with you in achieving its authorization.

Very truly yours,

ED GAITHER, *Manager.*

RESOLUTION

Whereas it appears that now is the time for all Colorado congressional Representatives to pull together to obtain the authorization of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project; and,

Whereas this association is directly affected by the proposed construction of said project which would enhance the economic development of the entire Arkansas River Valley: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Arkansas Valley G. & T. Inc., urge the Congress of the United States to authorize the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado, together with the necessary Federal transmission systems to provide the maximum in dependable electric service to the preference customers in the area.

I certify that this is a true excerpt from the minutes of the members' meeting held Wednesday, March 29, 1961, in Pueblo, Colo.

JAMES N. MYERS, *President.*

Progress in Building Complete Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been written of late about adopting a transportation policy for our Government.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to insert the following speech by Morris Forgash, president of the U.S. Freight Co., which contains more constructive ideas regarding our transportation system than any recent article which it has been my privilege to read:

PROGRESS IN BUILDING COMPLETE TRANSPORTATION

(By Morris Forgash, president, U.S. Freight Co.)

It is a pleasure and an honor for me to participate in this transportation conference which has been arranged as a preliminary to the 13th annual Salzberg Memorial Lecture. The brilliant and outstanding men who have consistently appeared on this program in the past have made this annual event a challenging and a noteworthy affair.

The spotlight is on the railroads today, but the fact that you have on the program such people as Jim Lyne, Dr. Williams, and me, is proof that the subject is not to be considered in a vacuum of self-analysis. Railroads are a very vital element of our national life, and it behooves us to candidly examine their current posture and critically analyze the direction in which they are going, but we must constantly keep in mind that our real objective is a strong transportation system, not merely a healthy railroad industry.

The significance of transportation to the culture, prosperity, and progress of people is nowhere better illustrated than here in

Syracuse. The history of Syracuse, which can be traced back more than 300 years, is a vertitable saga of American transportation. From Indian village to trading post—from giant salt-producing center to beautiful metropolis—the destiny of Syracuse has been shaped by transportation—Indian travois and packhorse, canalboat and road wagon, railroad, motortruck and airplane.

Syracuse is fortunately situated, transportationwise, but enterprise, not fortune, directs the course of events in transportation and it is a curious fact that among the many modes of transport which serve Syracuse today the coordination and means of interchange are not much better than existed between road and canal in the days when freight was transferred where Clinton Square now stands. True, we are at least beginning to make progress in the direction of complete transportation, but it has been a slow and painful process because of the resistance of apathy, atrophied thinking and entrenched ideas.

The decade of the 1960's which we have set within the scope of our sights for this conference, is the 14th decade of American railroading. In the last month of the year 1830, "The Best Friend of Charleston," pride of the South Carolina Railroad, pulled the first train of cars ever drawn by a steam locomotive upon a track on the American continent. In the next several decades railroads literally mushroomed over the American landscape, and each road was built to its own specifications, with no thought of connection or completeness or interchange. The width of track ranged from 2 feet on the Brighton and Harrison to 6 feet on the Erie. The running and working parts of cars were equally individualistic.

Circumstances ultimately forced standardization of equipment and completeness of service among the various railroad systems, just as coordination and standardization will be forced upon our transportation systems today. The Civil War showed us the folly of having three widths of track between Chicago and New York. After many years and by painful and costly process, we came to standard tracks and cars, and worked out the mechanics of interchange on the rail lines. We have been talking now for a long time about coordination and standardization of the 20th century transportation plant, and we cannot afford to wait for a war to make up our minds that we must do something about it.

For more than half a century the railroad industry functioned without Federal regulation. In the words of the distinguished first Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Thomas M. Cooley, the railroads "were thus enabled to determine in great measure what rules should govern the transportation of persons and property; rules which intimately concerned the commercial, industrial, and social life of the people."

Then, on February 4, 1887—74 years ago—the act to regulate commerce was approved. The first report of the ICC is an interesting document. There were then an estimated 1,200 railroads, with about 138,000 miles of track. One hundred and eight railroads, operating more than 11,000 miles, were in receivership. The railroads were on the verge of destroying themselves, because they had lost the public confidence, largely because of widespread rebates, drawbacks, and special rates.

Nevertheless, it was not the purpose of the act to restrain or destroy competition. In their first report to Congress, the Commissioners, then five in number, said: "A study of the act to regulate commerce has satisfied the members of the Commission that it was intended in its passage to preserve for the people the benefits of competition as between the several transportation lines of the country." The Commissioners further said—and this is particularly important in the light of recent recommendations that have been urged upon Congress:

"It might possibly be within the competency of legislative power to prescribe for the several interstate railroads equal mileage rates for the whole country; but this, if endorsed, would put an end to competition as a factor in making rates, and to a very large extent deprive the great business centers of the country of their several natural advantages, and also of the benefit of expenditures made by them in creating for themselves new channels of trade."

That interpretation of the intent and meaning of the act has prevailed for three-quarters of a century. It was, in effect, restated by Congress in the Transportation Act of 1958. It is still sound, and I am of the opinion that adherence to those first principles will result in rejection of recent recommendations for a statutory floor under competitive rates, and for severe restrictions on fourth section relief, as well as any other efforts to reverse what Congress did in 1958.

Moving down the corridor of time from the 1st to the 45th annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, we find the Commission again commenting about competition—this time a new and different kind of competition—that of the highway hauler whose superiority for certain tasks had been demonstrated by the First World War. In that report, filed in 1931, the Commission said that the railroads "have so many and so great inherent advantages of economy, particularly in the case of the longer hauls and the heavier traffic, that we cannot believe that they will not be able to withstand the competition of the motortrucks."

But, said the Commission, the "service must be provided which the shippers demand and require" and "It is probable that motor service may with advantage be used to supplement or to coordinate with the rail service." Means of making the necessary changes in service, such as "containers, demountable truck bodies, so-called railwagons, and changes in car types" were already appearing on the scene, the Commission pointed out. Finally, the Commission said that the old rate theories "often open a door to effective competition which might well be closed."

It is one of the inexplicable paradoxes of history that in the identical report in which the Commission made these wise and foresighted observations it referred to its decision in the Container case, rendered that same year, which rejected new pricing techniques for this new service, prescribed rates on the old classification basis, and dried up the very service which the Commission advocated for a period of almost 30 years.

When the Commission, in 1931, said that the railroads had many great inherent advantages in the longer hauls, and suggested that motor service might well be used to "supplement or coordinate" with such rail service, it had freshly concluded the most comprehensive investigation of motor service ever undertaken. The decision in this case, docket 18300, rendered in 1928, recommended Federal regulation of motor carriers. At that time the average length of haul of motortruck service ranged from about 20 to about 100 miles, depending on the territory involved. One large truck operator estimated, for the record, that the truckman's advantage over rail in ton-mile cost stopped at a point between 50 and 60 miles.

The kind of coordination the Commission then envisaged and advocated is the only kind that has any meaning—the joining of end-to-end services of differing modes of carriage so that each supplements and complements the other. Each mode must perform within the orbit dictated by its economic and services advantages. I think you will agree with me that this is a most descriptive and concise definition of the term "complete transportation."

It would not have been so formidable a task, back in 1931, to have worked out a plan of coordinated rail and motor service, given men in transportation with the will and the foresight to do so. Motor operations as they then existed were fully within the scope of their economic utility and ideally suited to complement rail service. But we let the golden opportunity pass for lack of initiative and imagination, and as motor service grew and lengthened out to be competitive with the rails for all distances, any idea of effective coordination became vastly more difficult to implement.

However, the picture has not changed to anything like the degree the public has been led to believe. We have long-distance trucking, it is true, but it accounts for only a very small portion of the total service. The average motor common carrier haul per ton in 1959 was 273 miles. Although I have no official figures on the subject, I am confident that at least 90 percent of all intercity motor carrier movements in this country are for distances less than 500 miles.

Coordination or complete transportation based on the irrefutable economic facts that the railroads still are the most efficient medium for moving large quantities of freight over long distances, and that the trucks excel in the shorter hauls, can even now be achieved. In fact, it is being achieved on an increasing scale through the newer forms of piggybacking. But those who fear coordination of a type that will reflect the true economic advantages of the respective participants in any given joint haul have raised such a hue and cry that, to some who are not acquainted with the facts, the picture may seem to be one of contrived confusion.

Controversy and confusion are not limited to the area of piggybacking. The railroad industry, which has received a constantly declining share of the total traffic of the country over a period of 25 years or more—which has seen its employment cut exactly in half in just 30 years—stands accused of driving domestic water carriage to the wall, and of engaging in predatory and unfair raids on the traffic of motor carriers. It is time to examine the facts.

DO WE HAVE MORE SOLUTIONS THAN PROBLEMS IN TRANSPORTATION?

What is the problem in transportation? Certainly we won't find any solutions until we define the problem. We have a competitive struggle, yes, but competition is the essence of free enterprise in a democracy. If we ever eliminate competition we will destroy initiative. Could it be that we have mistaken competitive jockeying and jostling for more basic problems?

Let me take just a moment to recount how we came to be where we are today—using broad brush strokes. This is necessary for proper perspective and direction. In the 1930's competition of a lusty young motor carrier industry had a depressing effect on the railroad rate structure. Then came World War II which strained the resources of all carriers, and virtually destroyed intercoastal and coastwise shipping.

It is a monumental distortion of historical fact to charge either the railroads or the I.C.C. with responsibility for the virtual disappearance of American coastal shipping. When the Government took over many vessels in this trade during World War II the industry was already sick. In the 10-year period immediately preceding the war the industry lost $8 million. The fleet of vessels was literally decimated by wartime activities. Many of the lines never resumed operations after the war. Those that did were beset by spiraling labor costs, incessant

strikes, and astronomically mounting replacement and operating costs. Mr. Ralph E. Casey, president, American Merchant Marine Institute, summed the matter up very well in an address delivered in July 1959, before the annual convention of the International Longshoremen's Association at Miami Beach, when he said:

"You know, as well as I that our once flourishing domestic trades are now dead. It is often said that this is the result of unfair treatment by the Interstate Commerce Commission. That may have played a part, but when they tell me it costs more to load a ship in New York and unload it in San Francisco than it does to bring it 5,000 miles around three coasts, including the transit of the Panama Canal, I question whether the Government is primarily to blame."

We should recognize the truth of what Mr. Casey said and should not require the competitors of the ship lines to subsidize them by holding an umbrella over their rates.

Now the railroads have ultimately heeded the repeated and long-continued admonitions of the regulatory agency and the Congress and are embarking on a vigorous program of self-help. They have introduced not only new pricing techniques but new and improved services based on technological advancements and new ideas. They are reexamining their competitive posture up and down the line in an effort to recapture the traffic which they once indisputably enjoyed but which they lost to other modes of carriage.

The railroads were told to do these things as long ago as 1931 in the Commission's report to which I earlier referred. They were admonished by the Commission in some of the decisions in the ex parte rate cases to employ different rate-making techniques. In its report in ex parte No. 206, decided in 1957, the Commission told the railroads that "the time had probably come when consideration should be given to ways of increasing rates other than by means of horizontal increases." Congress bluntly told the railroads to improve their services and modernize their rate structure when it enacted the Transportation Act of 1958, and it made certain, by enacting section 15a(3), that in doing so they would not be required to hold a rate umbrella over their competitors. But when the railroads at last embarked on a determined program to arrest their declining position in the transportation picture the anguished cries of their competitors were heard across the land.

Again I say, "What is the problem?" Competition took traffic which the railroads once handled and which they perhaps thought, with a trace of complacency, they would always have. Is the problem now to prevent the railroads, by artificial barriers, from getting some of it back if they can do so through the exercise of their inherent advantages and a little initiative? I do not think so.

Congress thoroughly examined all facets of the transportation picture just 2 years ago. The responsible Senate committee heard evidence which now fills 2,300 printed pages in four volumes. The corresponding House committee held thorough but less exhaustive hearings. Weighing all the facts, the committees concluded and the Congress agreed, that the railroad industry was in need of immediate help in several directions.

Among the reasons for the plight of the railroads, the Senate committee found, were Government assistance to their competitors and overregulation of the railroads. But by all odds the most significant finding was that the railroads had not consistently been permitted to assert their inherent advantages in the making of rates. To correct that situation section 15a(3) was enacted.

The purpose of section 15a(3), as plainly stated in the Senate committee report on the 1958 act, was "to encourage competition in transportation." But the statement is insistently made, and repeated again and again: "Yes, Congress intended to insure greater freedom in ratemaking, but it did not intend to permit unfair or destructive competition." The statement is perfectly true, but what is it intended to prove? We must all agree that unfair and destructive competition is prohibited by the law. The Transportation Act of 1958 did not create the prohibition—it merely restated a provision of existing law. Is the repeated statement of the proposition now intended to imply that the ICC is ignoring or misconstruing a fundamental precept of the law, and, if so, that the courts will sustain the Commission in perpetrating unlawfulness? That would be a terrible indictment of our administrators and judges. Every decision on a controverted issue leaves a disgruntled litigant, and each of the basic modes of carriage has been disappointed with one or another of the Commission's decisions under section 15a(3), but the courts, not Congress, are where the issues should be reviewed.

The decisional process with regard to such factual situations as have arisen so far under section 15a(3) has not yet run its course, but there are insistent demands that the section be changed to fit this or that preconceived idea of what the final decisions ought to be. I suggest that Congress and the people knew very well what the policy of section 15a(3) was when it was enacted. The words of the statute are plain. They are reinforced by even plainer language in the committee reports. Only the Interstate Commerce Commission and the courts are vested with the legal authority to apply the language of the law to stated factual situations. We do not write our laws in sand, nor should we erase them with hysteria.

However well intended, I strongly believe that efforts to change the policy laid down by the Transportation Act of 1958 at this time are both premature and unwise. You are familiar with some of the specific proposals for statutory change. The Doyle report would place a statutory floor under competitive rates, based on a statistical formula, and establish "umbrella type" ratemaking by force of statute. Bill S. 1197 would add a great many impossible complicating factors to the presently plain and simple provisions of section 15a(3), and hence would no doubt also result in statutory "umbrella" ratemaking.

These proposals would take us in exactly the opposite direction from the course we so carefully charted in 1958. In fact, they would reverse a policy to which, except for an unfortunate experience with the so-called recapture clause of 1920, we have adhered through the entire history of regulation—careful avoidance of ratemaking by legislative fiat. If we substitute statutory for regulatory ratemaking in the smallest area, it could spread dangerously and rapidly throughout all regulatory law.

Such proposals do not take account of the realities of today nor the potentialities of the future. If they were intended, for example, to aid the motor carriers someone has failed to calculate rightly. They could destroy the motor carrier industry. Ratemaking is not an exact science—it no longer follows a pattern—it reflects the terrific imbalance of traffic, particularly of manufactured products and products of the farm and the forest. The common carrier rate structure has been eroded by the cumulative effect of the contract carrier, the "gypsy" trucker, the "gray area" operator. Yet, we are told that we must be careful not to destroy traditional patterns of ratemaking—that we must protect the integrity of the rate structure. How can you destroy something that no longer exists?

To fill their vehicles and prevent costly empty movement; to meet the irresponsible rates of the unregulated carriers; to fulfill the demands of products that cannot possibly bear their full share of the transportation burden, the carriers make vast numbers of rates that will not meet any formula based on costs.

Statement numbered 4–60, released by the ICC in September 1960, lists 80 commodities moving in rail carload service which do not defray out-of-pocket costs. A similar study would undoubtedly show a larger number moving at submarginal rates in motor service. We are not going to change the factors that cause these commodities to move at below-cost rates: What are we going to do—force the common carriers to give up the traffic, or give the first common carrier in the field squatters' right by refusing to let anyone else meet his rates? I repeat that, whatever alternative we choose, the motor carrier industry may well be the first victim of any scheme of statutory ratemaking or inflexible rate floors. I am, personally, having a great deal of difficulty in visualizing or understanding how any standard of ratemaking in the form of legislative directives to the regulatory agencies can make due provision for these extenuating circumstances and conditions that a carrier encounters almost daily. I have extreme doubt that anyone can produce the appropriate legislative language free of confusion and devastating ambiguity.

Once we embark upon ratemaking by legislative fiat we will have put our feet upon a road that will lead to the ultimate stifling of initiative and stultification of progress. I respectfully commend these observations to the careful consideration of our lawmakers and all others who have a responsibility in the matter.

From what I have said so far you may have gained the impression that I am talking about "roadblocks" rather than "progress" in the building of complete transportation. What I have been trying to do is to clear away some of the confusion so as to arrive at a clear point of departure. And I will ask your indulgence for one more detour because it is important that we understand the factors bearing on the subject if we are to understand the subject itself.

GOOD ADMINISTRATION OF TRANSPORTATION LAW REQUIRES GOOD MEN—SOME WAYS TO SECURE AND KEEP THEM

Since 1940 the national transportation policy of the United States as applied to domestic surface carriers has been directed to three ends—the "developing, coordinating, and preserving" of a national transportation system, by various means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce and defense of the Nation. We have entrusted the implementation of that policy to 11 men. Unfortunately, we could not vest them with magic wands by which to discharge their fateful task. Sometimes I am afraid we have not vested them with even the least of their due—our complete confidence. Lately I have been more apprehensive on that score.

As I said a little earlier, it has become a popular pastime to make the Commission a scapegoat for everything that is conceived to be wrong in transportation. We should always remember that so long as we adhere to our established principles of Government we must depend on these men who sit on the Commission to interpret and enforce the law, and if we so impair the standing of the agency as to make it impossible any longer to obtain the services of dedicated men of talent and integrity, we will have destroyed one of our greatest legacies. We

will have sold our birthright for a mess of pottage. Maybe it has only an indirect bearing on my subject matter, but I ask you to consider for a few moments some matters relating to the ICC that I consider to be of vital importance.

I am reminded that the then Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, addressing a meeting of the Association of ICC Practitioners in 1930, said:

"I suppose that no agency of Government has more complicated problems than those which confront the Interstate Commerce Commission, and no intelligent student can fail to realize that the success of this endeavor in a sphere of the highest importance is to a very great extent the measure of our capacity for self-government."

Viewed in that light, to insure the success of the Interstate Commerce Commission in its mission becomes a personal and a demanding obligation of every citizen.

We have been extremely fortunate in the caliber of men who have been attracted to service on the Interstate Commerce Commission throughout its long history. It was Eastman who gave us his famous 12-point Primer on Administrative Tribunals just a few weeks before he died in 1944. The sixth point has been more quoted than any other. It reads:

"The statutes which the tribunal administer should be well, simply, and carefully framed, but the personnal which does the administering is more important than the wording of the statute. Good men can produce better results with a poor law than poor men can produce with a good law."

What has attracted and held the great men who have made careers of service on the ICC? There is an indefinable spark which kindles in men a desire for unselfish public service—we see it in the teaching profession, in the sciences, and in government. Over and beyond that, however, is the fact that the high public esteem in which the ICC has traditionally been held has invested membership on the Commission with an aura of dignity like that surrounding the high Courts, the National Legislature and the Cabinet posts. If that standing and dignity are lost, a great deal of the incentive to men of stature and dedication will disappear.

In view of the absolutely incalculable importance of the proper administration of our transportation laws, we should, instead of maligning and belaboring the Commission, immediately take steps to strengthen it—give it adequate and competent personnel—put it on a healthy financial diet—and insure its ability to continue to attract men of the highest order of intelligence and integrity. What steps can we take?

A good place to start is with the Commission's budget. James M. Landis recently said that "ecenomic rigor, if not parsimony" has characterized the Budget Bureau's attitude toward the agencies for almost a decade. In the last couple of years a little more generosity has been evidenced, but still the budget of the ICC is ridiculously low considering the importance of its mission. Twenty million dollars to regulate in industry that bills us $20 billion a year for its services. Twenty-three hundred people to man an agency that employed 2,600 in 1940. And since 1940 the Commission has acquired jurisdiction over two new agencies of transport—three parts have been added to the act—we have acquired two new States and added numerous new laws to the statutes which the Commission administers.

If the Commission, accustomed to a starvation diet for these many years, is too modest to ask for what it needs in the way of budget and staff, management consultants can be hired to advise Congress. Delays in the functioning of the administrative processes can cost the carriers and the public in a matter of days what we pay to run the ICC a whole year. Is that the way to run any business—or a Government agency?

We get back, of course, to the fact that the essential ingredient of good administration is good administrators, and administrators are people—people with families and responsibilities. We should insure them of more adequate compensation and security. No board of directors of any corporation in America or the world makes more important or far-reaching decisions than the 11 members of the Interstate Commerce Commission. To attract the kind of men that you and I want on the Interstate Commerce Commission I suggest that a salary of $30,000 a year be provided. And with adequate salary should go a reasonable allowance to reimburse agency members for expenses necessarily incurred as an incidence of their position.

Tenure of office is more important than salary to men who value their independence. Until comparatively recent times the vast majority of appointees to the Commission quite evidently accepted the post as a career, and those who distinguished themselves, as a surprising number did, were insured of reappointment regardless of the political party in office. Aitchison set a record of service with 34 years and 9 months—then came Balthasar Meyer with 28 years, Eastman and Clements with 25, Mahaffie with 24, and a long list with 15 to 20 years of service. In contrast, all of the present members of the ICC have been appointed since 1953.

This is not something which reflects unfavorably on the current members of the Commission or on the administration, past or present, but it is a symptom which ought to be arrested before it becomes a chronic condition. How can we have any continuity of policy or attract men who seek public service as a calling, and not a stepping stone, unless we insure them a tenure of office that will permit them to plan ahead and relieve them of tension and pressures? We should provide a statutory term of office for members of the regulatory agencies of 10 years, and allow for reappointment up to the age of 65. Retirement pay should be adequate to insure that no ex-Commissioner would have to go out in industry and seek a job.

We are well aware of the constant pressures to which our agency members are subjected. Why not give them a little insulation against these forces by providing them with a tenure that will extend through two presidential terms and into a third?

Precedent is one of the most important facets of our system of jurisprudence. It gives stability to the law and inspires confidence in the people that they can proceed in a given manner without fear of reprisal. Continuity of service helps to insure stability of policy. One other way to insure such continuity and stability is to follow a custom that seems to have fallen into disuse in recent years of elevating career men to commission membership when career men of stature and ability prove themselves worthy of such appointment.

Perhaps you may think I have unduly emphasized this point, but it is one of the most important issues in transportation today. Crisis has been developing around our independent agencies and, as Chief Justice Hughes said long ago, this is an area so vital to our well-being that its success will measure our capacity for self-government. I have been an advocate of a Department of Transportation for promotional activities and I am convinced that we will ultimately come to that, but the problem of the regulatory agencies is an entirely separate matter. They do not belong in an Executive Department. I have suggested three immediate steps that we should press for, and we can muster the strength to put them through if we really try. They are:

1. Sharply increase the budget of the ICC with authority and direction to hire the necessary personnel at all levels to get the job done, whether in safety, enforcement, or the decisional process.

2. Increase the salaries of the members of the Commission, and provide them with a reasonable allowance and adequate retirement. I would also increase the salaries of the top-level career employees.

3. Provide for statutory tenure of 10 years, with authority to reappoint up to retirement age.

This may not be the complete answer to the problems revolving around our agencies which have given rise to tons of studies and reports in recent years, but it is something concrete. It is a good starting point.

CONTAINERIZATION, STANDARDIZATION, AND SIMPLIFIED PRICING—KEYS TO COMPLETE TRANSPORTATION

I can think of no better way to indicate to you why I have spent so much time leading up to what I shall make a very brief report on progress in building complete transportation—which boils down to progress in containerization and piggybacking—than to quote from the January 1961 issue of Fleet Owner, as follows:

"Month by month piggyback takes on more weight and size than a razorback hog in Arkansas. This consistent growth over the past 2 or 3 years is in spite of a tangled web of rate conditions, a tug-of-war for control between trucks and rails, and a wide range of nonstandard equipment. The reason's simple. Shippers like the lower mileage rates and the convenience."

This innovation in transportation that is growing like a razorback hog cannot be considered in a vacuum. I think, however, that I have discussed enough of the atmosphere in which it exists—now for a brief discussion of the containerization and piggyback movement without which compete transportation is unattainable.

In 1954, in a declaratory judgment proceeding before the ICC, the common carrier truckers vigorously pressed the position that the railroads could not haul highway trailers on flatcars without motor carrier certificates. The Commission brushed this aside, and said that the railroads not only could haul their own freight in their own trailers, but could haul the trailers of shippers, forwarders, and private carriers—but not those of common carrier motor carriers except under joint rates and divisions.

Unfortunately, in my view, the Commission, in its decision in the case I am referring to—and that was in 1954—strained the definition of joint rates beyond all recognition. It gave its blessing to a device that had been employed in a few places, whereby motor carriers forwarded their trailers over the rails rather than pulling them over the highways. This was called substituted service, an apt term. The Commission said the motor carriers could not so forward their trailers and pay the published rates of the railroads, but when the fiction of a joint rate was indulged, and the rate paid by the motor carrier was put in a contract labeled division sheet, the same result was accomplished. The substituted service arrangements came to be known as plan I. When true joint rail-truck rates are entered into we have plan V.

Notice ought to be taken of the fact that the long-distance motor carriers are not satisfied with the two plans of piggybacking which the Commission has said are available to them—plans I and V. They seek authority to use published tariff rates of the railroads, of a type represented by plan III and IV which I will presently describe. Clearly, as the Commission has said, this would make them carriers and shippers at the same time—it would cause them to violate their

permits which specify movements over the "roads, highways, streets, and ways by motor vehicle"—it would require rewriting the definition of a motor carrier and practically the whole of part II of the act. It might even raise constitutional questions.

Plan I—substituted service—has not prospered very well. It has nothing to recommend it to the shipper—he deals only with the motor carrier, pays the regular motor carrier rate, and if any economies accrue from the service they stick to the motor carriers' hands. It is not coordination but substitution.

Plan V piggybacking has had and continues to have a stormy career. As I said, it rests on a true joint-rate and through-route arrangement between railroads and motor carriers—the type contemplated by the statute. But not many such arrangements were ever entered into for the transportation of general freight. In the hauling of new automobiles plan V gained considerable headway, and caused a tremendous furor.

A year or so ago some of the railroads and automobile haulaway carriers—in most cases the short-haul motor carriers—began entering into arrangements for the hauling of new automobiles, in motor trailers loaded on flatcars. A flatcar would hold two such trailers with four or five automobiles each. This improved speed and efficiency and reduced costs and it was an eminently satisfactory arrangement to the railroads and motor carriers involved and to the man who pays the bill—the shipper. But it took some traffic from the long-distance automobile haul away carriers and they cried that they were being driven out of business. A propaganda barrage of unrivaled proportions was mounted against plan V piggybacking, and it still continues.

Oddly enough, advancing technology rendered the original plan V operation practically obsolete before it ever got a good start. Now, instead of loading truck trailers on flatcars the railroads use, very largely, specially designed, lower-level flatcars fitted with trilevel racks which will accommodate 12 standard or 15 compact cars. This still could be termed "piggybacking" and still could rest on a joint rail-truck rate, but it is, in fact, something entirely new in transportation.

Now what crime have the railroads committed in thus initiating a new and complete transportation service? Why, according to widely publicized charges, they are hauling new automobiles at rates generally 50 percent or more under rates offered by the truckaway companies. Think of that. The transportation costs on 5 million new motor vehicles can conceivably be cut in half. What are we to do—ban this innovation which for the first time in 25 years holds forth the hope of halting the continuing upward spiral of freight rates?

But, says truck labor, if you don't stop this it will destroy the jobs of 15,000 truck employees. To this rail labor asks, would it be in order for 450,000 rail employees who have lost their jobs largely because of erosion of rail traffic to send condolences?

The truly phenomenal thing about this innovation which enables the railroads to slice the freight rates on automobiles in half is that it still is only 50 percent as efficient as it could and ought to be. Just as he always has in the case of the automobile haul-away service, the shipper is still required to buy a roundtrip ticket for a one-way ride. The rail equipment, specialized like the motor equipment, has to deadhead back to origin after it delivers each payload. Why? For lack of an idea? No—for lack of initiative.

Equipment that will haul new automobiles in one direction and dry cargo—even liquid cargo—in the other, is already in actual production. Isn't it time that we started to give the poor, long-suffering shipper a break? Why not bring back to him what he consumes and uses in the same car that hauls away what he produces? Everybody will be the beneficiary.

Plans III and IV piggyback, under which shipper-owned trailers, or shipper-owned trailers and flatcars are hauled from ramp-to-ramp at a stated charge per flatcar movement, are now too well known and too well accepted to require detailed description. These plans, too, have come under attack in legal proceedings and by propaganda. The opposition reflects the competitive efficacy of the service.

By these plans the railroads found a way of bringing about coordination through the beverage of economics. By publishing a charge that reflects their own cost advantage for the movement of trailers on flatcars, they can and will make it uneconomical for the shipper to use his own trucks for the long haul. The rail and truck services then will seek their own level with a resultant combination of road-and-rail hauls that is tailored to shippers' needs, not carriers' convenience.

Piggybacking of the type represented by plans III and IV, and automobile hauling, represents the first break the shipper has had in a generation in the matter of freight charges. It constitutes the first simple answer to the equation into which the shipper resolves his transportation problems—time and price. The traffic manager views transportation as a link in the distribution chain and since it is a very expensive link, he buys it with care. He no longer has to take the carriers' word for how much it costs to move his goods from factory to store—he can find out for himself and he will buy his own trucks if he is pushed too far.

But the railroads have not lost their inherent advantages as mass and distance haulers—they simply neglected to exploit them for a while and the parade of progress almost passed them by before they woke up to what was going on. The railroads can beat the private hauler's costs, and better his speeds. They have proved it by plans III and IV piggyback. There is no other development on the horizon that offers any hope of stemming the tide of private carriage. And the key to success of these plans in meeting private carriage is the simplified freight rate—so many dollars per movement—the same basis on which the shipper calculates his cost of doing it himself.

Piggyback service, once it got moving, developed with such startling suddenness that it is still beset by growing pains, not the least of which is the lack of standardization of equipment and method. The problems are being earnestly studied, and, while there will be a certain amount of obsolescence as we experiment or jump the gun without carefully analyzing the situation, in time uniformity will be achieved.

No transportation service in modern history has moved ahead so far so fast as piggybacking since its revival in 1954. In 1960 piggyback flatcar loadings were more than a third greater than in 1959—more than double what they were in 1958—five times greater than in 1955. This means that well over a half a million cars, loaded with more than a million trailers, were handled in 1960. Still accounting for only about 2 percent of all freight car loadings, it is obvious that if the present rate of growth continues piggyback loadings will account for a very substantial portion of rail service within a comparatively short time.

As a matter of fact, many railroad officials today admit that the fate of the boxcar as the predominant factor of rail transportation—a position it has held for more than a century—is sealed. It will not be good business to continue to buy boxcars from which the railroads obtain only 46 miles of service a day when flatcars in TOFC service average 175 miles a day and some perform up to 450 miles. It will be uneconomical to continue to move freight in boxcars with a 40 percent empty return ratio when that empty milage can be cut in half, or more, by piggyback service.

An editorial in the Washington Post on March 21 of this year, dealing thoughtfully with the situation in transportation, said:

"The nub of the transport problem is rapid, technological, urban, and industrial growth and change. It is a problem of rapid adaptation, calling for the closest coordination of all types of common and private carriage."

The editorial does not tell us anything we did not already know, but it is something that should have been said sooner and more often. Industry simply moved away from the railheads. Plans III and IV piggyback are the first practical media the railroads have found for providing the off-track shipper a through service combining the flexibility of the truck with the speed and economy of the railroad.

The shipping public will demand more and more piggyback service—they will demand its speed, its low basic cost at a unit price, its nearly damage-free safety, its predictability and its convenience.

That is, very briefly, a report on progress in building complete transportation as it looks to me today. Rome was not built in a day, so we must have patience and perseverance. On the other hand, we are told that construction of the Tower of Babel stopped instantly when the people were caused to speak different languages. We must understand what we are talking about when we speak of coordination—it is not to be confused with substitution. We must make certain when we talk of transportation problems that we are not speaking simply of somebody's attempt to gain a competitive advantage, or slug a competitor. Our effort should be to produce the best possible transportation for the development of commerce and the defense of our Nation.

Progress in building complete transportation is being achieved despite great turmoil and uncertainty. It is being achieved because some people in transportation, and I am one of them, have faith that when all the shouting has died down we will emerge still holding fast to first principles. It is being achieved because competition is forcing change, stimulating new ideas, putting the spur to enterprise. It will continue so long as we adhere to the principles of regulation first established 74 years ago and consistently followed ever since—a maximum of competition with a minimum of control. Progress will stop when we abandon these principles of free enterprise, for when enterprise ceases to be free it is dead.

This is a time for cool heads and firm resistance to hysteria. Radical changes in basic transportation laws are being urged under the mantle of expediency. We are being importuned to bridle competition with the halter of legislative fiat. Our regulators are being assailed and maligned.

The call now is to statesmanship, in and out of Government. The regulation of transportation, no less than transportation itself, is at a crossroads. Let us remember the truth of what Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes said long ago—the success of this endeavor in a sphere of the highest importance is to a very great extent the measure of our capacity for self-government. The call is to you and to me, and we cannot afford to remain silent. Our destination is clearly indicated—let us march.

Tax Credit Proposal To Encourage Foreign Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the prevailing and understandable concern regarding Federal tax policies, foreign aid, competition for foreign markets, and related problems, I believe the House will be interested in a proposal for tax credit to encourage exports from the United States which has recently come to my attention.

This proposal originates with an able industrialist, Mr. Robert Abplanalp, president of the Precision Valve Corp., of Yonkers, N.Y.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include the résumé of Mr. Abplanalp's proposal which I commend to the consideration of my colleagues generally and to the members of the Committee on Ways and Means in particular:

PROPOSED TAX CREDIT TO ENCOURAGE EXPORT FROM THE UNITED STATES

In the postwar period, the U.S. program of foreign aid, supplemented by establishment or expansion of foreign production facilities by numerous U.S. enterprises, has helped to rebuild foreign industry. These factors, the native industry of the people, incentives to produce and export sponsored by foreign governments, etc., have resulted in such a dramatic recovery that foreign industry no longer requires aid. It has in fact become a formidable adversary to U.S. exporters.

Not only is it becoming increasingly difficult for U.S. industry to compete in the foreign market due to differentials in wage rates, overhead and tax rates, but foreign industry is increasingly finding markets for its production in the United States. Of even greater import is the fact that, at a time of considerable unemployment in the United States, American industry is turning increasingly to foreign production thus utilizing vast amounts of foreign produced raw materials and heavily tapping the foreign labor pools.

Clearly a return to high protective tariffs, restrictions on the establishment of foreign factories by U.S. industry or other regulative measures are not desirable, nor suggested. What should be sought are incentives to U.S. industry to increase dollar volume of exports through U.S. production. Should such an incentive at the same time not reduce tax income to the U.S. Government, nor call for direct subsidy, it is doubly desirable.

The plan proposed below provides the following advantages:

1. Encourages U.S. industry to expand its export programs while placing no restrictions on corporate choice of foreign against domestic manufacturing.

2. Insures direct increased employment of U.S. labor and use of U.S.-manufactured raw materials.

3. Costs the U.S. Government and taxpayers nothing in terms of loss of taxes now being collected or in the cost of any subsidy.

4. Promises, through increased domestic employment and production, to increase the amount of corporate and individual taxes collected.

5. Directly attacks the problem of outflow of gold and currency.

The proposed plan would provide a Federal income tax credit based on the increase in export sales of domestic manufacture. The calculation would be made as follows:

1. Determine increase in export sales by comparing export sales for the current fiscal year to average export sales for the 5 preceding years.

2. Obtain the percentage of increase in export sales to total sales (domestic and foreign) for the current fiscal year.

3. Apply this percentage to net taxable income for the current fiscal year. The resulting amount would be exempt from income tax.

For example, assume sales as follows:

	Export	Domestic	Total
1960	$500,000	$9,000,000	$9,500,000
1959	500,000	8,000,000	8,500,000
1958	500,000	8,000,000	8,500,000
1957	400,000	7,500,000	7,900,000
1956	600,000	7,000,000	7,600,000

Thus average export sales for 5 years would be $500,000.

Assume that in the 1961 fiscal year export sales are $1 million; domestic sales $9 million, giving a total of $10 million sales with an assumed net taxable income of $1,500,000.

1. Increase in export sales over previous 5-year average is $500,000.

2. Percentage of increase in export sales to gross sales: $500,000 of $10 million equals 5 percent.

3. Income exempt from tax: 5 percent of $1,500,000 equals $75,000.

Thus the tax saving would be 52 percent of $75,000 or $39,000.

It is thus seen that the tax so forgiven is based only on the income derived from increased exports. A corporation only benefits from an increased volume of dollar exports. Furthermore, unless exports continue to expand beyond the average level for the preceding 5 years, the exporter gains no continuing tax advantage.

In some situations, U.S. manufacturers may export at cost to gain a foothold in a foreign market, etc. In such cases, it might seem that a loss in Federal tax revenue might result. However, this does not follow since the "cost of goods sold" is composed mainly of wages paid and raw materials and components purchased from supplying companies. In the case of the former, the collection of personal income taxes comes into account and in the latter case, the profits of all the supplying companies are subject to regular business taxes and the increases in both types of collections will more than offset the exemption allowed the manufacturer-exporter. Furthermore, nonprofit operations would at best be temporary situations based only on gaining an eventual basis for doing profitable business.

It is expected that there would be little or no increased cost of enforcement on the above in the sense that normal audits by the Internal Revenue agencies could accurately determine the claims.

Recent proposals have been made for tax relief to U.S. corporations with foreign subsidiaries. The question arises as to whether (foreign subsidiaries or domestic production by American labor and our traditional American engineering and business efficiency) is in the best interest of our country. The fact is, that almost any manufacturing corporation operating anywhere leaves more wealth behind it than it can accumulate and take with it by payment of dividends or by actual liquidation.

Considering again the relationship of net profit to the gross dollar volume, the difference between the two being taxes paid to foreign governments, wages paid to foreign labor on which foreign governments again collect taxes, and costs paid to local foreign suppliers of raw materials, components, and services, all of which produce taxable income to support the local governments and distribute wealth to the working populations, it is understandable that the only situations which would really accrue dollar exchange wealth would be those in which net profits after foreign taxes are substantially greater than 50 percent of the total business transacted. These situations are practically nonexistent. Therefore, it seems almost idiotic to encourage domestic corporations to operate manufacturing subsidiaries abroad as opposed to the above which creates a dynamic incentive to permit merchandise made by American workers to take its proper position in world markets.

The Wrong Attitude on Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, South Dakota's distinguished editor of the Daily Argus Leader of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Fred C. Christopherson, has written a thought-provoking editorial on the Peace Corps proposal. It points up emphatically the need for careful planning and clear thinking if the Peace Corps is to be an asset to America rather than a brood of ugly American ducklings.

To me, this editorial also underscores the essentiality of developing in America a Freedom Academy for the training of Americans serving our country overseas as the necessary prerequisite of any effective functions which can be undertaken by those who might be selected for duty in the Peace Corps.

I ask unanimous consent that the Christopherson editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE WRONG ATTITUDE ON PEACE CORPS

Somewhat strange was the attitude displayed by a group of college students last week in respect to requirements being set up for the Peace Corps.

The students were members of a National Students Association Committee to consider youth service abroad. At their meeting, held in Washington, they reviewed conditions surrounding the establishment of the Peace Corps and came up with two suggestions. One of these was opposition to any loyalty oath as a requirement for service in the Peace Corps and the other was that any security check on applicants by the FBI should be sharply limited.

It seems to us that the students who adopted this attitude disqualified themselves in so doing.

The objection to the loyalty oath may be regarded as incidental and perhaps a matter of slight importance.

But the objection to an exhaustive review by the FBI of the applicants is something else. Certainly the Government has every

right to know all it can find out about students who might seek to represent the Nation in the Peace Corps. It would be remiss in its responsibility, in truth, if it didn't insist on a careful scrutiny of all applicants.

The applicants must be screened for a variety of reasons. One is to check their poise and personalities as well as their tact, diplomacy and understanding. Another is to ascertain their understanding of the American way and their capacity to enunciate it. A third, and by no means the least important, is to block agents whose objective might be to destroy the value of the Peace Corps.

The failure of the committee members to recognize these valid points is sufficiently surprising to induce one to wonder about the basic concepts of those who participated.

Flint Blazes Trail With Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor, dated April 22, 1961, entitled "Flint Blazes Trail With Schools." The article describes the splendid educational program being carried on in Flint under the direction of the Mott Foundation. The account of the Flint program follows:

FLINT BLAZES TRAIL WITH SCHOOLS

(By Carl I. Brahce)

There is hope for a solution to the financial crisis in American education, without recourse to Federal aid. Such is the conviction of Frank J. Manley, director of the community school program in Flint, Mich., which operates with a substantial grant from the Mott Foundation, of which Charles Stewart Mott is chairman.

"Every community has a potential not even realized by its citizens" asserts the congenial director of the Mott program—Flint Board of Education. "When the doors of public schools are truly opened to the people, the benefits can hardly be imagined. We've been at it 25 years and we're just scratching the surface."

What happens when schools are used to their fullest potential? Education is strengthened in many ways, virtually in all ways, since this gives the taxpayers a "real interest in their schools," says Mr. Manley.

AFTER-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

"More than 90,000 men, women, and children take part in a great variety of after-school activities during the average week in Flint. The daytime school enrollment is about 40,000. The results of parents, teenagers, adults of all ages returning to school has a beneficial effect in the classroom, teacher-parent relationships, neighborhoods—it's evidenced in the whole revitalized city of Flint."

Industrial Flint, where automobiles zip off the factory assembly lines, has cast off a smudgy, bawdy reputation for one of community pride and achievement. Cooperation is as real to Flint folk now as the sound of the noonday whistle. More than 200 citizens have contributed more than $18 million to build a magnificent college and cultural center—with a theater, art center, planetarium, public library, in addition to a growing community junior college and a branch of the University of Michigan.

A new municipal center, actions to improve the downtown area, and implementation of a master plan for the city point the way to continued growth and development.

INDUSTRY COOPERATES

Cooperation of local industry and businesses with the schools, city government, and agencies has promoted such educational developments as a basic economics program to help adults know more about their society, a successful physical well-being and safety program, a physical fitness program, and a police-counselor liaison team pioneering school-police teamwork to reduce juvenile crime.

Mr. Manley's leadership has inspired the dedication of many individuals who contribute their zeal to the improvement of the Flint community.

"Understanding," Mr. Manley points out, "is the shining hope for our educational system. We are constantly striving to achieve greater understanding among men."

He cites four barriers to this objective: Ignorance, indifference, inertia, and intolerance.

More than 1,000 classes in adult education offered in Flint help accomplish this objective, bringing citizens into the schools. Other classes are designed to improve knowledge and skills and to stimulate an informed public.

Here are teenagers deciding how to use their profit money from the teen club dance to benefit the school; families frolic in swimming pools, whirl around gymnasiums on roller skates, work together in arts and crafts classes. Neighbors share experiences in child study sessions, men's clubs, women's clubs; mothers don aprons to cook school breakfasts for visitors; fathers make teaching aids for classrooms, turn out to convert scrub areas into playground parks, plan school fairs and other community projects.

INTERNATIONAL GAMES

Community school directors, who are members of the school staffs, direct the after-school programs. They continue to serve each neighborhood community during the summer program that is climaxed with 5,000 contestants in the Flint Olympic games. Winners of the sport events vie with athletes from Hamilton, Ontario, in the international CANUSA (Canada-United States) games. This yearround use of the public schools draws overwhelming support from the Flint taxpayers.

During an industrial recession in 1957, voters approved by more than 80 percent a special levy of 2.5 mills to build new community schools. Included was a $4 million high school, now the busy center for a variety of activities. Like the other 41 community schools, this new southwestern community high school is designed with community-type facilities that not only serve the public during after-school hours, but also enrich the regular instructional program.

The Flint Board of Education now receives $1,200,000 of a $20 million budget from the Mott Foundation to provide pilot project funds and support the physical well-being program, adult education program, Mott Camp, and other programs benefiting the community.

RISK MONEY PROVIDED

Since the partnership of Frank J. Manley and industrialist Charles S. Mott began in 1935 to open school doors experimentally to help youth, the Mott Foundation has made possible many programs and improvements in the educational curriculum. Believed to be the only private foundation channeling funds through a board of education, the Mott Foundation has provided risk money until the projects prove successful and can be taken over by tax funds.

"The surprising thing to many is that the entire program could be supported by the average taxpayer for just 2 cents more a day," comments Mr. Manley.

"An average taxpayer with four children pays 24 cents daily, or about a penny a subject for school taxes. I ask you, where else can you get that value for a penny today?"

The extra cents add up to only $6 more a year the taxpayer would pay if the people absorbed the entire program now carried on with $1,200,000 of Mott Foundation funds.

SPECIAL BUILDING UNIT

Another financially bright picture is disclosed in regard to the extra community-type facilities designed into all Flint community schools. These community-type facilities include a large gymnasium auditorium, a community room, office facilities and in some cases, a branch library.

A man who has devoted many years to watching the figures of school construction costs suggested a special building unit that has revolutionized Flint schools.

He is Jack Barrett, former business manager for the school board. A methodical analyzer. Mr. Barrett heard about small buildings for use by early grades in a Texas community. The Flint Board of Education experimented with a primary unit in 1953 to house children in an outlying area.

ARCHITECTURE CONFORMS

"The response was so favorable by parents, teachers and students that more were built," explains Mr. Barrett. "Flint now has 101 primary units, for kindergarten, first, second, and third grades."

The highlight is that by using this practical and successful method of building, Flint has succeeded in providing facilities for the entire community without stretching the educational dollar.

"The primary units are built on individual lots three or four in an area, the architecture conforming to the homes in that location" says Mr. Barrett.

"They provide neighborhood schools close to the homes of young children, offer a homelike atmosphere freedom from the older children, and relief from the more formal routine necessary in a large school building."

The primary units, 28 feet by 40 feet or 1,120 square feet, are built at an average cost of $11,500. This is just about half the cost of a standard elementary school classroom.

GROSS AREAS COMPARED

"Although originally considered for sale as ranch houses when no longer needed as schools, not one unit has been sold in Flint. The construction relieves crowded schools and gives the school board time to determine long-range needs of a particular community before investing in a regular school," Mr. Barrett adds.

Using the gross area per pupil in a fixed class size of 30 pupils as a fair measuring comparison, Mr. Barrett determined that the average gross area per pupil in regular schools built in Michigan in 1958–59 was 62.4 feet.

In the community-type elementary schools constructed in Flint, the gross area per pupil in the main building is 76.8 square feet.

"However," Mr. Barrett says, "when the 67 primary units in the 11 areas served by these schools are included, the gross area per pupil drops to 62 square feet. This is slightly below the Michigan average for 1958–59." (Although Flint has 101 primary units, only 67 are in the areas served by the 11 new elementary schools.)

This has been the method used by the Flint Board of Education to provide community-type facilities at practically the same

cost paid in other cities for conventional school buildings.

Proud of the advances made in such curriculum areas as the talented child program, primary cycle intensives program, superintendent of schools Dr. Spencer W. Myers cites the financial backing of the schools by Flint citizens.

SURVEY UNDERTAKEN

"We have many forward-looking programs, and are working to make further improvements," Dr. Myers points out. "Because the people are involved closely with the schools, they know more about them and are more willing to provide financial support to our educational program."

Principals and teachers are now engaged in a survey to determine all ways the after-school activities program benefits or contributes to the regular classrom instruction.

Other communities are finding that they have resources to initiate community school programs. Towns such as Roseville, Mich., have cooperatively opened their school doors by spirited leadership, gaining financial support of the city council.

In "Developing Community Schools in Michigan," the community school committee of the Michigan Association of School Administrators describes developing programs in 10 communities.

The publication cites the department of public instruction's statement of philosophy: "This relationship between the community and the school that we support has come to be known as the community school concept. Through the development of the community school, education is seen as a continuing factor in the lives of the people as long as they live."

EDUCATORS VIEW PROGRAM

Educators and municipal leaders from more than 40 communities throughout the United States came to Flint in early April to view the Flint community school program.

The Third National Community School Clinic, held April 4–6, was cosponsored by the American Association of Public School Administrators, the American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, and the Mott program of the Flint Board of Education.

More than 5,000 visitors a year now arrive in Flint for a firsthand look at the open-door policy that provides a hope that communities can support their schools without the philanthropy of a Mr. Mott in their town.

Davy Crockett's Widow Came to Texas To Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, almost every school boy and girl knows of the heroic fight to the death by Davy Crockett and other heroes of the Alamo. But not much has been written about other members of Crockett's family, especially his wife, Elizabeth Crockett.

David Crockett went from Tennessee to Texas in 1835 planning to acquire land, buid a home and send for his wife and family. But when he arrived in Texas, Crockett found that the Texans had revolted against Mexico; so he joined the army of independence and gave his life for the ideal of human liberty at the Alamo.

It was many months before Davy Crockett's wife, Elizabeth received word of his death. She remained in her native Tennessee for 18 years and then decided to go to the land where her husband had laid down his life. She made the trip to Texas by covered wagon in 1854 with her son, Robert, and his family. They resided in Ellis County and later in Johnson County—now Hood County—when the State of Texas granted free to Mrs. Crockett a league of land.

Mrs. Crockett died at age 82, in 1860 and her grave in the Acton, Tex., cemetery is marked by a monument erected by the State of Texas in 1913.

The Texas Parade of April 1961, published an excellent article written by Louise Cheney about Mrs. David Crockett. I ask unanimous consent to have the article, entitled "Davy Crockett's Widow" printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

DAVY CROCKETT'S WIDOW

(By Louise Cheney)

(The wife he left behind in Tennessee came to Texas 18 years after Davy's death. A monument stands to her memory.)

Towering toward the wide Texas sky in the Acton Cemetery is a tall monument topped with the life-size statue of a famous pioneer woman, Elizabeth Crockett, wife of the immortal Davy who died for Texas freedom in the Alamo.

The beautiful and pathetic figure of the woman faces the west, one hand shading the eyes, in an attitude of patient waiting for the return of a husband who never came back.

The monument is of Texas granite and was sculptured in Italy. The statue atop the tall shaft resembles Elizabeth Crockett in detail as to features and poise. The State of Texas appropriated funds for the memorial in honor of David Crockett's widow in 1910. Sculptured in 1911, it was erected in 1913. Since the monument was placed in Acton, Elizabeth Crockett's grave has become a public shrine visited by great numbers of people annually. The word, "Crockett," stands in bold relief on the base of the monument. The granite slab covering Mrs. Crockett's grave carries the following words:

"Mrs. Elizabeth Crockett, wife of David Crockett. Born in Buncombe County, N.C., May 22, 1788; married to David Crockett in Lawrence County, Tenn., 1815; died in Johnson County, now Hood County, January 31, 1860. Age 82."

Buried alongside Elizabeth Crockett are her son, Robert Patton Crockett, who died in 1889, and his wife, Matilda Porter Crockett, who passed away in 1864.

When David Crockett left Tennessee for Texas in 1835 his intention was to acquire land, build a home, and send for his wife and family. But came the revolt of Texas against Mexican domination and Crockett joined the army of independence at Nacogdoches that same year. History records how heroically he gave his life in the defense of the Alamo. It was many months before Elizabeth Crockett learned that the husband for whom she was patiently waiting was dead. She remained in Tennessee for 18 years and then decided to go to the land for which Crockett had laid down his life. With her son, Robert, and his wife she made the long, hard trip via covered wagon in 1854. They first settled in Ellis County where they resided for 2 years. The State of Texas patented Mrs. Crockett a league of land in Johnson County (now Hood County). In 1856 the Crocketts moved to their new home where Robert built a log cabin in a group of liveoaks surrounded by hunny, sloping meadows near the Brazos River. He farmed the land for many years and also operated a wooden toll bridge over the river. The modern structure that spans the Brazos today at nearby Grandbury has been dedicated to his memory.

In the old pioneer cemetery at Acton where Elizabeth Crockett rests are a number of graves, dating back to the last century, which are built up of rock and covered with large coffin shaped slabs hewn from solid limestone. These slabs serve as headstones, for the inscriptions are chiseled upon them. These unique rock coffins are found in only one other cemetery in Texas, Old Rock Church, a short distance from nearby Bluff Dale.

Acton Cemetery is located a short distance south of the town of Acton in the eastern part of Hood County (a few miles east of Grandbury). To reach there follow U.S. Highway 377 west of Cresson, turn left at the large granite State marker, and drive south 4 miles. (Cresson is on the Fort Worth-Grandbury highway.)

Our Glorious Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include a poem by Mr. Philip C. Brown, of Fallbrook, Calif. Mr. Brown has dedicated his life to designing and painting flag designs. In a display of flags shown at the San Diego County Fair in 1959, our present 50-star flag was among his 30 designs. In this troubled world, I feel that it is time to place a new value on the flag and its meaning, and this original poem by Mr. Brown should cause us to pause and reflect:

OUR GLORIOUS FLAG

(By Philip C. Brown)

How beautiful against a cloud
To see our colors, flying proud;
Our glorious flag, majestic, grand,
Inspiring sight through all the land.
It stands for liberty, hard bought,
Justice for all, freedom of thought;
Calling for loyalty to truth and right
And equity, not rule of might.
We love this flag with thoughts sublime,
Not just today but for all time.
Of all the flags throughout the world
None has more beauty when unfurled.
And as we take a closer look,
"In God we trust," in Holy Book;
We thankful are through all our days
God's providence directs our ways.
But why, oh why, are there so few
Who own and fly their colors true?
Each home should boast a flag to fly
That, patriotism shall not die.
So fly the flag you call your own,
On every occasion make it known—
Here in this house find loyalty;
We're richer far than royalty.

Serving Country and City in Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this is centennial year in my home State of Kansas, and many excellent articles have been written concerning our State, its history, growth, and development.

A very excellent article, written by Maurice Flagg, entitled "Serving Country and City in Kansas," appeared in the April issue of the Red Cross Journal. The article described many of the Red Cross activities that are carried on in our State.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

SERVING COUNTRY AND CITY IN KANSAS

(By Maurice Flagg)

Kansas, as its centennial seal proclaims, is Midway, U.S.A., and has been since the troubled days 100 years ago when it became the first of the prairie territories to achieve statehood.

The wild west of folklore, movie, radio, and TV fame began in Kansas. All the trails of the Old West started in Kansas, crossed the State, or ended there—the Santa Fe, the California, the Oregon, the Gold Rush, the Chisholm, the pony express, and many others along which passed the people who opened up the West. The legendary towns—Abilene, Newton, Dodge City, Fort Riley, Fort Scott, Leavenworth, Hays, Great Bend, Medicine Lodge—are still there and very much alive; some, in fact, remain partly cow towns where only a little imagination is needed to reconstruct in mind's eye the old days.

But if your eye is for the romance and excitement of today, there is an up-to-date, booming Kansas of infinite variety and fascination to discover during the State's centennial year.

Cattle drives are now a thing of the past; today one man raises steer calves and sells them to another who grazes them to full growth and then sells them to a third who fattens them for the Nation's tables. Plenty of cowboys care for these cattle still, and the many summer rodeos throughout the State are perhaps the main social events for Kansans. The vast prairies—the home of a few Indians and millions of buffalo a hundred years ago—are now planted to mile upon rolling mile of green and golden wheat, and other grains. The skyscraper of virtually every Kansas town is the grain elevator, which may have only 2 bins or more than 200, but is always gleaming white and the most distinctive landmark in view. (Contrary to a widespread belief, Kansas is not flat. Most of the State rolls gently, like the ocean on a calm day. The eastern part of the State, however, is hilly and tree-grown. The greatest change from east to west across Kansas is the gradual disappearance of trees until on the high plains of the west there is only an occasional waterhole or creekside clump of cottonwoods to vary the vastness of earth and sky.)

There is far more going on in Kansas today, however, than agriculture. Wichita has long been one of the Nation's major aircraft building centers. Hutchinson lies atop vast, actively worked salt deposits. Hardly a week goes by without announcement of new oil or natural gas wells brought in; gleaming, futuristic appearing refineries have sprung up.

And, of course, the more there is to do, the more people come to work. The estimated population of Kansas when it entered the Union 100 years ago was 14,000; today, just over 2 million people live and work in the Sunflower State.

HIGH SCHOOL RED CROSS SERVICE

Service activities by high school Red Cross members are as varied as Kansans' interests and community needs. Members volunteer at hospitals, institutions, and in a host of Red Cross chapter services. Youth members are found increasingly on chapter boards and committees, speaking for their fellow youth members and planning with adult members greater opportunities for young people in community service through Red Cross. In school, Red Cross youth members create school chests, albums, records, and paintings. Also carried on in Kansas high school classes are many forms of carefully planned production—clothes and layettes for disaster victims, toys and stuffed animals for children, games and decorations for military and veterans hospital wards and recreation rooms.

IDEAS, IDEAS

The really significant story that high school Red Cross service in Kansas has for members throughout the country is in ideas. For Kansans are independent thinkers who are always turning a thing over to find whether there isn't a better way to do it. Many of their ideas and methods will be of interest to all councils, and some of them will be of special interest to rural high school members, whose unique problems in service program building are often insufficiently realized.

IDEAS FOR COUNCILS

Idea: Sedgwick and Saline County chapters are experimenting with a division of the rural areas into council districts so that the councils of two or more rural high schools within convenient distance of one another can work together on building and carrying out service projects in their respective schools. It's hoped that this plan will help overcome the common situation of the rural school that enrolls but gets little opportunity to serve because of its distance from the headquarters town.

Idea: In addition to regular meetings of the citywide council, presidents of individual school councils in Wichita now meet monthly with the Sedgwick County youth service director and citywide council officers to discuss problems and plan toward coordination of individual school activities. It's hoped that county school council presidents can attend meetings several times a year to bring city and county council activities closer together.

Idea: Labette County, in southeastern Kansas, plans to send county as well as city delegates to the training center held each summer at Wichita.

Idea: Members who attended the Sedgwick County chapter training center have formed themselves into a speakers bureau in the Shawnee County, Labette County, and Sedgwick County chapters. They present the story of Red Cross high school service in classrooms, assemblies, meetings of other youth groups, and meetings of adult organizations in the community. The Labette County member-speakers receive speech class credit for their presentations.

Idea: In Saline County schools, the student and Red Cross councils are one and the same. Service projects through Red Cross thus involve representatives of the entire school.

Idea: The Red Cross council at Wichita's Southeast High School goes to all the school clubs and asks whether they would like the council to arrange for each to serve the community as a group through Red Cross. Among the examples of results are chess club members who go as a group to play chess with hospital patients, medical careers club members serving as aides at the Wichita Regional Blood Center.

Southeast High council members also conceived the idea of making available to all students copies of the project checklist that routinely goes from chapter director to teacher-sponsors each fall for indication of projects to be undertaken during the year in individual schools. The Southwest High council asked students to check the projects they were interested in; those checking a project were then appointed to the committee responsible for carrying it out. This method of building a project and council organization involving large numbers of students has now spread to several other Wichita schools. (Southeast High presented Red Cross-interested students with special challenges. A vast school of over 2,000 students, it has no homerooms. Without the tradtional base of council organization, member-leaders in the school had to find new ways of council building.)

Idea: West High School in Wichita features during its enrollment campaign a main-lobby booth at which interested students may sign up to serve on the Red Cross council. Result: The council has grown from 6 to 65 members in 2 years. The council divides itself into large working committees to direct and help carry out specific projects.

Idea: The council at Kapaun High in Wichita is made up of a representative from each club and organization in the school, with each group conducting its service projects through Red Cross.

Idea: In Shawnee County, proposed expenditures from the membership service fund are placed by school councils concerned before the countywide council and must receive the latters' approval.

Idea: The council president and vice president at Wichita's Sacred Heart Academy are required to have attended a training center.

Idea: All Kansas councils and adult leaders with whom the writer talked believe that the basic responsibility for Red Cross service in and through high schools lies with the council, with the teacher-sponsor serving as adult consultant.

SERVICE PROGRAM IDEAS

Idea: The group of 20 Salina High School students who serve as nurse's aids at Schilling Air Force Base Hospital meets each month at the home of a different member wit the hospital gray lady chairman and the hospital nurse sponsor to work out their volunteer service schedule for the coming month, discuss questions and problems, and socialize. (The group, by the way, is entirely made up of teenagers living on the base. Two a day work after school during the week and more serve on weekends; they serve in the women's and pediatrics sections. One of their special values to the hospital, said Chief Nurse Maj. Bernadine Armstrong, is in keeping everything running smoothly when the nurse shifts change.)

Idea: Councils of two junior highs in Parsons (Labette County) joined in planning and putting on a dance—semi-formal, 75 cents the couple, 50 cents stag—whose profit was applied to purchasing the more expensive items in a joint-project school chest.

Idea: At Wichita's Southeast High School, a record of Kansas folk songs is being cut with the narration in Spanish. Work began last year with a boy collecting the songs and a group working out the technical problems of taping the songs and cutting the record.

Idea: Being advanced in Sedgwick County is a disaster preparedness plan that has as its goal the training of two percent of every

high school's students in disaster service skills. All participants receive a general orientation to Red Cross and civil defense functions in disaster. Each then chooses a specialty—first aid, blood service, shelter assistance, canteen service, or disaster area survey work—and receives intensive training in the specialty. Friday afternoon training and practice sessions, as well as giving instruction in the phases of community disaster service, build school teams prepared to provide all phases in disaster emergency.

Idea: Key people at the Sedgwick County training center are the staff assistants—last summer, six of them from Wichita high schools. They serve as resources on chapter Red Cross services and the high school program. With the Sedgwick County chapterwide council, they were largely responsible for planning the center; during the weeklong center sessions, attended by delegates from throughout the State, they conducted alone a daily session on specifics of council and program building in addition to resource duties at other sessions. (The center also features certificate courses in first aid; water safety, and care of the sick and injured.)

Idea: The council at East High in Wichita planned, wrote, produced, and moderated a TV program on enrollment—its whys, hows, and importance to today's high school student.

Idea: The council at St. Mary's High in Wichita last year planned a Valentine's Day party at one of its "adopted" care homes with a difference. Members first surveyed patients' dietary restrictions, then planned, prepared, and served the refreshments around the findings.

Idea: 13 members of an accelerated science class at Wichita's Roosevelt Intermediate High served last year in the blood center laboratory as part of their classwork. Project was suggested by the teacher; details were worked out by the blood center director, youth service director, and the teacher together.

Class members first received a basic explanation of blood program work. A session followed in the laboratory during which health safeguards in laboratory work were pointed out. Members then undertook carefully supervised laboratory activities such as test tube numbering, bottle assembly, test sheet assembly, and washing glassware. During these assignments, they also observed the basic technical work of the lab. Two students a day worked from 8 to 9 a.m. during the week, and three worked 4 hours on Saturday morning.

Students performed no actual laboratory procedures. Asked whether she believed the project feasible for high school students, Chief Technologist Irene Griffith said that the junior high class had been a good choice for the experience because the group could be instructed within the lab's technical restrictions without losing interest.

Idea: Working to reestablish a youth service program, the Shawnee County chapter last summer carried out, as a demonstration of what young people can do, a 38-youth volunteer service program at the Kansas State Neurological Institute in Topeka. Volunteers came from six Topeka area high schools; a number of them were recruited in future nurses clubs.

Idea: Salina High School council members have furnished and supplied two first aid rooms in the school and are now working on a third.

GETTING THE WORD AROUND

Idea: Sedgwick County forms international art program contributions into exhibits that are displayed at schools and community centers during the course of a year. After the year of home display they are sent on for oversea school exhibit.

Idea: At Sacred Heart Academy in Wichita each new issue of the journal is read by council members and teaser announcements written and posted on every homeroom bulletin board. Each council representative is given time to talk in her homeroom about the new issue. Copies are available in the homeroom, the library, or the teacher-sponsor's office. Individual articles are posted on the school's main bulletin board.

Idea: Topeka High School members built and manned a homecoming day parade float emphasizing the unity of youth Red Cross service and schools and community. The camera club at the same school takes all Red Cross youth service pictures as part of its club credit work.

Idea: 10 council members in Labette County readied blood donor booklets for distribution to every student in the country to take home to parents.

NOTES ON PROGRAM BUILDING BY MEMBER-LEADERS

Martha Jane Wendel, Sacred Heart Academy, Wichita; president, chapterwide council; member, Project IV of international study visit program, summer 1960:

"The chapterwide council was the weakest link in an otherwise strong chain of student Red Cross activities and programs.

"Beginning early last summer the council officers met regularly with Miss Norma Gooden, chapter youth service director, to discuss plans for the 1960-61 council. The two major problems that had always hindered the council were student support and interest, and student participation.

"Several suggestions for improvement evolved from our executive meetings and training center:

"1. Delegates at our training center were given in detail the purpose, organization, and functions of a chapterwide council.

"2. Constructive programing and careful planning for council meetings were musts. The officers plan agendas.

"3. The members of the chapterwide council are planning projects that will involve the council as a group.

"4. We are organizing an executive council in which school council presidents will participate. It will provide an opportunity to meet with the director to discuss problems and share experience."

Margaret Weilert, Sacred Heart Academy, Wichita; council president:

"The idea of adopting care homes for the aged was completely new to Sacred Heart Academy council members. After introduction of the idea to the council, it was readily approved by faculty members and students. Through our chapter director, we obtained the names of various care homes in the city which could accept visitors.

"The visiting of the four homes we have adopted involves the work of several committees, one for each home. The committee chairmen are members of the school council. They, in turn, are responsible for contacting student visitors and adults to serve as chaperones, arranging transportation, and providing entertainment and refreshments.

"The satisfaction received by these visits is overwhelming—not only to the students who visit the homes but also to the people who are visited. Most important is the joy of the old people to know that youth love and respect them enough to want to make their often lonely lives a little happier."

Linda Beth Schlueter, West High School, Wichita; council president:

"Wichita High School West's council was a new one compared to others in the city, and had not been successful. Last year, however, a group of sophomores, who had not had a previous opportunity to belong to such a service group, proved interested in high school Red Cross service.

"One of our first and biggest problems was that of obtaining student participation in our projects. We discovered that if students were informed, they were much more likely to respond. How to inform them? Here are some of our ideas:

"Posters: During our enrollment week we plastered the walls of the school with posters. These posters not only stressed the importance of joining, giving, and volunteering, but also gave general information on the projects available.

"Bulletins: A daily bulletin is read to the students over the public address system. We used bulletins and skits to advertise Red Cross youth services.

"Assembly: After our posters and bulletins had been before the students about 3 days, we held an all-school assembly. Immediately after this, members canvassed the classrooms for donations and gave the students a chance to volunteer for service projects on checklists we distributed.

"We make sure our administrators are also well informed. At West we work through an assistant principal, who is in charge of activities. If he understands what, why, and how things are being done, he is usually completely in favor of them."

Tom Jackson, East High School, Wichita, vice president, school and chapterwide councils; delegate to 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth:

"I am a motor service volunteer at our chapter house. During the summer the motor service chairman and I were talking about ways to save our chapter some money, and we hit on the idea of high school members coming down to the chapter house once a month to wash and wax all motor service cars and trucks. It sounded like a good idea so I took it to our director, who agreed. Then the real job came in—to convince the students. This was done through our council meetings. We made it a council project and set an open date for a convenient Saturday morning. We have presently had one car wash, which was a terrific success."

Ho Hum Hosannas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I have asked unanimous consent to include my nomination for the editorial of the week, from the columns of the Poughkeepsie Journal and the title is especially significant:

HO HUM HOSANNAS

Now that Senate and House have passed similar depressed areas bills and agreement is almost a formality, Washington discussions of the measure are strangely unenthusiastic.

Even friends of the measure are admitting that there aren't many new jobs in it, and that it will be quite a while, if ever, before any new jobs will develop. Few deny that the provision for aid to rural areas is unnecessary because the Agriculure Department already has a program in this field.

Some who voted for the bill concede that the emphasis on new plants is misplaced, because in many of the depressed areas satisfactory empty plants are abundant.

In sum, it appears that $400 million is to be spent just to show that Uncle Sam cares, even if the program itself won't help much, if at all.

A Great Man as Chief of the Army Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the Mobile Press of Wednesday, April 19, 1961, regarding the appointment by President John F. Kennedy in naming a great man as Chief of the Army Engineers. I am enclosing this story and an editorial about the President's selecting General Wilson for the highest engineering position we have, and it is so gratifying. This article speaks for itself, but I wish everybody could know this great man who has served two stretches in Alabama as resident engineer. He has served practically all over this earth, and if the President and all of us had looked all over this earth, we could never have found a more capable man than our own Gen. "Weary" Wilson.

I remember in the long ago before Gen. Lewis A. Pick went to his reward that he told me that he considered the then Colonel Wilson one of the great engineers of this Nation. It is going to mean much to this administration and this entire Nation and the world to have this man as head of this great Army Engineers, one of the finest groups that has ever served this country since we have had a nation. There has never been one iota of scandal about the Army Engineers. They have done some of the most unusual and practically impossible projects on this earth. Now, after all the years and all the great men who have served in this capacity, now we get one of our own homefolks and you do not know how much the people everywhere I have talked to appreciate what President Kennedy did in appointing this great man to be Chief of the Army Engineers, and I think everybody will appreciate what our Mobile Press Register way down in our beloved Southland has had to say about General Wilson. I wish I could just tell everybody all I know about this man, his wonderful wife and his family. I have worked with him over a quarter of a century and I have never known a greater and a better man.

I remember a little saying that goes something like this:

JUST THINKING

Life is not a treadmill. Life is a beautiful and fascinating field of endeavor and enterprise, with inspiring horizons of newer and greater fields beckoning ever onward. Work and service are blessings to enrich one's life, and make it truly worth living. Blessed is the man who does his work joyfully.

Now, I believe that was by a great writer, Grenville Kleiser, and I found that little quote in Sunshine, a magazine of May 1961. Well, that just fits Gen. "Weary" Wilson, because he is blessed and he does do his work joyfully, and that is the way it should be.

I remember so many things so many great men had to say about the development of our waterways, and I am going to quote here some of them because it says here "The Importance of Waterways Stated by Voices of Wisdom," which is included in "Waterways of the United States," published by the National Association of River and Harbor Contractors. The first was our great President, George Washington, and I quote:

Prompted by actual observations, I could not help taking a more extensive view of the vast inland navigation possibilities of the United States, both from maps and the observations of others as well as myself. I could not but be struck with the immense extent and importance of it, and with the goodness of that providence which has dealt its forces to us in so profuse a hand. Would to God that we may have the wisdom and courage to improve them.

The next was by Abraham Lincoln, and I quote:

No commercial object of Government patronage can be so exclusively general as not to be of some peculiar local advantage; but, on the other hand, nothing is so local as not to be of some general advantage. The Navy, as I understand it, was established, and is maintained at great annual expense, partly for war, when war shall come, but partly also and perhaps chiefly, for protection of our commerce on the high seas. This latter object is, for all I can see, in principle the same as internal improvements. The driving of a pirate from the track of commerce on the broad ocean, and the removal of a snag from its more narrow path in the Mississippi River, cannot, I think, be distinguished in principle.

The next was by Theodore Roosevelt, and I quote:

The development of our inland waterways will have results far beyond the immediate gain to commerce. Deep channels along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, and from the gulf to the Great Lakes, will have high value for the national defense. A channel is no deeper than its shallowest reach, and to improve rivers short of the point of effective navigability is a sheer waste of all costs. The improvement of our inland waterways can and should be made to pay for itself, so far as practicable, from the incidental proceeds from waterpower and other uses. Navigation should of course be free. But the greatest return will come from the increased commerce, growth, and prosperity of our people.

The next was by Herbert C. Hoover, and I quote:

Modern forms of development have made water carriage the cheapest of all transportation for many types of goods. With greater depths and with improvements in craft, it is possible to restore our waterways. Nor will this jeopardize the prosperity of our railways as some predict. Through the improvement of our waterways, it will be possible to distribute industry and population better, because waterways tend to place many towns and cities upon an equality in transportation.

And, last but not least, by our own President John F. Kennedy, who has done such a good job, and I quote:

Water is unquestionably one of the vital keys to our future security and survival, as well as to our well-being. If this Nation is to end the waste of our water resources, if we are to develop more fully the use of our water for economic growth and the needs of our exploding population, we should—without further delay—greatly accelerate our programs as regards conservation, transportation, power, flood control, and other aspects of our natural water resources.

Mr. Speaker, I agree, and I know you will, with every word that all of these great Presidents have had to say about the development of our waterways, from George Washington, our first President, down to the last President, the present President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

J.F.K. NAMES MOBILE MAN

WASHINGTON.—Maj. Gen. Walter King Wilson of Mobile was nominated by President Kennedy Tuesday to be Chief of Army Engineers. The President also nominated Wilson for the rank of lieutenant general.

Wilson is commanding general of the Engineer Center at Fort Belvoir, Va. He will succeed Lt. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, who is retiring.

Wilson was the Mobile district engineer from June 1949, to September 1952, when he was named South Atlantic division engineer at Atlanta.

He is married to the former Miss Jeanne Herman of Tuscaloosa, Ala.

Wilson was born at Fort Barrancas, near Pensacola, Fla., in 1906. During his period as Mobile district engineer, the district office completed work on the Alatoona Dam, continued construction of the Jim Woodruff Dam, and started work on the Buford and Demopolis Dams.

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Press, Apr. 19, 1961]

WILSON'S SELECTION FOR HIGHEST ENGINEER POSITION IS GRATIFYING

Mobilians undoubtedly are in unanimous accord with action of President Kennedy in nominating Maj. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Jr., to be Chief of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and for promotion to the rank of lieutenant general.

Local gratification, over the development stems from Mobilians' admiration for General Wilson and from their recognition of his outstanding ability. Moreover, since he owns a home here, and married Miss Jeanne Herman while she was a teacher at Leinkauf School, the general has very strong Mobile ties.

General Wilson served the Corps of Engineers twice at Mobile during his career. He came here first after graduating from West Point, and was district engineer here from June 1949 to October 1952.

Since leaving Mobile, he has served as division engineer of the south Atlantic division, with headquarters in Atlanta; division engineer of the Mediterranean division, where he did outstanding work in the construction of Air Force bases in north Africa; commanding general of the 18th Engineer Brigade, Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., and as Assistant Chief of Engineers for Military Construction.

The Wilson's home, to which the couple plan to retire when his Army career ends, is located in Spring Hill.

The general is widely known in Mobile as a result of the active role he played in civic and social life of the community while stationed here.

It will be a decided advantage to the Mobile district to have such a man in the Chief of Engineer's post, since he knows so intimately the conditions and the potential of this district.

A man of his ability, character, and long experience should have no difficulty winning approval by the Senate. It is inconceivable that the Nation could find a better man for the high post.

Crane Potests Seizure of Sea Water Booklets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with deep concern an article in the Indianapolis Star, a newspaper published in the capital of my home State, that Federal food and drug inspectors have obtained court authority to seize pamphlets and newspaper articles.

I have seen where Federal drug agents in Ohio have on several occasions seized pamphlets and newspaper articles written by Dr. George W. Crane, a newspaper columnist of some stature.

The pamphlets, some containing reprints of Dr. Crane's newspaper column, were seized, according to the report, because they appeared on the same counter with a display of items such as sea water and salt, sold on the theory that some trace minerals might have an effect on various ailments. These items have no connection with Dr. Crane's column or business.

It was stated that had the pamphlets been on another counter or across the room they would not have been seized.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the medicinal value of sea water and sea salt to be of little concern to the gentlemen in this body. However, I do feel that freedom of the press is a matter to be closely considered by this or any other body.

If the Federal Government wants to take action against a product, such as sea salt or sea water, it should take action against the product and not against the literature. It should be instructed to keep its hands off printed matter or else we may some day see Federal agents confiscating newspapers, magazines, and other pieces of literature because they contain something with which an agency may not agree.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include in the RECORD the newspaper article written in the Indianapolis Star by Lester M. Hunt and a copy of Dr. Crane's column on the seizure of the literature:

[From the Indianapolis Star, Mar. 13, 1961]

CRANE PROTESTS SEIZURE OF SEA WATER BOOKLETS

(By Lester M. Hunt)

The right of Federal food and drug inspectors to seize pamphlets and newspaper articles was challenged sharply yesterday by Dr. George W. Crane as "a dictatorial invasion of the right of a free press."

Dr. Crane, whose column "The Worry Clinic" appears regularly in the Indianapolis Star, cited several high-handed actions of the Federal drug agents in Ohio.

In one case, the agents seized several copies of a Crane pamphlet containing two reprints of his columns and a discussion of medicinal value of sea water and sea salt.

The pamphlets, he reported, were impounded because they appeared on the same counter as the sea products.

"Had they been on another counter across the room, they would have been legal," Crane said. "In other words, the Federal bureaucrats attempt to tell people on what counter they can place published material.

"In one place, it is legal. In another place, it is illegal. I am very disturbed over these actions which, if not challenged, will lead to a suppression of all information that a Federal department decrees is to be withheld from the public."

The next step, he pointed out, could be the censorship of newspapers, magazines, and all forms of public information.

One instance Crane cited involved the proprietor of a children's shop in Ohio who became interested in the medicinal properties of sea salt and put some in as a sideline.

The local newspaper in an Ohio town wrote a feature story about it and the proprietor pasted it on her store window.

"The Federal drug inspectors tore it down," the columnist said.

A grocery store in Ohio had similar difficulties.

One Ohio man heard of the possibilities of sea water and drove to the Atlantic coast where he filled a couple of barrels and brought them home.

He transferred it to gallon jugs which he sold for $3.75 each. They were labeled "Sea water" with instructions to boil 10 minutes before using.

The drug agents dumped the whole supply, Crane said.

Defending their action, Wallace Janssen, Information Director for the Federal Drug Administration, said yesterday in Washington that when advertising matter specifying diseases which a product will affect is distributed in connection with a product it constitutes a label.

It does not matter whether the material is attached to the product or not, as long as it is used to promote the sale, Janssen said.

He added that if the product is sold with no claims as to its therapeutic value, there is nothing the FDA can do about it.

The Crane pamphlets mentioned cancer, baldness, epilepsy, allergy, arthritis and schizophrenia among 20 suggested deficiency ailments which might be helped by the 44 trace chemicals reportedly found in sea salt and sea water.

All the ailments are those for which no cures have been found, Janssen said.

Crane mentioned the interest of many physicians in the progress of biochemistry and reported instances where sufferers had obtained remarkable relief after the use of sea water.

But aside from his belief that the ocean chemicals may be of great benefit to health, Crane maintained the public should be permitted to analyze the claims pro and con and reach its own conclusions.

"To arbitrarily seize printed pamphlets and newspaper articles is a dangerous precedent which could lead to such abuses as always occur when dictators gain power," he said.

"The people have a right to know the latest thinking in the fields of health and medicine and this they cannot have if the Government tells them what they can read.

"It is logical to believe that many of these mysterious chemicals will provide a preventive to many of the diseases that now baffle science."

Crane pointed out that 60 years ago the American Medical Association brushed off sea water, claiming it had no benefit whatever.

But now, he added, iodine, one of the ingredients, has been found to prevent goiter and is included in common table salt while another, fluorine, has been found to stop tooth decay and has been added to the water supply of hundreds of cities.

Crane has made no claims of cure for the ingredients of salt water but has merely suggested their value in view of the relief some persons have found in their use.

His position is that certain of the ingredients have been proven valuable and that further research may disclose still more.

[From the Indianapolis Star, Mar. 13, 1961]

THE WORRY CLINIC

(By Dr. George W. Crane)

Case H–458: Vivian V., is a spunky Quaker housewife.

"Dr. Crane," she said, "my husband has been selling sea salt and has been showing people your newspaper booklet about the "Ocean's 44 Trace Chemicals."

"Now a bureaucrat is trying to embargo our salt on the ground that we have no right to show people that newspaper booklet.

"He says that the uneducated public cannot come to their own conclusions.

"So the Government must think for them. Isn't this brainwashing?

"Besides, any newspaper reader who can read your column and booklets must have enough gumption to think for himself.

"My third-grader son is now using a textbook by Dr. H. S. Zim, in which about 40 chemicals are mentioned as vital for good health.

"So I asked this bureaucrat if we could show customers that textbook. He said 'No.'

"How can bureaucrats deny us little people the use of newspaper materials or books in our business?"

"In our Republic," said the late Frank E. Gannett, "the Government should fear the people; not the people, the Government."

Last month I addressed the Indiana Academy of General Practice at Indianapolis, and those 500 family doctors were amazed that any bureaucrat would try to oppose the chemical laws of the Almighty.

God put 44 water-soluble chemicals in our blood.

Yet this bureaucrat says our Government "recognizes only 12."

Dr. James H. Shaw, famous Harvard biochemist, has identified 30 of these chemicals just in tooth enamel, dentine and bone.

But our Government "recognizes only 12."

More than 5,000 doctors have eagerly written for the newspaper booklet named below and many are testing sea salt and ocean water on patients.

They and other biochemists know there must have been some reason why God put 44 water-soluble chemicals in our blood.

Yet the Government "recognizes only 12."

Freedom of the press and free speech are in dire jeopardy when any bureaucrats can try to brainwash our citizens and deny average folks the right to pass newspapers or newspaper booklets around among their neighbors.

Newspapers are your best protection against creeping socialism and dictatorship.

Hitler's secret police also tried to squelch freedom of printed matter. That is the first step on the road to dictatorship, so beware.

Our Government bureaucrats have the billions of our taxes behind them to bankrupt little people when the latter do try to defend themselves in court.

A bureaucrat in Ohio thus dumped a farmer's sea water in a ditch and the farmer hadn't the money to fight this issue of free speech, for how could his limited funds compete with the billions in taxes behind bureaucrats? So your newspaper is the only sure defense average people have left in America.

To Secure a World of Prosperous and Peaceful Free Nations We Need the Cooperation of the German People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the future prospects of a stabilized world of free nations of people enjoying a peaceful existence and higher standard of living depends upon the leadership and strength of our great country and other free nations. And one of the most important factors to achieve this objective is the problem of consolidating the great and creative energetic power and courage of the German people to this cause.

In connection with this I call your attention to the annual Sudeten German Day which is going to take place on Whitsuntide, May 20 to 22, 1961, in Cologne, Germany, with several hundreds of thousands participating, the principal speakers being German Chancellor Dr. Konrad Adenauer; German Federal Minister of Traffic, Dr. Ing. Hans-Christoph Seebohm who is the president of the Sudeten German National Union; and other members of the German Federal Government and Parliament.

The Sudeten German expellees, over 2 million of the total number of 13 million expellees and refugees from communism in West Germany, are going to reaffirm their dedication to the cause of freedom, democracy, and peace and their faith that, by peaceful means, the freedom of the enslaved peoples will be restored and their self-determination right returned to them in the future. In this faith the Sudeten German expellees feel united with the Ukrainians, Slovaks, Hungarians, Czechs, Poles, Balts, and all other peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

In the Sudeten bulletin, of volume 9, of January 1961, there appears an article by Anton F. Wuschek entitled "A Policy of Genocide," as follows:

A POLICY OF GENOCIDE
(By Anton F. Wuschek)

After the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans there remained approximately 170,000 to 200,000 Germans in the area that now embraces Czechoslovakia. Many of them are still residing in their old homes in the Sudetenland, others have been transferred to original Czech areas. Along with the Hungarian, Ukrainian, and Polish minorities in the C.S.S.R., the German element is one of the largest ethnic groups that do not belong to the official nation of the State of Czechs and Slovaks.

Little has been said of the existence of this German group within the past years. Not until last year did they become the subject of considerable discussion within Czechoslovak Communist Party circles, when, in connection with the introduction of the new Socialist constitution in the C.S.S.R. the new status of the ethnic minorities was decided on. Whereas the new constitution gives a minimum of cultural rights to the Ukrainian, Hungarian, and Polish minorities, it deprives the German minority every right to an autonomous group life. State President Antonin Novotny justified this fact with the statement that the German question was settled by the expulsion from their homes of some 3 million Sudeten Germans. The remaining Germans would thus no longer be considered as a minority.

The logic of this statement was by no means given unanimous approval. Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (CPC), Bruno Köhler, took the opportunity to discuss the Sudeten German issue in detail in the official organ of the CPC Zivot strany (No. 16, 1960). Köhler justified the discrepancy in the minorities policy of the CPC with the remark, that according to the teachings of Leninism, a correct solution of the nationalities issue called for application of the principle of adjustment to the current political situations while giving consideration to the interests of communism.

During the first Czechoslovak Republic under Thomas Masaryk (1918–38) the Communists were the greatest proponents of a radical nationalities policy in the CSR, aimed at a destruction of the Czechoslovak State. The Communists with Köhler as their spokesman vehemently condemned the attitude of the German parties in the CSR that were seeking a federative solution of the nationalities question within the scope of the existing State. Köhler criticized this stand on Februray 1, 1931, in an article in Roter Vorwärts (Red Forward), which reads as follows:

"The national demagogy of all these (bourgeois German) parties climaxes in the demand for 'national self-administration and cultural autonomy' for the German people within the Czechoslovak State * * * National autonomy means the recognition of the Czechoslovak State * * * means rejection a priori of the self-determination right of the German people."

Just how much Communist policy sought at that time to make itself an advocate of the interests of the non-Czech ethnic groups in the CSR becomes evident from the address of the Secretary of the Communist International, Dimitri Z. Manuilskij, before the second regular congress of the CPC:

"Since the CPC recognizes the right of national self-determination, including separation from the State, and combats all attempts to keep national minorities within the framework of the present State structure by means of force, it is obligated to support the demands posed by national minorities against national suppression by every possible means."

But times have changed in the meanwhile and the interests of the Communist rulers in the C.S.S.R. are other than they were in Czechoslovakia during the period between the two world wars. The expulsion of the Sudeten Germans and the confiscation of their property were welcome conditions for complete communization of Czechoslovakia. Bruno Köhler even admits this himself when he writes, in the above-mentioned issue of Zivost strany:

"The transfer of the German minority, totalling millions, did not take place without difficulty, particularly for those affected by the shift. * * * The consistent and timely solution of the problem of the German minority proved to be especially advantageous during the glorious days of February 1948 when the workers concentrated all their energies on achieving victory over the reaction, on a victory that finally made the road free for the establishment of socialism in our country."

Today the CPC openly declares that the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans was a prerequisite for the victory of communism in the C.S.S.R. In order to retain the fruits of this victory, the Red regime in Prague resists with all its might every attempt of the Sudeten Germans and the West to revise the expulsion of the rightful inhabitants of the Sudetenland. In trying to make permanent the injustice, the small minority of Germans still living in the C.S.S.R. today—because the authorities deny them permission to emigrate—are disregarded entirely. Not only are they disregarded, but systematic attempts are being made to do away with them altogether. At this point there begins a policy of genocide, a crime against international law. By conscious and deliberate action the Czech state leaders are trying to uproot an entire ethnic group by surrounding them by conditions that make it impossible for them to cultivate and perpetuate their native tongue and cultural attributes.

Although international jurists may differ as to whether the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans as such, which took place in 1945–46, may be classified as genocide—although expulsion measures were aimed at destruction of the entire Sudeten group—there may well be unanimity of opinion as to the new measures in the C.S.S.R. with regard to the total extirpation of the German minority in the C.S.S.R., that this is planned and systematically organized genocide. Bruno Köhler already anticipates the outcome of this policy when, in the above-cited article, he writes:

"Due to the entirely different situation, the question of the German minority had to be solved entirely differently from that of the Magyar, Ukrainian, and Polish minority in the C.S.S.R. This difference is also evident in the formulation of the republic's new constitution, which legally crystallizes all the important social changes we have affected. The constitutional text can contain no stipulation as to something which no longer exists; namely, a German minority in the C.S.S.R."

Peace Corps Volunteers and the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in the April issue of the Selective Service System monthly bulletin, Selective Service, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director, discusses the question of deferment from military service for those who wish to serve with the Peace Corps.

I believe that General Hershey's remarks will answer many of the questions that have been raised about the draft status of Peace Corps volunteers. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

PEACE CORPS RELATIONSHIP WITH SSS EXPLAINED
(By Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey)

The Peace Corps has been established by Executive order of the President. Legislation has been requested to continue this organization. The activities of the Peace Corps have been covered rather completely by the press, radio, and television. Its relationship with the Selective Service System has been indicated but a statement of this relationship seems advisable.

The Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is flexible enough to provide deferment for members of the Peace

Corps without amendment of any kind. In other words the relationship of the Selective Service System with registrants who become members of the Peace Corps can be handled administratively.

The power to defer registrants who perform functions in the national health, safety, or interest now exists. The establishment and operation of the Peace Corps is in the national interest. So the classification of registrants in the Peace Corps can be handled as any other registrant engaged in activities in the national health, safety, or interest. They will, of course, enjoy the right of appeal shared by all registrants of the Selective Service System.

These statements presuppose the continuance of the present situation of the United States in relations with other nations of the world.

The question has been raised as to the status of registrants who enroll in the Peace Corps, after their return from this assignment. This requires the assumption as to the situation of this Nation in the world, the age of the registrant when he returns, the physical condition of the registrant with reference to his acceptability for military service, his marital status, and the regulations which apply in existence at the time of his release from the Peace Corps, and whether or not the registrant on his return from service with the Peace Corps engages in an activity which permits him to be deferred in the national health, safety, or interest.

The fact that the registrant has been a member of the Peace Corps will not prevent him from qualifying for further deferment, the same as any other registrant who is engaged in activities vital to the national health, safety, or interest.

Cuba: Fidelismo Without Fidel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the current discussions of our policy toward Cuba, it is vital that we should not blunder into giving a new life to Castroism.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a perceptive editorial from South Carolina's most outspoken newspaper, which is commended for reading by all concerned with the formulation of U.S. policy.

The editorial follows:

FIDELISMO WITHOUT FIDEL

The United States should have nothing to do with an organization of Cuban exiles set up in New York last Wednesday under the name of the Revolutionary Council. It is headed by Dr. Miro Cardona, a former Premier of Cuba under Dictator Castro.

This new group, which the New York Times hails as "the equivalent of a unified provisional government" of Cuba, represents leftwing Cubans who want Fidelismo without Fidel.

If the United States backs Miro Cardona and his crowd, it will be acquiring another Cuban headache as bad as Fidel Castro.

The Revolutionary Council wants to continue the leftist revolution started by Castro. The new group represents a merger of the Democratic Revolutionary Front, a moderate organization, and the People's Revolutionary Movement, a group of revolutionary extremists.

It now appears that the extremists have won a victory over the moderates and that the leftists dominate the forces of the center. Nowhere in the new organization is there a place for Cuban conservatives, who are the true friends of the United States.

Head of the revolutionary movement of the people is Manuel Ray, former Minister of Public Works in the Castro government. Another revolution-of-the-people leader is Maj. Raul Chibas, one of Castro's closest associates from the beginning of the revolution.

Last November, the News and Courier warned that Chibas represented dangerous forces. This man was one of the leaders in Cuba throughout the period of the firing squad terror, confiscation of U.S. property and infiltration of Cuba by Communists. He is not to be trusted by the United States or by genuinely anti-Communist Cuban exiles.

The program announced by Miro Cardona is a charter for continuance of the leftist revolution in Cuba. It specifically endorses the so-called "agrarian reform," which means theft of private property. While a promise is made to pay for confiscated lands, it should be remembered that Castro also made such a promise. The fact is Cuba won't have funds to make indemnities at any time in the forseeable future.

The Revolutionary Council's program also states that the government "will definitely nationalize the public utilities of light and power, telephones, aqueducts, and railroads." In other words, one can be sure that this group, if it comes to power in Cuba, will carry on where Castro began.

This consolidation of authority by leftist Cuban exiles is a threat which the United States was recently warned against by Jose I. Rivero, editor in exile of Diario de la Marina, the great Havana newspaper. He warned that leftists in Washington will aid Cuban leftists in exile who want to continue the Castro revolution but without Fidel Castro, whose bad public relations have damaged the radical cause. Mr. Rivero specifically warned against "Fidelistas who have defected, who only yesterday were accomplices in the horrors of Castroism."

The United States should not raise a finger to aid former accomplices of Fidel Castro. Once they gain power they will turn on the American people. One terrible error was committed when Castro was recognized in the first place. The United States can't afford to give a new lease on life to the Fidelista revolution.

Watertown Daily Times Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, April 22, was the 100th anniversary of the Watertown Daily Times, the largest daily newspaper published in northern New York and one of the outstanding newspapers of the country. I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Times, to its editor and publisher, John B. Johnson, and to its capable staff.

Although a paper of less than 50,000 circulation, the Watertown Times has a high sense of public purpose and responsibility. It is one of the few daily papers of any size read regularly by the State Department, and its editorials are frequently quoted by the Voice of America broadcasts overseas. Its fine reputation has extended to the offices of other Members of Congress and the Federal Government, although they do not have direct daily contact with the paper.

The Watertown Times established a full-time Washington bureau in the fall of 1951 to give its readers more news of developments in the Nation's Capital of particular importance to their area. It covers the State and national political conventions of both political parties. It has correspondents covering the Presidential campaign activities. The Times sent its Washington correspondent, Alan S. Emory, to Alaska in 1958 for firsthand reports on what the 49th State was really like. Is assigned Mr. Emory to cover former Vice President Nixon's trip to the Soviet Union and Poland in 1959.

In 1956, feeling that residents of the East did not sufficiently understand issues that stirred the people of the Western States, the Times ran a series of articles by its own correspondent on issues of particular significance to the West.

The Times and I do not always agree, but each respects the other's views, and the newspaper's coverage of the news is scrupulously fair. Its leadership in the battle to make a success of the St. Lawrence Seaway is an established fact.

I take great pleasure in saluting the Watertown Times on the occasion of its 100th birthday and wish to bring this event to the attention of my colleagues in Congress.

"We Don't Have Information; We Do Have Information"—The Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I herewith enclose letters that indicate certain information is not available:

TENNESSEE ASC STATE OFFICE,
Nashville, Tenn., April 11, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: We are inclosing herewith tabulations showing participation in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan programs for the years 1958, 1959, and 1960 for barley, corn, grain sorghum, oats, rye, soybeans, and wheat as requested in your letter of March 27, 1961.

We regret that information is not available to us which would show how many of these producers secured loans on more than one commodity. We hope that this information will be satisfactory and will meet your needs.

Very truly yours,

CARL FRY,
Chairman, ASC State Committee.

Tennessee

PARTICIPATION IN THE 1958 CCC LOAN PROGRAM

Commodity	Number producers participated	Amount loaned
Barley	0	0
Corn	58	$178,552
Grain sorghum	4	1,692
Oats	1	1,417
Rye	0	0
Soybeans	1,589	2,078,430
Wheat	166	194,001

PARTICIPATION IN THE 1959 CCC LOAN PROGRAM

Barley	0	0
Corn	113	$308,346
Grain sorghum	1	1,011
Oats	0	0
Rye	0	0
Soybeans	188	410,613
Wheat	370	481,088

PARTICIPATION IN THE 1960 CCC LOAN PROGRAM

Barley	1	$855
Corn	60	138,280
Grain sorghum	1	1,040
Oats	0	0
Rye	0	0
Soybeans	32	79,282
Wheat	213	336,272

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
Syracuse, N.Y., April 14, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Enclosed is the information requested concerning Commodity Credit Corporation loans made in New York State for 1958, 1959, and 1960 for barley, corn, grain sorghums, oats, rye, soybeans, and wheat.

You will note that wheat and corn are the important commodities in the State participating in Commodity Credit loan programs.

Without considerable research in county offices we are unable to answer your last question in regard to the number of farmers having two or more of these crops under loan. However, we feel sure the number of these cases would be very small in our State.

If further information is needed, please let us know.

BRYAN LEONARD,
State Administrative Officer for the New York ASC State Committee.

Commodity	Year	Producers participating	Total loaned
Barley	1958	21	$16,711
	1959	3	2,174
	1960	1	885
Corn	1958	134	157,917
	1959	180	266,188
	1960	132	169,128
Grain sorghums: None.			
Oats	1958	67	44,770
	1959	26	23,213
	1960	38	41,067
Rye	1958	16	10,927
	1959	2	1,185
	1960	----	----
Soybeans	1958	----	----
	1959	1	1,420
	1960	----	----
Wheat	1958	1,180	1,999,051
	1959	989	1,564,303
	1960	1,027	1,605,188

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
College Station, Tex., April 11, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In compliance with the request contained in your letter dated March 27, 1961, listed below are the number of loans disbursed in Texas on 1958-, 1959-, and 1960-crop barley, corn, grain sorghums, oats, rye, soybeans, and wheat. Also listed are the quantities of these commodities placed under loan and the amounts of loans disbursed:

1958 CROP YEAR

Commodity	Number of loans	Quantity under loans	Amount of loans
Barley	2,094	[1] 2,285,544	$2,156,090
Corn	26	[1] 63,331	69,279
Grain sorghums	43,320	[2] 66,598,679	123,656,913
Oats	5,695	[1] 8,882,504	5,961,075
Rye	62	[1] 70,227	48,621
Soybeans	973	[1] 673,621	1,322,033
Wheat	20,027	[1] 43,480,461	80,676,289

1959 CROP YEAR

Barley	33	[1] 51,658	$38,891
Corn	68	[1] 136,786	163,019
Grain sorghums	16,308	[2] 30,222,198	214,392
Oats	134	[1] 195,967	113,217
Soybeans	19	[1] 38,724	68,997
Wheat	5,532	[1] 13,133,890	23,345,608

1960 CROP YEAR

Barley	159	[1] 261,119	$191,213
Corn	44	[1] 76,604	87,528
Grain sorghums	21,969	[2] 53,717,358	83,362,873
Oats	217	[1] 464,884	269,642
Soybeans	20	[1] 33,292	58,132
Wheat	10,185	[1] 29,764,335	53,383,820

[1] Bushels.
[2] Hundredweight.

We do not have a record of the number of producers who participated in the price support program, as distingiushed from the number of loans disbursed, or the number who obtained loans on more than one commodity. However, it is hoped that the above information will serve your purpose.

If additional information relative to the price support program is desired or if I can be of further service to you, please advise.

Very truly yours,

JACK BRADSHAW,
Acting State Administrative Officer.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURE STABALIZATION AND
CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
Columbia, Mo., April 11, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This acknowledges your letter of March 27, 1961 requesting information on the participation in Commodity Credit Corporation loan programs for the years 1958, 1959, and 1960. We regret the delay in our reply which was occasioned by your letter having been inadvertently forwarded to the director of extension at the University of Missouri.

For your information we attach a listing showing the number of loans and the total amount loaned for each of the years and commodities requested. However, we regret that we are unable to furnish specific information regarding the number of farmers who participated in two, three, and four of these programs, respectively. Our accounting records are not maintained on an individual name basis and therefore, it would be virtually impossible for us to assemble this information. Our experience with these programs would, however, enable us to estimate that 30 percent of the producers participated in two programs, 10 percent participated in three programs and no more than 2 percent participated in four programs in each of the years 1958, 1959, and 1960.

We hope this information is what you desire; if we can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE BOWLES,
State Administrative Officer.

	1960		1959		1958	
	Number of loans	Loan value	Number of loans	Loan value	Number of loans	Loan value
Barley	31	$26,720	27	$23,193	127	$104,935
Corn	10,923	23,836,996	13,122	27,935,857	5,884	13,117,597
Grain sorghums	1,617	1,790,984	1,364	1,860,116	6,881	8,410,186
Oats	24	12,422	24	12,951	83	58,982
Rye	7	3,456	6	1,836	19	15,524
Soybeans	2,065	4,072,977	3,858	7,497,077	9,539	20,316,406
Wheat	8,986	12,585,026	11,732	15,941,334	11,175	15,822,644
Total	23,653	42,328,581	30,133	53,272,004	33,708	57,846,364

Mr. Speaker, I herewith enclose statements that indicate the availability of information:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
College Park, Md., April 19, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Since furnishing the information pertaining to Maryland participation in price support programs for transmittal to you by Dr. Nystrom, we have received a letter from our area director on this subject, a copy of which is enclosed, and which we believe will be self-explanatory. However, if the Department in Washington should be unable to furnish the information you desire, please let us know.

We are returning the letter from Dr. Nystrom, together with attachments, as you requested in your note.

Sincerely yours,

DUDLEY C. AIST,
Administrative Officer, Maryland ASC State Office.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS, STATE OF MARYLAND,
College Park, Md., April 13, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: I have your thermafax copy of letter addressed to directors concerning grain producers.

I am attaching a copy of letter with attached data received from Mr. Dudley C. Aist, of the Maryland ASC State office. I hope this gives you the information you need. If it does not, I shall be glad to have you write me further.

Very truly yours,
PAUL E. NYSTROM, *Director.*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.
COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE.
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1961.

To: State administrative officers, northeast area.

From: Harris W. Soul, director, northeast area.

Subject: Requests for grain crop loan information.

It has come to our attention that Congressman BECKWORTH recently asked a number of States for information about grain crop loans in the past 3 years.

The information desired can be furnished by the Department in Washington so it will not be necessary for you to furnish it county by county.

COLLEGE PARK, MD.,
April 11, 1961.

Dr. PAUL E. NYSTROM
Director of Extension, Agriculture,
University of Maryland,
College Park, Md.

DEAR DR. NYSTROM: Attached is a tabulation which will give most of the information requested in Representative BECKWORTH'S letter of March 27. The answers to the questions in the final paragraph of Representative BECKWORTH'S letter could be obtained only by conducting a survey in each county in the State in which there was loan activity in any of the past 3 years.

Due to the urgency of the work in counties on the new feed-grain program it would be very difficult to conduct such a survey at this time, however, if he should still wish to get these figures we will conduct the survey and furnish the results to him after the feed-grain program has gotten underway. This would be in about a month or 6 weeks.

Very truly yours,
DUDLEY C. AIST,
Administrative Officer,
Maryland ASC State Office.

Participation in commodity loan programs in Maryland

	1958		1959		1960	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Barley		None		None	1	$7,175
Corn	53	$139,547	101	$278,584	88	316,545
Grain sorghum		None		None		None
Oats		None		None		None
Rye		None		None		None
Soybeans	4	6,826		None		None
Wheat	467	671,555	176	315,146	216	455,104

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
Clemson, S.C., April 19, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Your request for information dated March 27, 1961, on participation of farmers in this State in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program for several commodities, was referred to Mr. A. R. Crawford, acting State administrative officer, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee, Columbia, S.C. Mr. Crawford advised me on the subject as follows:

"We have taken no action to obtain the information requested by Congressman BECKWORTH, since we have just received a letter from our Washington office advising that the information sought by the Congressman covers a number of States and will be furnished at the Washington level."

I trust that you have received through the Washington office of U.S. Department of Agriculture the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,
GEO. B. NUTT, *Director.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 20, 1961.

Mr. HARRIS W. SOULE,
Commodity Stabilization Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SOULE: Please note the enclosures.

I am sending you a copy of the letter dated March 27, 1961, that I sent each State Director.

Since you state specifically you can furnish the information, I want it immediately and I want all of the information for which I asked in connection with every State. Because you do state you have the information in Washington, I shall expect the information forthwith.

Please return.

Kind regards,
LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1961.

DEAR DIRECTOR: For the years 1958, 1959, and 1960 I desire the following information:

How many barley producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your State in each year?

How many corn producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your State in each year?

How many grain sorghum producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your State in each year?

How many oat producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your State in each year?

How many rye producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your State in each year?

How many soybean producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your State in each year?

How many wheat producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your State in each year?

How many farmers participated in the programs of two of these crops? How many farmers participated in the programs of three of these crops? How many farmers participated in the programs of four of these crops?

For this information I shall be grateful.

Regards,
LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope to have the information soon.

John Francis Killea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE M. KILGORE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, the Lower Rio Grande Valley Chamber of Commerce of Weslaco, Tex., devotes considerable effort and energy to consistently bettering, on a local basis, the outstanding relations between the United States and Mexico. Because the valley recognizes devoted public servants in the foreign service are necessary to the implementation of our foreign relations, the chamber of commerce honored American Consul General John Francis Killea at Monterrey, Mexico, recently with a dinner at which time they presented him with a resolution of appreciation.

Since the resolution expresses so completely the gratification of the citizens of the Rio Grande Valley of Texas at the dedication of foreign service personnel, I would like to enter it in the RECORD for the information of all interested:

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION FROM THE LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ADDRESSED TO JOHN FRANCIS KILLEA, FOR DEVOTED AND DILIGENT WORK AS U.S. CONSUL-GENERAL STATIONED AT MONTERREY, NUEVO LEON, MEXICO

Whereas John Francis Killea is U.S. Consul-General stationed at Monterey, Nuevo Leon, Mexico; and the consular territory for which he is responsible covers most of the northeastern part of that nation; and

Whereas Mr. Killea has devoted himself to the diplomatic service of the United States with unremitting diligence toward furthering the interests of his fellow nationals; and

Whereas while keeping the welfare of the United States always foremost in his mind, he has at the same time won the high regard of the Mexican officials and people with whom he has dealt; and

Whereas Mr. Killea's understanding of the problems relating to international affairs has accrued to the benefit of the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Lower Rio Grande Valley Chamber of Commerce, That we extend forformally, on behalf of the entire organization, our sincere thanks and deep appreciation for his unselfish and valuable service to his Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of State of the United States, with the recommendation that it be placed in the permanent files relating to John Francis Killea.

Adopted this 7th day of March A.D. 1961.

BARRY L. TRASK,
President.

Groton Points With Pride to Its Members of the Famous 6th

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, steeped as it is in Revolutionary War history, is rich in its Civil War heritage as well. This is colorfully illustrated in a recent feature story in my hometown paper, the Lowell Sun. Shirley Foley has done a wonderful job in capturing the spirit of those exciting, tragic days a century ago. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Lowell Sun, Apr. 24, 1961]

GROTON POINTS WITH PRIDE TO ITS MEMBERS OF THE FAMOUS "6TH"

(By Shirley Foley)

GROTON.—One can almost hear the muffled sounds of "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" as he enters the Groton public library and is faced with the dramatic and historic relics of the Civil War which went on display this week as part of the town's celebration of National Library Week.

One sees among other things, a dilapidated leather dispatch case which may well have carried General Grant's orders to march on Vicksburg; tarnished medical instruments used aboard the Bohio by Dr. Giles Mosely Pease at New Orleans; and scores of muskets, battle sabres, and cannon balls used when "brother fought brother" in the fierce battles of Bull Run and Gettysburg.

As one examines these poignant reminders of a tragic era in the history of this Nation, his imagination is apt to run free as he recalls the events and episodes of the Civil War and the role these historic momentos might have played.

The exhibit, presented by the library committee under the chairmanship of Mrs. Steven Sabine of Farmers Row, utilizes the theme of the Civil War period since the centennial is currently being marked.

All items on exhibit belonged to early residents of Groton or to relatives and friends of families now residing there. Momentos have been loaned by citizens and organizations of the town and are valuable not only for their historical significance, but also because of the annecdotes connected with them which give a glimpse into the personal lives of those involved as well as the backstage drama of the war.

According to the history of Massachusetts, the 6th Regiment was the most famous organization called to the defense of the National Government. This was the first "to offer its services in the case of need; it was the first to shed its blood and give its lives, and it was the first command armed and equipped for active service to reach the national capital." Many representatives of the 6th were from Groton, and this fact is one of priceless historic value to the citizens of this town and one which gives them the enviable right to be recorded in the history of the country.

A dispatch case belonging to Lt. Col. Charles Hinchman, along with his discharge papers and letters he wrote to his father about the Battle of Chicamauga have been loaned by Richard Hinchman. There is an interesting sidelight attached to a Confederate coat Hinchman possessed. According to the story, the coat belonged to Colonel Russel, a Confederate soldier who was taken prisoner by Hinchman. After the war was over, the colonel wrote to Hinchman to tell him that in appreciation of the fine treatment he had received as a prisoner, he had named his horse "Hinchman."

Comdr. George Cary Sinclair, great grandfather of Dr. Helen Putman, resigned his commission in the U.S. Navy when Virginia joined the Confederacy, and was given the rank of commander in the Confederate States Navy. Among the items belonging to him on exhibit are his coat and the epaulets he wore. Also displayed are a silver creamer and sugar basin. According to the story, the silver was made for his ship but was never used. Commander Sinclair was in England overseeing the outfitting of his ship, the *Texas,* when the war ended.

One particular interesting item is a facsimile of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation loaned by the Historical Society. The original was destroyed in the Chicago fire, and there are only 10 extant reproductions in the country today.

Another interesting reproduction is the letter of the century, one of the most famous letters of all times. This is the letter Lincoln wrote to Mrs. Bixby to tell her he was very sorry and deeply moved upon learning the news that her five sons had been killed in the war. This copy belonged to the great-great-grandfather of Norman B. Saunders.

The children in the public schools also participated in the exhibition by submitting essays and displays on some phase of the war. The four essay winners were Cindy Cable who wrote on "Clara Barton; "Teddy Wilkinson who wrote on "The Battle of Bull Run;" Fegina Cappeletti who wrote on "The Battle of Pea Ridge;" and John Ellis who entitled his essay, "Civil War Project."

There are many other Civil War items on display which graphically recall episodes dating from John Brown's historic raid on Harpers Ferry to General Lee's dramatic surrender at Appomattox, there, for the benefit of all townspeople.

Customs Facilities in Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach Should Be Placed at the Harbor Where They Belong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Customs District is the fastest growing customs district in the Nation. It collected $98,748,713 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960. Ninety percent or more of the district's collections come from the twin ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, according to a foreign trade survey prepared by the Union Bank of Los Angeles. Imports through the twin ports have increased more than 600 percent since 1946.

Yet, importers and exporters shipping through the port of Los Angeles or the port of Long Beach are subject to delays and inconveniences found in no other port in the United States. The Los Angeles Customs District headquarters is located 22 miles from the harbor area, in the traffic-clogged center of Los Angeles. This means that importers and brokers have to break up shipments and send part of their merchandise 22 miles inland for examination and appraisal. This means paperwork has to be shuttled between the coustomhouse and the harbor by messenger and that customs personnel waste time in unnecessary travel.

New customs facilities have been proposed for Los Angeles. Now is the time to eliminate the 22-mile bottleneck, and to establish the Los Angeles Customhouse in the harbor it serves. Yet the General Services Administration and the Customs Service are planning to perpetuate these difficulties and retain the 22-mile bottleneck by placing the new customs facilities in a new Federal building planned for construction at the Civic Center, downtown Los Angeles. This erratic decision should be reversed. The customs facilities should be placed at the harbor where they belong not 22 miles away.

Western Rental Housing Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the excitement in this year's Western Rental Housing Conference was over condominium which is a relatively new development for homeownership in multiple-dwelling units. Because of the wide interest, and because of the need for information the speech of Jackson Moffett, vice president of the California Pacific Title Insurance Co. is reproduced here:

CONDOMINIUM

Theoretically, there should be no title insurance distinction between applications for insurance of fee interests of a portion of a described piece of real property, regardless of whether that portion be the southeast quarter of the lot or of a described quarter of the building located thereon.

It is a general principle of law that a building permanently fixed to the freehold becomes a part of it, belonging to the owner of the land on which it stands. (*Lycoming Eire Inc. Co.* v. *Haven,* 95 U.S. 252 and *Ingold* v. *Phoenix Assur. Co.,* 52 S.E. 2d 366.) Parts of a building, just as parts of the actual land, may be owned by different people in fee simple, as when an upper floor belongs to one person, and the lower floor to another (*McConnell* v. *Kibbe,* 33 Ill. 75) or separate rooms or even parts of rooms belong to different persons. (*White* v. *White,* 16 N.J.L. 202). A person who owns the entire estate in real property may sell and convey any part of it. It may be divided horizontally, perpendicularly, or in any manner according to the will of the owner, even to the extent of granting a freehold interest in a part of the building (6 AM Jur 443).

In the face of this principle that the building is a part of the land and that parts of that building may be owned by different people in fee simple, and since our policies have been drafted to insure the ownership of any adequately described portion of real property, we should have no hesitancy in insuring the fee title to an apartment conveyed by deed. We have nevertheless accepted requests for this type of insurance with some reluctance, and of those policies issued as a result of such requests, all have contained qualifications limiting the extent of the insurance granted.

Up to this time there seems to have been a reluctance on the part of the lenders and title companies to become involved in condominium because of the failure of the deed to correctly and clearly delineate the nature of the estate being granted, both as to the apartment unit, and to the common portions of the land and building. Now in order to overcome these weaknesses, let us for a moment consider the objections and their solutions.

The courts of our land have been extremely liberal in construing descriptions of real property conveyed by deed, requiring only that it be described with sufficient definiteness and certainly to locate it from other property.

Title insurers have added the further requirement that it not only be sufficient to stand up under legal attack but sufficient without aid of extrinsic evidence, to eliminate the possibility of litigation which might arise by reason of any patent ambiguity. Since neither the fractional part of a lot type description nor the metes and bounds type description lends itself well to the problem of clearly defining an apartment, e.g., on the second floor of a building, use must be made of a reference type description.

It is of course not necessary to the validity of a description that the deed itself set out a complete description of the apartment which is being conveyed. On the principle that that is certain which is capable of being made certain, the apartment is sufficiently described in the deed by reference for identification to a plat in which the apartment is sufficiently described to be identifiable. Such a reference has the effect of incorporating the plat into the description so that which is described will be transferred to the grantee.

Assume that the apartment is conveyed with a description such as:

"A certain apartment consisting of approximately 1,000 square feet, located in the Southeast quarter of the second floor of the building on lot 6, tract 1,000 of said county, now known as apartment No. 200, and so designated on the door of such apartment, and as said apartment is shown on that plat attached hereto and made a part of this deed."

If the attached plat clearly identifies the exact boundaries of the subject apartment, then that portion of the building which is intended to be conveyed has been described with sufficient definiteness to make that real property the proper subject of our title insurance.

The weakness of the description is that the perimeter line is the wall of the apartment. The doctrine that such walls are party walls can only be applicable to inside walls and, in addition, it is not advisable to convey to the purchasers an ownership in severalty of the part thereof which rests on his side of the line, with an easement of support from the other part.

It is the intention of the parties to share equally structural maintenance responsibilities and, consequently, the weakness of the description can be eliminated by requiring the plat to clearly delineate the perimeter line as the inside surface of all walls. Although any dividing wall would still be a party wall, the parties can own such wall as tenants in common, thereby eliminating the cross-easement problem.

Regardless of the sufficiency of the deed as to description and other essential elements, we do not believe insurance of a single apartment ownership is by itself either practical or advisable. Such apartment fee ownership should be acquired concurrently with an undivided factional interest as a tenant in common in the base land and all common portions of the apartment building (the fractional interest being determined by the number of units involved).

In the absence of such a concurrent acquisition of the tenancy in common estate, each of the rights and obligations necessary for the enjoyment of the apartments, such as easements of ingress and egress, for utilities, obligations of support and maintenance of the building and property, would have to be expressed contractually and through cross-easements in each of the deeds of conveyance themselves.

The result of a concurrent conveyance would be to create in each grantee an absolute fee ownership in the specified apartment, and an undivided fractional interest as a tenant in common of the base land and all portions of the building where mutual and shared uses and responsibilities are intended. Since, as a tenant in common, each owner may enjoy all of the common estate in the same manner as if he were the sole owner, subject only to similar rights of his other co-tenants (*Prairie Oil and Gas Co.* v. *Allen*, 2 Fed. 2d 566), the difficult problem of separately setting forth each of the required easements has been eliminated. Such rights are present as an incident of the tenance in common estate acquired.

Such a plan should be acceptable to a purchaser of such an apartment once he understands the incidents of a tenancy in common estate, and particularly since it would simplify his ability to sell or encumber the acquired interests. His right, as is the right of other cotenants to use the common property, cannot be capricious or irresponsible. He must use it with the care of an ordinary prudent user of like property and, in the event of injury to the property, he cannot discharge himself of liability by showing that he used the same care that he uses on his separate property, unless that care is at least equal to the care of a prudent man. He may not alter or change the property to the injury of his cotenants and, since their possessory rights are equal, the burden of defraying necessary expenses incident to the common estate, such as repairs, taxes, etc., is one that devolves equally upon all the coowners in proportion of their respective interests (14 Am Jr. Cotenancy).

It is by this procedure of using a deed clearly defining the two distinct parcels and estates to be conveyed that we are now willing and prepared to insure individual units in a condominium. May I say also at this point, that certain lenders are now ready to make individual mortgage loans to condominium apartment purchasers based on an insured fee simple title for each apartment.

In closing, I feel that the condominium concept will open a vast and scarcely touched field to the builder-developer. It will help to satisfy the homeownership desire of a large portion of the public who, presently, because of land speculation, high building costs, and other economic factors are priced out of the market. I refer specifically to young married couples and retired people on a moderate fixed income. I believe the builder who undertakes condominium projects will be doing his community a real service, not only in providing far better land usage in high density areas, but in supplying the means to fulfill a tremendous ownership demand, be it in the $10,000 bracket or in the so-called ultra-luxury type running from $50,000 on up.

M. Stanton Evans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for a while during his swift rising career M. Stanton Evans, who at 26 is editor of one of the Nation's important metropolitan dailies, worked in Washington for Human Events. He has made many friends in the Congress who sincerely respect his ability, integrity, and intelligence. They will be interested in regard the following article concerning him published in the April 1961, issue of the New Guard magazine:

PROFILES IN CONSERVATISM—MERCURY OF THE MIDWEST

(By Carol D. Bauman)

Twenty-six years ago, when Stan Evans was born, the country was in the throes of the great depression. And Stan, along with all the other boys and girls, was taught that the Great Emancipator was not Abraham Lincoln, but Franklin Delano Roosevelt; that the Declaration of Independence did not free us from tyranny, the New Deal did; that there was no national debt, it was owed to ourselves; and that democracy did not mean rule by the people, but government by decree.

M. Stanton Evans, editor, writer, speaker, agitator, and lover of liberty, somehow maintained a sense of incredulity throughout his education, even at Yale. At 26, he is a successful editor of one of the Nation's top metropolitan daily newspapers, the Indianapolis News.

His latest honor comes from the Headliners' Club, a national journalistic society, for consistently outstanding editorial pages.

He was similarly hailed for contributions to Americanism by the Freedoms Foundation, with two awards for editorial writing, one in 1959 and another in 1960. His first book, "Revolt on the Campus," is due for publication in the fall.

A fiery, volatile personality, Stan Evans has been one of the biggest drawing cards for campus forums in recent years. He reminds one of a modern Samuel Johnson, discussing philosophy with eager students far into the night over cups of black coffee. For instance, after an engagement at a large midwestern college, he and his adherents spent most of the night talking politics and world affairs with an admitted Communist. He has probably influenced more students in the field of conservative thinking than he knows, more through personal contact than by his persuasive writing and speaking.

He is best and most fondly remembered by his Washington friends for his 3 years as managing editor of Human Events, the Washington political newsletter which has been the birthplace of many a new career in conservative journalism.

FOUNDING MEMBER

As an undergraduate at Yale, he was a founding member of the Conservative Club, and edited its publication, the Independent. The Calliopean Society was revived in his senior year, and he was the first chairman in its modern form. It had flourished in the 19th century as a Yale debate club, and enjoyed a brief resurrection under William F. Buckley, Jr.

On his graduation from Yale in 1955, Evans made the choice between going with a large corporation, and "saving the coun-

try"—with the result that he plunged into a writing job with the Freeman a month after his graduation. After a short tour of duty as National Review's Louisville editor, Stan joined the staff of Human Events in August 1956.

His prodigious output of literature has graced the Individualist, which he formerly edited. In it he gently chided the National Student Association in an exposé of the student organization's leftist leanings by citing examples of the more obvious misspellings, errors in construction and incorrect syntax in its voluminous publications.

"One gets the idea that if these students spent less time big-wigging and more time studying, they would be making a far greater contribution to education," he wrote.

His wit comes through with distinguished clarity in the occasional book reviews he still does for National Review. Commenting on Marilyn Monroe by Maurice Zolotow, he wrote:

"The marriage of Arthur Miller and Marilyn Monroe was so odd a mixture of libido and liberalism that I have long believed it was invented at an editorial conference of the New York Post."

Though he has retired to the comparative quietude of the Indianapolis News editorial offices, Stan still thrives on the foibles of the opposition. One of his rules for discussing politics with a liberal is to confuse the issue by saying exactly what the liberal thinks the conservative thinks. On Senator McCarthy:

"Personally, I didn't like what McCarthy was trying to do, but I liked his methods." Or,

"I'm not against the principle of Federal Aid to Education, I just think too much education would be dangerous."

But happily for the people of Indianapolis, Stan uses direct, no-nonsense language in his editorials. He leaves no doubt about the issue at hand, and unfailingly supports his Libertarian viewpoint with facts, figures, and cases.

NEW BOOK

In his new book, "Revolt on the Campus," Stan studies the extent of the conservative movement among the Nation's youth. Of this purpose, he says:

"I hope to illustrate not only the scope and power of the conservative movement among young people, but to discuss as well the high intellectual quality of the students and other young people participating in it. The book will have something to say about the philosophical premises of the movement, as well as about its performance in the arena of practical politics.

"When I say the conservative movement is spreading, I don't mean to imply that the majority of the students are conservative. They are not. Most students, I think, are still indifferent to political matters. But the conservative element on the campus is now on the offensive; it is articulate, resourceful, aggressive. It represents the group which, in 15 or 20 years, will be assuming the seats of power in the United States. That is why, in my estimation, it authentically represents the future of the country."

And as one of the Nation's youngest editors, Stan Evans has already begun to assume some of that power and influence. He accepts his position humbly, however, and has not initiated any sweeping changes in News policy.

Eugene Pulliam, recipient of one of YAF's annual awards last month, and owner of the News, knows Stan Evans is a real find for his paper. A conservative, an intelligent (Phi Beta Kappa, cum laude) critic, and a remarkable journalist, Stan's qualities are so well fitted to Pulliam's purposes that he could not resist the desire to hand him the reins of the News, editorially speaking, and say "Godspeed."

Results of Poll Taken in the Sixth Congressional District of Washington State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently mailed questionnaires to 65,000 residents of my congressional district, which includes all of Pierce County and all of Kitsap County with the exception of Bainbridge Island. It contained six questions dealing with issues which the President discussed during the last campaign, and which are now pending before Congress.

The names of the individuals receiving the questionnaires were selected at random from lists which gave no indication of the political leanings of those people. The number of recipients and the number of returns were sufficiently large to give assurance that a good cross section opinion of my constituency would be obtained.

To date there has been a much better than average response, indicating an increased interest on the part of my people in the affairs of Government. I have received thus far responses from 18 percent of the people who received questionnaires. More returns are expected, of course, but a sufficient number have now been received to determine the general views of the people of my area. I am sure that their opinions will be of interest to the other Members of the House.

The results of the poll expressed in terms of percentages are as follows:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Should medical and hospital care for the elderly be provided through the Social Security Act under a plan calling for an increase in the payroll tax?	64	33	3
2. Do you favor legislation which would provide Federal financial assistance to depressed areas at a proposed cost of $390,000,000 per year?	55	33	12
3. Do you approve of Federal financial aid for—			
(a) School construction?	55	41	4
(b) Teachers' salaries?	28	65	7
4. Do you believe Congress should enact legislation increasing the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 per hour and extending its coverage to include several million additional workers?	60	34	6
5. Do you favor new public housing legislation which is anticipated to cost in excess of $1,000,000,000 per year?	31	58	11

A Firsthand Report on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the short-lived Cuban invasion certainly has not been pleasant news for the freedom-loving people of Cuba and the citizens of our own country—the gravity of the issue and the intense concern of our Nation has been shown by the President's series of top-level discussions with the leaders of both parties and by the bipartisan support which all have given the President.

Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt in my mind that a large contributing cause for the defeat of freedom forces in this instance was due to the lack of accurate intelligence information.

This story is an old one and has too often been the case. This was true in Suez, in Hungary, in Laos and certainly appears to be all too true in the case of Cuba.

Our intelligence operations, in my opinion, are ineffective—and a review or reappraisal has long been in order—in fact it is overdue. This review and study must be a thorough one and must spare no effort to pinpoint what is wrong with the CIA—and other intelligence operations—and then establish a more effective intelligence agency for our country and for freedom.

The President has acted wisely in recalling Gen. Maxwell Taylor to active duty and giving him a special assignment of making a survey of the organization and capacity of the United States to deal with subversion, counterespionage and guerrilla warfare. The Attorney General, Mr. Robert F. Kennedy, also has been asked by the President to work on this important reevaluation and study of CIA operations.

While our CIA seemingly cannot get the information on the extent of subversion going on in Cuba, visiting reports seem to be able to see and report the picture.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a report on the details and extent of the Communist takeover in Cuba as reported by Canadian newspaperman, Mr. Eric Greiger and also United States columnist, Mr. Drew Pearson. Excerpts from their articles follow:

A FIRSTHAND REPORT ON CUBA

(By Eric Geiger)

The young official in the Cuban ministry for external affairs shook his head vigorously.

"Anybody who says we are going Communist here is just repeating American propaganda," he said. That was in Havana 2 weeks before the counter-revolutionaries landed.

The same statement was made by more than a score of Government officials whom I questioned about Communist influence in Cuba on my trip there which ended a week before the anti-Castro effort.

And what they said was in complete contrast with what anybody could see there if he has a pair of good eyes.

You don't have to speak Spanish, and you need no guide to see the evidence of Communist infiltration and influence.

All you have to do is stroll through downtown Havana.

It can turn into a frightening experience.

Pictures of Lenin and Khrushchev were prominently displayed in Government-owned store windows; corner newsstands had racks filled with Soviet newspapers and magazines, and there are hundreds of posters proclaiming the friendship between the Cubans and the people of the U.S.S.R., Red China, and other Communist nations.

HAMMER AND SICKLE

The Red hammer and sickle emblem seemed to be almost as prevalent as the picture of bearded Fidel Castro.

Cigar stores were selling lighters with the Communist symbol painted on them, and small boys were running through the streets waving little red flags.

Even more material proof of Castro's close link with the Red world could be found in the waterfront section.

Hundreds of Russian-made military trucks were lined up on the docks, apparently just having been unloaded from ocean vessels.

Warehouse yards were filled to capacity with heavy pieces of all kinds of machinery, the abbreviation CCCP (Soviet Union) clearly visible on some of them.

Near the presidential palace, just off the famed Prada Boulevard, an entire city block has been taken over for a gigantic Communist Chinese exhibition. At night floodlights illuminated a huge sign on top of the building proclaiming the close bond of friendship between the people of Cuba and Communist China.

COMMUNISTS' WREATHS

Large wreaths, bearing the hammer and sickle, have been placed on most of the city's monuments. One such wreath, dedicated by the Communist Workers of Moscow, is at the base of the monument honoring Cuba's national hero, Jose Marti, who led the independence movement in the 19th century.

The ornate lobbies of the big luxury hotels—once the gathering places for international society—are now swarming with somber-looking technicians and "advisors" from Soviet Russia, Red China, North Korea and half a score of satellite countries.

Although none of them is wearing military uniform, many were giving themselves away as military men by their gait and manner.

And then there is the newly established Cuba Institute for the Friendship of All People, an organization whose Communist character is probably more obvious than that of most other Government agencies.

Headed by a young man who hasn't yet reached his 23d birthday the institute operates a luxury hotel for visiting Communists and members of Red front organizations. It maintains a fleet of gleaming U.S.-made limousines for special tours through the country and generally seems to be Cuba's link with Communist and left-wing groups all over the world.

During a 3-hour visit in the institute's big lobby I met a truly international crew of Communists and fellow travelers, all of whom proudly wearing a badge reading "invidado" (guest) which signifies their status as official guests of the Cuban Government.

Some were obviously mere freeloaders who were having a good time posing as sympathizers of the Castro regime, but most of them made no secret of their Communist beliefs.

INVASION OUTLOOK

The invasion of Cuba came as no surprise to the people of the island nation. It had been expected for weeks by Castro followers and foes alike.

When I left Havana a few days before the fuse was lit, the city seemed like a huge powder keg * * * ready to explode any moment.

The sprawling, historic Cuban capital which once attracted fun-loving tourists from all over the world had become a gigantic military camp, bristling with arms and filled with an atmosphere of imminent war * * * and fear.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 20, 1961]

AN ACCIDENTAL VISIT TO SOVIET CUBA

(By Drew Pearson)

To understand why invaders sought to bring the fight for freedom to a quick climax in Cuba, drop in at the Havana Airport. I did so the other day—by accident.

Because of an airline strike, I found myself on an island-hopping KLM plane taking the roundabout way from South America to Miami. The American consul in Maracaibo at first flatly refused to stamp my passport for transit through Havana, but after considerable soul-searching let me go.

The plane carried 30 Russian technicians, also en route to Havana. The Dutch stewardess told me that KLM had carried about 600 of them in the last 2 months. To avoid New York they took the long way around, south to Curacao, then north to Cuba, which has become a virtual Soviet base 90 miles off the cost of Florida.

The Russian passengers were crowded together in tourist class. When American officials travel, they go in private plane at the taxpayers' expense, or first class. One British passenger, riding first class, went forward and struck up a conversation.

"I say," he asked a Russian, "Why don't you dress better? Why do you fellows always look so frumpish?"

"It is true that we don't dress as well as you," was the reply, "but give us time. We have been concentrating on other things."

OTHER THINGS

At Kingston, Jamaica, a British immigration officer stuck his nose in the door to announce: "No passengers from Iron Curtain countries will be allowed to leave the plane."

The rest of us stretched our legs for 30 minutes.

But at Havana it was different. Here the Iron Curtain passengers were given special treatment. They were ushered into the passport office and health office, while the first-class, better-dressed British and Americans waited in line.

At the plane were three Cuban musicians, serenading all the passengers—the standard Castro reception for all incoming planes. The traditional free Bacardi cocktail was also available. Over the facade of the airport in large letters, however, was plastered this challenge to arriving Americans: "Free Cuba in America."

And all over the airport was the usual propaganda so familiar in Communist countries: "Work for your country, not for yourselves," Cubans were reminded. "Get back to the land," the No. 1 Communist of the cabinet, Che Guevara, asked, enlisting cane cutters for the sugar fields.

Most ticket counters for U.S. airlines were closed. Tourist traffic had evaporated. Few passengers were entering Havana, many leaving. Our Dutch plane was delayed 2 hours while Castro's customs inspectors searched the baggage of outgoing Cubans to make sure they took with them none of the articles made scarce by the American embargo—soap, needles, or dollars.

Security in the Havana airport was nil. Any American in transit could have wandered out of the airport to downtown Havana, with no questions asked.

A COMMUNIST BASE

From that brief visit to Havana, I got a feeling of pleasant, philosophical frustration. From other reliable sources who have been able to penetrate into the heart of Cuba, I learned the following:

More than 3,000 Russians, Czech, and Chinese advisers are in Cuba. They operate the oil refineries, advise on sweeping new formulas for Cuban education, give intensive training to the Cuban military. The Cuban army has the most modern arms which the huge Skoda factory in Czechoslovakia can turn out, many of them more up to date than those of the U.S. Army. Some 30,000 tons of Czech and Russian arms lie uncrated in Havana harbor.

About 300 Cuban pilots are also in Czechoslovakia being trained to fly MIG fighters. When they return they will be able to knock any Cuban refugee bombers that venture over Havana out of the sky.

Soviet-bloc cooperation with Cuba has been stepped up to a point where the island is rapidly becoming a bristling Communist military base—which was the reason for the decision of anti-Castro rebels to strike now before Castro grew stronger.

HAVANA-GO-ROUND

Fidel Castro now sleeps in his office, his bodyguard doubled. He is deathly afraid of assassination. His fears may not be unfounded * * * Castro takes more popularity polls of the Cuban people than Dr. Gallup does of an American election. He is constantly reading and worrying over the polls. His popularity has slipped from about 90 percent when he first took office to about 30 percent now * * * Castro will be a tough man to defeat in guerrilla warfare. He understands it. For instance, his troops occupy the high ground, not the valleys and the towns, as did Batista's troops. It's easy to raid down into the valleys, then escape to the hills. Castro's militia occupy the hills.

The School Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, today, we hear much from people who advocate Federal aid to education. They tell us that Federal aid is necessary to provide for needed classrooms and adequate teachers salaries. There are many people who disagree with the proponents of Federal aid to education because they know that without Federal aid some 340,000 classrooms have been added in the past 5 years and over a 10-year period teachers salaries, according to the national average, have increased over 70 percent.

At this time, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Wednesday, April 19, 1961, issue of the Sarasota Herald-Tribune, which quotes facts and figures to buttress the conclusion "that it is hard to see any rational case for Federal educational grants-in-aid." Most interesting of these facts and figures is that at the going rate the States and local government can provide more classrooms within the next 10 years, without Federal aid, than the goal set by the White House Conference of 1955. The editorial follows:

THE SCHOOL BOOM

Without Federal aid, the public school system in the last 5 years added 340,000 schoolrooms, only 29,000 short of the goal set by the White House Conference of 1955. The goal for the next 10 years is 610,000 new classrooms. At the present rate, without Federal aid, 680,000 classrooms will be provided in the decade, exceeding new by 70,000.

Ten years ago, the national average of teachers' salaries was $3,126. It is now $5,389, an increase of 72.4 percent. All State expenditures for schools rose from $6.5 billion to $16.4 billion in the last 10 years. The 1970 forecast of $24 billion is not out of the reach of local authorities, whose bonds have found a ready market at rates lower than the Treasury commands.

These facts and figures were gathered by the Saturday Evening Post from the U.S. Office of Education and the Institute for Social Science Research, Washington. They buttress its conclusion that it is hard to see any rational case for Federal educational grants-in-aid.

Red River's Possibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD B. McSWEEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. McSWEEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Alexandria (La.) Daily Town Talk, Apr. 19, 1961]

RED RIVER'S POSSIBILITIES

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will hold a public hearing in Alexandria Thursday to determine the need for and public sentiment in favor of a thorough study of Red River.

The proposed study would include bank stabilization, channel improvement for navigation, flood control, land conservation, recreational benefits, and water for industrial and commercial use.

This is the sort of comprehensive study that is long overdue. For more than 50 years there have been recommendations for a variety of projects looking toward greater utilization of Red River, but at no time has a survey been made to determine its potentialities and needed improvements covering all uses.

Considerable work has been done in the field of flood control, with the result that flooding along the Red is now negligible by comparison with a generation ago.

But little or nothing has been done to restore water navigation or to improve the quality of the water for industrial use—to name only two neglected areas.

A new wave of interest has been generated by the experiment of a Texas businessman who negotiated the Red at low water last year with a specially built barge and tug. As a result there is a growing number of people along the Red who think navigation on the waterway is feasible.

The need for additional supplies of water for industry and irrigation also has been pointed up in recent years, and threats in the last few days to such recreational areas as Buhlow and Hog lakes have created a new awareness of the need for bank stabilization work along the river.

Certain projects to improve Red River generally are obviously warranted because it is apparent the cost would be low compared with the results.

None can be undertaken, however, until a thorough study has been made to determine what is needed, how it can be accomplished, and what the benefit-to-cost ratio will be.

Accordingly, the Town Talk wholeheartedly supports the proposed comprehensive study of Red River and suggests that all interested individuals and agencies be represented at the hearing in Alexandria tomorrow to add their approval to the proposal.

Sukarno in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in extending the hand of welcome to President Sukarno of Indonesia, who arrived in Washington this morning. He has arrived at a time when sober thinking about our relations with the emerging nations of the world is essential, thinking which must be matched by a seriousness on the part of these nations as well.

Fortunately, President Sukarno is indeed in a sober mood, if we may judge by the speech which he delivered in Los Angeles on April 22 before the Council for World Affairs. I am inclined to believe that he is prepared to pay attention to any suggestions we are willing to make to assist in the solution of the problem of West New Guinea and other issues which face his country and the world. At the same time, he would naturally expect sober appraisal from us about the position which his government maintains on these issues.

In his Los Angeles speech, President Sukarno asked for the active sympathy and the active understanding of our Nation. He asserted that Indonesia understood and appreciated our philosophy, and had been inspired by it.

Coming as he does in this frame of mind, I trust that it will be possible for us to make an effort to learn and to understand the position of the new nations and to see how far we can succeed if we challenge them to demonstrate in practice that they are in fact committed to an active, while independent, foreign policy. Let us hope that we can at the same time give deep consideration to how far we can go in carrying out the sentiments expressed in the excellent editorial in the Washington Post this morning, which said:

There is a constructive opportunity, "to exert independent influence for a long-term solution that will comprehend Indonesian claims but also will protect the rights and autonomy of the Papuan people."

I join with the Washington Post in welcoming Dr. Sukarno and his colleagues with good wishes for a fruitful discussion. I urge my colleagues to read the following Post editorial:

SUKARNO IN WASHINGTON

President Sukarno arrives at a time of critical reappraisal in Washington. The Indonesian chief of state is no stranger to this country, but like other leaders he will want to sample the qualities of the new administration. He also will want to present his own views on such issues as West Irian, China, and policy in southeast Asia.

He will find the Kennedy administration taking a fresh look at the need for change in colonial areas, and eager to understand the attitudes and sensitivities of neutral countries. Relations between the United States and Indonesia have improved considerably from the low point of 3 years ago, thanks in part to the overhaul of certain mistaken American assumptions. But it would be unfortunate to conclude that the secret of good relations is automatic endorsement of the Indonesian position.

Thus on the question of West Irian, Netherlands Foreign Minister Luns learned on his recent visit that, American policy will not be merely a tail to the Dutch kite. But this country could not condone an Indonesian effort to seize West Irian. Rather, the constructive opportunity is to exert independent influence for a long-term solution that will comprehend Indonesian claims but also will protect the rights and autonomy of the Papuan people.

More important from a world standpoint is the problem of Communist advance in Asia and the measures needed to strengthen the independence and internal security of the Asian countries. Perhaps Dr. Sukarno has some ideas on this point. He and his colleagues will be welcomed with good wishes for fruitful discussion.

Israel's Birthday

SPEECH
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a very high privilege indeed for me to join with my very able and distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], in hailing the independence of Israel and extending my heartiest congratulations and best wishes for the future to this inspiring, young nation and its loyal people.

It is most significant that our own great Nation moved with greatest expedition to recognize the new Government of Israel once it was established. It is also both gratifying and satisfying to realize that since that time our Nation and the American people have solidly supported the aspirations of Israel for self-determination, independence, and membership in the society of free nations.

The whole world admires the tenacity of purpose, zeal, loyalty, and great ability which have marked the brief history of the illustrious nation of Israel. Its problems were many, complex, and extremely difficult. At a time when it was faced with welcoming and caring for large numbers of refugees from war-torn lands who had been driven from pillar to post, so to speak and sought escape from persecution and privation, Israel, with superb spirit of confidence, humanity, and generosity, successfully grappled, not only with these challenging problems, but also with a host of other govern-

mental, social, and economic difficulties entailed in setting up a new, sovereign nation.

The unquestionable zeal for independence and the fierce determination to set up a government for its own people which Israel exemplified, speedily won the admiration, unbounded sympathy, confidence, and support of freedom-loving nations throughout the world. There is a great and moving nobility about Israel's impressive experiences in setting up and implementing a government of its own. Through most bitter sacrifice and travail, its leaders and its loyal people unselfishly labored to achieve their noble ends, and in the intervening years have given truly an unprecedented example of what practical idealism, talented, inspired leadership and dedication can achieve when they are combined with devotion to principles of freedom, are sparked with an indomitable will and are conducted and implemented by highest ambition, purposeful initiative, hard, ungrudging work, and a never-say-die spirit.

The Jews of the world, and especially the Jews of America, who so doggedly and generously moved to support this great experiment in free government are entitled to greatest credit; first, for their heartwarming loyalty to their own people; secondly, for their almost incredible generosity, and finally, for the outstanding, spirited encouragement they have furnished to the gallant leaders and noble people of Israel, a people so determined to establish a homeland and sovereign government of their own where compassion for the afflicted might bind up the wounds of war and persecution and where freedom, in all its brightness and beneficent effects upon the human soul, might dwell.

I am sure that the spirit of dedication and unselfishness which has contributed so greatly to the establishment of Israel will continue to fire its magnificent people with zeal and high purpose, and enable this intrepid, young state to solve its problems and develop its free institutions under the guidance and protection of a constitutional system of government, founded on liberty and consecrated to human freedom. May the good Lord bestow his richest blessings upon the great nation and inspired people of Israel.

Welcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE M. KILGORE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, a great portion of the district I represent, the 15th District of Texas, borders our southern boundary.

The residents in my district operate their own good neighbor relations program very efficiently. One of the recent exhibitions of this border friendliness was an international spring fiesta held by the cities of McAllen, Tex., and Reynosa, Tamaulipas, Mexico, on March 2–5.

So that all can see the response such an event secured from the sister Republic, I am entering below a copy of a translation of a newspaper article which appeared in the March 4 issue of El Manana, the Reynosa, Mexico, daily newspaper:

WELCOME

We are celebrating and for a good reason. This day will visit us the most prominent citizens of the valley of Texas and our neighbor, McAllen, in a caravan of good will which we appreciate very much.

Mexico, with its traditional hospitality, opens its arms today, through Reynosa, window of our country, in order to welcome our neighbors, better said, our friends.

This embassy of friendship, we esteem with all truthfulness because we know that we are being visited by our sister city in the spirit of progress, and in the constant anxiety of cooperation because it serves as an example to other cities to follow the same pattern, to be each day better neighbors and better friends.

We will not be able to offer much during your visit because Reynosa is a young city in progress material, but in spite of our defective neighborhoods, we offer you a sincere heart, always open to benefit mankind; we open our arms because in them fit all men of good will and because we know that your visit will strengthen even more the spiritual and material ties that bind us since a long time ago.

We hope that you will enjoy your visit as much as we will enjoy having you visit us and if we cannot leave a pleasant impression with you as a result of our defective materials noticed by everyone, we do desire with all our hearts that you take the life memory that in Reynosa, you not only have a friend and neighbor, but a city that wants, as well as all North Americans, agreement between men, based upon the solid ground that establishes the successful progress of cities.

Welcome, friends from the valley of Texas; when you return home, we ask that you give our warm regards to all who could not be with us today and also the assurance that while they participate with us in the policy of good neighborhood, they will not find another friend more faithful than Reynosa and Mexico.

The Advantages of Building With Condominium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEM MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Home Builders of the Greater East Bay are leading the way in an understanding of what condominium building is, and why it constitutes a step forward in better and cheaper housing under private enterprise for low-income families. I follow here with the speech of Lester Burdett, Jr., vice president of Alcan Pacific Co. at the Western Rental Housing Conference, a truly outstanding contribution to understanding of this new approach to housing:

The condominium law, established by the Romans in the sixth century, B.C., provided for joint sovereignty, or joint ownership, of property.

The law specifically provided for individual ownership of a given part of a communally held structure and land.

Under the condominium plan, housing has been built in Latin America, including Puerto Rico and, particularly, Brazil.

Condominium, however, differs from the cooperative procedure in that dwelling units can be sold, rented, or mortgaged by their owners independently. There is generally a requirement, however, that cotenants be given a priority.

In a cooperative, tenants pay their share of interest and amortization on a single blanket mortgage. In a condominium, there is a separate mortgage for each housing unit.

Before going into specific aspects of condominium, I would like to quote the definition given to these vertical subdivisions by the Congressional Committee which studied the Puerto Rican projects: "Condominium is the individual ownership of single units in a multiunit structure, with common ownership of halls, stairs, elevators, lobbies, driveways, etc. Condominium may be bought, sold, mortgaged, and are taxed separately. Each owner's property is liable only for his own mortgage debt. Another's default does not endanger his interests."

To better illustrate what we are dealing with let me review the three basic types of cooperative.

First. The traditional co-op where the owner purchases stock and is a shareholder in the entire project whether it be a high-rise building or a community of separated houses. Due to his stock interest, he has a corresponding vote in the management. The stock purchase generally entitles the stockholder to a long-term renewable proprietary lease. Hence his only real estate interest is a leasehold.

Second. The tenancy-in-common type of co-op wherein the purchaser by deed gets merely an undivided interest in the whole with the right to occupy a particular unit. For example, if there were 25 apartments, he would get a one-twenty-fifth interest in the whole, including common areas, parking facilities, utilities, etc.

Third. The condominium wherein the purchaser by deed gets a fee title to his unit and a joint ownership of the common areas and the ground underneath.

Mr. Moffett will more clearly define the property descriptions and what is meant by common areas. For our purposes let us consider that the owner has a fee title to his apartment or individual house. Incidentally, the condominium is used extensively in Latin American countries for commercial buildings. While visiting Mexico City recently I had the pleasure of discussing this type of commercial financing with both owners and developers and found enthusiastic approval on both sides.

What are the advantages of a condominium to a developer?

Anyone who has ever tried to put together a stock ownership cooperative in an area where the concept is not too well known will immediately recognize that the condominium is the answer to your prayers. About 18 months ago my company, Alcan Pacific Co., started to organize and plan a stock ownership co-op for senior citizens in Carmel Valley, Calif., known as Hacienda Carmel. There are 300 apartments with extensive community facilities on 40 acres of land. From the very outset I had educational, legal, and financing problems.

Let's look into these and see if the condominium may help to solve them. In the first place, with respect to the educational difficulties—starting with the planning commissions and the citizen's advisory commit-

tees under them—I discovered almost a total ignorance of any of the fundamentals of cooperative ownership. These good citizens were wary and, indeed, a little suspicious. Hence, it required months of explaining and illustrating what we were trying to do. Surprisingly enough, I discovered this same reaction among many lenders. Today, however, much of this education problem has been taken care of by the initiation and construction of a great number of stock ownership co-ops, at least in this northern California area. This program will necessarily inure to the advantage of those considering the condominium since you are offering them something much more attractive, but still the basic concept of community ownership and living.

The legal problems will still exist but perhaps will not be quite as complex since you may not be operating under the jurisdiction of the Corporations Commisisoner and the Security Exchange Commission. You will be selling real estate interests, something we are all accustomed to living with, rather than securities through securities brokers and agents, something we are not accustomed to working with. Incidentally, those of us who have worked with a stock ownership co-op not registered with the SEC and hence limited to offering within the State to bon fide residents, will have the door opened to interstate sales.

Financing: Here is perhaps the greatest advantage in the use of the condominium. Many lenders would not lend on a stock ownership co-op because of the foreclosure problems, i.e., foreclosing on the entire building or project because of the default of one or a small group of owners. The condominium eliminates this problem in that the units are individually owned in fee with an insured title. The lender therefore will be making a series of individual loans and the aforementioned foreclosure problem eliminated.

What are the advantages to the lender?

The advent of the condominium will open the door for lending institutions to a much broader field. Consider a rental apartment of 300 units—one loan perhaps of several million. This is beyond the legal capacity of many lenders. But these same lenders will be able to handle the smaller individual loans directly with the buyer.

What are the advantages to title companies?

Mr. Moffett will consider this matter, but suffice it to say here that the title companies should be happy to have 300 policies on this same apartment where in the past it would amount to only 1.

What are the advantages to the buyer?

In this area the condominium offers virtually the same tax and interest deduction benefits as other types of cooperatives. But your average buyer can understand and appreciate a fee title to his home a lot better and easier than he can a number of shares of stock in a corporation and long-term lease on his home.

To quote Jay McIver in his article in California Builder, November 1960, "Absence of mutual risk spells out the vital difference between the conventional stock corporation co-op, and homeownership in fee. The ever-present danger of default by one or more partners in the stock enterprise deters many buyers from taking the plunge into cooperative ownership. Still remembered vividly are the depression failures of the past. There is also an important psychological principal involved. Basically the stock corporation co-op is a rental concept. Psychologically it does not convey to its prospective shareholders any strong sense of individual homeownership."

What are some of the problems we can anticipate?

You can be sure there will be some difficulty with planning commissions, boards of supervisors, and perhaps with tax assessors. In the case of the latter they will be asked to levy and collect taxes on an apartment individually, rather than on the building. There doesn't appear to be any legal reason why this can't be done, at least in California. But local assessors may hesitate to assume this new concept and added workload without specific affirmative authority from the State legislature.

There may be temporary problems with lenders in some cases until the condominium is better understood and accepted locally and on a national level.

Will there be buyer education needed? Yes, of course, but I believe that by keeping this as simple as possible and not scaring the buyer with a lot of legal phraseology the newness will wear off and the general concept enthusiastically received.

Probably the greatest assist we are going to get in education and financing of the condominium is FHA authorization to insure loans on individual units in a condominium. The legislation has been drafted, hearings have been held on Capitol Hill, and there seems to be positive assurance that before this session of Congress is over FHA will have the necessary authority to insure these loans.

Some of the groups behind the move to obtain FHA insurance of condominium are NAHB, the National Real Estate Board, the State Home Builders Council, the California Real Estate Association, realtor groups and title insurance companies. I might add the names of two individuals to these groups: Mr. Don Stone of Stone & Schulte, and your own treasurer, John H. Tolan, Jr., of Barrett Homes Division of Barrett Construction Co.

This array of talent is actively working to obtain FHA insurance because of its impact on large scale financing of condominium. But what of conventional or private condominium financing? Is there any reason why it can't be done now without waiting for enabling legislation for FHA insurance? I say the answer is "No." If a title company is prepared to insure a fee simple deed on each apartment and a lending institution will make individual mortgage loans to prospective apartment purchasers, I see no obstacle to starting a condominium project now, providing construction money has been arranged.

In closing, I can't emphasize too strongly the need for education of public officials, lenders, title companies and the buying public in the overall condominium concept. A good public presentation on a national basis is mandatory. In this area the HHFA, FHA, and NAHB, and real estate boards can be of immeasurable help.

Anniversary of Israel's Independence

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the people of Israel and all her friends in America and elsewhere are today celebrating the 13th anniversary of Israel's establishment as a free, independent, and democratic State. It was only yesterday, it seems, that we witnessed the historical events associated with the rebirth of Israel to statehood—and now we suddenly realize that 13 years have passed since then.

Whatever trepidation or concern we may have had in this country for the welfare of Israel when it was born 13 years ago in the face of armed aggression by its Arab neighbors, we know today that its survival is firmly rooted in the strength of its ever-growing population and in the unflagging support that Israel is getting from the multitude of friends it has in the United States.

In these 13 years Israel has demonstrated to the world not only its significance to the life of the Jewish people, but it has also provided a shining example of what a determined people can do when the love of freedom, the desire for national rebirth, and the instinct for social justice inspire its aims and its efforts. This Israel accomplished not by the force of arms, but by its advancement in the fields of agriculture, industry, science, education, and other phases of its national activity.

Today Israel enjoys the admiration and good will of many nations and millions of individuals the world over who value Israel's friendship and its achievements. I am particularly pleased that the Government and the people of the United States enjoy the most cordial relations with Israel and are cooperating in many spheres of human endeavor for the welfare of all mankind and the peace of the world. I am pleased to note also that President Kennedy has always shown a positive interest in Israel and that this will lead to greater cooperation between our two countries in the future.

On this great anniversary, I extend my best wishes to the people of Israel, to its capable leaders, and to the Jews of America who have a major share in Israel's success. May we all soon achieve lasting peace in the world, as is prophesied in the Bible.

Are We Ready?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the House of Representatives again amended the Social Security Act; and while 400 Members of the House supported these amendments on a roll-call vote, I was 1 of the 14 Members opposing the bill, not because it did not incorporate some good features but because there were several objectionable ones to which I cannot subscribe.

In the first place, when life expectancy is increasing at the rate it is, I see no good grounds for cutting back or reducing the age of retirement as was done in this bill and wonder how long we can go on increasing taxes before reaching the point of diminishing return. The day of reckoning will come when those who want to promise the electorate an increased benefit every 2 years will have to face up to the facts of life.

Last Friday, April 21, my very good friend, Mr. Robert W. Leu himself a chartered life underwriter, delivered an address on social security to the Peoria Association of Life Underwriters in which he made some very cogent remarks which I believe deserve the serious consideration of not only you, my colleagues, but also the American public in general. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Leu's address in its entirety at this point in the RECORD:

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS ON SOCIAL SECURITY TO PEORIA ASSOCIATION OF LIFE UNDERWRITERS

(By Robert W. Leu)

Mr. Chairman, I consider it more of an honor to speak to my own local association than almost any other life insurance group I have addressed, for the Peoria Life Underwriters Association has produced some of the real leaders of the life insurance industry.

In the area of community service, also, we find a number of members of this association providing devoted leadership in a variety of worthwhile causes. This is, in truth, an association of which we can be, and should be, justly proud.

I am here today to ask the serious question "Are we ready?" to see that the social security program of our Federal Government is kept in its proper place in the American way of life.

To say that we have come a long way in 25 years of social security in these United States is perhaps the understatement of the year. We can hardly recognize the rather modest act of 1936 in terms of present day taxes and payments and yet I feel the same basic concepts should apply today as they did 25 years ago.

The social security system was designed in 1936 to pay monthly benefits to people who, because of age, could no longer support themselves by working. These payments were intended to be sufficient to provide the aged people in our society with a "floor of protection" against the hazard of old-age security.

In 1939 payments to survivors of family breadwinners who die prematurely were authorized.

Thus, the basic concept of social security was to assure, through a system of compulsory taxes and payments, a "floor of protection" for retired workers and survivors of family breadwinners.

Let us see what has happened to this basic floor of protection. When I entered the life insurance business 21 years ago the maximum survivor benefit under social security to a widow with 2 children was $65 per month. One of the great tragedies of our generation is that we have allowed inflation to erode the purchasing power of the dollar. Thus, we will have to agree the value of the dollar has depreciated approximately 55 percent since that time. Therefore, if our basic $65 figure is adjusted for inflation we find the figure should now be $144 per month.

But what is the maximum benefit today for a widow and two children? Two hundred and fifty-four dollars per month.

We must stand fast for the principle that social security should only funish a basic floor of protection; with individual, voluntary initiative relied upon to furnish the balance of the financial security.

But now who has arrived on the scene in our Nation's Capital to lead the welfare planners as the new Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare? None other than Prof. Wilbur J. Cohen from the University of Michigan, whom you will recall headed President Kennedy's so-called task force on health and security. Even though, as we have seen, benefits are now well above the original floor-of-protection level, Professor Cohen has repeatedly expressed the view since arriving in Washington that social security benefits should be increased another 40 to 50 percent—apart from adjustments that might be needed to offset any future inflation.

Now, my friends, are we ready to face the really big question?

Who pays for these social security benefits? We life insurance men, who represent the soundest financial institution yet created in the free enterprise system, need to remind the American people of one fundamental truth—Government cannot create anything. Let it be remembered that for every benefit paid there must be a tax to pay for that benefit.

It is most unfortunate that most of the discussions in Congress concerning social security relate only to the benefit side of the social security coin. We must insist that our representatives in Washington also examine the other side of the coin—the cost side.

Social security is not a one-way street. Therefore, discussions in Congress should give equal recognition to the heavy burden of tax as well as to benefit payments. The overwhelming majority of the citizens of the United States are not aware that present laws provide for the social security tax rate to rise to 9 percent by 1970. By that year social security tax collections will rise from the present $12 billion level to $21½ billion. We life underwriters need to remind the American people of the heavy social security tax which is already the law of the land.

If you will consult the actuaries at your home offices they will tell you that benefits for new employees, equal to social security benefits as they now stand, can be provided through private plans at a cost lower than the combined employer-employee taxes (9 percent beginning in 1970).

The present decade is often refererd to as the "soaring-sixties," although to date the business world has done very little soaring. By 1970 when Americans feel the full heat of social security taxes I suspect the next decade may well be known as the searing seventies.

I believe we life underwriters have another responsibility in helping our friends and neighbors to understand social security. Simply stated—"social security is not insurance." Over and over in the Halls of Congress the word "insurance" keeps cropping up in speeches and committee hearings on social security.

The truth is social security carries no "rights" to anything except what Congress may, from time to time, grant as benefits. The contributions to social security by both employee and employer are not "insurance premiums," they are a tax, pure and simple.

For the record, the Supreme Court, in a little noted decision on June 20, 1960, ruled finally on this question which has irked some of us insurance men for many years. Social security is not insurance, said the Court. You'll be interested to know that in a brief to the Supreme Court Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Flemming said social security "is not a federally administered insurance program." "The contribution exacted," he went on, "is a true tax. It is not comparable to an insurance premium."

Albert C. Adams of Philadelphia, past president of our National Association of Life Underwriters and chairman since 1952 of the association's social security committee, has long been a leader in the fight to insist that the Government stop the improper use of language in referring to the social security program, and he has redoubled his efforts in the light of the Supreme Court's clear decision.

"In the business community," he says, "truth in advertising is enforced to permit the public fairly to make up its collective mind as to the wisdom of patronizing the advertiser."

"In governmental matters, truth in advertising will likewise permit the public fairly to make up its mind as to the wisdom of retaining or expanding, or restricting existing legislation. It is as patently unfair for a governmental agency to expand on the basis of false and misleading advertising as it is for a business competitor to expand on the same sort of misrepresentations" concludes Mr. Adams.

There is no longer any excuse for Senators, Congressmen, or bureaucrats to speak so loosely as to refer to social security as insurance.

Our distinguished Representative in Congress, the Honorable ROBERT MICHEL, said to me just 2 weeks ago that he feels we life insurance men must take the lead in explaining the true picture of social security to the American people.

It seems to me this is an important and a grave responsibility. My fellow life underwriters, "are we ready?"

San Francisco Youth Association Celebrates Its 15th Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention and to the attention of my fellow colleagues an article that appeared recently in the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, relative to the 15th anniversary of the San Francisco Youth Association.

I have followed the activities of the San Francisco Youth Association for many years. I am well aware of the civic contributions made by the high school young people as delegates to the youth association, under the untiring guidance of its able executive director, Mr. Tom Rowe.

The San Francisco Youth Association is a citywide youth council, representing 26,000 high school students, with elected delegates from 47 high schools and youth-serving agencies. During its 15-year history the high school young people have carried out worthwhile projects of significance in the field of international understanding, as well as initiating projects for the civic betterment of San Francisco.

Among the projects undertaken in the field of foreign affairs has been a consistent support of the United Nations, the collection of textbooks and seeds for the Philippines, exchange of program materials with youth councils of southern Ceylon, Indonesia, and South Korea, and, active participation in the San Francisco-Osaka sister-city program.

During the past election, the San Francisco Youth Association initiated a project, entitled "Youth in Politics," and assisted in the recruitment of nearly 2,000 high school students who actively participated in the presidential campaign.

The former Presidents discussed in this article exemplifies the leadership potential to be found among the delegates to the San Francisco Youth Association.

But to commend the present delegates and their predecessors alone is to leave the reason for the success story of the San Francisco Youth Association but partly told. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to note the members of the adult advisory council of the San Francisco Youth Association. I believe I may safely say their unselfish work on the council is but a reflection of their individual concern with civic betterment in San Francisco.

The present members are: Mrs. Harriett Alden, Mr. Emil Anderson, Mr. William Becker, Mrs. R. E. Brennan, Mrs. William Brinton, Mrs. Richard S. Cahn (secretary), Judge Melvyn I. Cronin, Mr. E. R. Duncan, Rev. John T. Foudy, Miss Ruth Franklin, Dr. Joseph Hill, Mr. Donald Hofdendahl, Mr. James Kearney, Mr. Daniel E. Koshland (co-chairman), Mrs. Harry Krytzer, Mrs. James Lang, Mrs. Robert Lauter, Miss Mary Lins, Mr. Carl Livingston, Jr., Mrs. Thomas Lynch, Mr. Ray Milton, Dr. James Morena, Mrs. Polly Mosby, Mr. Edgar Osgood, Mrs. Tony Patch, Mr. Melvin Peterson, Mr. Maurice Powers, Rev. James E. Prindeville, Mrs. A. Boyd Puccinelli, Rev. Francis Quinn, Mr. Earl Raab, Mr. Neville Rich, Sr., Robert John L. Roberts, Mr. Robert Simcock, Mrs. Ward Miller Smith, Mr. William Solari, Jr., Mr. Roy Sorenson, Mr. James Wyatt, Mr. Stephen Zellerbach (chairman), and Mr. Herman Zischke (treasurer).

Under leave heretofore granted, I include the following article from the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin:

YOUTH ASSOCIATION WELL REMEMBERED ON 15TH ANNIVERSARY

Ten to fifteen years ago, they were five teenagers—four boys and a girl—and they had one thing in common: Each was a president of the San Francisco Youth Association (SFYA).

Today they are: A minister in Pittsburg, Calif.; an administrative secretary in Geneva, Switzerland; a professor of medieval history at Bryn Mawr College; and two accountants in San Francisco.

And all remember with warmth their experiences in the youth association, which is celebrating its 15th anniversary during the coming week.

"A fine training ground," says the Reverend Richard Roe, the organization's first 1946 president, who is now minister of the Pittsburg Congregational Community Church.

"She mentions it frequently," says Mrs. W. B. Baquie, whose daughter, Sylvia, was 1949 SFYA president.

"Sylvia is in Geneva now, and we've half expected she'd start a similar youth organization over there."

The others—David Herlihy, 1947; John Schultz, 1948, and Robert Lovejoy, 1950—are equally enthusiastic.

"They are," says Tom Rowe, executive director of SYFA, "a fine group, a credit to the organization. There is definite relationship between the association and the caliber of its graduates."

The caliber, as indicated by an anniversary check of the first five presidents, is outstanding.

Reverend Roe, a George Washington High School student during his SFYA days, went on to the University of California and the Pacific School of Religion.

He met his wife, Gerri, while a student. They have three children. Two years ago the pair directed a Palo Alto college group in community work and last year did a similar job in Holland.

Herlihy, the Bryn Mawr professor, is a graduate of St. Ignatius High School who won a scholarship to the University of San Francisco. He earned his master's degree in history at Catholic University, and his doctorate at Yale—also on scholarships.

Widely known as an expert in medieval history, Herlihy has written extensively for historical journals, and spent a year in Italy on a Fulbright fellowship.

That's a fair match for the Guggenheim award his wife, the former Patricia McGahey, has received. She will take her own doctoral degree next month.

Miss Baquie, another George Washington alumnus, is strongly remembered by Rowe for her interest in world affairs during her SFYA days.

It flowered after her graduation from the University of California with a major in international relations. She served 2 years with a vitally important, but secret, Government agency; transferred to the United Nations and went to Geneva, and while in Switzerland became an executive of the Joint Distribution Committee engaged in the resettlement of Jewish refugees.

"Just last week," her mother reports, "Sylvia accepted the position of administrative secretary with an investment company in Geneva."

Schultz, a graduate of Sacred Heart High School, and Lovejoy, a former Mission high student, have had remarkably parallel careers in some respects.

Both were graduated from University of San Francisco, both saw Army service in this country, both are accountants, and both the father of two children.

Schultz, of 105 Forest Side Avenue, is with the Shell Chemical Corp. here, and is active in encouragement of music and the arts.

Lovejoy, of 3900 22d Street, is with Arthur Andersen and Co., has been a strong supporter of boys' clubs and is currently active in Republican county politics.

Basic Aims of the National Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital played host to 2,500 Farmers Union members from across the country when the 59th annual meeting of the National Farmers Union was held here March 11–16. During that convention, the farm delegates approved a 1961 policy statement that includes the basic aims of this organization. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include those aims in the RECORD.

FARMERS UNION FOUNDED ON UNDERSTANDING OF GOD AND NATURE

The basic aims of National Farmers Union are founded on our understanding of God and nature. We live close to nature. Our livelihood depends on it and requires its understanding. Observation of nature compels respect for the dignity of the individual human being. We are convinced of the truth and rightness of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, its Bill of Rights and other amendments. We are opposed to the principles and practices of communism, fascism, and all other forms of dictatorship.

A. INHERENT HUMAN RIGHTS

All men are created equal, important in their own right, without distinction, or discrimination.

1. Freedom of expression: Freedom of thought, speech, radio, television, press, the secret ballot, religion, assembly to organize, and to petition the Government for redress of grievances must be expanded.

2. Equality of opportunity: Each person has a right to an equal opportunity to become educated, to choose his own way of living, to earn, spend, save, invest and own property, and to make his working and saving efforts and his property count for the benefit of himself and his family toward the attainment of their aspirations to the extent of his ability to do so without encroaching upon the equal opportunity of others.

3. Adequate standards: No person should be compelled by circumstances beyond his control to fall below an adequate standard of living.

B. THE FAMILY IS BASIC

The family unit of human society should be preserved and strengthened.

C. DEMOCRACY IS ESSENTIAL

It is our abiding determination to preserve and further improve the democratic nature of our governments. We believe in government by law, not by men outside the law. The inherent rights of man can be attained and protected only in a self-determining, self-restrained democracy. Government, the one cooperative endeavor embracing us all, is needed to protect the rights of expression, to insure equality of opportunity and to perform such service as can be performed more efficiently by people as a whole, rather than as individuals, cooperative business activities or other private groups.

1. Equal voice: Democracy should give each person an equal right to take part in making governmental decisions personally and through representatives of his own selection. All the people should have a voice in determining our laws and selecting the leaders of government under which they live. Each person is the best judge of his own best interests.

2. Responsive government: Democratic government is the only form of government through which the people by peaceful means can maintain freedom of expression and equality of opportunity. The checks and balances, the division of governmental powers, are necessary to the preservation of responsive representative government. By such means, we protect the rights of minorities, guard against the development of a totalitarian or despotic elite, and prevent the concentration of economic and political power in a few hands, thereby preserving the opportunity of our people to retain their rights and freedom.

3. Citizenship: We pledge the devotion of our energies and resources toward assuming the full citizenship responsibilities involved in the exercise of our democratic rights.

D. WORLD AFFAIRS AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

The foregoing principles have universal application; these are aims which reflect the aspirations of people everywhere. Farmers Union will continue to strive for the earliest possible attainment of a democratic world brotherhood of nations, operated on principles consistent with our Constitution and the Bill of Rights, living at peace with one another in a United Nations that derives its powers directly from the people of the world

and provides the basis and opportunity for constantly increased production and improved living standards. United States should in cooperation with other nations of the free world and within limits of our economic ability assist in expansion and strengthening of the productive capacity and living standards of people of other nations in ways that will help them move toward democratic forms of national government and ultimately a democratic world brotherhood of nations. Abundant U.S. food production can play a great, important and decisive role in the implementation of these policies.

E. EXPANDING ECONOMY OF ABUNDANCE

Continuously expanding national and world economies of ever greater abundance are essential to the improvement and extension of representative democracy and to the ultimate attainment of permanent world peace with justice.

F. THE LAND

The soil, water, forest, and other natural resources of the Nation should be used and conserved in a manner to pass these resources on undiminished to future generations.

G. FAMILY FARMING

Farm families on family farms are an essential balancing force in the social and political structure. They are vital to the stability of representative democratic government, to an efficient and productive economic system, and to a satisfying world society. On the family farm, the business and home are one. The family is owner of capital, borrower of funds and accumulator of savings, manager of home and business and the major source of labor. The child grows up with opportunity for well-rounded knowledge of nature, family, business and life. He learns the meaning of ownership and the security of a home. Grave danger to democratic institutions would result if we allow our entire population, including agriculture and small business, to become divided into separate groups of owners, managers, financiers, and workers.

H. PARITY FARM INCOME

Farm families have the right to earn and receive income from their work, management and property ownership equivalent to that earned and received by people in other walks of life from similar productive work and resources.

I. ENRICHED NEIGHBORHOODS AND COMMUNITIES

Successful rural family living depends upon the existence of strong rural neighborhoods and communities. To build these requires the development in rural areas of adequate cultural centers including: stronger churches and other religious centers; improved local governments; better schools; provisions for local discussion forums for all citizens; rural libraries and art centers and healthful rural recreation centers.

J. COOPERATIVES

Farm cooperatives and other patron-owned forms of private corporate business organizations are a stabilizing factor in our free enterprise society.

Cooperatives also play a uniquely significant role in maintenance and promotion of democratic processes.

We pledge our continued support for such cooperative business organizations in recognition of their important contribution toward the strengthening of the economic position of agriculture and other segments of our economy.

K. FARMERS UNION

Farm people need and have a right to set up and operate their own organizations to provide for themselves informational and educational services, to serve as a channel through which the right to petition government may be exercised and through which farmers can organize, develop and expand needed farmer-owned cooperative business institutions.

In this 60th year of National Farmers Union, each State, county and local union should make a concerted effort to expand and strengthen Farmers Union as the farmers' farm organization.

L. SUMMARY

We seek an agriculture of farm families on family farms, prosperous, efficient, masters of themselves, good stewards of the soil they till, standing on their own feet and seeking nothing of any man or government except a fair and equal chance to use their abilities to the fullest in their own behalf as useful members of a democratic society. We seek a like opportunity in life for our fellow man, both within our own country and in other lands. These aims can best be attained through combined individual and cooperative private action with and under programs of democratic government.

Is This the College for You?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in the May issue of Ingenue magazine, there is an article focusing on Mills College. This college is a great educational institution with an outstanding faculty, and a very successful alumnae to attest to the quality of educational opportunities offered.

I am very proud of Mills College and I am pleased to incorporate this article in the RECORD for the interest of my colleagues:

IS THIS THE COLLEGE FOR YOU?

Where would you like to locate? There's a new enthusiasm among students to switch coasts when it comes to choosing a college. This gives them a chance to see and know the country as a whole. It gives each individual a sense of freedom and a pioneer feeling of exploration to be on her own far from home.

This college is close to a colorful, cosmopolitan and friendly city that offers an additional polish to the learning acquired in class. It is an amazing blend of healthy naturalness and genuine sophistication which makes for good development.

It began way back in 1852, as a young ladies' seminary and became one of our earliest women's colleges in 1885, under the guidance of its president, a Williams graduate, and his wife from Mount Holyoke.

What type of college? This women's college believes in stimulating female thinking to the best of its particular abilities and might be for you if you believe in a liberal education as a solid background for living, not particularly a means to a livelihood. It promises intellectual, not economic security, although there is no question that it pays off. With a predominantly masculine faculty, many of whom are noted scholars, musicians, artists, you are exposed to the most valuable sort of teaching. (Pierre Salinger and Dean Rusk, prominent in the Kennedy administration, are former faculty members.)

Do you want a small college? Here, friendliness and informality touches every aspect of college life. In small classes with lots of individual attention, you can feel that you are a growing person. In one of the 5 dormitories with about 120 girls, you easily find your place among groups of friends.

There are no cliques, no barriers to friendships. There are no sororities—no need for them. You get to know the faculty (1 professor to ever 12 students) and the student body, and feel close to all. Current enrollment: 691 undergraduates, 63 graduates. This college states, "Ours is not an education just for information or an education just for skills, but an education for insight, which presupposes both knowledge and skills but is more difficult." Think about this statement. It can be an inspiration.

Have you a talent, a field? Perhaps you're one of those lucky girls with a burning interest in science or an urge to write, dance, paint. Here you'll have a chance to dig deeply into your subject, and to use your knowledge creatively.

If you have no field as yet, the requirements will put you on your academic track. You can't fail to find your special subject by the time you have sampled the necessary courses—English, a foreign language, a fine arts course, a natural science, a course in the humanities and physical education. You'll find your way.

WHAT ABOUT DATES, FUN, SOCIAL LIFE

This small college is surrounded by nearby large universities and men's colleges. There are many introductory mixers, proms, play productions and such. There are coffee, library and dinner dates. There are events at the other colleges, and there are the endless possibilities for fun in a nearby city—everything from a cable car ride to an opening night at the opera.

Extra-curricular activities include tennis, riding, golf, swimming or skiing at the college's own chalet-type lodge in the High Sierras. You can join campus clubs with specialized sports, social and intellectual interests, work on the paper or participate in student government work. This is one of those rare instances where the government actually is of, by and for the student body.

DOES A BEAUTIFUL CAMPUS APPEAL?

This campus is a dream—136 acres, handsomely wooded, wonderfully landscaped. White buildings, many of Spanish stucco with red tile roofs, suit the setting to perfection. Paths are banked with "lush" shrubs and trees. Year round, it is a place of beauty in a moderate climate with brilliant skies and "winey" air.

WHAT ABOUT CLOTHES?

Simple. Cotton skirts and blouses by day in the warm weather of fall and spring; cardigans or jackets early or late in the day. Skirts and sweaters for day in cooler months. Slacks or shorts are worn in some labs and on picnics. A raincoat is a must. You should have dark, not too high heels for the city. (It's really hilly). You'll also want a hat for city and chapel wear. You'll need wool dresses for informal dates and Wednesday dinners, a short formal, and cocktail-type dresses for dances, fraternity parties and such. Oh yes, you'll need a white dress to celebrate Founder's Day, and other traditional events. Clue: Gals in this section of the country wear thin angora socks to match sweaters and roll them to the ankles above white bucks. Sloppiness is out. This in contrast to easterners who wear heavy white socks with their sneakers.

AND MONEY?

Since this is a small independent college for women, you may expect that expenses will not be small as in some State-supported universities. But there are many available scholarships worth investigating. The average basic resident student fees per year total $2,300. Students say that an allowance of $25 to $50 per month is usual.

"CAMPUSLANG"

"Bent twig"—a student with an alumna relative; "Hey Day"—a big campus cleanup day followed by picnic and stunts; "Zippers"—those old hands who introduce new students to college life; "Cap Hunt"—when sophomores try to find hidden freshman caps; "Midwinter Formal"—in a city ballroom or country club; "Spring Weekend"—the biggest social event of the year; "Pearl M"—the pearl set pin worn by seniors and graduates; "the Oval"—an open, tree-lined lawn.

Approves President Kennedy's Actions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram sent by James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union to President Kennedy, which is as follows:

APRIL 21, 1961.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In behalf of the 750,000 Americans who belong to National Farmers Union I wish to thank you and congratulate you on speaking out as firmly as you did regarding the Cuban crisis. Your address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors is indeed a historic statement. You deserve the overwhelming support of the American people in this matter.

We fully appreciate your call for a sense of urgency. As you very well said, "The message of Cuba, of Laos, of the rising din of Communist voices in Asia and Latin America—these messages are all the same." As president of National Farmers Union I have seen this same message in many parts of the world where I have been. We wholeheartedly support you and will live daringly up to the challenge you have issued. We must move in every possible direction to halt and roll back the tide of worldwide totalitarian communism.

We, of course, agree that America must have a powerful shield of armament but this struggle will not be won with nuclear weapons, rockets and tanks. The struggle is going to be won, and I believe the free nations of the world will win it, in the rice paddies, the wheat fields, and in the hearts and minds of men.

The Cuban crisis should reassure you and all of us that we have been right in calling for all-out use of food for peace. We have been right for years in urging that everything possible be done to raise the standard of living and the hopes of the landless and starving people of the world. We are right in putting into action the Peace Corps, a reciprocal Peace Corps, a daring approach to land reform and all of the other economic and social devices which the majority of the people in the world who are underprivileged are seeking. We must, as you have very properly urged, move rapidly here at home to eliminate poverty, unemployment, and take those steps which will put into full production our human, industrial and natural resources so that America can adequately fulfill the role of leadership in leading the non-Communist world to victory over totalitarianism in Communist or in whatever form it may appear anywhere in the world.

You, Mr. President, are indeed a great leader in the most challenging period of mankind's history and we pledge to you our continuing, all-out effort, our support and loyalty in the titanic struggle for freedom and peace which you are waging.

Respectfully,

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

In the Service of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following bulletin should be of interest to every Member of this Congress:

IN THE SERVICE OF COMMUNISM

(The task of the people's army in the Soviet occupied zone—General Hoffmann the military confidant of Ulbricht)

We have been informed by sources in Berlin that the fifth anniversary of the national people's army was celebrated in the garrison towns of the Soviet occupied zone with parades, conferring of decorations and addresses, in which the soldiers were exhorted to "show their love for the workers' and peasants' power, as well as discipline and self-sacrifice, and at the same time to hate the enemies of the German people." By the "enemies of the German people"—and this was obvious from all the speeches that were made on this occasion—the Federal Republic was, in the first place, meant. Thus, the Minister of Defense Hoffmann, who was recently promoted to the rank of general, declared at a festive assembly held in the Friedrichstadt Palace in East Berlin: "In Europe the chief danger for the peace and security of the peoples emanates from the West German militarists. Obstinate and incorrigible as they are, Straub and Heusinger and their militarist fascist scum are constantly crying for revenge for the lost World War II."

Hoffmann talked about the "diabolical tradition of German militarism, which is being trained for a new aggression" and then stressed that the "national people's army" on the other hand, "personifies the good military traditions of the German people." In his order of the day, Hoffmann appealed to the people's army to continue "to fight for a constant readiness of action," and added that the troop units in 1960 "reached a new stage in their development."

It can be seen from Hoffmann's statements that the national people's army in his opinion has by no means reached the highest stage of perfection aimed at by the leaders of the SED Party; for there are still constant complaints about lack of discipline and political indifference on the part of the rank and file, whilst as far as the officers' corps is concerned, the leaders of the SED are to a certain extent afraid lest it might develop its position of power to a state within the state. In the meantime, the former officers of Hitler's army, who, after being retrained in the Antifa camps or in the National Committee of Free Germany, were taken over by the Soviet Zone army and in some cases were given key positions (as for instance the Generals Vinzenz Müller and Arno von Lenski), have been excluded again and to a large extent replaced by trustworthy old Communist and barricade fighters or veterans who have fought in Spain.

A striking representative of this new type of officer is the present Minister of Defense and Army General Hoffmann. By trade a mechanic, Hoffman, who is now 50 years old, has been an active member of the Communist Party since 1926; in 1935 he emigrated to the Soviet Union, where he became a Soviet subject and attended the Frunse Academy in Moscow; as political commissar of the 11th International Brigade he took part in the Spanish Civil War; he returned to Moscow in 1939, attended the comintern school there until 1943 and continued his military training. After the war Hoffmann was for a short time Ulbricht's personal assistant and was subsequently entrusted with the task of building up the Soviet Zone army, which was at first camouflaged under various names. In this capacity Hoffmann was the permanent representative of Zaisser in the state security service and in the chief administration of the people's police. In 1950 he was appointed inspector-general and head of the Chief Administration for Training, to which at that time the military units of the people's police belonged. In 1952 Hoffmann was promoted to lieutenant general of the garrisoned people's police, and at the beginning of 1956, when the national people's army was officially founded, he became commander in chief of the army and representative of the German Democratic Republic on the staff of the high command of the Warsaw Pact states. In July 1960 he was appointed Minister of National Defense of the German Democratic Republic as successor to Stroph, and on the recent occasion of the fifth anniversary of the national people's army he was promoted from lieutenant colonel to army general.

These personal data suffice to show that Hoffmann is obviously regarded by the Soviets and the SED chief, Ulbricht, as the surest guarantee that the tasks assigned to the Communist civil war army in divided Germany by the top political authorities will be carried out consistently. It was in this connection that the complete militarization of central Germany, in which the paramilitary units and various police organizations must also be included, was effected. Hence Hoffmann recently designated the units of the people's police, border police, and auxiliary police as the "other armed units in addition to the National People's Army." In the event of military attack on the Socialist camp, Hoffmann set the army the task of helping the working class and all peace-loving forces of West Germany to rid themselves of the rule of German militarism and of bringing about the victory of the policy of peace by setting up a truly democratic order in the west zones, too.

Very significantly Hoffmann added:

"Situations might arise in which the German Democratic Republic is forced to intervene in West Germany in order to insure that international treaties and the Potsdam agreement are observed."

Another important aim is the fostering of hatred against the Federal Republic which is systematically bred in the garrisons in the Soviet occupied zone. The official directives for the National People's Army, for instance, state:

"Every soldier of the German Democratic Republic must consciously fight for the workers' and peasants' power. He must know and hate his opponent and must be fully convinced that his own side will be victorious."

Again and again, Hoffmann stresses the inseparable ties between the army of the Soviet occupied zone and that of the Soviet

Union; at the beginning of the Korean war, for instance, he impressed on officers of the Soviet zone forces, which in those days were still camouflaged as garrisoned people's police, "We are not police but soldiers. When the time for action comes, we shall fight side by side with the Red army."

In connection with psychological military training and discipline, Hoffmann, strictly according to Lenin's doctrine, distinguishes between just and unjust wars, and, of course, it goes without saying that only the Communist East can conduct just wars, whereas the capitalistic West on principle only starts unjust wars. Hoffmann also stresses, "We Socialists do not oppose war in principle," and threaten to make short work of the pacifists if they should get active in the Communist sphere of influence. In order to increase the love of soldiering in the Soviet occupied zone, Hoffmann has since 1960 been voicing the theory that "Bonn is planning an atomic war against the German Democratic Republic," and bases his insistence on the necessity for the utmost military efforts on this theory. He is determined above all to foster hatred against the Federal Republic in order to create the preconditions for a state similar to civil war. The aim of these efforts is obvious, and Hoffmann, a Soviet subject, would be the last person to have any misgivings about carrying out the orders of his master.

The Need for a Federal Recreation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has no single agency, bureau, office, division, or department which has as its primary responsibility the promotion and development of recreation opportunities for the people of our Nation.

Recreation services can be found in the Armed Forces, hospitals, industry, parks, private and voluntary agencies, public recreation, recreation education, religious organizations, rural, State, and other services and settings. Yet there is no one place in the United States where the combined progress of recreation can be focused, related, and used on a two-way street.

There are many, many recreational needs which are not being met today. The larger city needs research assistance on land standards, types of recreation structures, programing, financing, general administration, in the same way that the smaller community does—perhaps even to a greater degree. Master planning, personnel problems, program development, and land acquisition face the urban metropolitan region and the small communities. Every type of recreation service in every setting needs a central agency which can gather and disseminate information.

My bill H.R. 216 would establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I believe that such a service belongs in a Department that is mainly concerned with human needs and the general welfare of the people.

The use of recreation as a positive and preventive force in our time and the time to come depends on the passage of this legislation. Misuse or abuse of recreation is a problem of paramount importance today.

The Federal Recreation Service, created by this bill would provide an agency which would offer communities and organizations ready advice. It would be able to offer technical data for the improvement of existing and proposed recreation services in communities and agencies. The purpose of the bill can easily be carried out within the framework of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with relatively little expense.

The benefits derived from the establishment of such a service would be great for and with the many public and private agencies striving to improve recreation programs, leadership, and facilities throughout our Nation.

How To Fight Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding newspapers in the Fifth District of Massachusetts, the Woburn Times, has once again contributed a thoughtful editorial well worthy of the attention of the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I now insert it in the RECORD:

HOW TO FIGHT COMMUNISM

Communism is for us a life or death challenge.

The fight against communism is not against bearded bomb tossers.

The fundamental point that we must all remember is that communism is both a movement of social protest and a conspiracy dedicated to world conquest.

Its social protest appeals to the victims of capitalist oppression and colonial exploitation. The oppression and exploitation are hard facts to millions who live in poverty and without education after their own sweat and their ancestors' toil enriched men who knew how to corner them and make them virtual slaves.

All the Communists can offer is promises, but the promises look good for they offer a better and happier life in a society dedicated to equality and justice.

The Communist conspiracy is a double threat of direct or military aggression, and the threat of subversion, or indirect aggression.

The intelligent attack on communism must be based on valid social doctrine and exposing and checking the Communist conspiratorial drive to power.

Russia poses itself to the underdeveloped nations as a great industrial power where all citizens are equal.

These things are enough for oppressed people. For if they can develop industry they will no longer be hungry or poorly clothed. If they get equality, they will have a freedom they have never before enjoyed.

While some Americans are satisfied that the former colonial peoples will have to develop through communism before they liberate themselves into what we know as Western Democracy, it is obvious to others that unless we observe strictly the tenets of social justice in dealing with these people, we are going to get nowhere with them.

As for the conspiracy toward world conquest, we must try to infiltrate every nation with our concepts of freedom, stirring up people to accept self-determination, blasting on our loudest loudspeaker whenever the Communists make a move.

As for segregation in this country, our greatest liability at the moment in our fight against communism, we have played the great American Symphony too long on just the white keys. Let's start using the black keys, too, and get some real melody and lilt in the tune.

The Constitution and What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an outstanding essay entitled "The Constitution and What It Means," by Robert French of Bellaire, Ohio. Robert, a ninth-grade student, was one of the winners in the essay contest sponscored by the American Legion of Ohio. His essay follows:

THE CONSTITUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS

(By Robert French)

The Constitution of the United States is a frame of our Government and the basis of all laws of the United States. It defines our rights and freedoms, and guarantees that other laws will not infringe upon these rights and freedoms. This Constitution is the supreme law of the United States.

The very existence of the U.S. Government is based on the Constitution. It outlines the plan of the U.S. Government, dividing it into three main branches: the legislative, the executive, and the judicial departments. The Constitution definitely outlines the organization and duties of each of these three departments which are organized in such a manner that each checks the other two. The Constitution makes provisions for new States to enter the Union and for foreign-born people to become citizens, thereby making the U.S. Government a democratic one. Thus, one might say that the Constitution is the frame of the U.S. Government.

The Constitution definitely states the powers of the government. It tells what the U.S. Government and the governments of the individual States may and may not do.

The 10th amendment states that the source of the powers not given to the Federal Government by the Constitution, and not prohibited to the State governments, rests in the citizens of the United States, who vote to select their representatives in the various branches of the Government. These elected representatives of the people of the United States have the power to pass laws in accordance with the Constitution; but the Constitution, itself, is the supreme law of the land.

The Constitution tells us our basic rights and freedoms in its main text, while some

of the amendments to the Constitution clarify and guarantee these rights and freedoms. Therefore, the Constitution is the declaration of rights and freedoms of Americans.

To me, a freshman in an Ohio high school, the Constitution is a great document which defines and outlines the Government of the United States, states my rights, and secures my freedoms. It provides a democratic plan as a foundation for our Government. It is something that I have inherited, a treasured gift from my ancestors. Thus, the Constitution, to me, is a symbol of our democracy.

The Constitution, in a broader concept, is more than a plan of our Government, a declaration of our rights, the supreme law of the land, or a symbol of our democracy. It is a great document giving us, the people of the United States, the responsibilities of justly governing ourselves and our fellow Americans. But not all Americans realize what the Constitution really implies and the importance of the obligations it imposes. The Constitution implies individual equality of opportunity; but not all Americans know equality of opportunities. To me this equality is a fact; to other people it is merely a dream, a symbol of hope. It is the obligation of the youth of America to make their dream a reality.

This is what the Constitution means.

B–70 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in these days of space age spectaculars, our scientists and engineers have considered that one of the areas in which the United States may well acquire a first is that of the supersonic airliner. But now, in the proposed cutback of the B–70 program, not only is our national security imperiled but also the timetable for America's first operational supersonic, commercial transport—which will grow out of the B–70 technology—is thereby moved back indefinitely.

In regard to national security, we could be assured that if our Armed Forces in certain situations might need a troop carrier able to travel 3,500 to 4,000 nautical miles in a couple of hours, the supersonic transport could supply this capability. The B–70, as a long-range bomber, could reach almost any point on earth and return at mach 3 speed. Supersonic airframe and engine technology, adapted to commercial air transport development, could uphold America's position as world leader in commercial aviation, could prove a boon to American industry, and could bring advances in science and technology that would pay off in economic growth and industrial progress.

The economic implications of a supersonic airliner are imposing. Today, fully 85 percent of the more than 5,000 airliners operated in the West are U.S. made. Exports of all types of aeronautical products have been running at an annual rate of $500 million. This is 12 percent of the total of all exported manufactured goods.

The economic lift to be gained from a supersonic airliner program would be considerable from a purely domestic standpoint. The aviation industry has the highest employment of any industry in the Nation. But the employment trend has been sharply down of late. Thus, manufacture of a major new product would be exceedingly helpful.

Almost a year ago, the Committee on Science and Astronautics of which I am chairman, held hearings on the status of the supersonic air transport program. As a result, the committee recommended that on the basis of national security and because of its close relationship to the commercial possibilities of supersonic travel, the complete B–70 development should be carried out.

The B–70 has been designed to compress time and distance far beyond anything of its type yet built, and I believe the research and development phase has progressed sufficiently so that added funds should go into a speedup of the program—not a cutback to the prototype phase. The development of new weapons systems requires such a long lead time that if we delay further, we may find that we have lost out to other nations. I believe in this instance we would be justified to take a calculated risk to push the B–70 program. I am among the first to recognize that these risks are expensive and money can we wasted. But when the security of our country is involved, when the program would not only have great military significance but infinite commercial possibilities as well, I feel it is necessary to take those risks and proceed with the development of this program with a sense of urgency.

A few weeks ago, the New York Times quoted Mr. Najeeb A. Halaby, new head of the Federal Aviation Agency, as saying in an address delivered to the Society of Automotive Engineers that there were "at least four cogent reasons for pushing the [supersonic airliner] project."

First, he said, it was important for the advancement of the technology of manned flight.

His second reason had to do with national security.

Third, he said, the Nation's prestige is involved. He warned that the United States was in danger of losing its traditional lead in aviation.

Mr. Halaby's fourth reason was economic. He said a fleet of supersonic planes would add to the Gross National Product by creating more jobs, by saving the time of executives, and by moving goods more quickly.

The B–70 and its sister, the commercial supersonic airliner, are too important to our national interest to be held back by insufficient funding.

The Knights of Columbus—The Good Right Arm of the Roman Catholic Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess public officials are frequently invited to communion mass and breakfast. It was my pleasure on March 19, 1961, to attend the communion mass and breakfast of St. Luke's Council No. 438, Knights of Columbus, at St. Rita's Auditorium, Bronx, New York, N.Y. One of the principal speakers was James E. Foley, chairman of the New York Chapter, Knights of Columbus. His address was so inspiring that I believe that it merits a wider audience than the several hundred attendants. In his talk, Mr. Foley set forth the conditions which gave rise to the need of a Catholic lay society that today numbers over 1,300,000 in over 4,500 councils throughout 62 jurisdictions of the world. Mr. Foley detailed the development of the organization and its accomplishments. His speech follows:

ADDRESS BY JAMES E. FOLEY, CHAIRMAN OF NEW YORK CHAPTER, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, AT THE ANNUAL CORPORATE COMMUNION MASS AND BREAKFAST OF ST. LUKE'S COUNCIL NO. 438, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, AT ST. RITA'S AUDITORIUM, BRONX, NEW YORK, N.Y., MARCH 19, 1961

Mr. Toastmaster, William O'Malley; Rt. Rev. Msgr. P. F. Mackin; Rev. William P. Burke; Worthy Grand Knight Antony B. Caramele; distinguished guest of the morning, Maurice Fitzgerald; Hon. Alfred E. Santangelo; distinguished guests on the dais; officers and members of St. Luke's Council, its Columbiette unit, its Columbian squires; my brother knights and friends, at the outset may I extend my personal gratitude to the chairman and his committee for having extended to me the courtesy of participating in this, your outstanding Columbian activity of the year. At the same time may I, on behalf of the remaining 40 councils comprising the New York chapter jurisdiction, note the combined appreciation of our entire membership to the splendid cooperation that has been extended to the chapter officers by St. Luke's Council. Particular emphasis should be made of the accomplishments of your Worthy Grand Knight Anthony B. Caramele for his outstanding efforts as chairman of the chapter speaker's course. Under his wise and able administration, the speaker's course this year enrolled the greatest number of participants since its inception in 1918.

I am particularly pleased this morning to join with you in testimonializing Maurice Fitzgerald for his many years of unselfish devotion to the workings of this council. Certainly, Brother Fitzgerald is an example of the efforts that have been expended by those who have been members of our order for a longer period of time than we of the new generation, and who have through their concerted actions designed the foundation upon which this very tremendous Catholic

fraternal order has been developed. It is the hope of all of us that the Divine Lord will grant to Brother Fitzgerald many additional years of health that he may assist in guiding the course of our development to a greater future.

March 29 of this year will mark the 79th anniversary of the birth and origin of the Knights of Columbus. Indeed, as Father Michael J. McGivney and a small group of some 14 laymen gathered together at St. Mary's Parish in New Haven, Conn., at the institution of Bishop Lawrence S. McMahon of Hartford, Conn., little did they realize that at that time they were giving rise to a Catholic lay society that, today, numbers over 1,300,000 in over 4,500 councils throughout 62 jurisdictions of the world.

The original purpose in the formation of the Knights of Columbus was to provide a fraternal benefits society, to the Catholics of those days, which might in some measure assist them and the members of their families when sickness and other hardships struck the breadwinner of the family. Thus, it was that we sought a Catholic fraternal organization that was cosmopolitan in membership, American in nature, and Catholic in character, and that would give to Catholic men a conduit toward economic advantages.

That our society has satisfactorily achieved this purpose can be attested to by its many accomplishments of the past. The record is monumental and inspiring: In 1914 an endowment fund of $500,000 at the Catholic University of America was established; during World War I the K. of C. hut and the K. of C. slogan "Everyone Welcome—Everything Free" were famous throughout the fighting area, and gave rise to the idea of the USO in World War II; in 1924 the order contributed the funds necessary to combat the so-called Oregon School Law through the Supreme Court of the United States, which statute would have outlawed parochial education; in 1947 our Catholic advertisement program was instituted which has since drawn 4 million inquiries and has enlisted over 400,000 in our correspondence course of religious instruction; the order has microfilmed the Vatican library which is available to scholars and study groups at St. Louis University; and finally, through your generosity, the Campanile of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, known as the Knight's Tower and which stands some 316 feet in height, second only to St. Mark's in Venice, was constructed. These are but a few of our contributions to the moral, educational, and social background of our country and our church.

However, due to the changing nature of our times, and due likewise to the tremendous development that has been made in workmen's compensation, disability, and hospitalization insurance plans, the initial design for which we were incorporated has slowly and surely given way to a new purpose to which we must all, today, dedicate the spirit and direction of our lives.

This new direction is in the field of Catholic action. Throughout the last presidential election, much mention was made of the fact that the Communists were now only 90 miles from the shores of the United States. I assure you, my brother Knights, if it were not for the worldwide efforts of the Catholic Church in opposing this atheistic philosophy of communism, that distance might be much shorter. On many an occasion, our heirarchy has extended to us the flattering characterization as "the Strong Right Arm of the Catholic Church." This, we inherit from those of our brothers who preceded us in this order and who have made the way for us today.

Yes, we have inherited a tremendously vital Catholic fraternal organization. We have inherited a rich heritage and a fruitful organization, but with this we have likewise inherited the responsibilities and the obligations that are coincident with the honors of the order. To these, we must revitalize the efforts and the spirits of our lives. Much was likewise said in the recent presidential election of a decline in the prestige of the United States abroad. I say to you that over the period of the past several years, there has been in some localities and I will emphasize that of our own, a decline in the prestige of the Knights of Columbus. Its cause can be laid primarily to the apathy and complacency of our membership, and to Catholics in general, in participating or letting themselves be heard on any measure which affects their social and public welfare.

Should we not reinvigorate our philosophy; should we not develop a greater spirit of public-mindedness; should we not as Catholics and as members of this wonderful order participate and cooperate thoroughly in the functions of the supreme council, of the New York State Council of the Knights of Columbus, and the New York Chapter Knights of Columbus? Should we not reappraise our attitude, then I say to you that each of our councils would be nothing more than local social organizations which would act to deteriorate the foundation of our society.

So, brothers, let's take that which has been given to us from the past and, using it as the basis for future development and construction of a greater edifice of the future, let us combine our talents so that 10 or 15 years hence, as we refer to the Knights of Columbus we will not be reciting the vicarious developments of our brother knights, but rather that each of us will be able to take pride in pointing to what he has done to develop this new structure of the future. Let us take recognition of the zeal of others outside our religion in effectuating legislation designed to assist in the propagating of their beliefs.

Your Congressman SANTANGELO has presented to you this morning a synopsis of President Kennedy's Federal aid to education program. In this program, no mention is made of financial assistance to private or parochial schools. I urge that you follow your Congressman's advice and write to your Federal Representatives advising them that, while you are not opposed to Federal aid to education, you would be opposed to it in any form where financial assistance to private or parochial schools is omitted. This is but one of the many instances in which you as an active member of the Catholic lay apostolate can assist your community, your church, and yourself by concerted action. Many others can be mentioned to you but time does not permit.

So, on this happy occasion, if we are to leave with but one thought in mind, let that thought be that we will devote and develop ourselves to instituting and implementing our own individuality in the Catholic lay apostolate through the Knights of Columbus so that the wonderful image of the past will become a greater reflection of the future.

The State Starves the Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following statement is attributed to Plato:

Democracy does not contain any force which will check the constant tendency to put more and more on the public payroll. The state is like a hive of bees in which the drones display, multiply, and starve the workers so the idlers will consume the food and the workers will perish.

Resolution Favoring Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Mr. Harvey Wood, superintendent of the Dimondale Area Schools, in my district:

DIMONDALE AREA SCHOOLS,
Dimondale, Mich., April 14, 1961.

Hon. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHANSEN: It has come to our attention through the Legislative Bureau of the Michigan Education Association that a Michigan school board recently had its resolution opposing Federal aid to education read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We believe that this action may have given some Members of Congress the mistaken impression that this board was speaking for all or a majority of Michigan school boards. Since we do not subscribe to this point of view, nor do we believe it to be representative of the thinking of the majority of boards of education in this State, we are requesting that you introduce the following resolution of our board of education into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"Mover by Fay, seconded by Baird, that the board of education of the Dimondale area schools, recognizing the need for increased support for education through Federal participation if our national objectives are to be attained, hereby endorses the concept of Federal aid to education. Carried."

The above motion was adopted at the regular meeting of April 10, 1961, and is on record in the official minutes of that meeting.

For the board of education:

HARVEY WOOD,
Superintendent.

I am, of course, happy to comply with the request of the board of education and Mr. Wood that the resolution of the board be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I unqualifiedly endorse and support the constitutional right of citizens or of any duly constituted governmental body to present its petitions and views to the Congress of the United States, including those instances, of which this is one, in which the views do not coincide with my own.

In response to a telephone inquiry to Mr. Wood, I am advised that the vote of the school board on this particular resolution was 4 to 3 in favor. I conclude therefrom that the sentiment of the board, either with regard to Federal aid to education or with regard to the board going on record in this manner, was something less than unanimous.

I believe one further comment is in order with respect to the statement made by Mr. Wood to the effect that introduction in the RECORD of a resolu-

tion opposing Federal aid to education on behalf of another Michigan school board "may have given some Members of Congress the mistaken impression that this board was speaking for all or a majority of Michgan school boards."

While I do not happen to have read this earlier extension in the RECORD, I am sure that no Member of this House is so naive as to believe that any single school board speaks for, or presumes to speak for, all or a majority of Michigan school boards.

I certainly do not presume to know what the thinking of the majority of boards of education in Michigan is on the issue, although Mr. Wood evidently believes that a majority of the boards of education of the State are not opposed to Federal aid to education. I notice that he cites no basis for his conclusion.

I made the point of inquiring of Mr. Wood as to whether the Dimondale board's action was unanimous, because I believe this is highly relevant to the whole matter.

I wish that on issues of this type, where there is a sharp cleavage of honest opinion, the practice of submitting minority views, which is an established procedure of the committees of this House, might also be followed by other governmental bodies. I believe it would contribute a great deal to the airing of opposing views at the grassroots.

I note with particular interest the obvious eagle-eye alertness of the legislative bureau of the Michigan Education Association in this matter. Of course, I do not deny the right of that organization to exhibit this type of interest and alertness.

At the same time I do not hesitate, in the face of either the Michigan Education Association activities, or the 4-to-3 vote of the Dimondale board of education, to reaffirm my own unqualified and vigorous opposition to the concept of Federal aid to education in general and to the specific program of Federal aid recommended by the present administration.

Msgr. George N. Habig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the people of Canton, Ohio, suffered a severe loss last week with the passing of Msgr. George N. Habig, pastor of St. Peter's Catholic Church for the past 30 years. I am among the many who feel a deep sense of personal loss. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial tribute from the Canton Repository:

MSGR. GEORGE N. HABIG

There was a community opinion of Msgr. George N. Habig that had been held for years and was as well known to him as it was to all the rest of us who loved and respected him—that no pastor could have served his parish, his city, and his metropolitan area with more distinction and compassion.

Monsignor Habig was full of learning, honors in the Roman Catholic Church, and Christian devotion. But the quality that shone from him in more than 30 years here as pastor of St. Peter's Catholic Church was serene kindliness. He was the prototype of everything a religious preceptor should be. He was his own best living example of the benison of faith.

At the age of 70, it cannot be said that any man is being taken prematurely from his work. Monsignor Habig had done all his duties well. But his presence in Canton will be sorely missed. It will be a long generation before we shall see St. Peter's Church without thinking of the good pastor who guided it from 1930 until his death.

Associated Students, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., Executive Committee Endorses Peace Corps as Great Step Forward in America's Concept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, a letter to me, dated April 4, 1961, from the president of the Associated Students, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., Mr. George H. Link, which enclosed a copy of a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Associated Students at the university in full support of the Peace Corps:

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS,
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Berkeley, Calif., April 4, 1961.

DEAR SIR: Please find enclosed a copy of a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Associated Students of the University of California at Berkeley at its meeting of March 7, 1961. We hope that you will consider the position of the representative body of the students of the University of California.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely yours.

GEORGE H. LINK,
President.

PEACE CORPS

Whereas the long proposed Point Four Youth Corps or Peace Corps is fast developing into a real institution under the Kennedy administration; and

Whereas such a Peace Corps would recruit young people to serve in technical capacities in developing countries, thus fulfilling the following objectives: (1) Oversea training to qualified persons who would otherwise be lost to international service, (2) skilled manpower for countries urgently in need of it, (3) development of a large-scale offensive by Americans to demonstrate our interest in and dependence upon the good will of "third area" countries; and

Whereas the present plan of organizing the corps to utilize both governmental and private agencies will enable it to draw upon private financial resources, to engage the service of skilled personnel existing in the private sector who might be unwilling to sever these ties, might be instrumental in preventing the problem of the corps being reacted to negatively as U.S. Government intervention, and will at the same time provide the central governmental coordination and financial subsidy necessary to make the corps effective on a large scale; and

Whereas the present plan of initiating the corps on a pilot basis will make it possible to find solutions to many of the essential questions which can only be solved in the field in the course of corps work, thus insuring the success of the corps when it is ultimately launched on a full-scale basis: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the undersigned 15 voting members of the executive committee of the Associated Students of the University of California, speaking as individuals and not claiming to represent the university or the student body as a whole, view the Peace Corps as a great step forward in America's concept of national defense and international relations and heartily endorse its creation as ordered by President Kennedy on March 1, 1961.

However, whereas the problem of draft exemption remains to be resolved; and

Whereas many graduating students who would be excellent Peace Corps material will feel that 3 years of service in an underdeveloped country would be time well spent, but would be unwilling to return from this service still liable to 2 years of active military service with the normal military reserve obligation still to follow; and

Whereas many students, especially those in fields requiring extended education, such as medicine, law, education, and engineering who would be particularly valuable to the corps, might be prohibited from participating due to the extended absence from a wage-earning capacity which the additional military obligations would impose; and

Whereas for maximum effectiveness, the method of selection, the training, and the service of corps participants must necessarily be of such a nature both quantitatively and qualitatively that it would be inherently protected from draft dodgers: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That we urge special consideration of a plan to exempt Peace Corps members who faithfully complete their tour of duty from peacetime active military service.

Ayes: Messrs. George H. Link, president; Don Alves, first vice president; Edward Germain, lower division representative; Roger Kauffman, men's representative; Dr. Armin Rappaport, faculty representative; Henry Schacht, alumni representative; Dean William Shepard, chancellor's representative; Larry Beyersdorf, Tom M. Jones, Dave Melander, Jerry Newfarmer, Brian Van Camp, Miss JoAnn Thebolt, representatives at large; Miss Dolores Robbins, second vice president.

Federal Court Judges

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Federal court judges, their dates of birth and dates of appointment (with age at time of appointment), April 1961

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Justices	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Age at time of appointment
Earl Warren	Mar. 19, 1891	Oct. 2, 1953	62
Hugo L. Black	Feb. 27, 1886	Aug. 18, 1937	51
Felix Frankfurter	Nov. 15, 1882	Jan. 20, 1939	57
William O. Douglas	Oct. 16, 1898	Apr. 15, 1939	41
Tom C. Clark	Sept. 23, 1899	Aug. 19, 1949	50
John M. Harlan	May 20, 1899	Mar. 17, 1955	56
William J. Brennan, Jr	Apr. 25, 1906	Oct. 15, 1956	50
Charles E. Whittaker	Feb. 22, 1901	Mar. 22, 1957	56
Potter Stewart	Jan. 23, 1915	Oct. 14, 1958	43
Retired:			
Stanley Reed	Dec. 31, 1884	Jan. 27, 1938	54
Harold H. Burton	June 22, 1888	Sept. 22, 1945	57
Sherman Minton	Oct. 20, 1890	Oct. 5, 1949	59

U.S. COURTS OF APPEALS (BY CIRCUIT)

Court and judge	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Age at time of appointment
District of Columbia circuit:			
E. Barrett Prettyman	Aug. 23, 1891	Sept. 28, 1945	54
Henry W. Edgerton	Oct. 20, 1888	Dec. 15, 1937	49
Wilbur K. Miller	Oct. 9, 1892	Sept. 28, 1945	54
David L. Bazelon	Sept. 3, 1909	Oct. 21, 1949	40
Charles Fahy	Aug. 27, 1892	Oct. 21, 1949	57
George T. Washington	June 24, 1908	Oct. 21, 1949	41
John A. Danaher	Jan. 9, 1899	Oct. 1, 1953	54
Walter M. Bastian	Nov. 16, 1891	Dec. 3, 1954	63
Warren E. Burger		Mar. 29, 1956	
1st circuit:			
Peter Woodbury	Oct. 24, 1899	Feb. 25, 1941	42
John P. Hartigan	Dec. 29, 1887	Jan. 1, 1951	64
Bailey Aldrich	Apr. 23, 1907	Sept. 10, 1959	52
Senior judge: [1] Calvert Magruder	Dec. 26, 1893	June 3, 1939	46
2d circuit:			
Charles E. Clark	Dec. 9, 1889	Mar. 9, 1939	50
J. Edward Lumbard	Aug. 18, 1901	July 12, 1955	54
Sterry R. Waterman	1901	July 13, 1955	54
Leonard P. Moore	July 2, 1898	Sept. 6, 1957	59
Henry J. Friendly	July 3, 1903	Sept. 10, 1959	56
J. Joseph Smith	Jan. 25, 1904	Sept. 2, 1960	56
Senior judges:			
Learned Hand	Jan. 27, 1872	Dec. 20, 1924	52
Thomas W. Swan	Dec. 20, 1877	Dec. 26, 1926	49
Harrie B. Chase	Aug. 9, 1889	Jan. 31, 1926	37
Harold R. Medina	Feb. 16, 1888	June 23, 1951	63
Carroll C. Hincks	Nov. 30, 1889	Oct. 3, 1953	64
3d circuit:			
John Biggs, Jr	Oct. 6, 1895	Feb. 16, 1937	42
Herbert F. Goodrich	July 29, 1889	May 10, 1940	51
Gerald McLaughlin	1893	June 14, 1943	50
Harry E. Kalodner	Mar. 28, 1896	July 27, 1946	50
Austin L. Staley	Dec. 30, 1902	July 5, 1950	48
William Henry Hastie	Nov. 17, 1904	Oct. 21, 1949	45
Senior judges:			
Albert B. Maris	Dec. 19, 1893	June 24, 1938	45
Phillip Forman	Nov. 30, 1895	Sept. 10, 1959	64
4th circuit:			
Simon E. Sobeloff	Mar. 3, 1893	July 18, 1956	63
Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr		Apr. 4, 1957	
Herbert S. Boreman	Sept. 21, 1897	June 17, 1959	62
Senior judges:			
Armistead M. Dobie	Apr. 15, 1881	Dec. 19, 1939	58
Morris A. Soper	Jan. 23, 1873	May 6, 1931	58
5th circuit:			
Joseph C. Hutcheson, Jr	Oct. 19, 1879	Jan. 26, 1931	52
Richard T. Rives	Jan. 15, 1895	May 3, 1951	56
Elbert Parr Tuttle	July 17, 1897	Aug. 4, 1954	57
Ben F. Cameron	Dec. 14, 1890	Mar. 16, 1955	65
Warren L. Jones	July 2, 1895	Apr. 21, 1955	60
John R. Brown	1909	Jan. 27, 1955	46
John Minor Wisdom	May 17, 1905	June 27, 1957	52
Senior judges:			
Edwin R. Holmes		Mar. 20, 1936	
Wayne G. Borah		Oct. 21, 1949	
6th circuit:			
John D. Martin, Sr	May 4, 1883	Sept. 7, 1940	57
Thomas F. McAllister	Mar. 4, 1896	May 22, 1941	45
Shackelford Miller, Jr	Sept. 4, 1892	Dec. 11, 1945	53
Lester L. Cecil	Nov. 21, 1893	July 18, 1959	66
Paul C. Weick	Aug. 25, 1899	Sept. 10, 1959	60
Clifford O'Sullivan	Dec. 8, 1897	Mar. 12, 1960	63
Senior judges:			
Charles C. Simons	May 21, 1876	Jan. 29, 1932	56
Florence E. Allen	Mar. 23, 1884	Mar. 21, 1934	50
7th circuit:			
F. Ryan Duffy	June 23, 1888	Feb. 2, 1949	61
Elmer J. Schnackenberg	Aug. 22, 1889	May 5, 1949	65
John S. Hastings	1898	Aug. 26, 1957	59
Win G. Knoch	May 24, 1895	Aug. 21, 1958	63
Lathan Castle	Feb. 27, 1900	Apr. 30, 1959	59
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judge: J. Earl Major	Jan. 5, 1887	Mar. 23, 1937	50
8th circuit:			
Harvey M. Johnson	July 16, 1895	Oct. 14, 1940	45
Charles J. Vogel	Sept. 20, 1898	Aug. 20, 1954	56
Martin D. Van Oosterhout	Oct. 10, 1900	Aug. 26, 1954	54
Marion C. Matthes	1906	Mar. 12, 1958	52
Harry A. Blackmun	Nov. 12, 1908	Sept. 21, 1959	51
(Vacancy.)			
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judges:			
Seth Thomas	May 18, 1873	Dec. 2, 1935	62
John B. Sanborn	Nov. 9, 1883	Jan. 23, 1932	49
Archibald K. Gardner	Dec. 3, 1867	May 23, 1929	62
Joseph W. Woodrough	Aug. 29, 1873	Apr. 12, 1933	60
9th circuit:			
Richard H. Chambers	Nov. 7, 1906	Apr. 30, 1954	48
Stanley N. Barnes	May 1, 1900	Mar. 21, 1956	56
Frederick G. Hamley	Oct. 24, 1903	July 2, 1956	53
Oliver D. Hamlin, Jr	Nov. 30, 1892	Mar. 26, 1958	66
Gilbert H. Jertberg	Feb. 1, 1897	Aug. 21, 1958	61
Charles M. Merrill	Dec. 11, 1907	Sept. 21, 1959	52
M. Oliver Koelsch	Mar. 5, 1912	Sept. 23, 1959	47
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judges:			
Clifton Mathews	Feb. 12, 1880	Mar. 23, 1935	55
Homer T. Bone	Jan. 25, 1883	Apr. 1, 1944	61
William E. Orr	Oct. 26, 1881	Sept. 28, 1945	64
William Healy	Sept. 10, 1881	June 21, 1937	56
Albert Lee Stephens	Jan. 25, 1874	June 18, 1937	63
Walter L. Pope	Jan. 26, 1889	June 21, 1937	56
10th circuit:			
Alfred P. Murrah	Oct. 27, 1904	Sept. 4, 1940	36
John C. Pickett	Sept. 3, 1896	Oct. 13, 1949	53
David T. Lewis	Apr. 25, 1912	June 5, 1956	44
Jean S. Breitenstein	July 18, 1900	June 27, 1957	57
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judges:			
Orie L. Phillips	Nov. 20, 1885	Apr. 29, 1929	44
Walter A. Huxman	Feb. 16, 1887	May 23, 1939	52
Sam G. Bratton	Aug. 19, 1888	June 1, 1933	45

[1] Senior judges are those who have retired from regular active service but are available for special judicial duties from time to time. (See Public Law 85-219, Aug. 29, 1957.)

U.S. EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Judge	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Age at time of appointment
Albert B. Maris	Dec. 19, 1893	June 24, 1938	45
Calvert Magruder	Dec. 26, 1893	June 3, 1936	43
Thomas F. McAllister	Mar. 4, 1896	May 22, 1941	45

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

Sam E. Whitaker	Sept. 25, 1886	July 13, 1939	53
Joseph Warren Madden	Jan. 17, 1890	Jan. 7, 1941	51
Don N. Laramore	Dec. 22, 1907	Mar. 17, 1954	47
Marvin Jones	Feb. 26, 1886	July 9, 1947	61
James R. Durfee	Nov. 3, 1897	Apr. 22, 1960	63
Senior judge: Benjamin H. Littleton	Aug. 27, 1889	Nov. 6, 1929	40

Federal court judges, their dates of birth and dates of appointment (with age at time of appointment), April 1961—Continued

U.S. COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

Justices	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Age at time of appointment
Arthur M. Smith	Sept. 19, 1903	Apr. 30, 1959	56
Ambrose O'Connell	July 8, 1881	June 10, 1944	63
Eugene Worley	Oct. 10, 1908	Mar. 9, 1950	42
Giles S. Rich	1904	July 19, 1956	52
I. Jack Martin	July 18, 1908	Aug. 6, 1958	50
Senior judges:			
Joseph R. Jackson	Aug. 30, 1880	Dec. 14, 1937	57
Noble J. Johnson	Aug. 23, 1887	June 10, 1948	61
Webster J. Oliver	Jan. 14, 1888	June 24, 1940	52
Senior judges—Continued			
Charles D. Lawrence	Aug. 5, 1878	Feb. 22, 1943	65
Irvin C. Mollison	Dec. 24, 1898	Oct. 29, 1945	47
Jed Johnson	July 31, 1888	June 25, 1947	59
Paul P. Rae	June 15, 1899	June 22, 1948	49
Morgan Ford	Sept. 8, 1911	July 15, 1949	38
David John Wilson	Oct. 27, 1887	July 26, 1954	67
Mary H. Donlon	Aug. 25, 1893	Aug. 1, 1955	62
Scovel Richardson	Feb. 4, 1912	Apr. 8, 1957	45

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

Court and judge	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Age at time of appointment
Alabama (northern):			
Seybourn H. Lynne	July 25, 1907	Jan. 3, 1946	39
Harlan Hobart Grooms	Nov. 7, 1900	Aug. 3, 1953	53
Alabama (middle): Frank M. Johnson, Jr.	1918	Oct. 22, 1955	37
Alabama (southern): Daniel H. Thomas	Aug. 25, 1906	Mar. 9, 1951	45
Alaska: Walter H. Hodge	1924	May 29, 1958	34
Arizona:			
Dave W. Ling	Jan. 22, 1890	June 3, 1936	46
James A. Walsh	Sept. 17, 1906	July 7, 1952	46
Arkansas (eastern):			
J. Smith Henley	May 18, 1917	Oct. 25, 1958	41
Gordon E. Young	Apr. 26, 1907	Sept. 10, 1959	52
Senior judge: Thomas C. Trimble		June 18, 1937	
Arkansas (western):			
John E. Miller	May 15, 1888	Mar. 12, 1941	53
J. Smith Henley	May 18, 1917	Oct. 25, 1958	41
Senior judge: Harry J. Lemley	Aug. 6, 1883	May 11, 1939	56
California (northern):			
Louis E. Goodman	Jan. 2, 1892	Dec. 24, 1942	50
George B. Harris	Aug. 16, 1901	July 9, 1946	45
Oliver J. Carter	Apr. 7, 1911	Sept. 27, 1950	39
Sherrill Halbert	Oct. 17, 1901	Aug. 26, 1954	53
Albert C. Wollenberg	June 13, 1900	May 19, 1958	58
Lloyd H. Burke	Apr. 1, 1916	July 23, 1958	42
William T. Sweigert	Nov. 13, 1900	Sept. 21, 1959	59
Senior judge: Michael J. Roche	July 21, 1878	Aug. 24, 1935	57
California (southern):			
Leon R. Yankwich	Sept. 25, 1880	do	47
Peirson M. Hall	July 31, 1894	July 3, 1942	48
William C. Mathes	Dec. 17, 1899	Oct. 17, 1945	46
Harry C. Westover	May 19, 1894	Oct. 18, 1949	55
James M. Carter	Mar. 11, 1904	do	45
William M. Byrne	July 10, 1896	Sept. 27, 1950	54
Ernest A. Tolin	Aug. 2, 1904	Oct. 30, 1951	47
Thurmond Clarke	June 29, 1902	Aug. 3, 1955	53
Fred Kunsel	June 2, 1901	Sept. 10, 1959	58
Myron D. Crocker	Sept. 4, 1915	Sept. 21, 1959	44
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judge: Jacob Weinberger	Jan. 4, 1882	Feb. 21, 1946	64
Canal Zone: Guthrie F. Crowe	July 24, 1910	July 3, 1952	42
Colorado:			
Alfred A. Arraj	Sept. 1, 1906	Aug. 6, 1957	51
Olin Hatfield Chilson	Nov. 22, 1903	Mar. 5, 1960	57
Connecticut:			
Robert P. Anderson	Mar. 27, 1906	Apr. 27, 1954	48
William H. Timbers	Sept. 5, 1915	Sept. 2, 1960	45
Delaware:			
Caleb M. Wright	1908	July 27, 1955	47
Caleb R. Layton III	July 4, 1907	Apr. 17, 1957	50
Edwin D. Steel, Jr	May 7, 1904	Apr. 23, 1958	54
Senior judges:			
Richard S. Rodney	Oct. 10, 1882	July 31, 1946	64
Paul C. Leahy	Feb. 9, 1904	Jan. 14, 1942	38
District of Columbia:			
F. Dickinson Letts	Apr. 26, 1875	May 5, 1931	56
David A. Pine	Sept. 22, 1891	Mar. 20, 1940	49
Matthew F. McGuire	1899	Aug. 1, 1941	42
Alexander Holtzoff	Nov. 7, 1886	Sept. 28, 1945	59
Richmond B. Keech	Nov. 28, 1896	Oct. 14, 1946	50
Edward M. Curran	May 10, 1903	Oct. 16, 1948	43
Edward A. Tamm	Apr. 21, 1906	June 22, 1948	42
Charles F. McLaughlin	June 19, 1887	Oct. 21, 1949	62
Burnita S. Matthews	Dec. 28, 1894	do	55
Luther W. Youngdahl	May 29, 1896	Aug. 29, 1951	55
Joseph C. McGarraghy	Nov. 6, 1897	Mar. 28, 1957	60
John J. Sirica	Mar. 19, 1904	do	53
George L. Hart, Jr	July 14, 1905	Aug. 29, 1958	53
Leonard P. Walsh	Mar. 3, 1904	Sept. 14, 1959	55
(Vacancy)			
Senior judges:			
Thomas Jennings Bailey	June 6, 1867	May 22, 1918	51
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Feb. 9, 1902	Dec. 19, 1944	42
Municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia:			
Andrew McCaughrin Hood	1900	July 7, 1942	42
Thomas D. Quinn		Nov. 1, 1951	
Senior judge: Nathan Cayton	Jan. 22, 1899	1942	43
Municipal court for the District of Columbia:			
Mary C. Barlow	1918	Mar. 3, 1950	32
Edward A. Board	Apr. 27, 1916	July 3, 1953	37
John H. Burnett	1896	July 17, 1956	60
Austin L. Fickling	1914	do	42
Andrew J. Howard, Jr	1897	Nov. 2, 1950	53
Catherine B. Kelly	1917	Mar. 28, 1957	40
Milton S. Kronheim, Jr	Oct. 5, 1911	Mar. 29, 1949	38
John J. Malloy	1905	Nov. 1, 1951	46
Godfrey L. Munter	1897	July 17, 1956	59
Frank H. Myers	Apr. 11, 1897	Feb. 13, 1948	51
George D. Neilson	1906	Apr. 29, 1940	34
Mildred E. Reeves	1900	July 3, 1953	53
Thomas C. Scalley	1898	Mar. 3, 1950	52
John Lewis Smith, Jr	1912	Aug. 26, 1957	45
Harry L. Walker	1909	July 27, 1955	46
DeWitt S. Hyde		Sept. 14, 1959	
Senior judge: Armand W. Scott			
Florida (northern):			
George H. Carswell	Dec. 22, 1919	Apr. 10, 1958	39
George N. Whitehurst	May 18, 1891	Feb. 23, 1950	59
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judge: Dozier A. DeVane	Aug. 2, 1883	Apr. 22, 1943	60
Florida (southern):			
George W. Whitehurst	May 18, 1891	Feb. 23, 1950	59
Bryan Simpson	May 30, 1903	Sept. 26, 1950	47
Ernett C. Choate	May 21, 1891	July 20, 1954	63
Joseph P. Lieb	1901	Aug. 13, 1955	54
William A. McRae	Sept. 25, 1909	Mar. 8, 1961	52
Senior judge:			
John W. Holland	Sept. 30, 1883	June 1, 1936	53
William J. Barker	June 25, 1886	Feb. 5, 1940	56
Georgia (northern):			
Frank A. Hooper	Apr. 21, 1896	Oct. 21, 1949	53
William Boyd Sloan	July 9, 1895	Mar. 23, 1951	56
Georgia (middle):			
T. Hoyt Davis	July 4, 1892	Jan. 30, 1945	53
William A. Bootle	Aug. 19, 1902	May 20, 1954	52
Georgia (southern): Frank M. Scarlett	Jan. 9, 1891	Feb. 14, 1946	55
Guam: Eugene R. Gilmartin		Aug. 29, 1958	
Hawaii:			
C. Nils Tavares	Apr. 12, 1902	Oct. 13, 1960	58
(Vacancy.)			
Idaho:			
Chase A. Clark	Aug. 29, 1883	Mar. 10, 1943	60
Fred M. Taylor	Feb. 25, 1901	July 20, 1954	53
Illinois (northern):			
Michael L. Igoe	Apr. 16, 1885	Nov. 21, 1938	53
William J. Campbell	Mar. 19, 1905	Oct. 10, 1940	35
J. Sam Perry	Nov. 30, 1896	Aug. 22, 1951	55
Julius J. Hoffman	July 7, 1895	May 14, 1953	58
Julius H. Miner	May 25, 1896	Feb. 27, 1958	62
(Vacancy.)			
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judge: Walter J. LaBay	1889	Mar. 31, 1944	55
Illinois (eastern):			
Casper Platt	June 6, 1892	Oct. 13, 1949	57
William G. Juergens	1904	June 22, 1956	52
Senior judge: Fred L. Wham	June 15, 1884	Mar. 1, 1927	43
Illinois (southern):			
Fred O. Mercer		June 19, 1956	
Omer Poos	Aug. 22, 1902	Aug. 21, 1958	56
Senior judge: Charles G. Briggle	Jan. 27, 1883	Jan. 25, 1932	49
Indiana (northern):			
Luther M. Swygert	Feb. 7, 1905	Oct. 16, 1943	38
Robert A. Grant	1905	Aug. 26, 1957	52
Indiana (southern):			
William E. Steckler	Oct. 18, 1913	Apr. 7, 1950	37
Cale J. Holder	Apr. 5, 1912	Aug. 6, 1954	42
Iowa (northern): Henry N. Graven	June 1, 1893	Mar. 24, 1944	51
Iowa (southern): Roy L. Stephenson	Mar. 14, 1917	May 31, 1960	43
Senior judge: Edwin R. Hicklin	1895	Aug. 16, 1957	62
Kansas:			
Delmas C. Hill	Oct. 9, 1906	Oct. 1, 1949	43
Arthur J. Stanley, Jr	Mar. 21, 1901	July 7, 1958	57

Federal court judges, their dates of birth and dates of appointment (with age at time of appointment), April 1961—Continued

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS—Continued

Court and judge	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Age at time of appointment
Kentucky (eastern):			
H. Church Ford	July 28, 1884	Mar. 28, 1935	51
Mac Swinford	Dec. 23, 1899	Aug. 21, 1937	38
Kentucky (western):			
Roy M. Shelbourne	Nov. 12, 1890	Feb. 8, 1946	56
Henry L. Brooks	Dec. 9, 1905	Aug. 21, 1954	49
Louisiana (eastern):			
Herbert W. Christenberry	Dec. 11, 1897	Dec. 20, 1947	50
J. Skelly Wright	Jan. 14, 1911	Oct. 21, 1949	38
Louisiana (western):			
Ben C. Dawkins, Jr	Aug. 6, 1911	Aug. 3, 1953	42
Edwin F. Hunter, Jr	Feb. 18, 1911	Oct. 3, 1953	42
Senior judge: Benjamin C. Dawkins	July 19, 1881	May 5, 1924	43
Maine: Edward T. Gignoux	June 28, 1916	Aug. 26, 1957	41
Maryland:			
Roszel C. Thomsen	Aug. 17, 1900	May 12, 1954	54
R. Dorsey Watkins	Sept. 27, 1900	Aug. 12, 1955	55
Senior judge: W. Calvin Chesnut	June 27, 1873	May 9, 1931	58
Massachusetts:			
George C. Sweeney	July 23, 1895	Aug. 24, 1935	40
Francis J. W. Ford	Dec. 23, 1882	June 24, 1938	56
Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr	May 27, 1906	Dec. 19, 1941	35
Anthony Julian	Mar. 25, 1902	Sept. 10, 1959	57
Andrew A. Caffrey	Oct. 2, 1920	Oct. 13, 1960	40
Senior judge: William T. McCarthy	Dec. 5, 1885	Feb. 2, 1949	64
Michigan (eastern):			
Theodore Levin	Feb. 18, 1897	July 27, 1946	49
Thomas P. Thornton	Mar. 8, 1898	Feb. 2, 1949	51
Ralph M. Freeman	May 5, 1902	June 10, 1954	52
Frederick W. Kaess	Dec. 1, 1910	July 6, 1960	50
John Feikens	Dec. 3, 1917	Oct. 13, 1960	43
Senior judges:			
Arthur F. Lederle	Nov. 25, 1887	Mar. 6, 1936	49
Frank A. Picard	Oct. 19, 1889	Feb. 23, 1939	50
Michigan (western):			
Raymond W. Starr	Aug. 24, 1888	July 25, 1946	58
W. Wallace Kent	May 1, 1916	June 10, 1954	38
Minnesota:			
Gunnar H. Nordbye	Feb. 4, 1888	Mar. 18, 1931	43
Robert C. Bell	Nov. 1, 1880	June 13, 1933	53
Dennis F. Donovan	Apr. 9, 1889	July 18, 1945	56
Edward J. Devitt	May 5, 1911	Dec. 10, 1954	43
Mississippi (northern):			
Claude F. Clayton	1909	Mar. 12, 1958	49
Senior judge: Allen Cox	Feb. 16, 1887	Mar. 2, 1929	42
Mississippi (southern): Sidney C. Mize	Mar. 7, 1888	Feb. 3, 1937	49
Missouri (eastern):			
George H. Moore	Jan. 20, 1878	May 29, 1935	57
Roy W. Harper	July 26, 1905	Aug. 7, 1947	42
Rudolph H. Weber	Nov. 26, 1909	Mar. 14, 1957	48
Richard M. Duncan	Nov. 10, 1889	July 14, 1943	54
Missouri (western):			
Albert A. Ridge	Oct. 31, 1898	Apr. 7, 1945	47
R. Jasper Smith	1908	July 3, 1956	48
Richard M. Duncan	Nov. 10, 1889	July 14, 1943	54
Roy W. Harper	July 26, 1905	Aug. 7, 1947	42
Senior judge: Albert L. Reeves	Dec. 21, 1873	Jan. 24, 1923	50
Montana:			
William D. Murray	Nov. 20, 1908	May 9, 1949	41
William J. Jameson	1898	Mar. 28, 1957	59
Senior judge: Charles N. Pray		Feb. 8, 1924	
Nebraska:			
Richard E. Robinson	1903	July 3, 1956	53
Robert Van Pelt	1897	June 13, 1957	60
Senior judge: John W. Delehant	Sept. 3, 1890	Feb. 13, 1942	52
Nevada:			
John R. Ross	Mar. 1, 1899	May 15, 1954	55
Senior judge: Roger T. Foley	May 25, 1886	May 2, 1945	59
New Hampshire: Aloysius J. Conner	Apr. 13, 1895	Dec. 9, 1944	49
New Jersey:			
William F. Smith	Feb. 24, 1904	Feb. 15, 1941	37
Thomas F. Meaney	Sept. 6, 1888	July 3, 1942	54
Thomas M. Madden	Mar. 28, 1907	Oct. 25, 1945	38
Richard Hartshorne	Feb. 29, 1888	Oct. 20, 1951	63
Reynier J. Wortendyke, Jr	Mar. 22, 1895	June 8, 1955	60
Arthur S. Lane	Dec. 26, 1910	Aug. 30, 1960	50
(Vacancy.)			
New Mexico:			
Carl A. Hatch	Nov. 27, 1889	Jan. 21, 1949	60
Waldo H. Rogers	May 17, 1906	May 15, 1954	46
New York (northern):			
Stephen W. Brennan	1883	May 6, 1942	59
James T. Foley	July 9, 1910	Feb. 2, 1949	39
New York (southern):			
Sylvester J. Ryan	Sept. 10, 1896	Nov. 1, 1947	51
John F. X. McGohey	1894	Oct. 21, 1949	55
Irving R. Kaufman	June 24, 1910	do	39
Sidney Sugarman	Sept. 4, 1904	do	45
Edward Weinfeld	May 14, 1901	Aug. 5, 1950	49
Thomas F. Murphy	Dec. 3, 1905	July 2, 1951	46
Edward J. Dimock	Jan. 4, 1890	July 11, 1951	61
David N. Edelstein	Feb. 16, 1910	Nov. 1, 1951	41
Archie Owen Dawson	Oct. 9, 1898	Apr. 27, 1954	56
Alexander Bicks	Mar. 17, 1901	May 12, 1954	53
Edmund L. Palmieri	May 14, 1907	do	44
William B. Herlands	July 19, 1905	Aug. 12, 1955	50
John M. Cashin	Aug. 31, 1892	Aug. 17, 1955	63
Richard H. Levet	Jan. 24, 1894	Mar. 8, 1956	62
Gregory F. Noonan	Mar. 12, 1906	Oct. 21, 1949	43
Frederick Van Pelt Bryan	1904	June 19, 1956	52
Charles M. Metzner	Mar. 13, 1917	Sept. 10, 1959	42
Lloyd F. McMahon	Aug. 12, 1912	do	47
New York (southern)—Continued			
Senior judges:			
Vincent L. Leibell	Dec. 10, 1883	June 20, 1936	53
Edward A. Conger	1882	June 24, 1938	56
John C. Knox	Oct. 13, 1881	Apr. 12, 1918	37
Samuel H. Kaufman	Oct. 26, 1893	June 22, 1948	55
William Bondy	1871	Mar. 2, 1923	52
John W. Clancy		June 22, 1936	
New York (eastern):			
Matthew T. Abruzzo	Aug. 30, 1889	Feb. 15, 1936	47
Leo J. Rayfiel	Mar. 22, 1888	July 30, 1947	59
Walter Bruchhausen	May 29, 1892	May 8, 1953	61
Joseph C. Zavatt	1900	Aug. 7, 1957	57
John R. Bartels	Nov. 8, 1897	July 30, 1959	62
Jacob Mishler	Apr. 20, 1911	July 6, 1960	49
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judges:			
Clarence G. Galston	Apr. 18, 1876	Apr. 29, 1929	53
Mortimer W. Byers	May 28, 1877	Nov. 20, 1929	52
New York (western):			
Harold P. Burke	June 6, 1895	June 18, 1937	42
John O. Henderson	Nov. 13, 1909	Sept. 21, 1959	50
North Carolina (eastern): Algernon L. Butler.	Aug. 2, 1905	Aug. 31, 1959	54
North Carolina (middle): Edwin M. Stanley.	Mar. 9, 1909	Oct. 23, 1957	48
Senior judge: Johnson J. Hayes	Jan. 23, 1886	Apr. 6, 1927	41
North Carolina (western): Wilson Warlick.	Mar. 8, 1892	Feb. 2, 1949	48
North Dakota:			
George S. Register	Nov. 27, 1901	July 27, 1955	54
Ronald N. Davies	Dec. 11, 1904	do	51
Ohio (northern):			
Paul Jones	Nov. 4, 1880	Mar. 2, 1923	43
Frank L. Kloeb	June 16, 1890	Aug. 20, 1937	47
Charles J. McNamee	Dec. 5, 1890	Mar. 9, 1951	61
James C. Connell	Sept. 20, 1897	Aug. 10, 1954	57
Girard E. Kalbfleisch	Aug. 3, 1899	Sept. 21, 1959	60
Senior judge: Robert N. Wilkin	May 4, 1886	June 3, 1939	53
Ohio (southern):			
Mell G. Underwood	Jan. 30, 1892	Feb. 12, 1936	44
John H. Druffel	Feb. 6, 1886	Sept. 22, 1937	51
Carl A. Weinman	Jan. 27, 1903	Sept. 8, 1959	56
Oklahoma (northern):			
Royce H. Savage	Mar. 31, 1904	Oct. 1, 1940	36
William R. Wallace	Feb. 21, 1886	June 8, 1950	64
Oklahoma (eastern): Eugene Rice	do	Aug. 11, 1937	46
Oklahoma (western):			
Stephen S. Chandler	Sept. 13, 1899	May 13, 1943	44
Ross Rizley	July 5, 1892	Apr. 13, 1956	64
Oregon:			
Gus J. Solomon	Aug. 29, 1906	Oct. 21, 1949	43
Claude McCulloch	Jan. 14, 1888	Aug. 20, 1937	49
John F. Kilkenny		July 30, 1959	
Pennsylvania (eastern):			
J. Cullen Ganey	Apr. 22, 1899	June 19, 1940	41
Thomas J. Clary	Aug. 21, 1899	Oct. 21, 1949	50
Allan K. Grim	Oct. 15, 1904	do	45
John W. Lord, Jr	Dec. 19, 1901	May 20, 1954	53
Francis L. VanDusen	May 16, 1912	Aug. 1, 1955	43
C. William Kraft, Jr	Dec. 14, 1903	Aug. 12, 1955	52
Thomas C. Egan	1894	Aug. 26, 1957	63
Harold K. Wood	Oct. 26, 1901	Sept. 10, 1959	58
Senior judges:			
William H. Kirkpatrick	Oct. 2, 1885	Mar. 3, 1927	42
George A. Welsh	Aug. 9, 1878	May 20, 1932	54
Pennsylvania (middle):			
John W. Murphy	Apr. 26, 1902	May 27, 1946	44
Frederick V. Follmer	Dec. 13, 1885	Aug. 7, 1946	61
Pennsylvania (western):			
Wallace S. Gourley	Aug. 4, 1904	Nov. 29, 1945	41
Rabe F. Marsh	Apr. 26, 1905	June 8, 1950	45
Joseph P. Willson	Jan. 7, 1902	July 14, 1953	51
John L. Miller	Mar. 24, 1901	May 20, 1954	53
John W. McIlvaine	June 22, 1907	Aug. 1, 1955	48
Herbert P. Sorg		Aug. 1, 1955	
Puerto Rico: Clemente Ruiz Nazario	Nov. 23, 1896	Mar. 15, 1952	56
Rhode Island: Edward William Day	May 24, 1901	Nov. 10, 1953	52
South Carolina (eastern):			
George B. Timmerman	Mar. 28, 1881	Jan. 23, 1942	61
Ashton H. Williams	Aug. 15, 1891	July 3, 1952	61
Senior judge: J. Waties Waring	July 27, 1880	Jan. 23, 1942	62
South Carolina (western):			
Charles C. Wyche	July 7, 1885	Jan. 30, 1937	52
George B. Timmerman	Mar. 28, 1881	Jan. 23, 1942	61
South Dakota:			
George T. Mickelson	July 23, 1903	Dec. 9, 1953	50
Axel J. Beck	May 6, 1894	Mar. 4, 1958	64
Tennesse (eastern):			
Robert L. Taylor	Dec. 20, 1899	Nov. 2, 1949	50
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judge Leslie R. Darr	Nov. 8, 1886	June 2, 1939	53
Tennessee (middle): William E. Miller	Feb. 3, 1908	Mar. 16, 1955	47
Tennessee (western): Marion S. Boyd	1900	Sept. 27, 1940	40
Texas (northern):			
T. Whitfield Davidson	Sept. 23, 1876	Feb. 5, 1936	60
Joe B. Dooley	Dec. 13, 1889	July 9, 1947	58
Joe Ewing Estes	Oct. 24, 1903	Aug. 1, 1955	52
Senior judge: William H. Atwell	June 9, 1869	Jan. 9, 1923	54

Federal court judges, their dates of birth and dates of appointment (with age at time of appointment), April 1961—Continued

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS—Continued

Court and judge	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Age at time of appointment
Texas (southern):			
Allen B. Hannay	Feb. 14, 1892	Aug. 12, 1942	50
Ben C. Connally	Dec. 28, 1909	Oct. 13, 1949	40
Joe M. Ingraham	July 5, 1903	Aug. 6, 1954	51
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judge: Thomas M. Kennerly	Jan. 24, 1874	Feb. 7, 1931	57
Texas (eastern):			
Joe W. Sheehy	Oct. 21, 1910	June 8, 1951	41
Joe J. Fisher	Apr. 16, 1910	Sept. 10, 1959	49
Texas (western):			
Ben H. Rice, Jr.	Dec. 12, 1889	Sept. 28, 1945	56
Robert E. Thomason	May 30, 1879	June 5, 1947	68
Utah:			
Willis W. Ritter	Jan. 24, 1899	Oct. 21, 1949	50
A. Sherman Christenson	June 9, 1905	May 28, 1954	49
Vermont: Ernest W. Gibson	Mar. 6, 1901	Oct. 18, 1949	48
Virgin Islands: Walter A. Gordon	Oct. 10, 1894	Aug. 29, 1958	64
Virginia (eastern):			
Albert V. Bryan	July 23, 1899	June 5, 1947	48
Walter E. Hoffman	July 18, 1907	July 15, 1954	47
Oren R. Lewis			
Senior judge: Sterling Hutcheson	July 23, 1894	Feb. 10, 1944	50
Virginia (western):			
Ted Dalton	July 3, 1901	Aug. 13, 1959	58
(Vacancy.)			
Senior judges:			
Alfred D. Barksdale	July 17, 1892	Feb. 5, 1940	48
John Paul	Dec. 9, 1883	Jan. 14, 1932	49
Washington (eastern):			
William J. Lindberg	Dec. 17, 1904	Apr. 25, 1951	47
Charles L. Powell	Apr. 19, 1902	June 17, 1959	57
Senior judge: J. Stanley Webster	Feb. 22, 1877	Apr. 28, 1923	46
Washington (western):			
John C. Bowen	May 12, 1888	Mar. 20, 1934	46
George H. Boldt	Dec. 28, 1903	July 14, 1953	50
William J. Lindberg	Dec. 17, 1904	Apr. 25, 1951	47
West Virginia (northern):			
Harry E. Watkins	Nov. 6, 1898	Mar. 3, 1937	39
Charles E. Paul		Mar. 5, 1960	
West Virginia (southern):			
Harry E. Watkins	Nov. 6, 1898	Mar. 3, 1937	39
John A. Field, Jr.	Mar. 22, 1910	Aug. 13, 1959	49
Wisconsin (eastern):			
Robert E. Tehan	1905	May 19, 1949	44
Kenneth P. Grubb	Sept. 14, 1895	June 16, 1955	60
Wisconsin (western): Patrick T. Stone	June 21, 1889	June 13, 1933	44
Wyoming: Ewing T. Kerr	Jan. 21, 1900	Oct. 22, 1955	55

Extinction via Imports?

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and my colleagues for a very interesting and enlightening discussion on April 18 of the effect of imports upon the textile and apparel industries in the United States and to associate myself with the discussion.

The apparel industry is an important factor in the economy of the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri, and my concern of the disastrous effects upon the industry of imports is amplified by the fact that our lead mining industry is seriously depressed due to excessive importations of lead. I do hope that the action taken to save our textile and apparel industries will be stronger than the insignificant quota impositions that were used to assist the ailing lead mining industry. In the case of lead, the quotas came too late and were too liberal to materially aid the industry. This is attested to by the fact that imports are now providing almost 60 percent of the annual United States lead requirements.

I wholeheartedly agree with my colleagues that immediate action must be taken to avert the destruction of these 2 great industries employing 2,100,000 Americans. Our present trade policies can only lead to chaos; they must be altered.

Certainly, our foreign friends cannot validly object to a firm system of quotas that will assure our manufacturers of their fair and proper share of the market in view of the serious threat of extinction which our textile and apparel industries are facing.

I also hope that my colleagues are equally concerned over the deplorable conditions existing in our domestic mining industries.

Red Buildup in Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Cuba, Laos, South Vietnam, the Congo and other areas all have one thing in common—intense Communist subversive activity, intense Communist propaganda and ineffective counterefforts by the West, led by the United States. The following editorial entitled, "Red Buildup in Laos," from the Chicago Sun-Times of April 15, 1961, carries a practical, worthwhile analysis of the situation in Laos:

RED BUILDUP IN LAOS

After a period of crisis, the situation in Laos has been marking time. But the surface quiescence covers developments that are extremely disquieting.

For while Soviet Premier Khrushchev has been withholding his answer to British proposals for a cease-fire, Russia has accelerated its airlift of arms to the Pathet Lao rebels.

Only one conclusion can be drawn from this. Khrushchev is stalling. By the time a cease-fire is agreed upon in some form, he intends the Communist forces to be so strong no coalition or neutral government can stand up to them. Or the arms shipments can serve him equally as well in taking a tough bargaining position at the conference table.

The West's lack of clear information both as to current Russian activities in Laos, as well as Soviet intention was strikingly illustrated this week. Intelligence reports from abroad told of a tripling of the delivery of Russian arms to the Communist-held portion of the tiny kingdom. President Kennedy told newsmen, however, he believed the flow had remained fairly uniform. But the next day the U.S. State Department confirmed there has been an increase in the shipments since the fighting came to a standstill.

Thus, in the absence of positive Russian cooperation, the situation is moving back to the same grave atmosphere which marked Mr. Kennedy's call for a peaceful settlement last March 23.

The British proposal was for a three-stage Laos solution—a cease-fire, reactivation of an Indian-Canadian-Polish truce team, and the convening of a 14-nation conference to work out guarantees of the southeast Asia country's permanent neutrality.

Beyond acceptance in general terms, this has never been answered by Khrushchev, despite repeated British efforts to win an actual cease-fire agreement from him.

Doubtless, the reply is being reconciled between European Communist leaders and the Asian Communists, headed by Mao Tse-tung. It could be that Khrushchev finds—or pretends to find—difficulty in producing a reply reflecting his own professions of peaceful coexistence and the more belligerent attitude of Mao. Or the delay could simply be a prelude to raising more conditions, thus paving the way for gaining by negotiations what he cannot gain by force.

Meanwhile, the buildup of Communist strength goes on in a race against the advent of the monsoon season, due in the next few weeks. Thereafter, military operations in the usual sense by SEATO or anyone else will be impossible.

Communist bands will simply be free to roam the rugged countryside, well armed and equipped, establishing themselves in command networks and subjugating the population outside the main towns and villages. What happens at the conferences will make little difference to Laos under these circumstances.

In any event, until the Soviet dictator shows some signs of emerging from his mood of inscrutable truculence on the Lao question, it is unwise for the West to concede—as did President Kennedy and British Prime Minister Macmillan last week—that any future coalition government in the southeast Asia country must include Communist supporters. Such points might better be saved for the bargaining table. Advance indications are they will be needed.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 22, 1961:

The omnibus judgeship bill for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges passed 336 to 76. The final version was the Democrat bill proposing 70 new judgeships (10 circuit, 60 district; at present there are 68 circuit, 245 district judges). Earlier, amendments to limit the number of new judgeships, to 35 and 59, respectively, both Republican sponsored (I supported) were defeated by near party-line votes.

Background: The acute need for additional judgeships is unquestioned. The question was how many more? Last year the House Committees (Judiciary and Rules) unanimously approved 35 new judgeships, after the judicial conference recommended 54. This year the Senate approved 73 new seats. In between the Judicial Conference approved 59 and 69 respectively. The Senate held no hearings and the House held hearings only on the 59 after last year's study and approval of 35.

Arguments for the 70 new judgeships centered around the need and the judicial conference's latest recommendation of 69. Arguments against, centered around Judiciary Committee action which cut last year's recommendation from 54 to 35, so why now go beyond the latest recommendation, particularly without hearings in either House or Senate on the need for this number? To me the debate was a sad commentary on Members playing politics with the judgeships instead of putting merit and need first. Obviously, the 2-year delay in action by a Democrat-led Congress was solely a gamble on political grounds, awaiting the presidential election outcome, so that the new judgeships would be Democrat selected. As Mr. BROWN (Ohio) put it quoting the Rules Committee chairman: "We gambled on this judiciary bill and we won. We gambled on the results of the election and now we will name the judges." There it is plainly stated. For my part, I shall continue to vote on the merits of a bill, smart politics, whatever they may be, notwithstanding.

There are some interesting philosophical byproducts of this debate: (1) 35 judges, we clearly established by hearings and study, were needed, perhaps even more. But 70 have never been established as needed; (2) Members of Congress are even more vulnerable now to legitimate criticism because so many are attorneys and may well be looking hopefully toward appointment to the Federal bench; (3) we should not forget the increasing workload and shift of cases as Federal courts replace State courts in our continuing Federal centralization of our Government; (4) many Members were forced to vote against the bill (including myself) who are indeed for additional judgeships and have for years sponsored such legislation because of this political padding of the number; (5) the northern Democrats and southern Democrats coalesced to pass the bill. There was no coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats against it. Only Republicans, 76 of them, opposed the bill; (6) the President can appoint 89 judges (15 circuit and 74 district) now—all Democrats—a number not appointed by any of his 3 predecessors until 4 years in office. Last year President Eisenhower offered to select on a bipartisan basis 50 percent from either party as an incentive to stimulate Congress to act, but Democrat leadership refused to act despite the need.

The lessons of this bill were twofold; Congress is playing politics with the Federal judiciary and a heavily concentrated one-party political philosophy by Federal judges is a danger to our society.

Social security amendments of 1961 passed handily 400–14 (plus 3 paired against). The bill generally followed the Kennedy proposals: (1) increased minimum benefits from $33 to $40; (2) lowered men's retirement age to receive benefits from 65 to 62; (3) increased the widow's benefits from 75 to 82½ percent of the worker's retirement benefit; (4) lowered the qualifying work requirement from 1 quarter each 9 months worked to 1 quarter per year (years since 1950); (4) increased social security taxes one-eighth percent employer, one-eighth employee beginning in 1962.

Arguments for are self-evident: There is wider coverage and greater benefit offered for an almost gratuitous cost. Arguments against as expressed in minority views (MASON, Illinois, UTT, California, ALGER, Texas) include: (1) A closed or gag rule prescribed floor debate preventing amendments being considered (remember the Rules Committee fuss and the real danger should the committee change the rules of floor debate). (2) Social security is actuarily unsound because it shifts the cost (like a chain letter) to future generations—some $300 billion in present and future obligations of this program are "unfunded." Examples of why (a) For $13 paid in $9,100 can be received. (b) For the maximum amount paid in since social security started in 1937 of $2,580, a man and wife retiring this year can receive $31,200. (3) This bill considers social security as an antirecession, pump-priming device which it never was intended to be (Document 81, February 2, President's message). (4) Social security taxes are becoming a secondary graduated income tax scheduled to go up to 9¼ percent by 1969. As a first dollar tax there are no deductions so it hits modest incomes the hardest. Many will pay more social security tax than income tax. (5) This is not insurance. The Supreme Court justifies it only as welfare. It is a hoax and pretense to present it as insurance. It can be voted out. It is political.

Perhaps Sam Gompers, the father of labor unions, said it best: "Compulsory social insurance is in its essence undemocratic and it cannot remove or prevent poverty. The workers of America adhere to voluntary institutions in preference to compulsory systems, which are held to be not only impracticable, but a menace to their rights, welfare, and their liberty."

For my part, I refuse to vote increased costs which further imbalance an already dangerously imbalanced program. I predict the whole program will either collapse financially or will be voted out by later generations who refuse to pay the charge accounts the program is running up.

The basic faults of the program rest on (1) assumption of constantly increasing number of new entrants to the program, who will pay the taxes, always on high income—there dare not be a slowdown in population growth or a decline in pay scales or this program will fail to collect what must be paid out; (2) unforeseen factors earlier unknown include (a) people are living longer, so there are progressively more beneficiaries than anticipated at the outset, (b) Congress constantly increases coverage and benefits for political reasons, to please voters (always just before election every 2 years—this bill now being the exception).

Opposition in Congress is growing as the fallacies of the social security program are seen or suspected. Since my coming to Congress, opposition has increased from 2 (of which I was one) to 17 recorded votes. This number will grow. My hope is that we can correct the program before it collapses irreparably, leaving many older citizens without the promised security.

THE COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY—WORLDWIDE DOMINATION

Communism versus the United States: We are at war because the enemy is at war with us and intends to win either the cold war of subversion or a shooting war, limited or worldwide. These are the goals of the Communists who intend to bury us, literally, in victory at arms through violent revolution, if necessary, or figuratively by subversion and propaganda and/or forcing us to spend ourselves into bankruptcy. Communism, the worldwide conspiracy, headquarters in Moscow. Success has resulted in 43 years from murder, enslavement, lying, deceit, blackmail and refusal to honor contractual agreements. Now approximately half of the world is dominated by the Kremlin. Meanwhile fifth column activities go on in all the other nations above or underground, regardless of illegality. The U.N. has been used as a propaganda tool where Russia pays too little, controls too many votes, vetoes action, minipulates the Secretariat, and disregards both the charter and any agreements reached within the U.N.

The United States as the leader of the free world, on the contrary, abides by law and contracts. The United States has caused no world problems through conquest, has sought no new real estate nor enslavement of any people. The United States has tried to negotiate honorably any disagreements between nations through the U.N. The United States abides by the U.N. Charter and agreements. The United States has sought to provide leadership by example, and to help and to protect any nation maintaining or seeking freedom defined as the right to its own self-determination. The United States has even sought in good conscience to be understanding of and get along with the Russians. The United States has practiced peaceful coexistence. Military alliances with other nations are defensive only. Exchanges of all kinds—educational, cultural, trade and technology—even with the enemy, have characterized U.S. conduct. Foreign aid has been given to many nations to help each nation develop. Over the years since World War II's end (when we were militarily stronger than the entire world) the United States has been continuously losing strength relatively and the Communists have been gaining. U.S. successes at most have been a temporary halting or slowdown of communism's growth—half the world since 1917—962 million people and 10 nations engulfed since World War II. Today Cuba is in the balance, Laos is tottering, Africa is leaning. Tomorrow what other area or nation, and the day after, until what—the United States stands alone confronted by the entire world? Too late then will it be to enflame the enslaved people, who like Hungarians, are thoroughly crushed and unable to rise.

Let's look at the balance sheet (BARRY GOLDWATER, "Conscience of a Conservative," Soviet Menace, p. 86). The United States officially recognized the Communist Russian Government in 1933. United States has subsidized Socialist and Communist governments, dedicated enemies, and neutral governments, hardly U.S. friends, then or now. United States has lost at every negotiation by agreeing to negotiate matters not negotiable (example: agreeing to other nation's enslavement by Communists). United States has lost the propaganda battle through the U.N. at every turn, the exchange program has

brought Communist spies and dupes, peaceful coexistence as a practice by the U.N. has meant bowing to Russia's wishes because of the Russian world blackmail through the balance of terror, the threat of an atomic world war III.

So the United States has been weakened by the U.N. actions and by its own policies; another example of the latter being the self-imposed ban on testing of nuclear weapons. Tactical weapons for limited warfare are needed and tests are needed.

Our policies of peacefulness have led to the outright invasion of our hemisphere by the Communists in Cuba, 90 miles away, in violation of the Monroe Doctrine. The bill of particulars in Cuba reads like all the others. (1) U.S. citizens have been executed, (2) Cuba has expropriated over $1 billion of U.S. citizen's property, (3) the propaganda lies have well discredited the United States in the eyes of the word, despite U.S. hands-off policy, (4) the revolutionary forces are unquestionably tools of the Communists.

What are we going to do about Cuba and communism—assuming we still consider freedom paramount and believe in "Give me liberty or give me death." The agonizing reappraisal, so long overdue, will include the realization that the Communist menace will not be licked by local skirmishes in outlying countries. No; the trouble center is the Kremlin. To beat them, to win this struggle, the United States must: (1) realize we are at war and we must win; (2) take the offensive, no policy of drift or awaiting another new trouble area; (3) keep building our present military superiority—start nuclear testing and develop the tactical warfare nuclear weapons needed for limited warfare; (4) keep our economy strong—cut down welfare spending, stimulate free enterprise production by tax cuts; (5) be firm, tough, the self-recognized leader: Stipulate and make others conform to our standards, defined and defended as peace, freedom and justice, as against the Socialist and Communist domination of people, and their appraisal of and demand for other standards; (6) extend foreign aid only to anti-Communist friends on our terms, mainly as loans and technical assistance with self-matching effort from the recipient nations; (7) declare communism the outlaw of civilization; withdraw recognition of the Communist leaders as the government of the Russian people; refuse to do business with them or to make contracts that won't be honored, even as we refuse to recognize Red China, as a bandit nation; (8) encourage captive nations to revolt, being particularly careful on timing; (9) encourage expatriated people to liberate and regain their homeland (China, for example); (10) be prepared for armed conflict, knowing that all nations respect strength (particularly the bully)—talk tough, but be tough.

Only as we pursue a firm, clearly outlined course of U.S. self-imposed interest, as the free world's leader, can we hope to avoid world war III, and if it should come, God forbid, survive it while communism perishes.

Recalling Spengler's Forecast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of the problems of foreign affairs, I believe that the following editorial by Constantine Brown is deserving of the careful attention of the Members of Congress:

RECALLING SPENGLER'S FORECAST—40 YEARS AFTER, IT IS FOUND THE FATE OF WEST'S CIVILIZATION IS IN DANGER

(By Constantine Brown)

The diplomatic Pearl Harbor we suffered at the hands of the Communists in Cuba brings back to the minds of many the superpessimistic book the Decline of the West, written in 1914 by the German philosopher Oswald Spengler. All those who read the English translation in the early twenties described it as "so much intellectual posh." How could anybody in full possession of his faculties, it was asked, predict that Western Christian civilization, which had just emerged stronger than ever after the defeat of the Central Powers, was on the downgrade? After the various peace treaties had been concluded, the British, French, and Japanese empires were even more powerful than ever. Amferica, which had been aloof from foreign entanglements, had just joined, with her immense might, the concert of the world powers.

Yet today, some 40 years after the first English translation of Spengler's book, it appears that he was not as "cock-eyed" as many considered him in those days. The fate of the Western Christian civilization hangs in the balance. Through the blunders, lack of vision, and ill-placed optimism of its leaders, we have created a destructive, materialistic, atheistic force—the Soviet-Communist empires—which stand ready to engulf us. The U.S.S.R., which has survived exclusively with the assistance of the West, now has become an empire greater than those known in the past.

The Government of the United States, influenced by misguided idealists, tolerated and indirectly assisted the creation of the Chinese Communist Empire, which now has more than a fair chance of conquering the whole of Southeast Asia. The Chinese Communists under the able leadership of Mao Tse-tung were sold to the American people as "agrarian reformers." For the last 10 years the combined forces of the British Government and the American political sentimentalists have tried to have the barbarous Chinese regime accepted in the United Nations. Judging by recent reports from London concerning the conversations between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan, they are in a fair way of achieving the goal. The United Nations, which used to be the great club of peace-loving nations, is rapidly changing to a tool in the hands of international communism.

The West, and particularly the English-speaking countries, is endeavoring to stave off the decline of the West by placating the tigers by negotiations. Yet it has become obvious over the nearly half-century since communism established itself in Russia that negotiations are meaningless—unless they serve the purposes of the modern Attilas. President Eisenhower secured the Korean armistice with the Communists. It is true that there has been no fighting there since. But according to all informed observes the Korean puppets of Mao in the North are now in a fair way to swallow up the South by negotiations. Despite the firm assurances we hear from Washington, there is real concern that soon we may have another Berlin crisis in order to force another series of negotiations which would serve the objectives of the Communists. We are willing and ready to negotiate the Communist-fabricated and supported Lao crisis. And only the wishful thinkers or the ultranaive actually believe that we could save that kingdom from the Red clutches.

Beset with jealousies and lack of reciprocal understanding, the West even at this late and tragic hour believes that negotiations will save our civilization. The game as we have been playing it for the last 15 years is to see how cheaply the modern Huns can be bought for what may be only a moment of peace.

Remarks of the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., Friday, April 21, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a profound and informative address delivered on April 21, 1961, in Washington, D.C., at the annual meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States:

It is a pleasure to be here and to share with you the Administration's thinking about some of the pressing economic problems that have a bearing upon our Nation's present and future well-being.

To begin with, I think one can fairly say that there is a substantial concensus in our country today on national economic goals:

We want a steadily expanding economy, based upon a strengthened system of free enterprise.

We want a rate of growth sufficient to give us an ever-rising standard of living and to provide jobs for all.

We want to assure the education of our youth and the health and security of those who are growing old.

We want an economy that can adequately provide for our national defense and furnish our fair share of the development needs of less fortunate peoples in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

We want to accomplish all of this in an atmosphere of relative price stability.

Inevitably there will be differences among us over the means we should employ to achieve our objectives. But we must not permit such differences to obscure our basic agreement. We must recognize that unless all elements in our society work together, we cannot mobilize the massive effort required of our Nation in meeting the challenge of the sixties.

Before considering the fiscal and monetary policies we should follow to achieve our objectives, let us look briefly at ourselves as we are today:

We are a people who have built what is clearly the strongest and most advanced economy on earth. But, as recent experience demonstrates, we have not mastered the art of keeping our economy operating at the highest sustainable levels.

The recession from which we are now beginning to emerge has been relatively mild. For example, in terms of constant dollars which allow for inflation, gross national product is now only 2.2 percent below last year's peak, compared with a decline of 4.7 percent in the 1958 recession. Personal income and industrial production have also

fallen less than in previous postwar recessions.

However, before we take too much satisfaction from these figures, let us remember that they are relative. The absolute figures tell a far different story: Current unemployment, with 6.9 percent of our labor force out of work, approaches the worst days of the 1958 setback. A record number of our cities are classified as areas of substantial unemployment.

Why, in view of the relative mildness of the recession, do we have 5½ million people unemployed?

The answer is clear: We have not been producing at our full capacity for some years. Even last year, at the point of highest production in our history, our economy was operating well below its potential and we still had 5 percent of our labor force unemployed. We can and must do better in the future. Meanwhile, until we find ways to improve the overall performance of our economy, the extent of current unemployment demands prompt and forthright action by the Federal Government. President Kennedy has, therefore, taken a number of steps to speed recovery:

The annual veterans' dividend of $250 million, ordinarily paid out over the course of a year, was paid in full during March.

Tax refunds were speeded up and we are now $500 million ahead of last year's pace.

Government programs have been expedited by the prompt obligation of available funds.

Most important, a temporary unemployment compensation bill has been enacted.

These actions, together with increased defense spending that got underway last fall and reduced revenues stemming from the recession, have created a budgetary deficit of about $2 billion in the current fiscal year. Such a deficit is not a cause for alarm in times like these. On the contrary, it is a stimulus to recovery that can, and should, be readily offset by surpluses as prosperity returns.

Another deficit is in prospect for fiscal 1962: one of about $3 billion. This, too, will be entirely appropriate. The economy will require the stimulating effect of a modest deficit in the coming fiscal year if it is to move forward at an adequate pace.

The innate strength of our economy, the increase in Government outlays which I have mentioned, and the automatic action of the so-called built-in budgetary stabilizers, are apparently putting an end to the current recession. Looking backward we may well find that the turning point was reached early in March. But, unless we act energetically, recovery is likely to be sluggish, just as the decline was gradual and slow.

No matter what the pace of our recovery from the recession, there are major problems confronting us which must be solved if we are to realize our full economic potential. We must find ways first to achieve and then to maintain production at full capacity. We must insure employment for our steadily growing labor force. At the same time, we must preserve reasonable price stability.

If we balance these goals against our accomplishments, I think it obvious that new and forward looking governmental action is called for.

Excessive Federal spending is clearly undesirable. But our minimum national needs must be met. Let me cite those which merit highest priority:

First, after careful reexamination, the President has concluded that we must increase our defense expenditures in the coming fiscal year by 1½ percent, or about $650 million. Surely, no one can logically question our need or our capacity to spend whatever is required for our Nation's security.

Second, we are confronted by a shameful lag in education. More education will, of course, assure the flowering of our national culture. But, beyond this, we must recognize that education today lies at the very root of a nation's power and well-being. Without adequate education, we cannot hope to achieve the economic growth we desire. Our shortcomings in providing our citizens with education according to their needs and capacities is a blight upon our future. The problem has grown so large that an additional Federal contribution is clearly and urgently required.

Third, we must supply the ever-growing needs of our municipalities: slum clearance, improved transportation, modern sewage facilities, and increased water supply. These needs are placing an unbearable burden upon our larger cities.

We can and we must fulfill these needs. Fortunately, if our economy operates at full capacity, our present tax system can yield a surplus of several billion dollars. Our problem is not, therefore, how to raise additional revenues but to get our economy operating at higher levels. Moreover, in setting tax policy, our most difficult task is not obtaining more revenue but strengthening and modernizing our whole tax system so as to stimulate growth and improve equity. One of our major objectives is thorough-going tax reform. An extensive review is now under way and we expect to present concrete recommendations to the Congress next January.

In the meantime, there is one important tax reform that cannot wait: This is legislation to spur the modernization of our plant and equipment. It is an unpleasant fact that our plant equipment is growing older year by year. By contrast, thanks to more liberal investment incentives than are available under our laws, Western Europe and Japan are modernizing at a much faster rate. We must step up our rate of modernization if we are to maintain our Nation's competitive position. The installation of new and more efficient equipment is of prime importance in enabling us to meet foreign competition in the drive for export markets which are so essential to improving our balance of payments.

Since the installation of modern equipment means that labor can produce more, we must recognize that it may complicate the problem of unemployment. However, modernization will also increase jobs in the capital goods industries. Indeed, we estimate that the tax incentive President Kennedy has recommended should lead to an increase of from $2 to $3 billion a year in expenditures for plant and equipment. Some 250,000 new jobs would be required to provide this equipment. In addition, at least as many more people would find employment as an indirect result of these expenditures. Although major benefits to economic growth will accrue over the longer run, it is also clear that this tax incentive will have a substantial effect in speeding our recovery from recession. And, as our economy speeds up, increased consumer and business demand will expand the variety and volume of goods produced, thus creating new jobs to replace those eliminated by increased productivity. This is the way of future progress.

The legislation the President has requested is carefully designed to promote increased spending for modernization and expansion. Its enactment is necessary to speed full recovery and promote rapid grown thereafter. Initially, it will result in some loss of revenue. To compensate for this loss, he is asking that a number of serious tax defects be corrected:

First, expense accounts—an area where abuse has virtually become a national scandal. Tighter enforcement of the present law is not an adequate solution, for it would put an unacceptably heavy discretionary burden upon Government tax auditors. What is needed is a new and stricter legislative definition of allowable deductions. This is what we are asking.

Second, we are asking for withholding at the source of interest and dividends. Our best estimate is that about $3 billion of income from interest and dividends goes unreported every year. This situation is clearly unfair to all wage earners and, indeed, to the majority of taxpayers. We are asking that it be corrected by a workable withholding provision that, as in the case of wages, will collect at the source a substantial portion of the tax on interest and dividend income.

Third, we are asking for repeal of the 4-percent dividend credit. This credit was adopted in 1954 in an attempt to lighten the double taxation of dividend income. But, at only 4 percent, it has not served its purpose. Furthermore, it gives considerably greater benefit to those in the higher income brackets than to the vast majority of stockholders. This favoritism in the law is unhealthy and should be ended. The related $50 exemption should also be dropped.

Finally, we seek an end to tax provisions that encourage American business operations abroad through the use of tax havens. We also want to withdraw preferential tax treatment for American capital going into industrially advanced countries, for such treatment discriminates against the investment of capital at home. These changes will have a needed and favorable impact upon our basic balance-of-payments deficit. We are not, however, recommending changes in tax inducements for investment in underdeveloped countries which are an essential part of our overall program to help these countries grow.

I have briefly outlined our overall fiscal and budgetary thinking. I have also told you something of our plans for the immediate future as regards taxation.

Now, let me take up monetary policy. This is a field where we face an entirely new situation brought about by the recently achieved convertibility of foreign currencies. Convertibility permits owners of liquid funds to shift them freely from one world financial center to another in search of higher interest rates. Therefore, the extremely low short-term interest rates of previous recessions could have dangerous repercussions today. Short-term interest rates much below present levels might well touch off a renewed outflow of dollars that could imperil our balance of payments and the soundness of our dollar.

Nevertheless, we need low, long-term rates to stimulate borrowing for modernization, plant expansion, housing construction, and the like just as much today as in previous periods of recession. Accordingly, the administration is attempting to promote lower long-term interest rates without putting downward pressure on present short-term rates. For one thing, the Federal Reserve is now purchasing securities of all maturities, instead of restricting itself to short-term Treasury bills. For another, President Kennedy has taken direct action in the housing credit field which has helped to lower average mortgage rates by more than a quarter of 1 percent since the turn of the year.

Far more meaningful than interest rates, however, is the quantity of funds flowing into investments. Here, we see evidence of improvement in the mortgage credit area, where, although rates are still on the high side, availability of credit is no longer an inhibiting factor. We also see increasing evidence of growing municipal and corporate borrowing.

Finally, since the budgetary deficits that are presently envisioned are modest and bear no comparison to the deficit of 1959, monetary policy will remain free to act in support of business recovery. Therefore, the substantial increases in interest rates that characterized the 1958–59 period are not likely to recur this time.

To sum up:

Our policies—be they budgetary, tax, or monetary—should have one overriding goal: the promotion of a healthy rate of economic growth within a reasonable atmosphere of economic stability. We must meet the needs of the day in the fields of defense, education, housing, highway construction, urban development, and other essentials. Fortunately, we are in a position to meet them—this year, and the next, and in the long run—without undue strain on our economy.

We must overhaul our tax system to provide greater fairness and incentives for efficiency and growth, beginning with an investment incentive this year, and following with a basic overhaul next year.

We must maintain an interest rate structure conducive to the steady flow of funds into investment.

To achieve all these things will not be easy. But with determination and perserverance we should be able to attain our goals. In the process, we can look forward to a period of growth and prosperity during the sixties such as this Nation has never known.

Communism and the House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, this is the second in a series of articles by Robert B. Dresser, dealing with communism and the House Un-American Activities Committee.

It appeared in Economic Council Papers, volume XVI, No. 2, on March 1, 1961:

COMMUNISM AND THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

(By Robert B. Dresser)

In November 1954 Senator William F. Knowland rose on the floor of the Senate and delivered a momentous and prophetic address. It was at a time when the question was being considered whether we should permit the Chinese Nationalists to bomb the mainland of Red China in order to prevent a Communist landing on the island of Quemoy, then and now in the Nationalists' possession.

Three out of five Joint Chiefs of Staff, including the Chairman, and also Secretary of State Dulles, recommended this move. President Eisenhower decided against it.

SENATOR KNOWLAND'S ADDRESS

In the course of his address Senator Knowland made the following statements:

"Are 'coexistence' and 'atomic stalemate' synonymous terms? If they are not, just what is the difference? Is the former merely an inevitable prelude to the latter? And what of our foreign policy and our defense policy when such an atomic stalemate takes place? Does not atomic stalemate mean inevitable Communist nibbling aggression, rather than peace in our time? How many years remain when we still have some initiative left? These are some of the basic questions before the Government and the people of the United States.

* * * * *

"The survival of this Republic and the possibility of a free world of freemen hangs in the balance.

"The civilizations that flourished and died in the past had opportunities for a limited period of time to change the course of history. Sooner or later, however, they passed the point of no return, and the decisions were no longer theirs to make.

"Coexistence and atomic stalemate will result in ultimate Communist victory. * * * We must face up to the fact that the Communist concept of 'peaceful coexistence' means that the United States or other free nations of the world will be allowed to exist only until communism is able to subvert them from within or destroy them by aggression from without.

"It is my belief that the Soviet Union is advancing the Trojan horse of coexistence only for the purpose of gaining sufficient time to accomplish what we may term 'atomic stalemate.' When would they hope to accomplish this objective? The target date is probably between 1957 and 1960.

* * * * *

"Let us examine the possibility then of even a troubled peace. It is more likely that at that point, when the free world has become paralyzed and immobilized by the realization that the United States and the Soviet Union could act and react one upon the other with overwhelming devastation, the men in the Kremlin will see their best opportunity to start with what for the want of a better term I will call Operation Nibbling, wherein they will seek to take over the peripheral nations bite by bite.

* * * * *

"Then they will start down through our smaller allies first to soften us up. These will not all be nibbled at once, but will be spaced out so that as each country passes behind the Iron Curtain, it will increase the despair of the other victims and the paralyses of the nations who might be willing to resist.

* * * * *

"Before our eyes the people of the United States would see nation after nation nibbled away and when the realization finally dawned that this policy would inevitably result in our country becoming a continental Dien Bien Phu in a Communist totalitarian world, the chances of our winning such a struggle would be so lessened and the Soviet world so extended that they then would be prepared for an all-out challenge to us wherein we would be allowed the choice to surrender or die.

* * * * *

"Time is running out and I would remind the Senate that in this day and age of the airplane and the atomic weapon, time is not necessarily on the side of the free world."

DR. GERHART NIEMEYER'S STATEMENT

The December 10, 1954 issue of David Lawrence's U.S. News & World Report contains an article by Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, of Yale, entitled "1964—After 10 Years of Coexistence," in which strikingly similar views are expressed.

W. H. FERRY'S STATEMENT

On January 13, 1960, W. H. Ferry, the vice president of the Fund for the Republic, wrote a letter to the Santa Barbara News-Press, from which I quote as follows:

"When one says that war is unthinkable, it must be taken as a literal statement, i.e., nuclear war cannot be thought about. We have no vocabulary, no recourse to imagination sufficient to deal in logical terms with the prospect of 60 or 70 million American corpses, to say nothing about the carnage accompanying a nuclear attack, and to say nothing of the effects of radiation lingering over generations.

"Perhaps this is one reason why all current assessments of the impasse between Russia and the United States end up in the same sterile and hopeless formula: Arms and yet more arms.

* * * * *

"Suppose we were to go in the other direction? Suppose we were to junk all of our weapons of whatever kind? Suppose we were to tell the world that we are doing so because we are convinced that it is the only practical way out of the fateful dilemma in which all are caught?

"The best possible result of such a decision is * * * that Russia would follow our example * * *.

"The worst possible result is that Russia would instantly take advantage of our defenselessness to bomb the United States into radioactive rubble. In this case we would not be worse off than if we had engaged in a two-way war. All that would be lacking would be a regret among survivors that we had not had vengeance on our attackers. But this result seems wholly unlikely. It may better be supposed that Russia does not desire the extinction of the United States but its submission as a nation and great production center to communism.

"Another and more possible result then is that this country would be taken over by the Reds, commissars replacing our managers and mayors, legislators and union officials, broadcasters and publishers. * * * This is a desperate and repellent vision; and while I do not believe that this would be the outcome, it is necessary to accept it as a possibility if one is willing to argue that unilateral disarmament is the only practical policy for this country to adopt. Red domination of this and other free nations is at least thinkable. We can at least imagine it in all its hateful and dismal aspects, while we find the consequences of a nuclear, germ, and gas war unthinkable and unimaginable. We would survive as a nation with the greatest of traditions and with the unquenchable intention of demonstrating by argument and peaceable resistance the power of freedom and justice as man's best and only proper organizing principles.

"It might well take years or decades to regenerate freedom and justice. But we would have the chance to do so, a chance that by common agreement would not be vouchsafed us in the case of an all-out war which no nation could win. Should war come, the task would not be resisting or throwing off the hand of an oppressor by reasonable means; it would be the task of rebuilding civilization from barbarism and chaos.

* * * * *

"The alternatives are drastic and repugnant in the highest degree. But the important point is that there is an alternative to our present policy."

Here you have it—in the year 1960—precisely what Senator Knowland predicted in 1954.

The significant thing is that a prominent American, holding the position that Mr. Ferry holds, should be preaching this doctrine. This raises the question as to how many of our citizens share Mr. Ferry's views and whether their number will increase until they are sufficiently strong to force an acceptance of their views. May Heaven forbid.

WHAT HAVE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE BEEN DOING?

What have the American people been doing since Senator Knowland delivered his warning in 1954?

Have they been rooting out the Communists in their midst and putting their own house in order?

Broadly speaking, the answer is "No." Thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of

our citizens have been duped or deceived by Communist propaganda, and have been unwittingly led to adopt ideas and programs of Communist origin, the effect of which has been to aid immeasurably the accomplishment of the Communist objective. The evidence of this is legion. It may be found in abundance in the reports of the Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, in the statements and writings of J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the FBI, and in the statements and writings of many others.

It is important to understand how the Communists operate.

TESTIMONY OF J. EDGAR HOOVER IN 1947

The following is an excerpt from the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover before the Committee on Un-American Activities on March 26, 1947:

"For the most part [Communist] front organizations assumed the character of either a mass or membership organization or a paper organization. Both solicited and used names of prominent persons. Literally hundreds of groups and organizations have either been infiltrated or organized primarily to accomplish the purposes of promoting the interests of the Soviet Union in the United States, the promotion of Soviet war and peace aims, the exploitation of Negroes in the United States, work among foreign-language groups, and to secure a favorable viewpoint toward the Communists in domestic, political, social, and economic issues.

"The first requisite for front organizations is an idealistic sounding title. Hundreds of such organizations have come into being and have gone out of existence when their true purposes have become known or exposed while others with high-sounding names are continually springing up."

SOVIET TWO-PRONGED THREAT

No informed person can be anything but gravely concerned at the Soviet threat. It is a two-pronged threat: (1) Destruction by force from without, and (2) the gaining by peaceful means of control from within. Naturally, Russia prefers the latter course, for it would give her control of the vast resources of this country intact.

Let no one think that this is a fantastic idea. Starting with a population of less than 200 million at the end of World War II, Russia has since rapidly expanded her influence in Europe and Asia until today she controls roughly 40 percent of the world's population and 25 percent of the earth's surface and this control continues to be rapidly expanding. The United States has approximately 6 percent of the world's population.

CONDITIONS IN UNITED STATES UNDER COMMUNISM

Speaking of the conditions in the United States under communism, J. Edgar Hoover states in his "Masters of Deceit":

"Under communism, a tiny minority, perhaps 10 to 20 men, would rule the United States. An open dictatorship called the dictatorship of the proletariat would be established. * * *

"The Constitution, and all our laws, would be abolished. If you owned productive property you would be arrested as an exploiter, hauled before a revolutionary court, and sentenced to a concentration camp—that is, if you convinced the 'judge' you were worth saving at all. All property used in production would be confiscated, thus leading ultimately to total communization, meaning state ownership. This confiscation would include your home, business, bank deposits, and related personal possessions. These would belong to everybody. You have no right to own them under the Communist scheme.

"The revolution would affect every man, woman, and child in America. Communists do not propose to remodel our government or retain any part of it. They would tear it to the ground, destroy all opposition, and then create a new government, an American province in the Soviet world empire. * * *

"All industry would be nationalized and farms taken away from their owners. A small businessman is just as guilty as a large businessman; both must be liquidated. Rents, profits, and insurance would be abolished. Countless occupations, termed by the Communists as useless and parasitic, would be ended. * * *

"Action would be drastic, immediate, and without appeal. An armed Red guard would enforce the orders of party henchmen. Hotels, country clubs, and swimming pools would be used for the benefit of 'workers,' meaning, in most cases, party bosses. The workingman in the mines, factories, and mills would be told to work certain hours for certain wages. Labor unions, as we know them, would be obliterated. All such organizations would be owned and operated by the Communist government, and no laborer would be permitted to organize a union or to strike against his government. * * *

"This picture of a Communist America is not overdrawn."

COMMUNIST ATROCITIES

Millions of Russians have been killed by their Communist masters and millions more sent to Siberia to work in slave-labor camps until death came to their relief.

In the Ukraine alone, during the 1937–38 purge, under the direction of Khrushchev, an estimated 400,000 were killed and terror gripped the whole population.

A second purge in 1943, also conducted by Khrushchev, "was if anything more bloody and more horrifying than the first."

And more recently we have the cruel slaughter of the Hungarian freedom fighters. "Our Ambassador in Moscow at the time asked Khrushchev what he would do to stop the blood flowing in Hungary. To which the master of the Kremlin replied: 'We will put in more troops and more troops until we have finished them.'" ("The Crimes of Khrushchev, Part I"—testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee, Sept. 4, 1959, of Eugene Lyons, a senior editor of the Reader's Digest, former press correspondent stationed in Soviet Russia, student of international communism and biographer of Khrushchev.)

And this is the man who was invited to visit this country and who was entertained by President Eisenhower, and with whom a further summit conference with our present President appears to be under consideration.

Also, we should not forget the many millions liquidated in Communist China.

COMMUNIST AGREEMENT WORTHLESS

How long will it take the American people and their leaders to learn that the Communists never have kept, and never will keep, any agreement they make, unless it is to their advantage to do so?

The summit conferences are justified by our leaders as a means of easing international tension. However, the only tension is the tension created by Russia herself, and all she has to do is to desist from her skulduggery. A summit conference is not needed for this. The Russian purpose is not to compromise, but merely to exact further concessions from the West.

In Heaven's name, let's stop this nonsense.

COMMUNISM AN INTERNATIONAL CONSPIRACY

The Communists do not constitute a political party. They are a group of international gangsters and criminals of the most vicious type. To accomplish their objective they will lie, cheat, steal, and murder. Why can't the American people and their leaders understand this and act accordingly?

STATEMENT OF DMITRI MANUILSKI

In 1953, Dmitri Manuilski, a Soviet official and at one time the presiding officer of the United Nations Security Council, stated to the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION'S COMMITTEE REPORT

In its 1958 report to the association's house of delegates, the American Bar Association's special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives said:

"The Communists aim to keep us complacent until the choice is annihilation or surrender, at which time they confidently expect us to submit to a negotiated surrender."

This, of course, is the purpose of their policy of so-called peaceful coeixstence—to lull us into a feeling of security until they are strong enough to take over.

DIFFICULT FOR AMERICAN PEOPLE TO BELIEVE

It is difficult for the American people to believe that these things are going on right in their midst—they are so foreign to anything that our training and past experience have taught us. And yet the evidence is overwhelming that these things are and have for some years been going on beneath the surface and that they are rapidly reaching a climax.

CONCLUSION

Are we as a people so dumb that we cannot be made to see? Are we so lazy and indifferent that we will not take the time to acquaint ourselves with the facts which involve our very survival? If so, we deserve the fate that will inevitably befall us.

Let me close with this quotation from a statement by America's Future:

"While Butcher Mikoyan charmed, Soviet fighters shot down an unarmed transport, lured off its course with 17 American boys. Six are dead. Eleven have vanished. Mikoyan swears the plane crashed. But a recording of the attacking pilots' crosstalk proves he lies.

"Congress screams and America boils at the callous brutality of this murder. Yet only 17 were involved. Meanwhile, every day 175 million Americans and hundreds of millions of other freedom-loving people are being led nearer to slavery or slaughter. They are being led there by the blind and stupid refusal of too many Americans, in and out of Government, to recognize Communist subversion and act to stop it. In schools and colleges, in Government, and labor unions, in communications and entertainment, even sometimes in business, we help the Communists undermine us. The murders, lies, insults, and diplomatic sideshows are only little incidents, planned diversions. They keep us from seeing the real threat.

"His head buried in sand, the ostrich sees no enemy and thinks there is no danger. How like the ostrich are we. The evidence

is all around us, but to see it and recognize it for what it is disturbs our dream of peace.

"It's up to you. For your own protection, will you look and listen? Will you know the enemy, understand his tactics, recognize his plans in operation, learn to anticipate his moves, stop giving him odds in this death struggle?"

Wisconsin Electric Co-op Celebrates Silver Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, just a year after REA celebrated its 25th birthday, Wisconsin Electric Cooperative—WEC—is observing its silver anniversary. This statewide organization of rural electric and rural telephone cooperatives has made a large and valuable contribution to the sound growth of the rural electrification movement in Wisconsin as well as setting a good, workable pattern for the organization and development of similar associations in other states.

Throughout the past 25 years, WEC has pioneered in many fields and has many "firsts" to its credit. In 1936, it started the first and only cooperative engineering service. Four years later, WEC began publishing the Wisconsin REA News, which was the first statewide rural electric co-op newspaper in the Nation and which remains a leader among REA publications. WEC was also the first statewide organization to merchandise line materials, a service which now has been expanded to cover 13 States.

When delegates from WEC's member co-ops assembled in Madison, Wis., last month for their silver anniversary meeting, they passed a series of resolutions that are in keeping with WEC's tradition of looking to the future. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a series of those resolutions in the RECORD:

RESOLUTIONS OF WISCONSIN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE DELEGATES

RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Whereas the availability of low-cost energy in our rural areas can play a highly significant role in reversing out-migration population trends and bolstering and diversifying the economies of our rural areas; and

Whereas cooperatively-owned rural electric systems are the chief suppliers of electric service in rural areas where the need for an effective program of rural community development is greatest; and

Whereas by organizing the resources available in these areas, and organizing the leadership potential of our electric cooperatives, much can be accomplished to introduce new industry, consolidate and improve the standards of existing industry, improve the efficiency of farming and develop areawide community improvements programs; and

Whereas the potential of such a program can be greatly enhanced through the availability of low-interest loan funds as provided in legislation now being considered by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we initiate rural community resource development programs in our service areas, that we direct WEC to develop the groundwork for a coordinated approach to such a program, and that we endorse S. 1 and H.R. 4569, which provides for a $100 million revolving fund for low-interest loan funds for rural development.

REA LOAN FUNDS

Whereas we fully endorse the sentiments expressed by the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, in reference to the Rural Electrification Administration program that much remains to be accomplished in bolstering rural electric service and to correct conditions in rural telephone service; and

Whereas particularly in the field of securing long-range solutions to wholesale power requirements of REA borrowers, there is a critical need for low-interest loan funds to meet the long-range requirements of rural people; and

Whereas only one-third of the Nation's farms have modern telephone service, and the REA loan program is the most effective means whereby modern service can be brought to all of America's rural people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respectfully request that the Congress appropriate an amount of loan and administrative funds for both the rural electric and telephone programs at a level adequate to meet all sound and feasible requirements of the program for the coming fiscal year.

REA TELEPHONE LOAN POLICY

Whereas in rural America today only one farmer in three enjoys modern telephone service and the greater portion of modern telephone service now available in rural areas has been achieved through the low interest loan program conducted by the Federal Government through the Rural Electrification Administration; and

Whereas despite the considerable progress achieved in this field through the REA loan program since 1949, the attainment of the full potential of this effort has been retarded and may forever be blocked by the language of the act and the administered policies of REA which actively promote and encourage the use of loan funds to rehabilitate small privately owned companies serving limited areas because, although this creates small pockets of modern service in a limited area, it destroys the feasibility of development of areawide subscriber-owned systems developed from a nucleus of several existent companies; and

Whereas the ready availability of REA financing to speculators interested in buying out small and underdeveloped companies results in lively competitive bidding which has resulted in inflated market prices, which are subsequently pumped into the investment costs to unnecessarily increase the cost of service; and

Whereas we feel as a matter of sound public policy, REA telephone and electric loans should be available only for the exclusive purpose of making modern service available to rural people at lowest possible cost, those policies which promote and encourage such speculation and inflated rates are contrary to the intent of Congress particularly when they serve as an obstacle to the achievement of areawide service; and

Whereas five out of every seven REA telephone borrowers are privately owned companies, and two out of every three loan dollars for telephone development go to private borrowers, that this policy is, in fact, developing limited, small islands of modern rural telephone service while actually retarding, if not emasculating, the potential for large-scale development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to enact such changes in existing legislation to direct and permit REA to give first priority in its loan policy to areawide telephone development at the lowest possible cost consistent with good service; and be it further

Resolved, That a complete investigation be undertaken, reviewing all existent telephone loans with the objective of directing disallowal of any further low interest financing in instances where operations are being conducted in a manner where the objective of service to all rural people in an area is being subjugated to policies aimed at trafficking in the differential between REA interests rates and the permissable rate of return allowed by regulatory commissions on borrowed equity; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Wisconsin Public Service Commission to limit permissable rates of return to give recognition to the low cost of REA borrowing so as to prevent speculative profit taking on REA financing.

TRIBUTE TO OUR DECEASED ASSOCIATES

Whereas the joy of gathering here this week at the silver anniversary annual meeting of the initial organization of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative as a central service agency for our membership is restrained by the tragic automobile accident last month which resulted in the untimely death of our first and recent president, H. O. Melby; of Vernon Electric Cooperative Treasurer Elmer Smith; and of Vernon Manager and Mrs. N. F. Leifer; and

Whereas over the years, Mr. Melby provided us with inspired leadership in the efforts of we rural people to organize ourselves to provide the highest concepts of rural service, and Mr. and Mrs. Leifer and Mr. Smith were loved by everyone for their devotion and achievements to this program; and

Whereas the unusually tragic accident which so abruptly brought to a halt the association of these beloved people with us has shocked us deeply and demonstrates the continuing challenge of developing new leadership ready to step into our ranks as they become thinned by sudden tragedy, as well as the attrition of the inevitability of death: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we spread on the minutes of this meeting our profound sense of deep loss at the sudden departure of these devoted associates, and that we wish to convey our great sympathy to their immediate families; and be it further

Resolved, That we wish to similarly express our sorrow in the deaths during the past year of former beloved associates and directors Ervin Starck, C. W. Miller, and Vernon Birong, and we want to express to their immediate families our high regard for them achieved during the years when they served WEC with distinction and devotion to our common objectives.

CONGRATULATIONS TO NORMAN M. CLAPP

Whereas we feel that the State of Wisconsin was singularly honored by the appointment by President John F. Kennedy of a native son of Wisconsin to the high post of Administrator of REA; and

Whereas we have great respect for the new Administrator Norman M. Clapp for his lifelong devotion to the principles and objectives of the REA program and have full confidence that he will serve in his post with distinction; and

Whereas we have always considered Norman M. Clapp as an outstanding friend and supporter of the REA program as a means of achieving significant improvements in the social and economic standards of our rural areas on the basis of his service as a member of the senatorial staff of the late U.S. Senator Robert M. La Follette and as a friendly and sympathetic publisher and editor of two newspapers in Wisconsin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we extend our congratulations, our good wishes and cooperation to Norman M. Clapp in his administration of the REA program; and be it further

Resolved, That we express our gratitude to his predecessor, David A. Hamil, for his years of service to the REA program and want to convey to him our very best wishes for the future.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION RESEARCH

Whereas agriculture is the largest single industry and source of employment in the economy of the United States; and

Whereas the application of electric energy to agriculture constitutes the most effective single means available for improving efficiency, reducing operating costs, increasing quality and improving the standard of living of farm producers; and

Whereas there is a great need for increased facilities for intensifying research and broadening the areas of electrical applications in agriculture, but that this work has been drastically impeded both by inadequate funds committed to such research, and limited physical facilities for research; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States now has before it legislation which would authorize the construction of an Electrification Research Center proposed to be located in Minnesota which includes an appropriation of $2 million for construction and conduct of an expanded research program in farm electrification: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we convey to the Congress our respectful recommendation that this legislation be enacted into law.

ADMINISTRATION RESOURCE POLICY

Whereas the President of the United States has outlined to the Congress his basic resource policies, which include the following basic principles in respect to the marketing of power produced from publicly financed facilities: (1) Preference in power sales shall be given public agencies and cooperatives; (2) domestic and rural consumers shall have priority over other consumers in the disposal of power; (3) power shall be sold at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles; (4) power disposal shall be such as to encourage widespread use and to prevent monopolization; and

Whereas the President reported that he had directed the Secretary of the Interior to develop plans for early interconnection of Department marketing agencies with adequate common carrier transmission lines, and to plan for further national cooperative pooling of electric power, both public and private; and to enlarge such pooling as now exists; and

Whereas the President has called for a broad new power policy under which the Nation's natural resources would be fully developed for maximum utilization; and

Whereas we fully agree with the recent public statement of the Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall, that "furnishing adequate low-cost power for homes, farms and industry is a matter of basic importance to the economic growth and defense of the Nation and is, therefore, a matter of governmental concern": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we heartily endorse the farsighted objectives of the President's resource policy to assure maximum development of our natural resources and to promote widespread use of electric energy at lowest possible cost as essential to the Nation's maximum economic development; and we further

Resolve, That we favor the inclusion of power generation as an integral part of multipurpose development wherever feasible as a basic and essential means of achieving maximum development of our natural resources.

ATOMIC POWER FOR RURAL AREAS

Be it resolved, That we respectfully request of the Atomic Energy Commission that it carry forward a greatly expanded program of development for nuclear reactors specifically designed to meet conditions of rural electric service; and be it further

Resolved, That we express our good wishes to one of our members, Rural Cooperative Power Association of Elk River, Minn., for complete success in its operations beginning this summer of a nuclear unit in conjunction with its conventional generating facilities.

REVOLVING FUND ON REA APPROPRIATIONS

Whereas through the availability of capital loans for the purpose of constructing rural electric and telephone facilities throughout the Nation, we are making rapid strides in achieving our objective of electric and telephone service to all rural people; and

Whereas all funds advanced for these purposes are being fully repaid with interest at no cost to the Nation's taxpayers, and are actually productive of many billions of dollars in new tax revenue to governmental units through new taxes paid and their productivity of greater efficiency, lower cost production, higher earning power and the $15 billion market they have created for electric appliances and wiring; and

Whereas the annual appropriation of funds for this purpose is actually a fully returnable investment by the Federal Government as these loans are fully liquidated under the most remarkable repayment record of any nationwide credit program in the Nation's history; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States is considering possible legislation which would provide for a capital budget under which fully repayable appropriations and self-liquidating investments would be earmarked as investments rather than expenditures; and

Whereas as an alternative to such a plan, the Congress is also considering a plan where all REA allocations of funds for rural electric and telephone loans would be set up as a revolving fund with repayments annually credited to the fund and requiring new appropriations only for those amounts where new allocations exceed repayments: now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we endorse the principle of the capital budget as a more realistic reflection of actual governmental expenditures; and be it further

Resolved, That we also endorse the principle of legislation which would establish with the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund of REA allocations and repayments with such repayments credited against total allocations in any given fiscal year.

JAMES SULLIVAN

Whereas James F. Jim Sullivan, as a member of the staff of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative for the past 14 years, has demonstrated great ability and devotion to the program of cooperative rural electrification; and

Whereas Jim's work successively as editor of the Wisconsin REA News, as assistant public relations director, as assistant to the general manager, as the originator and editor of the "Top o' the News Capsule" and as a speaker at a great many electric cooperative meetings throughout the country, has earned for him the respect and admiration of all those who have come to know him; and

Whereas Jim's knowledge of the REA program throughout the State and the Nation and his proven ability to further the interests of the rural peoples it serves has been recognized by his recent appointment as administrative assistant to REA Administrator Norman Clapp: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the delegates to WEC's 25th annual meeting, That we congratulate Jim on the recognition that he has received and Administrator Norman Clapp on his good fortune to obtain so able and devoted assistant. We wish Jim and his wife, Muriel, every success and happiness in Jim's new field, with the knowledge that what is WEC's immediate loss is the national REA program's gain. Another good Wisconsin product is being contributed to make the national REA program better and the lives of all peoples in the Nation affected by that program, enriched.

Too Much Money for Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in the Blue Island (Ill.) Sun-Standard, one of the typically fine community newspapers in my district, contained a message of basic commonsense which all Members of Congress should read. For the benefit of my colleagues, I therefore place this article in the RECORD:

TOO MUCH MONEY FOR GOVERNMENT

One basic fact we must understand about our Government's reckless, profligate, sky-for-limit spending program is:

It coincides perfectly with the clearly enunciated Marxist theory that high taxes will surely destroy the private enterprise system. The United States is drifting toward a slashing tax system guaranteed to blast our traditional economy, which is rooted in individualism, and to leave in its place a mistaken form of serfdom.

A new economic theory has been conjured out of thin air and is getting serious attention in governmental circles. It claims to depend on national growth and expansion to lead the way out of financial troubles. It is one of those modern ideas which champions change for the sake of change, being ready to discard as old fashioned all of the time-tested ideas about taxes, balanced budgets, and national debt. It is claimed that, if the national economy is expertly managed along credit lines, it can go along indefinitely in the red.

This optimistic theory reared its head some years ago, when we faced real emergencies—depression, two World Wars, and the Korean "brushfire." No present emergency looms up to provide excuse for heavy domestic spending and continued deficit financing, save the ever-increasing bill for national defense, which could be met easily by decreasing needless domestic spending and ill advised foreign aid. Yet, there is enough contentious, mistaken stubbornness to argue that our Government need not count the billions; we can spend ourselves out of debt, stabilize Federal finances by a program of waste and, chief aim of some, let the spenders find favor with the multitude by handing out more and more gratuities.

Is this the path to national solvency? No. A few things—among them, honor, and honesty—do not become old fashioned, save among outcasts and criminals who have said goodby to integrity.

Modernism is a hoax. It is playing havoc with America. We must have more integrity, more decency, from the top right down to the bottom in government. Taxes as now levied spell theft from one, charity toward another, disaster for all.

Charity should be reserved for those who are dependent through no fault of their own; not for the indolent or the greedy. Too much charity kills incentive for the worker as well as the businessman. More

state aid, less incentive; more unrealistic share the wealth, less freedom; more centralized government, less America.

Already our people are staggering under a killing taxload. In addition to income and property taxes are the countless hidden taxes. The sardonic Khrushchev is waiting for U.S. prosperity to collapse. Unless we, as a nation, and as individuals, revert to sound economic practice, our Soviet foe will be rewarded for his patience.

No government $300 billion in debt can withstand a sudden letdown in commerce and survive. More than one kind of financial crisis could suddenly jolt us off our complacent acceptance of inflationary prosperity. Bankers know that we are doing business with 47-cent dollars and many of them are unhappy about it. Outrageous taxes, inflations, a break in the economic levee, then what?

One U.S. Senator said: "If I had to reduce all I have learned in 14 years in Congress, I could sum it up in these words: 'Please do not give your Government so much money.'"

Another high Government official said: "Everybody is overtaxed, and the middle class is being taxed out of existence." This realist spoke the truth. Please remember, in this connection, that the Soviets, to solidify their conquest of a subdued nation always—with routine and ruthless determination—proceed to liquidate the middle class, known to them the bourgeoisie. Is our Nation pursuing a like course?

Patriots can, if they will, stop these terrifying excesses, these mistaken concepts of justice. First, learn the pertinent facts. Study them with diligence. Pass them on to your associates; they will be surprisingly grateful, for our people want to know. Influential public opinion stems from such earnest beginnings.

How United States Confirmed Soviet Space Feat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, ever since April 12, when Russia announced the first successful attempt to orbit a man in space and return him safely to earth, the Committee on Science and Astronautics, and I as its chairman, have been deluged with communications calling this feat a "hoax" perpetrated by Russia.

In the New York Times of Sunday, April 23, Mr. John W. Finney, the New York Times reporter who writes so knowledgeably on space matters, gives an answer to these accusations. Because of the interest in this matter, I submit his article, entitled "How United States Confirmed Soviet Space Feat," for the attention of my colleagues:

HOW UNITED STATES CONFIRMED SOVIET SPACE FEAT

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, April 22.—At the annual convention here this week of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, an editor of a Texas newspaper arose to announce that some people down in Texas did not believe that the Soviet Union had actually put a man into space. The reaction of the Texans was sympotomatic of a flurry of widespread doubt seemingly stirred up by hurt national pride and deep-seated distrust of the Russians, about the authenticity of the Soviet feat.

The skeptics may find some solace in passing the Soviet accomplishment off as a hoax, but their doubt flies in the face not only of Soviet statements but also of every bit of evidence available to the American Government.

As Dr. Frank Press, a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee, told the doubting Texas editor, "there is no doubt in the minds of any knowledgeable person in this field that the Russians did what they said they did."

WHY SO CERTAIN

How could American officials be so sure that Maj. Yuri Aleksesyevich Gagarin had indeed circled the earth in a space ship, as triumphantly announced by the Moscow radio in the early morning hours of April 12? Their certainty springs from the fact that through a combination of electronic and traditional cloak-and-dagger espionage the United States is able to keep a secret eye on Soviet space activities.

For several years the United States has maintained a global surveillance network to keep track of Soviet launchings. So effective is the system that the United States has had knowledge of every major Russian space shot in advance of the Moscow announcement as well as of missile launchings that were never announced.

In the maze of Government secrecy, no information is much more sensitive or secret than the electronic intelligence obtained by listening stations monitoring activities of the Soviet Union. On repeated occasions a public statement that the network exists or that it has monitored Soviet failures on the launching pad has provoked Presidentially ordered investigations into the source of the information.

The existence of the network, however, is now an established fact, well known to the Russians and alluded to by Government officials in their announcements that the United States had known in advance of a Soviet space launching or in their hints that the Soviet Union has had launching failures just as the United States has had.

FIRST CLUE

The first clue that a major Soviet space shot was impending came early in April when Soviet tracking ships were spotted taking up position in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Immediately, official Washington and the secret surveillance network was alerted.

As launching preparations began at the Soviet missile site at Tyura Tam, north of the Aral Sea, secret United States listening posts in the Middle East tuned in on the increasing volume of radio messages passing between the launching site and downrange tracking stations. The messages and their very volume told what was going on at the launching pad.

It is no secret to the Soviet Union any longer that its launching activities are being subjected to electronic eavesdropping by the United States. The Russians, however, might be surprised at the effectiveness of this form of electronic spying.

One report common within U.S. space circles is that the United States is able to follow every minute and final seconds in a Soviet countdown, and in fact, the countdown is marked on a blackboard in a U.S. monitoring station just as is presumably being done in the Soviet blockhouse at Tyura Tam. Probably the best testimonial to the effectiveness of this radio monitoring network is that at times the United States has been able to ascertain when the Soviet Union has encountered failures on the launching pad.

When the huge Soviet launching rocket rose above the horizon, long-range tracking radars in Turkey—and reportedly also in northern Iran and Pakistan—followed the spaceship in the initial leg of its journey. By the time the rocket had flashed eastward across Siberia, it came within range of another powerful U.S. radar located on Shemya in the Aleutian Islands.

A quick look at the Shemya tracking information showed that a satellite had been launched, rather than junst another long-range ballistic shot into the Pacific. Within seconds word of the satellite launching had been flashed to a command headquarters deep in the basement of the Pentagon and thence to White House officials.

Thus the White House press secretary, Pierre Salinger was able to announce shortly after Moscow radio made its 2 a.m. announcement that the United States had known in advance of the launching.

If the Soviet spaceship has continued circling the earth—instead of making just one orbit carrying it down across the Pacific, around the tip of South America and then back up across the Atlantic and Africa to the Soviet Union—it would have come under detection by other segments of the U.S. surveillance network.

SURVEILLANCE FENCE

Strung across the United States, from Georgia to California, is Spasur, the space surveillance fence developed and operated by the Navy. Any satellite passing through the fence's fanlike beams of radio signals sends back telltale radio echoes. Within a few passes, Spasur, and its electronic computer, in Dahlgren, Va., is able to tell the orbital path of the satellite. Using this information, Air Force radars, such as the Lincoln Laboratory's Millstone Hill radar in Westford, Mass., are able to lock onto the satellite and provide more precise information on its orbit and even its size.

From the information of the electronic surveillance network, therefore, it was conclusively established that a Soviet satellite had been launched early Wednesday morning last week. It was also because of this network that American officials could be so definite in dismissing the still unexplained series of reports that seeped out of Moscow about how a Soviet astronaut had been launched before April 12—reports, incidentally, that have contributed in their own way to the doubts about the Soviet achievement.

As U.S. officials pointed out, they would have known if a Soviet satellite had been launched and there was no evidence that any space ship was placed into orbit before the 5-ton vehicle of Major Gagarin.

But even if it was established that a Soviet satellite had gone into orbit, this still goes not answer the questions of how did the United States know that a Soviet astronaut was inside the space ship and that it was, in fact, Major Gagarin who stepped out of the satellite after a trip around the world.

Here the evidence becomes obscured in the most secret, clandestine channels of intelligence. One possible surce of confirmation may have come from monitoring the messages that, according to Soviet accounts, Major Gagarin sent back to earth during his trip. Or, from intelligence sources within the Soviet Union, the United States may have received information confirming the Soviet account.

GAGARIN MONITORED?

Officials will not say whether any of Major Gagarin's messages were monitored and for obvious reasons will not discuss what independent intelligence information may have been received from within the Soviet Union. All they will say is that the official con-

gratulations of President Kennedy were withheld until it was certain that the Soviet Union had indeed scored the historic first flight into space.

Ironically, the doubts about the Soviet feat have been kindled by the secrecy of the administration and of the Soviet Union. Under a new secrecy policy, the administration has withheld information, provided in the past, about the tracking of the Soviet shot and the spotting of the Soviet tracking ships. To complicate the confusion in the public mind, tracking information obtained by the military was not made available immediately to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which had been designated as the official spokesman on Soviet space shots.

SOVIET EVASIVENESS

The Soviet Union, for its part, has contributed to the doubts by its evasiveness and contradictory accounts about certain circumstances of the flight. Still unresolved are such details as: Did the space ship have portholes for Major Gagarin to look out at the earth below, how was the space ship designed so as to resist the tremendous temperatures of reentering the earth's atmosphere, and how did the astronaut return to earth, in a parachute or inside the capsule?

The Soviet Union, which has traditionally been reluctant to describe the details of its space fights with the same openness as the United States, may never clear up these minor mysteries. But there is no mystery about whether Major Gagarin circled the earth. Every bit of evidence available to the United States confirms the feat and rules out the possibility of deception.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

2774

Monday, April 24, 1961

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bill on sale of surplus farm products.

House sent minimum wage increase bill to conference.

House committee began hearings on general farm bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 6147–6169

Bills Introduced: 22 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1696–1717; and S. Con. Res. 21.

Pages 6152–6153

Bill Referred: H.R. 6027, to improve benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program by increasing minimum benefits and aged widows' benefits and by making additional persons eligible for benefits under the program, passed by House on April 20, was referred to Committee on Finance. Page 6147

Surplus Farm Products: Senate passed without amendment S. 1027, to increase funds for sales of surplus farm commodities for foreign currencies by $2 billion for calendar year 1961. Pages 6170–6174

Appointments to Boards and Commissions: Vice President appointed William A. Burden, of New York, to be a member of Citizens Commission for NATO, in place of David Rockefeller.

The Vice President also appointed Senator Smith of Massachusetts to Board of Visitors to U.S. Coast Guard Academy; and Senator Muskie to Board of Visitors to U.S. Merchant Marine Academy. Pages 6147, 6160

Authority To Report: Committees were authorized to file reports during Senate adjournment until Thursday.

Page 6190

Merchant Marine Academy: S. 576, clarifying the status of staff personnel at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, was passed with committee amendment.

Pages 6190–6192

Boating: Senate passed with committee amendment S. 883, to extend the application of the Federal Boating Act of 1958 to certain possessions of the U.S.

Pages 6192–6193

Communications: S. 1288, to provide more flexibility with respect to annual inspections of communications equipment aboard ship, was passed without amendment. Page 6193

Minimum Wage: Senate insisted on its amendments to H.R. 3935, Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961, agreed to hold conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators McNamara, Morse, Randolph, Smith of Massachusetts, Pell, Burdick, Goldwater, Dirksen, and Prouty. Page 6193

Confirmations: One civilian, and one judicial nomination were confirmed. Page 6221

Nominations: Four judicial nominations were received. Pages 6214–6221

Program for Thursday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 5:27 p.m. until noon Thursday, April 27. No legislation is definitely scheduled. Pages 6190, 6214

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—DEFENSE

Committee on Appropriations: On Friday, April 21, subcommittee continued its hearings on fiscal 1962 budget estimates for the Department of Defense, having as its witnesses Charles J. Hitch, Assistant Secretary (Comptroller), and Maurice H. Lanman, Assistant General Counsel, both of the Department of Defense.

Hearings continue on Wednesday, April 26.

APPROPRIATIONS—HEW

Committee on Appropriations: On Friday, April 21, subcommittee continued its hearings on fiscal 1962 budget estimates for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, having as its witness Assistant Surgeon General Robert J. Anderson, Deputy Chief, Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

APPROPRIATIONS—INTERIOR

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee resumed its hearings on fiscal 1962 budget estimates for the Department of the Interior, receiving testimony from In-

Appendix

Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, we have recently heard a great deal of talk concerning the crisis in the balance of international payments, that is to say in the gold flow out of the United States. Although at the moment the gold flow problem appears to be abating somewhat, it may again return to plague us. On the theory that all interested citizens have a right to be heard on this very difficult and perplexing question, I take pleasure in placing in the RECORD the thoughts of Mr. J. Keller Kirn, Sr., of Lancaster, Ohio, a student of this and related problems.

In addition, Mr. Kirn has favored me with a copy of a letter he has written to the editor of the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch on the general subject of teaching communism in the schools. I am also including this letter in the RECORD in the hope that those with such proclivities will be deterred thereby.

The articles follow:

GOLD

Importing $100 million gold from England in 1907 stopped the panic. Each nation went its own way and made its financial policies subject always to the limitation that if it overextend itself, other nations would drain away its gold and force it to reverse its policies, without war. This illustrates how currency redeemable in gold coins stabilizes credit and halts inflation.

When Mr. Charles Henry, Lancaster, Ohio, paid $1.25 for his hair cut August 3, 1960, he said he remembered when he paid 10 cents for his hair cut. That was when we were on a gold standard. In other words we now have 8-cent-paper dollars not redeemable in gold coins, invested in U.S. bonds, deposited in banks, and in our hands. Increased prices wil increase our so-called income but further reduce our 8-cent-paper dollars not redeemable in gold coins, and reduce our pay checks.

Lancaster, Ohio's John Sherman, Secretary of the Treasury under President Hays, raised our 35-cent dollar to a 100-cent dollar with gold.

According to John Sherman's "Recollections of 40 Years in the House, Senate, and Cabinet," volume II, page 74, those opposed to restoring the gold standard and coinage for our use predicted "that resumption in gold and silver would be impossible on the then volume of paper money; that if it were attempted the desperadoes of Wall Street and the money kings of Europe would present greenbacks and take the gold as fast as it could be paid over the counter of the Treasury. Not a year rolled around until resumption came, and these Wall Street desperadoes and these money kings of Europe, instead of coming and demanding our gold in exchange for greenbacks, now bring their gold to us and want greenbacks for it. They don't want the gold at all and we can't put it on them. United States notes now travel the circuit of the world with undiminished honor, and be everywhere redeemed in coin."

When we were on the gold standard in 1920, our recession lasted only 1½ years and was followed by 7 years of real prosperity. We had a flexible wage scale that permitted immediate and adequate adjustments in accordance with changing conditions. Prices fell until buying resumed according to the law of supply and demand. We balanced the budget each year during that time. Franklin D. Roosevelt never balanced the budget.

We had more gold January 2, 1933, than on November 2, 1932, therefore there was no need to take us off the gold coin standard and there is no need to keep us off the gold coin standard. Neither our Nation nor any other nation has ever maintained a 100-percent gold coin reserve for convertibility of all nongold money, just as banks can't keep all of depositors money in banks and make loans.

Restore the gold coin standard at $35 per ounce of gold, nine-tenths fine, then recall our currency not redeemable in gold coins and replace it with currency redeemable in gold coins.

Standards must stand. Reducing the gold content of our dollar to raise the price of gold produced more dollars but not more gold, just as reducing a yard from 36 to 18 inches produces more yards but not more cloth.

Emulate Switzerland, at peace with neutrality as proclaimed by our President George Washington April 22, 1793, and prosperous with currency redeemable in gold coins, since 1815. Switzerland is not a U.N. member.

Constitutionally yours,

J. KELLER KIRN, Sr.

LANCASTER, OHIO.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, Apr. 14, 1961

LOOKS TO BIBLE AND CONSTITUTION IN DEFENDING AMERICAN PRINCIPLE

To the EDITOR:

Dr. Oswald Hoffman, speaker on the Lutheran Hour, March 12, 1961, stated that a man said: "We started with communism, why do we fight it now?"

Acts 2:44–45: "And all that believed were together, and had all things in common; and sold their possession and goods and parted them to all men, as every man had need."

Some would not work. 2 Thessalonnians 3: 10: "For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work neither should he eat." After that each man was given a piece of land to cultivate to feed himself and family. From that time, communism stopped and prosperity began.

Clyde Moore in his column stated: "Dr. Alexander Miekeljohn maintains that Communists should be allowed to teach. To be consistent, no doubt he would be opposed to quarantining a teacher with smallpox, as it would do the students good to learn first hand about the disease and decide for themselves whether or not that wanted it."

Instead of learning all about communism to fight it, learn all about our U.S. Constitution to defend it.

Do our citizens prefer to be governed by those whom they elect with laws made in pursuance of the Constitution or be ruled with rules made by the bureaucrats whom they did not elect?

U.S. court decisions are the law of the land, only when they are made in pursuance of the Constitution consisting of three branches, legislative, judicial, and executive. There is no fourth branch for Government ownership of operation of industries, as under socialism and communism.

William Penn said: "Men will either be governed by God or ruled by tyrants." With blessings come responsibilities. Parents demand that teachers and professors who try to destroy our "In God we trust" Constitution be fired now.

Abraham Lincoln said: "The Constitution was adopted to preserve our Government, not to act as a protecting screen for those who while claiming its privileges, seek to destroy it."

Emulate Switzerland, at peace with golden rule neutrality as proclaimed by President George Washington, April 22, 1793, and prosperous with currency redeemable in gold coins, since 1815. Switzerland is not a U.N. one-world member.

J. KELLER KIRN, Sr.

LANCASTER, OHIO.

There Are More Criminals in the United States Than There Are College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the following article, written by the Honorable Keen Johnson, former Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, former vice president of Reynolds Metals, Inc., and now back at his first and old love, writing editorials for the Richmond (Ky.) Daily Register. The following editorial appeared in the Register on April 11, 1961:

THERE ARE MORE CRIMINALS IN THE UNITED STATES THAN THERE ARE COLLEGE STUDENTS

An aggressive attack upon organized crime is proposed by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. Congress will be asked to enact a series of anticrime laws which it is believed would strengthen the Government, provide authority to run down racketeers and curb organized crime activities.

Attorney General Kennedy served as chief counsel of the congressional committee investigating racketeers in labor unions. As result of that experience he wrote a book, "The Enemy Within," in which he expressed deep concern about the steadily increasing crime activity. Now, as Attorney General, he urges laws that will curb interstate gambling rings, strengthen the Federal Firearms Act;

give more protection to witnesses cooperating with congressional investigators and make it more difficult for lawbreakers to cross State lines.

The steady increase of crime should cause us more concern than it does. We would probably have a better understanding of its seriousness if we understood what it is costing us as taxpayers.

J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, says: "Crime costs the U.S. taxpayers $28,500 a minute; $1,710,000 an hour."

There are three times as many criminals as college students. The criminals force us to spend each year 4⅔ as much on them as we spend on all forms of education, public and private.

Major crimes have increased 56 percent since 1950, four times the increase of our population. And Hoover predicts that there will be another 35 percent increase in crime in the next 10 years.

The increase of law violation, the steady sweep of crime is just as frightful in Madison County in Kentucky as it is throughout the Nation. It would be fortunate if we should become concerned about it here at home.

It is a strange anomaly that in this the most literate of all nations, where exists greater opportunity for living a life of rectitude, crime flourishes, criminals increase in number and in their sinister disregard of law.

The most disturbing thing about it is that we accept with complacency a situation that gradually gets worse. The effort of the Attorney General to make a vigorous attack on crime should be widely approved. There should be cooperation from Congress in enactment of anticrime laws that would help check lawlessness.

Second Thoughts on Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the value of study and deliberation often proves a sounder policy than snap judgments inspired by impetuous idealism. A recent editorial in the Chicago Daily News, entitled "Second Thoughts on Peace Corps," certainly deserves the attention of the Members of Congress:

SECOND THOUGHTS ON PEACE CORPS

The managers of the Peace Corps are having some sobering second thoughts. Bill Moyers, assistant to R. Sargent Shriver, the Director, accompanied Vice President Johnson to Africa. What he saw of native living conditions gave him the shudders and a new conception of the "very real problems" facing the project.

The idea of a corps of eager and dedicated young men and women on missions of light to the far corners of the earth caught the public imagination. College campuses buzzed with excitement.

Some of these young people may be merely leaping at what they imagine to be an exciting adventure. But most are motivated by genuine idealism.

If some of them saw it in terms of Steig's "dreams of glory," with themselves being cheered by adoring natives, that would be youth.

Moyers himself sounds as if he had never before visited—and certainly few of the Peace Corps applicants ever have seen—a village of mud huts, in which the family lives with the chickens and water buffalo and subsists on bread and onions. Even if the corpsmen did not shrink from this hardship of "living with the people," the health hazards would threaten Americans habituated to sanitary conditions.

The flies, the mosquitoes, the filth that he saw so alarmed Moyers that he has warned Shriver that it will be necessary to include a medical assistant and a public health expert with each of the American teams.

That begins a retreat from "living with the people." That prospect was never very real anyway, because anybody who eats three square meals a day is already set apart from most of the inhabitants of the areas that need help the most.

The search goes on for young people who combine a knowledge of Swahili, farming, road building and carpentry. But there is also a growing awareness that this is no business for amateurs.

Illinois Senate Resolution Supports U.S.S. "Arizona"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following joint resolution passed by the Illinois State Legislature:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Springfield, Ill., April 20, 1961.

Hon. PETER F. MACK, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACK: As authorized, I am enclosing herewith a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 13 as adopted in the 72d general assembly of this State.

Sincerely,
CHARLES F. CARPENTIER,
Secretary of State.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

Whereas the project to build a permanent memorial over the hull of the U.S.S. *Arizona*, sunk in the December 7, 1941, attack on Pearl Harbor and still containing the bodies of 1,102 servicemen entombed within it, is slowing because of lack of funds although the project is nearing completion; and

Whereas the Navy Club of the United States of America, one of the originators of the plan to enshrine the *Arizona* and its gallant dead as a memorial to all who died at Pearl Harbor on the "day of infamy" in 1941, has been responsible together with the Pacific War Memorial Commission for raising $250,000 privately toward the $500,000 needed; and

Whereas the Hawaii Legislature has appropriated an additional $50,000 toward the memorial, leaving an additional $200,000 still needed; and

Whereas the completion of this memorial is in the interest of the Nation as a whole as a shrine to the men who gave their lives and as a symbol for future eternal vigilance: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That Congress is memorialized to appropriate the necessary $200,000 in additional funds so that the memorial over the U.S.S. *Arizona* may be completed at an early date as a national shrine for the men killed at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and that suitable copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and the Members of Congress from this State.

A Journey to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include another in a series of articles on Ireland written by Mr. Thomas Heffernan, editor, Sunday Independent, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., this article having appeared in that newspaper on April 23, 1961.

Mr. Heffernan wrote this highly interesting and informative series on Ireland following an extensive trip through that country last fall.

The indicated article follows:

A JOURNEY TO IRELAND—IRISH GYPSIES CALLED TINKERS, AND THEY ARE NOT POPULAR

(By Tom Heffernan)

You don't hear much about gypsies in Wyoming Valley any more—those swarthy travelers whose background was so mysterious and who used to arouse neighborhoods by moving a whole caravan into an empty storeroom for the winter.

In Ireland they are still common, though not called gypsies very often and proving also to be of entirely different appearance.

In fact, they looked much like the regular Irish folk. But there the similarity ends and they definitely are not well liked.

We saw our first a short time after arriving at Shannon Airport and while being driven to our hotel in Adare, about 4:30 o'clock of a Saturday morning by the wonderful Paddy O'Toole of Shannon Travel.

ALL WAGONS THE SAME

It was as a man on a bicycle, going the same way we were, loomed up ahead of us in the headlight beam.

"There's a tinker," said Paddy, and we wanted to know how he knew.

"We just passed a wagon," Paddy explained and these wagons of the tinker and every one exactly like every other one and thus unmistakable.

They look as if a huge, straight-sided barrel had been mounted on wheels.

Then, told the story by the sound of Paddy's voice, we wondered why they were not liked.

It seems that, generally, they are not considered of any value to any community, careless, perhaps dirty, paying no taxes, supporting nothing but themselves, their honesty suspected and—getting closer to the Irish heart—to be watched in a horse trade.

A REAL EVIL

And like gypsies everywhere, they seem to go in for trading horses.

That some of the horses they acquire are believed to be shipped to the Continent for human consumption is one more thing the horse-loving Irish hold against them.

Naturally, as the common name of "Tinker" suggests, they also earn a bit here and there at mending jobs.

Seen along the roadside of an evening, huddled over a tiny fire on the steep shoulder of a road, having a crude dinner in the open they are far from a romantic lot of wanderers.

Instead, they look pretty pathetic.

IRISH FARMS ARE UNCLUTTERED

We are not one to find everything better in other countries—mostly because it isn't possible to do so.

Not in many cases.

However, there is a great difference between homes in marginal farm areas in Ireland and here in Luzerne County—and Luzerne County does not gain by the comparison.

In most local cases, as a drive in any direction will disclose, the local homes are apt to be marked first by an old automobile or two, in various stages of dismantling as the principal feature of the front or side yard.

Then, far too often, a lot of the rest of the land near the house will be marked with a pile of old bad springs, a tumbledown chicken coop, some piles of ashes and what-have-you.

NOTHING TO THROW AWAY

Not so in Ireland and it well may be that the Irish in these poorer farming areas cannot afford to throw things away.

Certainly it is true they never had an automobile—of any vintage—to let go to rust and ruin in the front yard.

Furthermore, with the houses usually built of stone or a stuccolike cement, the lack of paint is not so noticeable.

They may be poor and the cow barn may be too close to the house of the farmer's family to let the olfactory nerves get much of a rest, but you'll find no clutter of rubbish in piles around the house.

It might be added that the most common type of architecture—that of the Irish cottage—is good.

MOST FARMERS WELCOME HUNTS

The overwhelming majority of the Irish farmers have no objection to the hunts riding across their land.

As a matter of fact, with the places where the hunts are to meet are scheduled and made known well in advance, and something like a holiday air is met there quite often.

Many farmers and villagers turn out to watch and lots of them, keen about the sport, try to keep up as they can.

The youngsters run across the fields and as far as they are able.

Schoolchildren usually come out of the school buildings to watch as the hunt passes.

Farmers or their young people with horses often join in.

When a fox goes to ground, down into a hole, a crowd gathers in no time.

TWO RUGGED INDIVIDUALS

Twice, however, in the course of our hunting holiday in Ireland, we came upon land the owners of which denied permission to ride over.

In both cases it caused the hunt to scatter a bit as different routes were sought in the effort to keep up with the hounds.

And on one occasion, with Lord Hamilton—a handsome big fellow in his forties—was acting as master of the County Limerick hounds since Lord Daresbury had been called to London, the result of one farmer's attitude was that we were rather confined in a field.

We could not jump the fence without getting on forbidden land.

So Lord Hamilton turned to us to remark, quietly:

"We will now leave the field—through the gate."

Having had quite a few hours of what was for us hard riding and with many jumps, we had to give, as an honest answer:

"Perhaps that's something to be thankful for."

MISSED MEETING U.S. AMBASSADOR

We had the misfortune to miss meeting with former U.S. Ambassador to Ireland Scott McLeod—who was popular on the Emerald Isle.

Our original plan called for one week in Adare, County Limerick, and then a week in Dublin.

However, we liked Adare so well we hastened back, leaving on a Wednesday when Ambassador McLeod was not due to return from a trip to Geneva, Switzerland, the next day.

Both Mr. McLeod and his office—which we also missed visiting—most graciously gave us some service that was most helpful and thoroughly appreciated.

POLICEMAN IS CALLED GUARDA

Police in Ireland are known as civil guards and, when you speak to them, you call them what sounds mostly like guarda.

They are an impressive lot, according the respect to be found associated with police throughout Britain, and most accommodating.

The guarda really offers service and all of them make it a point to be specially easy with visitors.

However, be sure to have your driver's license with you if you intend to operate an automobile.

Power To Regulate Rests Better With the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., April 18, 1961:

IN OUR OPINION: POWER TO REGULATE RESTS BETTER WITH THE CONGRESS

A battle seems to be shaping up between President Kennedy and the House Legislative Oversight Subcommittee for control of the Federal regulatory agencies.

The agencies were created by Congress. They include the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), the Federal Power Commission (FPC), the Securities Exchange Commission (SEC) and other groups that regulate certain areas of our lives.

Congress reserved the right to oversee their operation after creating these agencies. Representative OREN HARRIS, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman of the subcommittee, is concerned over what appears to be the President's efforts to gain control of the agencies.

The chairman's concern is proper. The regulatory agencies can best serve the people with a minimum of political control.

Some people lean to the view that the regulatory agencies should regulate themselves, independent of both Congress and the White House. This offers the possibility of dictatorial action and seems inadvisable.

A reasonable amount of check against unlimited power seems the best course. And this power to check the power of regulation is better reserved to a continuing body of elected Representatives, rather than being given to one man, who may be gone in less than 4 years.

Speech by the Honorable William M. Tuck, Representative From the Fifth District of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 23, the Commonwealth of Virginia officially marked the opening of the Civil War Centennial. The Honorable WILLIAM M. TUCK, who so ably represents the Fifth District of Virginia in the House of Representatives, delivered the address at the opening ceremony at the State capitol in Richmond.

Congressman TUCK has long been identified with those who cherish the ideals, traditions and heritage of our people and who are endeavoring manfully to impart to the present generation the importance of preserving liberty, freedom and the rights of our people and to prevent government by men and not by law.

Representative TUCK was introduced by the Honorable Charles T. Moses, president pro tempore of the Senate of Virginia. Senator Moses and I live in the same county and I am proud of the splendid work he is doing to preserve our way of life and the freedoms and privileges of our people.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the splendid address of the Honorable WILLIAM M. TUCK:

SPEECH BY HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK, REPRESENTATIVE, FIFTH DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA, SUNDAY, APRIL 23, 1961, CEREMONIES MARKING THE OPENING OF THE CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL IN VIRGINIA

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen of the late Dr. Edwin Anderson Alderman, president of the University of Virginia, in his matchless address to a joint session of the Congress of the United States commemorating the life and services of Woodrow Wilson, adverted to the comments of an ancient Athenian. This individual had commended the fitness of the Athenian Public Memorial, but doubted the wisdom of any speech on such occasions. He declared that where men's deeds and actions have been great, they should be honored in deed only; that the standing and character should not depend upon the judgment and the words of one; that their virtues should not depend upon whether he spoke well or ill. While I know that what I say has no comparable value to the situation described by Dr. Alderman, nevertheless, I find myself incapable of employing words that would justly and accurately portray the scenes which obtained in Virginia a century ago, or to give appropriate expression to the sentiment which permeates the breast, or the thoughts which crowd upon the mind at this time.

We have met here today to open formally the Virginia Civil War Centennial anniversary. This occasion is a mere milestone on the road of time, a niche in the long corridors of history. But in the deeper sense of noble sentiment and high obligations to our Commonwealth and to our country, we are here to commemorate the soul-wrenching ordeal through which Virginia passed and from which, despite hardships and

handicaps, she emerged to take her proud place in the forefront of the sisterhood of American States.

Virginia had furnished much of the leadership which established the Union. Madison was named by the muse of history as the father of the Constitution, just as another great Virginian, George Washington, had been the Father of his Country. And Virginia herself was loved and respected, as she is today. She was then, as now, known as the "mother of States and of statesmen." And so she stood in those sorrowing days entrapped within a national disturbance of complex causes, a commonwealth of powerful prestige whose movement to one side or the other was fatefully awaited by all.

As Virginia waited, there was little hope of escape. Soon the decision must come, and 100 years ago it did come, from within the walls of this very building where we are gathered, from the assembled trustees of the will, the conscience and the power of Virginians everywhere.

To the broad southern mind, the election of Abraham Lincoln meant secession. They say no happiness in a Union presided over by him. The very waves of the deep southern discontent, and the northern discontent with the ways of the South, profoundly threatened the foundation of the Nation. As these waves beat against this State, Virginia was caught in the vortex of these angry emotions.

To the eternal and everlasting credit of the Virginians of a century ago, they exhausted every resource and explored and employed every honorable device to preserve the peace and save the Union short of fighting against the people of the South. None of the succeeding generations have had cause or reason to blush and no apologies to make. We can stand proudly in the confident knowledge that, upon the record established, our ancestors took a firm but conciliatory stand. Moral heroism, though less frequent and less acclaimed than physical courage, nevertheless is worthy to excite our highest admiration.

Because of the prominent part Virginia took in the conflict that followed, as well as the fact that so much of the actual warfare occurred on Virginia soil, her name is synonymous with the war. But let us never forget that Virginia did not start that war. At the very hour when Fort Sumter was under fire, an official Virginia committee was in Washington for a conference with Lincoln on his policy toward the South.

At that time Lincoln was not conciliatory, and his reply to the Virginians meant coercion, of which they could not approve. Distinguished historians have pointed out that it was not the firing at Fort Sumter, but it was the Lincoln proclamation calling for 75,000 troops that produced Virginia's ordinance of secession. On many occasions that impeccably honest and irreproachably correct citizen of Rockbridge County, Gov. John Letcher, destined to become Virginia's determined and much-loved war Governor, stated his and the position of Virginia to be that "he would resist the coercion of Virginia and to the adoption of such a policy of coercion whenever the attempt is made by either Northern or Southern States." Governor Letcher furthermore stated his position and that of Virginia which constituted the very crux of why the State adopted the resolution of secession: "I will regard an attempt to pass Federal troops across the territory of Virginia, for purpose of coercing a Southern seceding State, as an act of invasion, which should be met and repelled."

Virginia was in no mood to tear the Union asunder. In 1861, as in 1775, she labored long and arduously for peace and conciliation. She it was who sponsored a resolution in Congress creating a commission of one from each State in the Union to solve the differences.

The Governor of Virginia in November 1860, called a special session of the legislature to deal with the problem facing the Nation. This session of the general assembly passed a resolution calling for a convention, with the understanding that no action taken by the legislators would be binding upon the people of Virginia until they had a chance to vote on it.

The Virginia Legislature on January 19, 1861, passed a resolution calling for a peace convention in Washington. This resolution authorized the commissioners to confer with the President and with representatives from the seceded States in the hope that an atmosphere could be created whereby the seceded States might find it practicable to return to the Union. The aging and beloved ex-President, John Tyler, of Virginia, was commissioned to call on President Buchanan. Another distinguished Virginian, Judge John Robertson, was sent to South Carolina to urge against any action by that State which might result in war pending the peace conference. As a result of President Tyler's visit to President Buchanan, the latter requested Congress to leave the status quo undisturbed until Virginia had run her course in the cause of peace. South Carolina in the meantime agreed to take no action that would precipitate a conflict.

When the Virginia Convention met on February 13, the delegates to that convention put aside the business of passing an ordinance of secession and settled down to explore the possibilities of compromise. These are only a few among many other actions taken by Virginians of that period to avert this gory conflict, and the record of Virginia's attempts to reconcile the difference and to bring about compromise is long and need not be here repeated. Her efforts along these lines persisted until the very moment of the beginning of hostilities.

The inauguration of President Lincoln and his Executive order calling for troops to invade the South shook Virginia. The country was already at war when Virginia seceded. It was no longer a question af whether the State should go to war; it was simply a question of deciding with whom she would war.

On the 17th of April the secession convention passed an ordinance of secession subject to popular approval. Volunteers were summoned into the State service, and upon the 18th they descended upon the Harpers Ferry arsenal and captured arms, ammunition, and machinery.

Already the long shadow of Robert E. Lee was discernible. This gentleman shared the views of the Virginians of that day that every honorable effort should be made to avoid war. He was a colonel in the Regular Army. He had established a most creditable and distinguished record in the service.

Lee did not know for sure that Virginia had seceded until the morning of April 19, when he went into Alexandria on business and there read the news he had hoped he would never see: "Virginia had seceded." To his mind that meant the wreck of the Nation, the beginning of sorrows, the opening of a war that was certain to be long and full of horrors.

When other hopes had failed before this time, Lee told himself that secession could not become an accomplished fact until the voters of Virginia had passed on the ordinance of secession, as they had specifically reserved the right to do, but now Lee's judgment told him that war would not wait on a referendum. Virginia would certainly consider that her safety required the seizure of Federal depots within her borders. The Federal Government, on its part, would certainly take prompt action since the State just across the river from its Capital had left the Union.

As one of the senior field officers in Washington, he might be summoned at any hour to defend Washington by invading Virginia—which he could not do. Duty was plain. Their could be no holding back. The time had come. All the Lees had been Americans, but they had been Virginians first.

Dearly as Lee loved the Union, anxious as he was to see it preserved, he could not bear arms against Virginia, which had seceded and doubtless would join the South. Her action controled his own. He could not wait for the uncertain vote of the people when war was upon him. So after midnight on the 19th he sat down and wrote this letter, not more than 15 hours after he had received positive information that Virginia had joined the ranks of the seceded States:

ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA
(WASHINGTON CITY P.O.),
20 April 1861.

Hon. SIMON CAMERON,
Secty of War.

SIR: I have the honor to tender the resignation of my commission as Colonel of the 1st Regt. of Cavalry.

Very respty your obt servt,
R. E. LEE,
Col. 1st Cavly.

Lee sent in his resignation to General Scott on the 20th. In it he said: "Save in defense of my native State, I never desire again to draw my sword." That same day he received a communication from Judge John Robertson requesting in interview. It was set for the 21st. On the evening of the 21st a messenger arrived at Arlington mansion with a letter from Robertson. He apologized for his delay and—this was the important item—invited Lee, in the name of the Governor, to repair to Richmond for conference with the chief executive.

Lee realized, of course, that this meant participation in the defense of Virginia, but he did not hesitate a moment. In a few words he notified the Governor's representative that he would join him in Alexandria the next day in time to take the train for Richmond.

Dressed in civilian clothes and silk hat, Robert E. Lee departed from Arlington on the morning of April 22, never again to enter its friendly portals. If he heard a tall clock chime as he left the mansion door of his beloved Arlington, it was but to strike the beginning of his hour of growing greatness and glory.

No one knew better than Robert E. Lee, the trained soldier and the veteran of Mexico, the agonies that war would bring, although it is to be hoped that he was spared the prescience to know of the sorrows that would like sea billows roll during those 8 April days, as he passed along the road leading from Petersburg to Appomattox.

He was a man of simplicity and of superb dignity. He rode on before the crowd to the Spottswood Hotel at Eighth and Main Streets. A few hours later he was in conference with the Governor, who informed him that the general assembly had authorized the appointment of a commander of the military and naval forces of Virginia with the rank of major general.

The appointment was proffered, and that very night the convention unanimously approved the choice in an historic display of good commonsense. That night Lee carried to his hotel the heaviest burden borne by any man since George Washington, and next day he went to work at a simple office on Main Street—without so much as a clerk to help him.

On that same day 100 years ago and just before the noon hour struck, Lee climbed the hill leading to the Capitol. He was escorted by a committee from the convention and walked between the massive columns of the south portico of the Capitol to the old hall of the House of Delegates. Along the way he paused in the rotunda of the Capitol and gazed momentarily at Houdon's famous marble statue of Washington.

A few minutes later the doors opened and Lee stepped forward on to the convention floor, amid a hush of silence, before a multitude of admiring eyes. His father and other ancestors had been there many times before him.

The convention rose ecstatically to its feet. An escort by his side spoke out: "Mr. President, I have the honor to present to you and to the convention Major General Lee."

The members sat down. In measured tone, the chairman addressed the general at considerable length, formally apprising him of the actions of the convention. Faith and confidence were expressed in him as seldom they are in any individual in this doubting world. He was handed a scroll of faith and a commission of honor so demanding that it was obvious he would be expected to respond.

What he said was this: "Mr. President and gentleman of the convention:

"Profoundly impressed with the solemnity of the occasion, for which I must say I was not prepared, I accept the position assigned me by your partiality. I would have much preferred had your choice fallen on an abler man. Trusting in Almighty God, an approving conscience, and the aid of my fellow citizens, I devote myself to the service of my native State, in whose behalf alone will I ever again draw my sword."

We are here today to relive those precious memories of a century ago. We are here today because, thank God, we are not unmindful of the unexcelled heroism and valor of the men and women of the South on and off the battlefield. We cannot forget the sacrifices of our forefathers. We do not want to forget them. We shall prize and appreciate them as long as patriotism and love of country linger in the human breast. We must not fail to remember that history is prolog, that as the great Virginia patriot, Patrick Henry, said, we have no way of judging the future but by the past. The Civil War was an object lesson to us, a tragic reminder of the horrendous results which occur when men are driven to employ force as a means of solving their problems. We must look upon our tests today with the same spirit of sacrifice shown by our forefathers a century ago.

Today we hear of depressions and recessions. What we had in the South after the close of the Civil War was devastation. A mere depression or recession would have looked like a high form of relief. Hundreds of thousands of our men were killed or wounded, or otherwise incapacitated. Our manpower was thus depleted. Our homes, our cities, and our towns were in ashes. Our lands lay in waste, and our fields were impoverished. Our livestock was consumed or carried away. We were without tools and instruments with which to labor.

Our money was valueless. Our smokehouses were empty. Little children were starving. Vituperation and malediction laid like a pall over all the land. All that we had left and that was much, was the character of our people and the marrow in their bones. They did not subscribe to the something for nothing doctrine, so familiar to us today. They knew that worthy achievement comes only from service and sacrifice.

Without complaint, the returning Confederate soldier began to lay the foundations of a new order and a new civilization. Although Virginia lay prostrate and had been swept by a besom of desolation and destruction, the fields which ran red with the blood of our people in the spring were ripe with a teeming harvest in the fall.

They had no government to which to look, save the whim of martial tyrants. There was no Marshall plan. There were no Federal lending agencies, no Government relief programs, no veterans' benefits. The only Federal agency operating in the South was the Freedmen's Bureau, a rapacious corps of human vultures, with an eye on property that might be picked up at a fraction of its true value, or for no price at all. Though these facts and others not here related are to be deprecated, these statements are made in no tone of bitterness, for there were many in the North who wanted it otherwise, but who were powerless to mollify the wrath of the radicals. The situation presents a contrast in study between the attitude of the American Government toward its defeaed enemies of World War II and the attitude of the same Government toward defeated fellow Americans after the Civil War.

But it was from these ruins that Virginia and the other Southern States, without assistance, have grown to greatness. Today the eyes of the Nation and of the world are turning toward the South, which now definitely become economic opportunity No. 1. In the last decade the white population of the South rose by 22 percent. Factory employment jumped 31 percent, more than four times as fast as in other States. Cars and trucks, a sign of wealth and industry, increased by 68 percent, while the rest of the United States had a gain of only 47 percent. Personal income in the South increased 58 percent during the last 10 years, whereas the income in other States advanced by only 49 percent. The Virginia figures taken alone present even a better picture. This economic development and improvement has done much to enhance the cultural, educational, and civic status of our people.

We are not refighting the Civil War; we are restudying it. We hope to engage in this worthy endeavor with eyes undimmed by emotion and minds unclouded by prejudice or by passion. We hope to derive from this study inspiration left by the heroic men and women of the past, to bind ourselves in an undestructible unity through understanding of one another, and by so doing to form a united country that can face with confidence the constantly arising problems created by the new scientific and rapidly developing world. We are here today because we want to rededicate ourselves to the fundamental principles of liberty and freedom. We are doing so in order that we may show a devotion to the sound doctrines of government that safely guided the destinies of the Nation throughout its long and glorious history.

Many of the problems with which we are now confronted could easily be solved if only the country had leadership of the type provided the people of the South by Robert E. Lee during the tragic era that followed the war. The people of that generation would have frowned upon the faithless and perfidious promises so characteristic of some of the leaders of the present generation. They would have scorned men who promise one thing today and do another tomorrow. They would have looked with disdain upon the wastrels and squanderers who are as careless with our rights as with our money, and who swarm like locusts around our Nation's capital, and who consistently advocate spending more each year until the country is hanging on the cliff of financial irresponsibility.

If we could revive that spirit of patriotism, of self-reliance, of self-denial which existed during the days of the Civil War and the years that followed, we could restore fiscal sanity and sound government, and speedily discharge the national debt.

What is it that we want to gain from the Civil War and the great men like Robert E. Lee who participated in it? We want to gain freedom for ourselves and for our children from the harsh restrictions of a central government which have been needlessly and recklessly imposed. We need to gain self-reliance and to indulge in the practice of self-denial, the outstanding and inspiring examples, which Lee gave to his followers in the South during the terrible years of reconstruction.

After the war, Lee was the uncrowned leader of his people. He was disfranchised. He held no office, no commisison. His strength lay in his character, his faith and courage, the confidence of the South and the hope for his people that still lingered in his Christian heart. He consistently refused offers of worldly gain and preferred instead to share the miseries of his people. Like the gentleman and patriot he was, he clung to Virginia in her fallen fortunes. The life he lived is worthy of emulation on the part of us all.

In addition to the fact that he ranks among the foremost soldiers of all ages and all nations, he possessed remarkable private virtues. His life taught the futility of vain regret; that human virtue is superior to human calamity.

He was the champion of reason rather than passion. He pleaded for silence and patience as the true antidote to excitement and passion. He knew that hate could thrive only on ignorance. If there was an attempt to besmirch his name, he covered it with a cloak of charity.

He exemplified in the highest degree the virtues of modesty and simplicity and was always sustained by the strength of his religious faith.

Notoriety and applause were not only distasteful but even painful to him.

In every relation of life, he set the example of a devoutly religious man. It has been said that "he was as devout as Stonewall Jackson, with an added note of sweetness and light."

No man in all American history has had such a profound influence and control over the hearts and minds of man as did Lee during the harsh and trying years of reconstruction.

The illustrious historian, Dr. Freeman, in the last chapter of the last volume of his matchless "R. E. Lee," describes the tour Lee took through parts of the South in 1870 just before his passing. Throngs came out at every point causing him embarrassment over the profuse attention heaped upon him. At one of such stops, a tall, 13-year-old boy was seen to maneuver himself quietly through the crowds until at least he gained a place by the side of the great southern chieftain where he could look into his noble countenance. The name of that 13-year-old boy was Woodrow Wilson.

In conclusion, if there is one incident in the life of Robert E. Lee that should be selected to serve as a message to the young southerners and to succeeding generations whose parents stood in hushed awe with heads bowed at every hearthstone on that bleak day in October 1870, when his blameless life ebbed out, it was one that occurred on his last trip to northern Virginia, which he loved so dearly. So great was the admiration of the people for the southern leader that he was almost deified. A young mother handed her babe over to the arms of the great general and asked him to bless the child. He took the child before he realized the nature of the request, and then with some embarrassment, he returned it to the mother's arms with these words which come ringing down to us through the centuries past: "Teach him to deny himself. That is all."

Speaking for Thousands of Jobless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I have on numerous occasions addressed the

House of Representatives in an effort to call attention to the severe economic conditions that have visited with our domestic textile industry as a consequence of free-flowing textile imports. I have, at the same time, introduced several pieces of legislation which are designed to effect a correction in this deplorable condition.

I am not alone in my concern. The tide of protests against too-liberal textile imports swells with each passing day, from whence I hope will come a wave of reason that will sweep the perplexing problem of textile imports from our American shores.

In this regard I enclose a pertinent article from the April 21 issue of the Bangor Daily News, a prominent Maine publication:

SPEAKING FOR THOUSANDS OF JOBLESS

The American textile industry finally got a hearing before Congress this week, and it presented strong arguments for stricter import quotas. Spokesmen for the industry in Maine and other textile regions showed that foreign competition is throwing thousands of men and women out of work and threatening the entire U.S. industry.

There was only one sour note. This came from the Committee for National Trade Policy which charged that "the injurious effect of textile imports has been exaggerated."

We invite members of the committee to visit Maine and talk with the 10,000 workers who have lost textile jobs in recent years. They also should look at the closed plants and mills, and those operating at a reduced pace because they can't sell their goods in competition with those produced by cheap foreign labor. They would find the same story in the textile States of the South.

Finally, they should listen to J. M. Cheatham, past president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, who says the present trend imperils the U.S. textile industry and the jobs of 2 million workers.

Under present conditions, the American industry is operating under an unfair handicap. Wages of textile laborers in foreign countries runs as low as 10 percent of U.S. wages. Foreign manufacturers have the latest in equipment and technological know-how, thanks to a large degree to U.S. postwar aid. The setup is such that foreign firms can purchase U.S. cotton at 8 cents per pound less than American firms. The U.S. Government itself is responsible to a large extent for putting the U.S. industry at a disadvantage.

Now that southern Members of Congress have added their protests to those of Maine and other New England States, perhaps something will be done about a long overdue restriction on textile imports.

GSA and Customs Service Propose Hindrance to Development of Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach currently represent a capital investment of some $280 million. However, by 1970 the port of Long Beach alone will represent an investment of $300 million, and Los Angeles Harbor plans similar expansion. Yet, the General Services Administration has proposed that harbor development be held back by the dead hand of the past. It has proposed to institutionalize a 22-mile mistake at unnecessary cost to the Federal taxpayer by building multimillion-dollar customs headquarters into a new Federal office building in the traffic-choked, landlocked Los Angeles Civic Center.

Originally, customs headquarters were placed in central Los Angeles, 22 miles away from the harbor, because the two manmade harbors were then little more than mudflats and lacked many of the facilities necessary to commerce.

This is no longer true. The harbor area communities now number more than 1½ million residents. The harbor area is the hub between the two metropolitan areas of Los Angeles to the north and fast-growing Orange County to the east and south. All banking and commercial facilities necessary for foreign trade exist in the port cities.

No other harbor in the United States has its customshouse 22 miles away. Most are within a few blocks of the harbor. Construction of this absentee customhouse has been protested by port officials at both harbors, by shippers, by customs brokers, by Los Angeles County officials, by importers, and by a resolution unanimously passed by the California State Assembly.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CARTHAGE, N.Y., *March 29, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I wish to extend you my encouragement and support for your sponsorship of House Resolution 211 which proposes the establishment of a Special House Committee for the Captive Nations. As a student of international affairs, I believe such a committee would be a sound weapon to employ against Russian suppression of these eastern European and central Asiatic peoples.

Although the censorship of the Iron Curtain keeps us unaware of the happenings in these countries, the infrequent news we do receive from them, such as the recent church-state conflict in Poland, gives us good reason to believe that the United States can do much to aid the cause of freedom in this area. The proposed committee would become a strong tool for fulfilling our and President Kennedy's hopes for the captive nations. As he has stated them: "Our best hope, and theirs, is rather in having more nations follow the example of Poland, Yugoslavia, and Finland in moving gradually, if cautiously, away from total Soviet political domination and in seeking greater economic independence as well. We can, however, help by offering the best possible concrete alternatives, by being prepared to take advantage of every opening to establish better relations with the West, by having ready various forms of economic aid to lessen their dependence upon the U.S.S.R. or China."

Respectfully,

DAVID C. SWARTZENTRUBER.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Bismarck, N. Dak., March 29, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congressman, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It gives us real pleasure to be able to note with pride and satisfaction in our newspapers that you have introduced a resolution in the U.S. House of Representatives, calling for establishment of a Permanent Captive Nations Committee.

Therefore, in behalf of our Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, State branch of North Dakota, and 25,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent living in this great State of ours, I wish to compliment you for your initiative and wholeheartedly congratulate you for your patriotism and farsighted move in introducing this resolution.

Such a committee is long overdue and your trailblazing courage manifested in the introduction of this resolution will do much toward exposing to the people of our country and to the whole free world, that the rule of Russian Communist tyranny in Moscow is a constant threat to freedom everywhere.

A committee on the captive nations would serve many good purposes. First of all this Committee would give moral support and courage to all forces which are fighting Communist enslavement. Also, the Committee would be able to collect true information and data on the various nations in the U.S.S.R., which later could be made available to our Government. The enslavement of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

constitutes the veritable Achilles' heel of the Russian-Communist empire, and the constant and ceaseless aspirations to freedom and independence of these nations are a great deterrent to Russian aggression and expansion. This Committee should also pass information to the American people and to the free world that the U.S.S.R. is not one nation but a conglomerate of many various nations. And, therefore, a Committee of Captive Nations should assist our Government in formulating its policy with respect to the captive nations.

The present state of affairs in the world shows that the struggle between the Communist world and the free world is entering a critical phase. The constantly increasing threat of Russian Communist imperialism with the universally known objective of world domination, indicates the urgent necessity of more effective and dynamic policies with respect to the captive nations enumerated in Public Law 86–90, and initiative on the part of the free world, especially by the United States of America.

Our organization wishes to assure you, that we fully agree with the arguments and conclusions of your resolution and deem it a privilege to aline all our forces in support of it.

Therefore you will no doubt be pleased to hear that we are making a direct appeal to both of our Congressmen of North Dakota, to the Honorable DON L. SHORT and the Honorable HJALMER NYGAARD, asking them to support your resolution.

Respectfully yours,

DR. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., State Branch of North Dakota.

RAVARINO & FRESCHI, INC.,
St. Louis, Mo.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Congratulations on your submission of the House Resolution 211 for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. It is gratifying to realize that this vitally important area may be given the attention which it necessitates.

A special committee such as this should make worthwhile advances in exposing the pseudobloc of Soviet Communists for what they really are. Unless we expect to fight the entire cold war ourselves, Soviet propaganda must be countered and a nationalism stirred in the captive nations.

If the people in these nations can be assisted peacefully to a strong enough resentment of Russian communism, desire for freedom, and hope of deliverance; Russia will be attacked in one of her most vulnerable spots.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. FRESCHI, Jr.

WALLINGFORD, CONN., *April 5, 1961.*

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Having read your present bill before the House Rules Committee, House Resolution No. 211 for the creation of a House Captive Nations Committee, I would like to express my full support.

It is only by taking a definite attitude toward the Communist-enslaved nations that our country can hope to be victor in the cold war. Moreover, there is a moral obligation for our country not to ignore these nations which have been deprived of their freedom. House Resolution No. 211 is a must, if liberty is to be preserved and tyranny overthrown.

Respectfully yours,

DANIEL F. ULBRICH.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UKRAINIANS,
New York, N.Y., March 29, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our organization, long active in helping Ukrainian immigrants to this great country to accustom to the new conditions in reliance on their own forces, is very happy to learn of your sponsorship of the resolution for the establishment of a Permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

We are writing our Congressman from the city of New York, the Honorable LEONARD FARBSTEIN, asking him to aid you in your resolution.

Faithfully yours,

ALEXANDER GLADYSHOVSKY,
Secretary.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., *April 9, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you on the bill that you presented to Congress. Your House Resolution 211 is the best action that a Member of Congress has taken in a long time regarding the subjugated nations of the world.

I certainly do hope that this bill will go into effect, as it is desperately needed for both our sake and for the sake of the subjugated nations as well.

Once again congratulating you, and also thanking you for your interest in the Russian dominated nations and peoples, I remain,

Very truly yours,

MARGARET TODARO.

MARCH 25, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is encouraging to read that men like you realize the great potential of future allies in the captive nations such as Ukraine, Armenia, and so on, in the most cruel colonial empire in the world, the U.S.S.R.

I hope you continue to work to establish a congressional committee of the enslaved nations. We who love America and freedom are behind you.

God love you,

Mr. and Mrs. FRED BLEECH.

WARREN, PA.

BAYSIDE, N.Y., *April 4, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am very glad that something is planning to be done for the captive nations in addition to naming a week for them.

It is our duty as Americans to help subjugated nations regain their freedoms and to free them from the bonds of Russia.

Therefore, I am in favor of your House Resolution 211, which will establish a Committee for Captive Nations. I sincerely hope that the bill will pass through Congress for our sake in trying to maintain world freedom and peace and for the sake of the subgugated nations themselves.

Yours very truly,

WALTER J. HESS.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Syracuse, N. Y., March 28, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Syracuse Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is very grateful to you for introducing the resolution asking for the establishment of a Permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

We consider that such a Committee on Captive Nations will be very helpful in informing the free world on conditions behind the Iron Curtain and in supplying our Government with all the information necessary to formulate its policies regarding the nations occupied by Soviet Russia.

At the same time we are petitioning Mr. RIEHLMAN, our Congressman, to support your resolution.

Respectfully yours,

MYRON SYDOROWYCH,
Chairman.

IWAN ROMANIUK,
Secretary.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I have lately read a copy of House Resolution 211 and do hereby give my full support to the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. In these precarious times a committee of this sort would expose to the world the ruthlessness and hypocrisy of the Communist way of life. This committee will give the free world a chance to take the offensive after the United States and her allies for so many years have been on the defensive. You have my support, Mr. FLOOD and I hope to get my Congressman, my friends, and my neighbors to back the formation of this much-needed committee.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES L. SCHWAB.

QUEENS CHAPEL, R.I.

Revised Gettysburg Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the month of April, as all Americans well know, is income tax reporting month, and inasmuch as the President has recently sent to the Congress his income tax program, I feel it is apropos to insert under unanimous consent, the following reprint from the March 30, 1961, issue of the Othello (Wash.) Outlook in the RECORD. While very few taxpayers chuckle while filling out their tax reporting forms, the following may have the effect of lightening our feelings on the matter:

REVISED GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

One score and sixteen years ago our fathers brought forth upon this Nation a new tax, conceived in desperation and dedication to the proposition that all men are fair game.

Now we are engaged in a great mass of calculations, testing whether that taxpayer or any taxpayer so confused and so impoverished can long endure. We are met on Form 1040. We have come to dedicate a large portion of our income to a final resting place with those men who here spent theirs that they may spend our money.

It is altogether anguish and torture that we should do this. But in the legal sense we cannot evade—we cannot cheat—we cannot underestimate this tax. The collectors, clever and shy, who computed here have

gone far beyond our power to add or subtract.

Our creditors will little note nor long remember that we pay here, but the Bureau of Internal Revenue can never forget what we report here. It is for us, the taxpayers, rather to be devoted here to the tax return which the Government has thus far so nobly spent.

It is rather for us to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these vanishing dollars we take increased devotion to the few remaining; that we highly resolve that next year will not find us in a higher income tax bracket.

That this taxpayer, underpaid, shall figure out more deductions; and that taxation of the people, by the Congress, for the Government shall not cause solvency to perish.

Mandan, N. Dak., Opposes Rail Merger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Mandan, N. Dak., have unanimously adopted a resolution opposing the pending application of the Great Northern, Northern Pacific, Burlington & Seattle, Portland & Spokane Railroads to merge into a gigantic single railroad of unprecedented size and economic power.

This resolution sets forth clearly the reasons why the city commissioners of Mandan are concerned about this development, and therefore, at the request of the commissioners, under unanimous consent I insert the full text of this resolution in the RECORD, together with these explanatory remarks:

Whereas the Northern Pacific Railway Co., the Great Northern Railway Co., the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railway Co., and the Seattle, Portland & Spokane Railway Co., are proposing to merge into a single company; and

Whereas such proposed merger would create a monopoly in transcontinental railroad service; and

Whereas such railroad companies now serve competing areas in this State and do not in any manner extend the services of either or any of them into new territories not already covered by extending its lines beyond the service areas in which they presently operate; and

Whereas the proposed merger would sharply reduce services and facilities in practically the southern half of this State; and

Whereas the proposed merger will result in loss of job opportunities, destroy property values, and seriously affect the economy of this area of the State, including the city of Mandan; and

Whereas the companies proposing to merge are in excellent financial shape and there is no economic justification for such mergers; and

Whereas the Northern Pacific Railway Co. was given public lands upon which to construct its railroad and was given many privileges not otherwise enjoyed by other industries, all of which make it imperative that it continue to provide good, competitive railroad service for this area of the State; and

Whereas the proposed merger would seriously impair the taxing abilities of the State and the various political subdivisions of this State and would jeopardize the continued operation of schools and other governmental units in this area, as well as seriously affect the entire economy of this area; and

Whereas the city of Mandan, in the county of Morton, and State of North Dakota, a municipal corporation, does not consider such merger to be in its best interest or in the best interest of its people or the people of this county and State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Mondan, N. Dak., as follows:

1. That the city of Mandan opposes the proposed merger and submits that it is not in the best interest of this Nation, State, or city and that such merger would seriously impair the economic and social growth of this city and others and that, therefore, it is urged that the Interstate Commerce Commission disapprove such proposed merger and that the city of Mandan further urges the officers and shareholders of such companies from further pursuing any further effort to accomplish such merger.

2. That the city auditor is hereby authorized and directed to forward a certified copy of this resolution to the U.S. Senators and Representatives of this State; the Governor of the State of North Dakota; the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission; the Public Service Commission of the State of North Dakota; and the presidents of such railroad companies.

By order of the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Mandan, N. Dak.

JOHN HANDTMANN,
President.

Attest:

ARNOLD T. LIVDAHL,
City Auditor.

I, Arnold T. Livdahl, being the duly appointed, qualified, and acting city auditor in and for the city of Mandan, N. Dak., do hereby certify that the annexed resolution is a full, true, and correct copy and transcript of a resolution duly passed by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Mandan at a regular meeting held at the city hall in said city of Mandan, N. Dak., on the 30th day of January 1961.

I further certify that such resolution was passed by a unanimous vote of all the members of the board of city commissioners and that said resolution was then spread upon the minutes of said meeting.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto placed my hand and the seal of the city of Mandan, N. Dak., on this 7th day of February 1961.

ARNOLD T. LIVDAHL,
City Auditor, City of Mandan, N. Dak.

Problems of the Domestic Textile Industry

SPEECH
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, numerous studies of the problems currently besetting the American textile industry have been made. All of them point out the fact that the time is now at hand for urgent action by the proper agencies of Government.

This industry, with the closely related apparel industry, employs more than 9 million persons in the United States. In wages and purchases, it pumps billions of dollars of revenue into our economy. In recent years, however, this industry has come under attack at home and abroad from the low-wage areas of the world.

American producers are unable to meet the competition of low wages and long hours from oriental countries. Under these conditions we face the loss of this essential industry. American workers and their employers do not ask for a protective shield behind which they can hide from the realities of world commerce. But they do ask and are entitled to have market conditions of fair competition. I am convinced that, given this, American ingenuity and resourcefulness can meet competition from anywhere in the world.

I am concerned that we, who are in a position to act, do not stand aside and in effect underwrite the ruin of thousands and thousands of jobs.

I urge most strongly that the Government establish country-by-country quotas for each commodity as recommended by the Senate subcommittee report "Problems of the Domestic Textile Industry."

Commemoration, Scholarly Effort, and Women of the Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, during the Assembly of the Civil War Centennial Commission at Charleston, S.C., April 10 to 12, I had the distinct honor of being one of the speakers on the fine program which was presented there.

Since that occasion, I have had several requests to make my remarks public. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the speech I made at the assembly in the Appendix of the RECORD:

COMMEMORATION, SCHOLARLY EFFORT, AND WOMEN OF THE CIVIL WAR

(By Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL)

I bring you greetings from your own Capital in the District of Columbia—the finest and greatest capital in the world. There are many reasons for this and not the least of which is the fact that our Capitol Building is more of a symbol of freedom and hope for mankind everywhere than any other capital in the world.

Students of history and of our heritage know, also, that this is so because this Capital is the place where more moving and meaningful history has been made by reaping benefits for its people and for all people than any place else in the world.

Nehru, in his simple eloquence, told us in a joint session of Congress, 1949, I quote, "During the last 2 days, I have paid visits to the memorials of the great builders of this Nation—I have done so because they have long been enshrined in my heart and their example has inspired me as it has inspired innumerable countrymen of mine. These memorials are the real temples to which each generation must pay tribute and

in doing so catch something of the fire that burnt in the hearts of those who were the torchbearers of freedom not only for this country but for the world. For those who are truly great have a message that cannot be confined within the particular country but is for all the world."

This is a fine admonition and reminds us of our own heritage. It tells us that much can be learned from our own history. Certainly it suggests, too, what can come from a study of our own Civil War period with a proper and adequate commemoration of significant events of that period.

On the north and south entrances of the Archives Building in Washington are some interesting inscriptions. One of them reads, "What is past is prologue." This is true.

Another reads, "Study history." This is good advice.

On the south side one reads, "Eternal vigilence is the price of liberty." A necessary reminder.

On the other side of that entrance it reads, "The heritage of the past is the seed that brings forth the harvest of the future." This suggests that we revive and relive history.

We need to note these admonitions. I believe that is what we are doing in this commemoration. Let us do it well.

It is hoped that the National Commission can give adequate leadership and inspire, encourage, move, and use the best talents available everywhere. We need to do this in such a way as to assure that all of us on the National Commission and you and the organization you represent will carry out to the fullest the intent of the authors of this idea to commemorate that tragic but significant experience of 100 years ago. Some are suggesting this is a time for celebration. I feel that this is not a time for celebration; but it is a time for commemoration.

The Civil War Centennial Commission, headed by Gen. U. S. Grant III, the grandson of a great general and President, who himself is great, decided at the Commission's first meeting that the Civil War is something for us to commemorate and not to celebrate.

Further, I am sure historians everywhere agree this 4-year nationwide centennial of the Civil War emphatically should not be a celebration.

In my opinion, the events of 100 years ago are far too important to be debased by a carnival spirit or by a string of useless holidays. Just as those events were of supreme importance to our Nation then, so today they deserve to be properly commemorated by us.

But some people ask, What is it that we are commemorating? Sincere and earnest people sometimes ask: Why focus on a bloody war, on an era of bitterness? This is a fair question that deserves a fair answer.

One thing is certain: Those of us who serve on the Federal Civil War Centennial Commission have no thought of reviving the sadness, the anguish, the bitterness of 100 years ago, or of romanticizing a bygone era. The centennial is not a retreat to a shadowy, unreality of the past.

For all of us, and especially we who like to think of ourselves as historians and who, like myself, like to be with historians and for various reasons have a special interest in this, the most tragic experience of our heritage, are certain, too, that we need to read, study, pause, think, and reflect on our interesting and meaningful past so that we can learn again from the lives and lessons of our history.

This will lead us to testimonials, conclusions and ideas that went into the establishment of this great idea we call American. It will help us understand the problems of the struggling nations of the present in other parts of the world and it can be of immeasurable benefit to us as we seek to help ourselves by helping them with their problems in this difficult time.

If individually and collectively we do this well and thoroughly we will learn again to feel the spirit that carried the people we call our forefathers through grave difficulties in their search and fight for the right.

As we think of the millions who gave the last full measure, and we will be reminded of this often, we should remind ourselves of a thought expressed at Gettysburg 2 years ago by America's most beloved poet, historian, and private citizen—Carl Sandburg. I quote:

"We have heard that the dead hold in their clenched hands only that which they have given away. When men forget, if they ever knew, what is at the heart of that sentiment, and it is terribly sentimental, they are in danger of power being taken over by fantastic fools or beasts of prey or men hollow with echoes and vanities."

A proper commemoration can effectively bring this noble thought to mind in many ways. A celebration can talk about it but commemoration can make us feel this moving truth. We need very much right now to make people note the drama and feel more of our history.

We, the leaders of the free world, indeed lovers of liberty everywhere, need to reflect on and to understand the import of what a son of a Confederate veteran, a present day American statesman, said recently in Washington. The occasion was the reenactment of the first inauguration of Abraham Lincoln. SAM RAYBURN spoke during the introduction of that program and said:

"Prejudice, hate, agitation brought about the Civil War. I have always thought if it had not been for hotheads in the South and the inane and insane agitators of the North that Abraham Lincoln, by his justice, his fairness, his great statesmanship, would have prevented the Civil War which destroyed the flower of our young manhood in this country that at that time was so sorely needed.

"As a son of a Confederate soldier, who did what he thought was right, I say for him and for myself after that was over, he was proud that our great Union was preserved.

"The saddest thing that ever happened to the border States and the Southland was for an insane man to assassinate Lincoln. Lincoln was strong enough in the hearts and minds of the people in the North that he could have prevented, and would have prevented, some terrible things happening in some parts of our beloved country. But North, South, East, and West, we are proud indeed."

I say, Yes, we are happy and proud of our Nation and of the hope that it holds for better things for us and for the world. Commemorations like that reenactment attended by over 20,000 people and seen, heard, and read by many millions more is a moving experience that solemnizes and lauds the worthwhile things that need to be noted and forever remembered by us and by the world. Like an ancient psalmist, Lincoln reminds us: "We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies."

We will find from commemoration how necessary it is for all of us and not just part of us "to be eternally vigilant" and have deep convictions about the eternal verities of freedom. History tells us that in giving freedom to people we assure freedom for ourselves. In this way we were honored for what we gave and in giving we assured more security to ourselves. From those who fought and gave the last full measure in the battle 100 years ago we can learn from their example that death is not the worst of life, that defeat is not the worst of failure but that not to have tried to do our best at all times is real failure. Let us note that in their relentless trying to preserve this Union for us and forever they achieved one of the great successes in all recorded time.

Importantly and uppermost in our minds, too, must be the idea that the centennial should be a time of reflection for us. Reflection can be the beginning of wisdom. So let us learn as well as remember. Let the Centennial be the occasion for serious study of the war in all its complex phases—not only its technical aspects but its deeper meaning for us today.

To me, its deeper meaning is what it gave us as a Nation. Bitter, bloody, and tragic though it was, it yet made possible our unity today—a unity at once indivisible and marvelous—one that is not static but adaptable—a unity that gives cohesion and at the same time accommodates a vigorous diversity. To me this is the unity of a matured people who can remember the past while seeing the future. This is the unity that demands that we be the leader of the free world.

So, let us study this great chapter in our past and appropriate its wisdom and its heritage to today's problems. It is, after all, a heritage that comes to us from the men and women of both North and South, and one that all Americans proudly honor and cherish; people who possessed the cardinal virtues of true greatness: courage, wisdom, and goodness.

Goodness to love the right, wisdom to know the right, courage to do the right.

What can we do to assist the serious study of the Civil War? Well, we can search for documents, letters, diaries, photographs and newspapers of the period and then deposit these in our State libraries or historical societies. You are saying to yourselves, this is repetition, and I say, yes it is but this needs repeating often all across the United States.

We can establish scholarships and fellowships devoted to special studies by students in every age group where we now teach history and, in the institutions of higher learning, encourage real scholarly efforts in areas that have not been thoroughly researched and written about. Here it must be noted that it has already begun. The press, radio, and TV have started and already made some fine contributions. Catton, Nevins, Wiley are doing a great job but we don't have enough of them.

We can encourage our legislatures to appropriate funds that will enable our State archives departments to arrange, index and microfilm their documents bearing on the war. I was able to help some in Iowa recently, I am sure, by pointing out that the $40,000 that the commission was asking for this year, compared to the $225,000 that they approved for monuments at Vicksburg in the late 1800's when Iowa had less than one-eighth the population they now have, is pretty insignificant by comparison.

These are a few of the things all of us can do to help assure that the centennial will yield enduring contributions as well as bad oratory.

WOMEN OF THE CIVIL WAR

Then there is one vast and important area of the Civil War study that I hope will be undertaken which relates to the role of the women in that conflict. With the exception of the noble work done by Florence Nightengale, women never had anything to do in an organized way in a war before. In this war they were real heroines even though very little credit is given to them in the publications, books, and periodicals of this time.

Lincoln once said: "I am not accustomed to the use of language of eulogy. I have never studied the art of paying compliments to women; but I must say, that if all that has been said by orators and poets since the creation of the world in praise of women were applied to the women of America, it would not do them justice for their conduct during this war. I will close by saying, God bless the women of America."

Judging from the record we can say that Lincoln knew the value of the women's efforts during the war. But, it is very evident that students of that time and since didn't value or appreciate it.

To prove the neglect in this area, I offer, as exhibit A, Mark M. Boatner III's book "The Civil War Dictionary," as evidence to prove my point.

I preface my remarks by saying to you, first of all, that this book is a fine, complete, authoritative dictionary of the Civil War and ought to be available to all serious students and writers. What I have to say is not critical of the book, but rather, critical of the meager written record we have made of and for the women.

The flyleaf of the cover of this book proudly points to the 2,000 succinct biographical sketches in the book. I have recently read it and find that out of the 2,000 sketches, only 35 are about women. Much more evidence akin to this could be presented to prove my point.

May I just underscore this evidence by pointing out that there was a woman from Iowa who started that sanitary commission work there, and who, before the war ended, became one of the best known personalities of the war period. She was the first person in the whole United States to be officially assigned to a commission created by a legislature. She carried forward her responsibilities on the sanitation commission nobly.

She became concerned about the lack of proper diets for soldiers, talked to Stanton, Meigs, and Lincoln about it, and was named head of all the diet kitchens of the hospitals of the North. She was the author of the first book of recipes ever written for any army in history. She saw the great need to take care of orphans and started an orphans asylum association in Iowa in 1864. She talked to Lincoln about that and he endorsed the idea in his second inaugural address. She was a personal friend of many famous people in the District of Columbia, and especially close to the Grants, Julia and U. S.

Grant said she was one of the great heroines, if not the greatest heroine, of the war and, yet, she is not in Boatner's book, and no one except some people in Iowa knows I have been talking about Annie Wittenmyer. You don't know about her because no one ever wrote a good book about her.

And have you ever heard of that wonderful lady who established a home in Springfield, Mo., for orphans of both Confederate and Union veterans? Her name was Mary Whitney Phelps, and she was the wife of Gen. John S. Phelps.

There was another girl, a Richmond resident. She established a hospital on her own after the first battle of Bull Run. Later the Confederate Government took it over, and she was commissioned captain by President Davis, and became the only woman to receive a regular commission in the Confederacy. My, what relief she and her kind brought to thousands. To most of you the name, Sally Tompkins is new, isn't it?

Have you ever heard of Madame Turchin, the immigrant from Russia, symbol of foreign aid, who went with her husband, a colonel in the Union Army, and served as nurse and mother confessor to the regiment. And, once when her husband became ill, she took over and led the regiment into battle with confidence and poise and won the skirmish.

In the books by Ishbell Ross on the lives of Kate Chase, Rose Greenhow, Clara Barton, and Mrs. Jefferson Davis, we find excellent samples of what can be done to reveal the devotion, even though some were by intrigue, and the wholesome and sometimes almost unbelievable and thrilling influence women can have in difficult and challenging times.

In these books she has demonstrated, as others could if they were inspired to study as she has and do the exceptionally skillful job of investigating and fine writing, the spirit of the women. All of this could give us a new insight and a new and different angle from which to view and appreciate the Civil War.

So much more needs to be done for so many other women who have made significant, interesting, and worthwhile contributions in so many ways. People like Elizabeth Waring Duckett of Maryland; just the story of how she got to Lincoln and Stanton and others in behalf of her father and brother who were in prison and was able to get them out.

Then there is the mother of the 1st Tennessee Regiment, Mrs. Betsy Sullivan. We only know about her through searching the records and yet in some ways there was no greater inspiration than any regiment could receive than she furnished by her devotion to the solution of many problems for the average soldier.

The story of the girl who earned the title "The Florence Nightengale of the South," Mrs. Ella Trader, of Arkansas, is a thrilling one, too.

These are just a few examples that suggest areas that need research, study, reviving, and writing about.

A study and review of the life of Mrs. Jeb Stuart could be a very interesting and worthwhile contribution.

Yes, the histories of wars are records of the achievements of men, for the most part: The chroniclers have had to record that women, by their intrigues or their fatal gift of beauty, have been the cause of strifes innumerable; and it is confessed that they have inspired heroism and knightly deeds, but they have had small share in the actual conflicts. It has been their portion to suffer in silence at home, and to mourn the dead. For them it has been to hear of sufferings which they could not alleviate, to grieve or rejoice over results to which they had contributed only sympathy and prayers.

But, it was different in our conflict to save the Union. Other wars have furnished here and there a name which the world delights to repeat in terms of affection or admiration, of some woman who has broken through the rigidity of custom and been conspicuous either among armed men, like the Maid of Saragossa, or in the hospitals, like the heroine of Scutari. But, the Civil War furnished hundreds as intrepid as the one, and as philanthropically devoted as the other. Indeed, we may safely say that there was scarcely a loyal woman in the North or South who did not do something in aid of the cause—who did not contribute, of time, or labor, or money, to the comfort of the soldiers. No town was too remote from the scene of war to have its society of relief; and while the women sewed and knit, and made delicacies for the sick, and gathered stores, little girls, scarcely old enough to know what the charitable labor meant, went from house to house, collecting small sums of money, the fruitful energy of all keeping the storehouses and treasury of the sanitary commissions and comparable organizations full, and pouring a steady stream of beneficence down to the troops in the field.

Everywhere there were humble and unknown laborers. But there were others, fine and adventurous spirits, whom the glowing fire of patriotism urged to more noticeable efforts. There were those who followed their husbands and brothers to the field of battle and who went down into the very edge of the fight, to rescue the wounded, and cheer and comfort the dying with gentle ministrations; who labored in field and city hospitals, and on the dreadful hospital boats, where the severely wounded were received; who penetrated the lines of the enemy on dangerous missions; who organized great charities, and pushed on our sanitary enterprises; who were angels of mercy in a thousand terrible situations.

There are others who have illustrated, by their courage and address in times of danger, by their patience in suffering, and by adventures romantic and daring, some of the best qualities in our nature. Like the soldiers of the armies, they were from every rank in life, and they exhibited a like persistence, endurance, and faith.

There are many hundreds of women whose shining deeds have honored their country and, wherever they are known, the Nation holds them in equal honor with its brave men. But, they are not known.

The story of the war will never be fully or fairly written if the achievements of women in it remain untold. They do not figure in the official reports; they are not gazetted for deeds as gallant as ever were done; the names of thousands are unknown beyond the neighborhood where they live, or the hospitals where they loved to labor; yet there is no feature in the Civil War more creditable to us as a nation, none from its positive newness so well worthy of records of the U.S. Sanitary Commission, U.S. Christian Commission, the various State historical society records, the thousands of references to women's activity found in local publications of the time will make it easy for us to do something in this area that will give the women the credit that is their due.

In assuring this credit we will add to our own heritage and will be building on the gallant spirit of graciousness and tenderness toward women of that time that we know about but which never has been properly recognized in writing.

Now let me summarize very briefly by saying, again, that we must commemorate appropriately, adequately, and as completely as we can. We will do this better if we encourage and engage the very best of our scholarly efforts everywhere. When we do this we will have more, more accurate and more complete, historical literature of this very significant time in our history.

And, I reiterate, we must demonstrate our gallantry toward the gentler sex. This story is a thrilling one and will reflect great credit on the women from both sides of the Mason-Dixon line.

In addition, and in conclusion, it may be worthwhile at this point to suggest also that we can learn much from the lives of all the people, great and small, who served the cause of the people as they understood the demands of their time—for my purpose now I should like to refer to two of them.

One became great and immortal before and during the war and one during and after the war. Both left us needed sublime words and thoughts at the close of the tragedy which point to the goal and call us to the task.

Ninety-six years ago last March 4, one of them, Lincoln, left us words and suggestions about malice, charity, firmness, right and the task before us. Told us what to care for, what we should do, achieve and cherish for ourselves and for all nations.

Soon after that Robert E. Lee, seeking to serve against a united nation, left us some unforgettable words and then an incomparable example of unselfish citizenship.

Bruce Catton, in one of his great books, tells us of it in this way:

"Through the sheets of rain that fell on the morning of April 15, 1865, a Baptist minister living on the outskirts of Richmond caught sight of a man on a gray horse. His steed was bespattered with mud, and his head hung down as if worn by long traveling. The horseman himself sat his horse like a master; his face was ridged with self-respecting grief; his garments were worn in the service and stained with travel * * *." Robert E. Lee had returned at last from the wars.

Lee, a paroled prisoner, was indicted for treason but was never brought to trial; and on July 13 he applied for a Federal pardon, which was never granted. Courageous and resolute in war, Lee was never bitter in defeat. "The war being at an end * * *" he wrote in September 1865, "I believe it to be the duty of every one to unite in the restoration of the country, and the establishment of peace and harmony * * *."

That month he became president of Washington College in Lexington, Va., a position which he held for the 5 remaining years of his life. On the morning of October 12, 1870, the old warrior lay dying. His former opponent, Ulysses S. Grant, was in the White House; but Robert E. Lee was once more on the battlefield. "Strike the tent," he murmured as he died.

I'm loath to close but I must because there are others who also have important observations to make but it cannot be wrong for me to suggest that we, like our forefathers, must strive for a greater, more appropriate and devoted patriotism toward the self-same ideals that they gave to us through sacrifice and preserved for us through sacrifice. I know of no better way to develop this patriotic spirit in the hearts and minds of boys and girls and in the hearts and minds of all our citizens and liberty-loving people everywhere than by reviewing, rewriting, reliving and reviving the great American story and its magnificent struggle for freedom.

Good luck as together we do those things that will give assurance for a greater and finer America for ourselves, forever and for everyone.

Four-Year Term for Members of House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Saturday, April 22, 1961, which sets forth a point of view with which I am sure many Members of the House concur. As the editorial points out, it is indeed very interesting that a majority of those questioned in a national poll favored a constitutional amendment to extend the term of Members from the present 2 years to 4 years.

The indicated editorial follows:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader, Apr. 22, 1961]

FOUR-YEAR TERM IN HOUSE

The idea that Members of the House of Representatives ought to be elected for 4-year instead of 2-year terms has long been advocated by many students of the American system of government. The basic argument advanced in favor of such a constitutional amendment is that the longer term would permit Congressmen to devote more of their time to their work and less to getting reelected every 2 years.

That argument, though it is not all that can be said on the subject, is a compelling one. And the proposal appears to be gaining popular favor. In a national poll, 51 percent of those questioned favored a constitutional amendment to make the House term 4 years. Only 34 percent of those questioned were opposed. This is an indication that public sentiment is moving in the right direction—toward giving House Members a 4-year term.

The principal argument against this is that the present 2-year term gives the voters a closer rein on its Representatives in the House. If they do not act in accordance with their constituents' wishes, they can be ousted in 2 years. That is an advantage of sorts.

This advantage is far outweighed, however, by the fact that having to run for reelection every 2 years puts enormous pressure on a Congressman. In a sense, he must run almost continually, and knowing that he can soon be whisked out of office may tempt him to vote for what is popular at the moment rather than on the basis of his honest convictions. Senators are entrusted with office for 6 years at a time. The House term should be increased to at least four.

Army Should Investigate Before Relieving General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include an editorial from the Hopewell News of Thursday, April 20. The editorial points out cogently the different treatment received by conservatives and liberals. It is shocking to see a vital part of the Federal Government discriminating against one of our generals simply because he is a conservative.

I commend the editor of the Hopewell News for bringing this matter to the attention of the public and I urge all of the Members of this body to carefully read the editorial which is as follows:

ARMY SHOULD INVESTIGATE BEFORE RELIEVING GENERAL

We think the Department of the Army made a mistake in relieving Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker of his command of the 24th Division in Germany "pending the outcome of an official investigation."

While the order did not name the John Birch Society by name Army officials acknowledged that the action was taken because of allegations that General Walker had been urging the views of that organization on the troops under his command.

Now the John Birch Society is a perfectly legal organization. It has not been cited for any reason. It has not even been investigated. Furthermore in this country a man is supposed to be held innocent until he is proved guilty.

In this case it is a little hard to know what the general could be proved guilty of. As we understand it the John Birch Society is very conservative. Just when has it become a crime to be a conservative in these United States? Just who abolishes the right of free speech?

We would lay a little bet that if General Walker had been accused of urging the views of some leftist, or pink organization we would never have heard a word about it. There is a large and growing number of so-called liberals, who Life Lines calls the "mistaken," who have been trying hard to make the word "conservative" a dirty word and the airing of conservative views a crime.

WELCH OFF BASE

Now we hold no brief whatsoever for this man Welch who founded the John Birch Society. Apparently he has strong and strange views, but that in itself is still not yet a crime in this country, and we understand that the society itself does not subscribe to the extreme views Mr. Welch has been alleged to hold. In fact, Mr. Welch has denied some of the statements attributed to him.

But, really, it does not matter just what the doctrines of the John Birch Society are, unless they are subversive, no man should be fired from his job and put under pressure, until after the investigation has been held and the full facts are known. All too often officials of our Government have protected leftwingers and pinks from the consequences of their actions and talk, when we thought it was downright subversive.

The main tenet of the John Birch Society, as we understand it, is a strong anti-Communist stand. Perhaps some of its other tenets, such as the abolition of the income tax, do not set well with officials in Washington who want to increase the tax burden on the American people to carry out their ideas of the all-powerful welfare state, but we do not see how they can object to anyone being strongly anti-Communist.

The international Communist conspiracy is our sworn enemy. It is trying by every means, by every hook and crook, to undermine and "bury" us. It's insidious propaganda is spreading in the United States. It had duped many innocent people into following its "line." It is weakening the will of the American people, while our welfare state is weakening our initiative and individual liberties.

INVESTIGATE NOW

We are not entirely familiar with the whole program of the John Birch Society, but its officers have been trying to get the Congress to investigate them. They have offered to come to Washington and answer any and all questions. Is not that a rather refreshing offer after all the hundreds and hundreds of people, some in high places, who have taken the fifth amendment when organizations to which they belong have been investigated by the Congress?

In view of what has happened to General Walker, we would strongly urge that the Congress go ahead and investigate the John Birch Society at once. Let's find out what all the shooting is about. But we have a real strong hunch it will once again be shown that all the so-called liberals and leftwingers are simply out to "get" anyone and everyone who can be labeled "conservative."

Well, we invite them down to Virginia. The woods are full of good, solid, substantial Virginia Democrats who glory in being called "conservative"; who stand foresquare for the American Constitution, the American flag, and are sworn enemies of anything and everything that is tinged with the poison of the international Communist conspiracy.

A Tribute to Credit Union Activities and Services of Mrs. Dyalthia Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in these days of loan sharks and amid the cries of various plans of credit through quick-

cash, check credit plan, instant money, tempting the average American to overspend, to run the risk of financial insecurity, insolvency, and bankruptcy it is comforting to read the true story of the financial situation in the typical farm and ranch community in the Southwest, Hereford, Tex., USA.

There are no loan sharks in that community because back in 1936 Dyalthia Benson came face to face with people and their money problems in her capacity as welfare worker. She helped organize the Hereford, Tex., Federal Credit Union to serve all residents within the county and the Hereford vicinity. Small loans were an exception with the two banks but the bankers encouraged Mrs. Benson's efforts. She has made thrift a byword by all who borrowed or invested. Although the bankers now have small loan departments they emphatically state that the community needs the credit union. The two banks, the savings and loan, and the credit union work very closely in financial and civic affairs and hold regular meetings with Mrs. Benson serving as chairman. This is a wonderful tribute to a dedicated American. Her story is the story of many dedicated men and women who have made the credit union movement a success throughout America.

A special tribute was paid to Mrs. Dyalthia Benson in an editorial written by Mr. Jimmie Gillentine in the Sunday Brand, Hereford, Tex., February 5, 1961.

With permission to revise and extend my remarks, I insert herewith the editorial written by Mr. Gillentine:

[From the Sunday Brand, Hereford, Tex., Feb. 5, 1961]

IT COULD HAPPEN ONLY IN AMERICA

Soaring to heights beyond any fairytale ever dreamed by Hans Christian Andersen is the story of an idea which took root in Hereford 24 years ago, and grew even faster than Jack's fabulous beanstalk.

The story centers around hard, cold cash. The guiding light and start of the performance is a generous woman with a gracious soul and a warm heart. The cast consists of ordinary, everyday people who need an occasional helping hand. The setting is a typical farm and ranch community of the Southwest, Hereford, Tex., U.S.A.

It all started back in 1936, when our heroine, Dyalthia Benson, came face to face with people and money problems in her capacity as welfare officer of Deaf Smith County. Always, it seemed, a bad circumstance might have been averted had a small loan been available somewhere along the line. Finally, Mrs. Benson organized the Hereford, Tex., Federal Credit Union in 1936 with an outlay of $125.44.

Just 24 years later, Horatio Alger would have found it difficult to believe the audited financial statement on December 31, 1960, when assets totaled $2,247,995.

Of equal importance to the manner in which the business has grown in the basic operation of the firm, created in the days when small loans were the exception with banks, and loan sharks were having their heyday in Texas. Thrift is a byword for all who borrow or invest, and Mrs. Benson is proud of the fact that the credit union now has 825 children among its depositors. She is also proud of the fact that the presidents of both Hereford banks were sufficiently interested to take part in the program at the annual meeting last December, because she wants the credit union to be supplemental to private enterprise.

Testifying to all of these things are a long list of teachers, clerks, janitors, farmhands, and even a few businessmen who have found assistance at the credit union down through the past quarter of a century. At least two of these people have been instrumental in organizing additional credit unions, when they moved to other communities.

These things speak well for the credit union, no doubt about that, but those who have seen the organization grow from the paltry $125.44 into a multimillion-dollar institution are more inclined to give credit where it is deserved, namely to Mrs. Benson. Without her interest, zeal, and ability, it would probably never have passed $1,000 in assets—and hundreds of people who today have a nest egg to fall back upon would be penniless and without credit.

Only in America could it happen. A dream, based on the Golden Rule, plus a few dollars, plenty of hard work, and a spark of ambition. Result: an outstanding institution which is setting a pattern for all America to follow.

Resolution of the Professional Men's Club of Rochester, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD it is my privilege to include at this point the following resolution adopted recently by the Professional Men's Club of Rochester, N.Y.

The Professional Men's Club of Rochester is an Italian-American organization whose membership includes many of Rochester's leading business and professional men. This resolution expresses disapproval at what the club believes to be flagrant and widespread abuse and degradation of Italian-Americans by certain segments of the television industry and requests that action of a legislative nature be taken to establish a set of fair practices in the entertainment industry which would prohibit malignment of any national group:

PROFESSIONAL MEN'S CLUB, ROCHESTER, N.Y., RESOLUTION

Whereas the Professional Men's Club of Rochester, N.Y., is an Italian-American organization whose membership is composed of persons of Italian extraction, and who, by scholarly pursuits, have been awarded degrees in the fields of medicine, law, dentistry, pharmacy, engineering, or in the various other arts and sciences; and

Whereas Americans of Italian extraction have made significant contributions to the cultural, social, scientific, educational, economic, and political life of America; and

Whereas in the course of the daily practices and associations of such professions, businesses, pursuits, and vocations, there has been experienced a rising tide of resentment and indignation on the part of this general membership, as well as on the part of those thousands of Italian-Americans comprising their patients, clients, clientel, and associates, in and about the county of Monroe, N.Y.; and

Whereas this resentment has resulted primarily from the predominant and persistent portrayal, in scripts and typecasting by segments of the television industry, of persons of Italian nationality as gangsters, hoodlums, perpetrators of fraud, gamblers, prison inmates, and persons of unsavory morals and character: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Resolved—

1. That the Professional Men's Club of Rochester, N.Y., does hereby except to, disapprove, and condemn the flagrant and widespread abuse and degradation of the Italian-American public, by segments of the television industry, whether by design, indifference, or otherwise.

2. That the Professional Men's Club of Rochester, N.Y., hereby excepts to, disapproves, and condemns, as un-American, and therefore, contrary to any standards or concepts of fairness, morality, and decency, the unjust enrichment and capitalization upon such discriminatory and degrading portrayals of Italians, by segments of the television industry, under the guise of entertainment.

3. That the Professional Men's Club of Rochester, N.Y., proposes and suggests that the television industry and its affiliated networks conduct a reevaluation of their programing; also that there be considered the creation, amendment, or enforcement of codes of fair practices to eliminate and prevent the discriminatory, degrading, and abusive portrayals of persons of Italian descent, or of any other nationality, or minority group.

4. That the Professional Men's Club of Rochester, N.Y., place itself upon record as urging the enactment or promulgation, of remedial legislation, rules, or regulations on local, State and/or Federal levels to provide for the establishment and/or enforcement of laws pertaining to fair practices in the entertainment industry.

5. That the Professional Men's Club of Rochester, N.Y., hereby dedicates itself to the elimination and prevention of such unfair and un-American practices.

VINCENT FRANCIOSA NOLAN,
Resolution Committee Chairman.
JOSEPH A. TADDEO.
VINCENT J. DIRAIMO.
ROSS IMBURGIA, M.D.
Committee Members.

Federal Aid to Education—An Opening Wedge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the heated and spirited public debate which we are currently experiencing on several issues involved in the question of Federal aid to education has tended to obscure a key question—is Federal aid necessary? If the increasing number of authorities are correct in their statements that States and local communities have built classrooms at a greater rate than the legislation would provide and have substantially increased teachers' salaries, then many of the advocates for Federal aid must have another motive in mind.

A recent editorial, found in the April 3, 1961, issue of the Williamsport, Pa., Sun-Gazette, clearly and cogently warns that the ultimate purpose—and certainly the necessary result—of Federal aid is Federal control.

I am pleased to call this excellent editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

AN ENTERING WEDGE

Beyond all doubt, proposed Federal aid to education has become one of the leading political issues of the day.

With much being said concerning the need for it, Dr. Russell Kirk, an authority on educational questions, is bound to draw fire when he argues "there is no financial necessity for Federal subsidies."

He says the Nation is growing rapidly enough that local and State taxes can absorb the educational load in the years between now and 1970.

Here is what Dr. Kirk told a New York audience a few days ago:

"What the zealots for Federal aid really desire is not simply more money but more power—great power. The present pretext of school construction and bonuses to teachers' salaries are intended merely as entering wedges: the first steps toward establishing a wholly centralized system of public instruction, directed by an important Washington bureaucracy."

These are blunt words. But we have learned from history and experience that once government enters into any sphere, no matter how modest the scale at the beginning, it demands and gets more and more power.

It should never be forgotten that he who pays the piper calls the tune.

Recreation Seeks a Place at the Water Table

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Members an address entitled "Recreation Seeks a Place at the Water Table," by Francis W. Sargent, executive director of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, Washington, D.C., delivered before the Eighth National Watershed Congress, Tucson, Ariz., April 19, 1961:

Human existence depends upon water.

I am sure that you are even more keenly aware than I of the vital truth of these opening words of the report of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources. For the past 3 days you have been in one way or another considering the dependency of humanity on water. Indeed many of you have devoted a large part of your lives to this problem.

Today I would like to add to your burdens, to emphasize yet another facet of human existence which is dependent in large measure upon water—outdoor recreation.

First, I would like to strongly associate the cause of outdoor recreation with wise agricultural, industrial, and domestic use of water. Our economy is dependent upon water, and if we do not have a strong growing economy which provides its citizens with disposable income and leisure time, there can be little outdoor recreation—an important ingredient for the health and happiness of the American people.

Let's look at the role of water in outdoor recreation—it is great.

The recently published California Outdoor Recreation Plan reports that 60 percent of all outdoor recreation activity is water oriented. If this holds true for the rest of the Nation it means that 600,000 out of each of those millions of Americans who are seeking outdoor recreation today seek water.

And it means that at least 60 percent of the growing numbers of Americans who will be seeking recreation in the outdoors over the coming years will also seek water. In fact that percentage may even increase. Water oriented activities are apparently growing faster than others. And to further complicate the matter those activities which require great expanses of water seem to be gaining popularity most rapidly of all.

For example, it takes a lot of water for the 8 million recreational boats which the Outboard Boating Club reports are using our waterways today. Water skiers and powerboat enthusiastis require the use of enough acre-feet to satiate many other thirsty uses. A new reservoir these days fills with boats as it fills with water.

Almost all outdoor recreation activities become more attractive with the presence of water. The first campsite or picnic spot taken is always the one closest to the lake or the stream or in fact, the ocean.

Water is simply one of the most important factors to the outdoor family.

This importance of water to outdoor recreation is reflected in the study program of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

One study is devoted directly to the problems of water recreation. It is being carried out for us by the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior and will consider such factors as access, planning of water projects, pollution abatement, conflicts in water use, and the relation of hydrology to reaction. There is a separate study considering the crucial problem of providing shoreline opportunities—opportunities that are perhaps becoming the most scarce commodity in outdoor recreation. Every day more of our fresh and salt water shorelines are being developed in one way or another and lost to the need of a growing population for a quiet beach, stream bank, or lake shore. This is one of the most critical areas for immediate effective action.

Another Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission study is considering the problems of providing fishing opportunities. It seeks to estimate in broad terms the existing supply and the probable kind, quality, and location of the fishing resources of the Nation for the next 40 years. And it will suggest alternative policies aimed at improving the adjustment of future supply to the anticipated demand.

In addition most of the other Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission projects are concerned with water because of its importance to the entire recreation complex. The national recreation survey of 16,000 households will provide the most extensive information yet compiled on the outdoor recreation habits and preferences of the American people. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission's inventory of publicly designated recreation areas will give the Nation an idea of what resources we have to meet the demand which these habits and preferences reflect. These two studies are both very much concerned with water activities.

Our study program is now being completed, analyzed, and interpreted. The information it develops will, we hope, be of lasting value to all those concerned with water problems as well as outdoor recreation. The Commission will use the data developed in these studies as a base for its policy recommendations—essentially to say what we should do with the potential we have over the next 40 years to meet the demand Americans seeking outdoor recreation will generate.

The recommendations and the studies of the Commission will be reported to the President and the Congress on January 31 of next year. Congress recently authorized this 5-month extension from the reporting date established in the original Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Act.

As our studies are not yet complete and as the Commission has not reached final agreement on its recommendations I cannot today report findings or conclusions. However, there are problems in the water field affecting recreation which have become abundantly clear in our studies, and I would like to share a few of them with you.

First, there are the traditional conflicts between outdoor recreation and other uses of water. Outdoor recreation does not consume water as some other uses do, but there are obviously some points where the needs of irrigation, power, navigation, water supply and industrial uses conflict with the needs of outdoor recreation.

One obvious example of this is the drawdown problem in reservoirs. If the shoreline is a vast expanse of mudflats, much of the potential for recreation on that lake is gone. If the lake is not drawn down to meet other needs it is not serving its purposes. Better coordination in planning and operation, carefully designed access points and midwater facilities can help in this area.

Second, and this may become an even more bitter controversy than the traditional one among different uses, are the conflicts among different outdoor recreation activities themselves. Water skiers and high speed boating enthusiasts cannot enjoy themselves in harmony and safety on the same area of water with swimmers or anglers. As the demand increases for recreational use of our limited water area this problem is going to rapidly grow worse.

Some areas have tried zoning—putting the water skiers in one area and the swimmers in another. Some have tried using alternate days for alternate activities and I understand that one lake in New Jersey has found it necessary to have a traffic cop out in the middle directing Sunday traffic.

Third is the problem of pollution abatement. Pollution is one of the great destroyers of outdoor recreation opportunities. This is one area where clear-cut action can, in effect, create new natural outdoor recreation opportunities.

As part of our study program we are seeking to find out just how much money is spent for outdoor recreation by all levels of government. In this study we went to some agencies not directly in the outdoor recreation business and asked them to estimate what proportion of their expenditures they felt benefited outdoor recreation. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare replied that it felt that every dollar it spent on water pollution control benefited recreation. Thus it well may be that in many areas the outdoor recreation benefits alone are sufficient reason for pollution abatement.

Fourth is the problem of access. There are actually a great many natural bodies of water in this country. Florida, for instance, has 16,000 lakes. Minnesota's license plates advertise that it has 10,000. These lakes are generally in public ownerhip and thus theoretically available for public enjoyment.

But in many cases access to the lake is blocked by a ring of private holdings, and the lake itself is thus appropriated to private use. Now this is a natural thing. Property owners on a lake would prefer that the lake not be crowded with weekend visitors from the city, but where waters are in public ownership, it seems apparent that public access must be provided.

This access problem is closely related to the role of the private sector of the economy—a role the Commission is convinced must be considered in meeting the demand

for outdoor recreation. Where feasible commercial enterprise can be encouraged to provide facilities.

In other cases where the land is primarily used for another purpose outdoor recreation may be an auxiliary use which returns a profit. We have grown to accept multiple use of our public lands. Perhaps this concept can be extended to private lands and bodies of water if suitable arrangements with the owners can be evolved. Farm ponds and small watershed improvements represent a considerable recreation resource. If means acceptable to both the private owners and the public can be worked out, these resources can help greatly to ease demand on other areas.

Another facet of the access issue is access to public water developments. Often hampered by inadequate planning, lack of authority and funds, our water resource development agencies have not been able to acquire enough land around reservoir sites to realize the optimum recreation benefit from the development. If this is not done early in the life of the project, the recreation opportunities may be lost or substantially reduced.

Finally, there is the problem of providing a place for recreation in water resource projects. There are only a limited number of sites in our Nation which will support water resources projects—whether they be large or small. And this limited number must serve all the needs of our people.

We have become accustomed to thinking of multipurpose projects, but too often recreation has not been a full party to the initial planning of such projects. Dr. Luther Gulick, of our advisory council, put it this way at our third joint meeting:

"Recreation is the orphan child and does not sit at the table when the menu is being planned and the dinner is served. We pick up the crumbs."

Outdoor recreation is now big business. While exact figures are difficult to assess Americans spent at least $5 billion in 1960 on water oriented outdoor recreation—boating, fishing, and swimming. This means that outdoor recreation has come of age. It's a major industry as well as a major activity.

It should be taken into the family and allowed to sit at the table when the meal is being planned and when it is served—but this may well mean that outdoor recreation should bear some of the family expenses, too. I do not believe that the millions of Americans seeking a place in the water will object if they have to pay an equitable fee for this privilege or if a reasonable part of their tax money is spent to provide it.

I realize that this homey little analogy leads directly into the middle of the benefit-cost ratio question—should outdoor recreation benefits be included in computing the benefits of projects. And this in turn raises one of the most difficult problems in this field—how do you realistically and equitably set a price on the benefits of outdoor recreation.

The Commission is considering this problem very carefully. In all candor I cannot promise that we shall come up with a completely satisfactory solution. The issue is extremely complex and there are far-reaching ramifications which require very careful study. The Commission has not reached any conclusions on this specific issue, but it is very much in their minds, and they will certainly recommend some action to the President and the Congress in this area next January.

But I can say that the Commission does feel strongly that outdoor recreation must be taken into the family as a full member in all natural resource planning. Long-range planning including recreation will lessen some of the earlier problems I mentioned. Conflicts among uses can be reduced. Conflicts among different recreation uses may be alleviated. The drive for pollution abatement can be bolstered.

This message to you today may not be an altogether pleasant one but it is a fact of life. Americans are demanding the use of water for outdoor recreation. They like the water. They want to sit by it, swim in it, fish in it, ski on it, and run their boats across it. And as there are more people with more money and leisure time to do these things the demand for recreation on water is going to increase.

Other uses, of course, will also be demanding more of our limited water supply. Therefore, it is imperative that all uses be considered fully in every action we take which affects water. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission is convinced that outdoor recreation can work in harmony with the other members of the water-using family, but it is also convinced that it is time to consider outdoor recreation a full-fledged member of that family.

Ten Reasons Why Communism Is Winning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

TEN REASONS WHY COMMUNISM IS WINNING
(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

American defeats in Cuba and Laos are causing some surprise in Washington. True, President Kennedy predicted that things would get worse before they got better. But his advisers on world affairs have insisted on treating the Communist power conspiracy as if it consisted of normal governments with which the United States could do business. They have got their fingers burnt. It remains to be seen if they have yet learned why communism is winning.

Here are the important reasons:

1. Communists play to win. Communizing the planet is their overriding task. The West, including the United States, wants only to call the game off. It fails to admit that this is a real war which it can win only if it gives it No. 1 priority and stops considering it just another problem like smog or juvenile delinquency.

2. Communists believe fanatically in the triumph of their social system. Khrushchev "knows" that he can win without major war. Mao is willing to have a major war to win. Americans fear major war almost as much as they fear communism. Some westerners are impressed by Communist successes. Many are beginning to see previously unobserved "virtues" in communism. Western policy is based on a naive belief that given time communism will, if "unprovoked," go away or lose its will to win.

3. In Communist society the people are terrorized and brainwashed to the point where they support anything—look at Cuba. In the West, people must be convinced before they will act. Their leaders cannot convince them that the cold war is the outstanding fact of this century until they themselves understand it. So far three American Presidents have not so understood it.

4. Communist societies sacrifice everything—comfort, decency, ethics, individual freedom—to naked power. The U.S.S.R. almost equals the United States in weapons (and outstrips it in rockets and missiles) with less than half the total production. The United States permits stoppages in arms factories and constant wage and salary increases while refusing to match its enemies in weapons lest its "peace economy" suffer.

5. Despite Western talk about a coming split between Red Russia and Red China, all Communist countries act as a single team. In Cuba, Russian, Czechoslovakian, and Chinese advisers and experts (and pilots?) work happily together to insure Castro's victory. Western countries ignore President de Gaulle's plea for a common policy and oppose each other in places like Algeria, Guinea, Indonesia, and Laos.

6. Communist tactics are infinitely flexible. They ignore all principles save that of winning, offer every discontented individual the promise of exactly what he wants when communism has triumphed, practice one system here and another there, and back their unending subversion with unlimited funds. Westerners have no tactics except "nonprovocation."

7. Communists' strategy is exclusively offensive. They look for soft spots and attack wherever they find one. The West, through fear of war, remains strictly on the defensive. It provokes no uprisings in Communist countries, dares not denounce the U.S.S.R. as a colonialist empire, and prevents South Vietnamese from invading North Vietnam (as the northerners do the south).

8. Communists consider nonalinement (of former Western territories) the first step in communizing them. The United States urges weak non-Communist countries to become nonalined, regards them as well as it does faithful allies and tries to pretend that nonalinement is the best defense against Communist infiltration—despite shrieking refutations in Czechoslovakia, Laos, the Congo, etc.

9. To Communists, international agreements, including the United Nations Charter, are instruments of expansion. The Reds never stand in the way of armed intervention (as in Hungary) whenever it serves communism. To the West, keeping agreements comes before the protection of vital national interests.

10. Communists win against non-Communists in places like Laos and Cuba, largely because the few fanatics terrorize the others into fighting by making them more afraid of their bosses than of the enemy. Western morals do not permit certain excesses yet many westerners find excuses for excesses by Communists.

The reader can doubtless find other reasons why the West is losing.

Always a Doctor in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. Lou Rauscher, staff writer, Sunday Independent, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., that was featured in that newspaper on April 23, 1961, and the subject of Mr. Rauscher's article was the Rogers family of Wilkes-Barre who have had a doctor in its family for the past 150 years. I found the article on

this distinguished family to be of great historical value and extremely interesting.

The indicated article follows:

FOUR GENERATIONS OF ROGERS FAMILY HAVE LISTED M.D.'S

(By Lou Rauscher)

There's been a doctor in the Rogers household for the past 150 years.

Lewis Leonidas Rogers III, is the fourth generation member of a local family physician cycle which extends back to his great grandfather, Joel Jackson Rogers.

Lewis III's grandfather was Lewis Leonidas Rogers, Jr., and his father was Lewis Leonidas Rogers, Jr. Both were physicians.

Joel Jackson Rogers, senior member of the family medical lineup, graduated from King's College in New York, now Columbia Medical School, and did his general practicing in the back mountain area.

He is remembered to this day for his trademark habit of answering calls with a distinctive shawl wrapped around his shoulders on cold days.

Joel Jackson Rogers in the mold of the physician of his time, ran his own drugstore and furnished his own prescriptions. He made his home in a colonial-type structure in Huntsville which ranks as a landmark of the area and which still stands today.

He died in 1913 and is remembered as one of the charter members of the Luzerne County Medical Society which celebrates its centennial this week.

PRACTICED IN KINGSTON

Joel Jackson's son, Lewis Leonidas Rogers, Sr., worked on the family farm during the summer and attended Jefferson Medical School. Graduating from there he became a general practitioner in Kingston with offices at 268 Wyoming Avenue, next to the Hoyt residence.

Lewis, Sr., was noted for his special herb tea prescriptions which he prepared in his office. He pursued his profession in the Kingston area for over 50 years, and was one of the founders of Nesbitt Hospital. Oldtimers still remember how he used to respond to home calls with a scrupulous dedication.

It's been said that, on a stormy night, Dr. Lewis Rogers, Sr., would forgo his horse and buggy and answer a call on foot. "He thought more of his horse than he did of himself," an admirer once said.

He was 72 years old when he died. A daughter is now living in Connecticut.

TOP X-RAY SPECIALIST

Lewis Rogers, Jr., after attending Wyoming Seminary and finishing at the University of Pennsylvania Medical School, developed into one of the area's top X-ray men.

Following his internship at Wilkes-Barre City Hospital, now the General, he practiced for a time from an office on East Northampton Street. After becoming an X-ray specialist, he moved to North Franklin Street, where he was to round out 28 years of serving the local population.

He served in the Army during World War I, being stationed at Camp Greenleaf, Ga. Attached to the hospital there, he became the first physician in Army medical history to operate an ambulance with a portable X-ray unit.

Returning to Wilkes-Barre after the war, Dr. Lewis Rogers, Jr., became president of the same county medical society which his grandfather had helped found.

Dr. Lewis Rogers, Jr., was only 50 years old when he died in 1940. He is survived by his wife, the former Elizabeth Seibel, sons Lewis Leonidas Rogers III, and John Seibel.

His widow maintains winter residence at 43 North Franklin Street, the same location as Lewis III's offices. Son John is a staff supervisor with Bell Telephone in New York.

KINGSTON HIGH PRODUCT

Rounding out the Rogers medical tradition is Lewis III. A graduate of Kingston High School, as was his father, Lewis III pursued his pre-med studies at the University of Pennsylvania and finished at Jefferson.

After interning at Wilkes-Barre General Hospital, he put in his residency at Robert Packer Hospital, Sayre. He entered the U.S. Army in 1943 and served in the Medical Corps until the end of World War II.

Returning to Wilkes-Barre in 1947, he set up his practice at its present location and now maintains a family residence in Carverton. He is married to the former Betty Whitenight of Kingston and they have four children, three of them girls. The children are Patricia, Deborah, Lewis IV, and Susan.

The family was in Washington during the week attending the convention of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Mrs. Rogers is a DAR member while two of the children belong to the CAR—Children of the American Revolution.

Just to prove that the medical tradition hasn't been limited to the Rogers side of the family, the present Dr. Rogers' grandmother, Mrs. Lewis Rogers, Sr., was a cousin of Dr. James Brooks, a Plains practitioner who still has a daughter living in Forty Fort.

OTHER DOCTORS TOO

Mrs. Lewis Rogers, Sr., also numbered Dr. pelatiah Brooks, Dr. Amos Barton, and Dr. Milton Barton among her relatives Dr. Brooks, an uncle of hers, was proud of his affiliation as a surgeon with the 44th Regiment of the New York State National Guard.

Dr. Amos Barton was a first cousin to Mrs. Lewis Rogers, Sr., and Dr. Milton Barton was his son. Both practiced for many years in Plains.

With this long line of doctors in the family, the obvious question is: Does Lewis Rogers IV intend to become a physician, too?

Members of the family say that the young man, presently attending Wyoming Seminary Day School, has a sister who seems more interested in the profession at this time.

As for what his intentions are: "All he talks about is that he wants to be a baseball pitcher."

Quiet Disciple of Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, Young Americans for Freedom, a national nonpartisan conservative youth organization, was founded in September of 1960. Since then it has quickly expanded and now represents more than 21,000 students and young people in 250 college and other chapters.

One of the founders of Young Americans for Freedom, who also serves on the board of directors, is George W. Gaines, 22, of New Iberia, La. George has served as a page in the 85th Congress and graduated from the Capitol Page School. Since then he has been active in politics and has studied at Tulane University.

In the April edition of New Guard, the official publication of Young Americans for Freedom, George has written an article concerning my colleague from Louisiana, Hon. HAROLD B. MCSWEEN. I would like to call this to the attention of the Members of the House.

The article follows:

QUIET DISCIPLE OF PRINCIPLE

(By George Gaines)

For the first time in 40 years, an independent Democrat is representing the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana, long considered the baronial fief of the Longs.

"I'm the first non-Long man to hold this seat since it was created back in 1913."

In his calm thoughtful way, HAROLD B. MCSWEEN, Congressman from the Eighth District of Louisiana, was talking about politics in his office in Washington, D.C.

"I represent what you might call a welfare district—most of the people there are used to a Congressman who votes for every budget-busting bill that comes along. My task is to sell them the idea of responsible conservative government and do a good job of politicking at the same time."

HAROLD MCSWEEN is a tall man with thinning reddish hair. He is young for a southern Congressman, only 34. He was first elected to the House in 1958, succeeding Huey Long's brother, George, and ran for reelection last fall against the late Earl Long. MCSWEEN was defeated by the slim margin of 4,000 votes and upon the former Governor's death (only a few days after election day) was selected by Democratic county chairmen to replace "Uncle Earl."

QUITE A CAMPAIGN

"It was quite a campaign," recalled MCSWEEN. "Earl called me just about everything you can think of, including a conservative. I couldn't and I didn't try to outpromise him. I campaigned as a Representative who would resist centralization of power, hold down taxes, and prevent the Federal Government from getting into States' affairs."

But some men don't fight as hard for their convictions as HAROLD MCSWEEN, who attracted national headlines before he had been in the House of Representatives 4 months.

In April 1959, President Eisenhower stood on the edge of his first congressional defeat. At issue was S. 144, the Rural Electrification Administration bill, which would transfer power to approve or reject REA loans from the Agriculture Secretary to the director of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

To farm-State representatives the bill was most attractive. It breezed through Congress according to schedule: 60 to 27 in the Senate, 254 to 131 in the House. Ike promptly vetoed it, exercising that right for the first time in the Democratic 86th Congress.

With the help of six farm bloc-minded Republicans, the Senate overrode the veto 64 to 29 with 2 votes to spare. By the time the burning issue reached the floor of the House, the pressure was enough to crack the House Chamber walls. HAROLD MCSWEEN, a member of the Agriculture Committee and a Congressman from a predominantly rural district, felt that pressure as much as, if not more than, anyone else.

As the House vote was tallied it became apparent it was going to be a real cliffhanger. At the end, the two-thirds needed to override the veto was short by 4 votes, 146 to 280. Among four Democrats who voted to sustain President Eisenhower's veto was Freshman MCSWEEN.

"No," admitted the Louisiana legislator, "I didn't know how close it was going to be. And I had no idea that I would receive as much publicity as I did on the basis of that one vote. I certainly didn't vote 'nay' to make the front pages. I just voted that way because the REA had been doing a good job under the present setup and I didn't see any reason why its administration should be changed."

McSWEEN attended Louisiana State University and received an LL.B. from that same university in 1950. Always interested in politics, he first ran for State office in 1956 for a post on the Louisiana State Board of Election. His opponent: Earl Long's sister. He won.

"I think I'm making progress," the young Democrat mused. "I'm picking up support as I go along, but frankly I don't know whether the trend of civilization is sympathetic to free government."

The Congressman, however, leaves little doubt where he stands. He has declared his intention to oppose Federal aid to education, the use of social security funds for aid to the aged, and the common situs picketing bill. Last year he publicly supported the Connally reservation.

His attention was called to a recent editorial in the New Orleans Times-Picayune which stated: "The real hope for maintaining conservative principles in the Nation lies mainly in congressional and State legislative contests and not necessarily in who fills the executive department."

"Yes," McSWEEN replied, "I agree with that generally. But the whole problem would be so much easier if conservatives would learn how to translate their theories into political power. Too much energy is wasted on unrealistic causes—like abolishing the U.N., or fluoridation or impeaching Earl Warren. Too many conservatives don't want to talk about the minimum wage or social security.

"As for the 'coalition,'" remarked the young Democrat, "I don't worry about it. The 'conservative coalition' in Congress reflects the people and nobody ever has to apologize for representing the people."

Intelligent, educated, purposeful, HAROLD B. McSWEEN goes quietly about his business of building support for his political philosophy. He is young and unperturbed about the possibility of defeat. There are many like him in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Free Movement of Milk of High Sanitary Quality in Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a joint resolution of the State of Wisconsin relating to memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will insure the free movement of milk of high sanitary quality in interstate commerce:

JOINT RESOLUTION 18, A

Joint resolution relating to memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will insure the free movement of milk of high sanitary quality in interstate commerce

Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States a series of bills, H.R. 50 to H.R. 57 which provide for the free flowage in interstate commerce of milk of high sanitary requirements which must be met under the provisions of said bills; and

Whereas milk is the most important part of the diet for most people; it is our most perfect food, containing almost all of the essential elements for human growth, and is the principal food of infants, children, the aged, and infirm; and

Whereas more than one-half of our States are importers of milk and about the same number of States are exporters; and more than 13 million gallons of milk and cream are shipped interstate each day; and

Whereas this State has a tremendous stake in this industry, about 85 percent of its production of milk going into interstate commerce in one form or another, and milk production is one of the principal industries of this State; and

Whereas although the laws of our State require that milk and milk products must be produced under high sanitary conditions and result in sanitary, high grade products; and

Whereas importers of milk in the importer States have regulations for high sanitary quality by use of unnecessary requirements or other health regulations which result in a crazy-quilt pattern of milk sanitation regulation which duplicates inspection procedure in thousands of plants in the exporter States, thereby causing great unnecessary expense to a producer in meeting the different code requirements of his many customers; and

Whereas it is highly desirable to all the people that there only be Federal sanitation requirements, only one code, which must be complied with so as to insure the free, economical flow of milk in interstate commerce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact one of the before mentioned bills, or a similar bill, into law, thereby insuring that milk and milk products produced within Federal requirements will have free flowage in interstate commerce; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to each House of Congress, and each Wisconsin Member thereof.

W. P. KNOWLES,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
DAVID J. BLANCHARD,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ROBERT G. MAROTZ,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Just Plain Jack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, this morning Mr. Pierre Salinger, President Kennedy's press secretary, in an interview over the Dave Garroway televison show made this statement:

What Washington needs is more humor.

Carrying out his idea, I wish to insert three additional columns by Art Hoppe, of the San Francisco Chronicle, on "Just Plain Jack":

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Feb. 26, 1961]

JUST PLAIN JACK BUILDS UP PIERRE

(By Art Hoppe)

Good morning, friends in televisionland. It's time once again for another episode of "Just Plain Jack," the typical success story of a typical American boy. With money.

As we join the rollicking heart-warming family in the big White House, Just Plain Jack is relaxing in the study doing one-handed pushups while writing Executive Order No. 10572 and dictating a speech. His aid and confidant, portly Pierre, enters, puffing a cigar.

Just Plain Jack: "Pierre, boy. How does this speech sound? 'We don't want a nation of spectators. We want a nation of participants in the vigorous life.'"

Pierre (shuddering): "Sounds great, chief. Absolutely great."

Just Plain Jack: "98, 99, 100." (He leaps to his feet and begins deep knee bends.) "Which reminds me, Pierre, I see Time describes you again as 'burly, belt-straining.' Throw me the medicine ball."

Pierre: "Could I roll it?"

Just Plain Jack: "Nonsense. We must move forward with vigor. Ready now. One, two, three, four."

Pierre (panting): "Chief, look out the window. The cops have taken their ball away and are chasing them off the lawn again."

Just Plain Jack: "Well, it's time they all got in here for the Cabinet meeting anyway. What's on the agenda today?"

Pierre (sighing with relief as he puts the medicine ball away): "Chin ups, Laos, Indian wresting, the Congo, 100-pound barbells, Berlin, and handstands. And, oh yes, you've been invited to attend the opening game of baseball season."

Just Plain Jack (chinning himself on the mantle): "Great. Do three laps around the grounds, Pierre. And about the game, which side am I playing on?"

Can Pierre do three laps? Will Washington win the opener? Is Adlai losing his paunch? Tune in next week, friends, for another episode. And in the meantime, as you go down the byways of life remember: nothing builds you up like just plain Jack.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 21, 1961]

JUST PLAIN JACK BECOMES A WHIG

(By Art Hoppe)

Good morning, friends in television land. It's time for another episode of "Just Plain Jack," the story of one typical American's struggle to lead a rich life. In spite of money. As we join them in the big white house, Just Plain Jack and the beautiful society girl he married are just entering his study.

Beautiful Society Girl: "Close your eyes, now. It's a surprise. I felt I ought to help you more in your work. I've been slaving on this night and day."

Just Plain Jack (ayes tightly shut and smiling expectantly): "Great, dear. I was afraid at first you hadn't quite captured the New Frontier spirit. We must move forward. With vigor."

Beautiful Society Girl: "There, now. Open wide. See? I've redone your whole study."

Just Plain Jack: "It's—uh—very interesting."

Beautiful Society Girl: "Silly, it's authentic. Every single thing in this room was made before 1802."

Just Plain Jack: "1802? Oh. Where's my easy chair?"

Beautiful Society Girl: "Silly, you sit here, see? On this authentic Jonathan Gostelowe ladder back chair. Comfy? Let me light the candle on this authentic cobbler's bench so you can see to read. There. I think if you slouch forward a little more, dear, the light will be just right."

Just Plain Jack: "It's awfully—uh—authentic."

Beautiful Society Girl: "And here. If you want to write another message to your friends up on the hill, you just climb up on this authentic William Savery stool, dip your authentic quill pen into this——"

Just Plain Jack (hesitantly): "You're a wonderful helpmate, dear. But I'm not sure 1802 exactly fits my image."

Beautiful Society Girl: "That's just it. I found all these treasures in the basement. Free. Don't you see? Economy. Tighten our belts. Ask not what your country——"

Just Plain Jack (brightening): "Economical, eh?"

Beautiful Society Girl: "Well, there is the refinishing. But they redid this authentic milking stool for only $783.22. And, of course, I did have to fly down to Florida a couple of times for conferences. And——"

Just Plain Jack: "$783.22?"

Beautiful Society Girl: "But just wait until I've finished the whole house. Every single thing in it will be authentic. Which reminds me, dear. Would you mind giving up shaving?"

Can this marriage be saved? If so, will muttonchop whiskers hurt Jack's image? Tune in again, friends. And in the meantime, as you go down the byways of life, remember: Nothing's more authentic than just plain Jack.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 4, 1961]

JUST PLAIN JACK OUTFOXES FOXES

Good morning, folks. It's time for another visit with Just Plain Jack. The true-to-life drama of the struggles of a young man with good looks, intelligence, money, and success to have fun.

(Music: "Ahunting We will Go.") As we join Just Plain Jack he is standing on the steps of his rustic weekend cabin, Glen Ora, hitching up his jodhpurs. The Beautiful Society Girl he married is beside him, nervously switching her riding boots with a crop.

Beautiful Society Girl (hesitantly): You really are determined to go again today, dear?"

Just Plain Jack: "Loved every minute of it yesterday. Brother Bobby and Brother Teddy did, too. The fox running this way and that, the baying of the hounds, the spectacular jumps. It's got touch football beat all hollow."

Beautiful Society Girl: "But, darling: You yourself said your mail was running 62 percent profox. And, remember, you wanted me to stop hunting because it was hurting your image. I guess I was a wee bit stubborn."

Just Plain Jack: "Nonsense. You were right to refuse. And I like your friends in the Hunt Club. They're great to talk politics with."

Beautiful Society Girl: "Yes. But I wish you wouldn't be quite so exuberant in talking about raising corporation taxes. And do we have to have all 35 Secret Service agents along today? They just don't fit in with the group. And the Sherman tank? Mrs. Vandastor's estate was a frightful mess."

Just Plain Jack: "Yes, but didn't Brother Bobby take the hedges well? And the way Teddy sailed over the water hazard. If I hadn't cleared that 6-foot fence I never would have beat them."

Beautiful Society Girl: "Yes, dear, but today I wish the three of you would use horses. It's——"

(Bobby and Teddy enter, each wearing Harvard sweatshirts, shorts, and track shoes.)

Just Plain Jack: "Hey, that's unfair, Wait'll I change."

Beautiful Society Girl (shuddering): "Never mind, dear. I've decided to give up fox hunting. Forever."

"Music: "Hearts and Flowers." Up and out.)

Will the Hunt Club be miffed? Are the Secret Service men sore? Tune in next week, folks. And in the meantime, as you go down the byways of life, remember: the best way to get a fox (or a mink) is with just plain "jack".

Lao Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, this story by Marguerite Higgins, which appeared this morning in the New York Herald Tribune, indicates what happens to a great and powerful country when indecision rules its policy:

UNITED STATES HAS LOST IN LAOS DESPITE THE CEASE-FIRE?

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON, April 24.—Even if the British-Russian cease-fire appeal to be issued tomorrow at last brings results in Laos, the United States will go to the international bargaining table at great disadvantage. The reason is the intensified Red offensive that threatens to swallow a crucial chunk of the beleaguered kingdom before peace talks can begin.

Announcement of the cease-fire appeal in Moscow and London said three documents had been released: The text of a joint Russo-British appeal for the cease-fire, addressed to the warring groups in Laos; a letter to Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru to convoke the three-man supervisory commission; and invitations to 14 nations to a Lao Peace Conference in Geneva.

WILL REBELS STOP FIGHTING

In Washington today it remains a question as to whether the Soviet accession to a cease-fire appeal will result in an end to the fighting immediately or whether it is just another maneuver to stay SEATO's hand while the Communists fight on.

The test will come, according to high officials, in the days immediately after the joint cease-fire appeal has been made public and followed up by a similar appeal by the Royal Lao Government. If the Communist rebels ignore the appeal and press their ever more menacing 11th-hour offensive, the United States will have no choice but to look to the contingency plans for military intervention in Laos as already worked out with the SEATO allies, these officials said.

In any case the international balance sheet on Laos already shows heavy losses for the United States—losses that will plague its negotiators at the 14-nation peace conference to be held May 12 in Geneva if a verified cease-fire on the ground has been achieved.

For the Communist military successes on the ground achieved since December by troops supplied by Russia and led by an estimated thousand officers and technicians provided by North Vietnam have already gained possession of three northern provinces Phong Saly, Sam Neua, and Xien Khouang) plus possession of the crucial Plaine des Jarres and the critical road-junction supply center of Vang Vieng. Additionally, there are innumerable pockets of guerrilla activity which make a map of free Laos look in some areas like a series of polka dots.

The Communist rebels in Laos have continued to grind ahead in their artillery and infantry attacks, and the Russians have continued to fly a military airlift despite the fact that Kremlin diplomats agreed in principle in late March to the urgent, last-ditch, cease-fire appeal sent to them by Great Britain and despite a solemn warning that without a cease-fire Washington was ready to go in with force.

Have the Russians been deliberately stalling, talking soft in the Kremlin but carrying an even bigger and more successful military military stick in Laos? The answer here is almost unanimously yes. But there is also a virtually unanimous decision that—if this cease-fire move is virtually immediate and not phony—the United States and its allies had better try to make the best of a bad bargain in hope that the peace formula to be worked out at the Geneva conference can in fact achieve the Austrian-type neutrality for Laos that the Soviet Union has privately agreed to in negotiations with the British.

THE FUTURE FOR LAOS

Why should the Reds agree to an Austrian-type neutrality when they are doing so well militarily and have key chunks of the 12 Laotian provinces already in their hands?

Because, say American officials, the Kremlin knows that there is a point beyond which the United States cannot be pushed in Laos and that point is rapidly being reached.

The best alternative—and least likely—foreseen for the 14-nation Geneva Conference that will include Red China would be a return to the 1954 Geneva accords which called for Lao neutrality, pledged the rebels to cooperate with the central government and yield their military positions.

A COALITION REGIME

A more likely alternative officials conceded is a coalition government which would be headed by neutralist leader Prince Souvanna Phouma and which would have to include some top Communists.

The most undesirable alternative from the United States point of view would be a partition of the country because the Communists merely use the partition line as a jumping-off point for new aggression.

The biggest hope in Washington is that pressure from the neutralist members of the 14-nation conference will make it inexpedient for Russia to reject the offer of truly neutral Austrian-type Laos.

In giving the plus side of the balance sheet on Laos, the United States pleads the fact that a cease-fire will spare intervention in a war which nobody, including some of the Laotians themselves, seemed to have much stomach.

APPEAL TO NEUTRALISTS

Although the Communists took new territory while negotiations dragged on between the British and the Russians, the Kennedy administration feels its cautious approach, plus its acceptance of a neutral (as distinguished from pro-Western) Laos, won support from southeast Asian neutralists (such as India) and muted European criticism of America's alleged trigger-happy tactics.

From the beginning of the Lao crisis, both Britain and France—the two European allies involved in SEATO—have been most reluctant to see force used even in face of the rising Communist offensive. Although the French have been privately most adamant, the British have been publicly the most vocal.

BRITISH WON OVER

It is considered a major achievement in the Kennedy administration that the President's restraint eventually won the British round to agreeing (in the Key West meeting with Prime Minister Macmillan) to join in any intervention if worst came to worst and every reasonable negotiating avenue seemed closed.

Even when it became clear to Washington that the Soviets were stalling while the Communists were winning new victories in Laos, the British held to their optimism and insisted that the United States should not make a military move lest it upset the diplomatic applecart. Thus the day before Mr. Macmillan arrived April 4 in Washington for

his formal sessions with the President, an official British Foreign spokesman told a press briefing in Washington that he expected a favorable Soviet reply "possibly in 48 hours, anyway at the end of the week." The acceptable Soviet reply was not delivered until today, nearly 3 weeks later.

DIFFERENCE IN APPROACH

This illustrates the fundamental point of difference of approach to the Russians that has marked British and American attitudes in the Lao affair. For many senior Americans experienced in Russian ways felt that instead of making soft statements in the hopes of spurring the Reds on, this would have the opposite effect; the essential point, the Americans thought, was to take measures making clear to the Russians that this country had the will to take countermeasures if the stalling continued.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. W. D. Workman is a highly respected writer and columnist. I recommend this article to the attention of the country and the Congress:

SOME MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

(By W. D. Workman)

"Federal aid without Federal control" is the spurious cry of those assorted educators, politicians, and do-gooders who wish Congress to dish out more money for schools, schoolchildren, and schoolteachers.

Yet without Federal control, there is grave doubt that mere financial assistance will do all those things the Federal-aiders want done. This column opposes Federal aid, with or without control, but it seeks as well to expose some of the addled preachments with which Federal aid is being sold.

Federal aid is, of necessity, a pattern of redistributing that portion of the Nation's wealth which the Federal Government thinks should be applied to education. This obviously involves taking (through the compulsion of taxes) from the rich to give to the poor. For the Government has no money of its own—and what it gives away it must first take away.

If the poorer States are to benefit, they must get back from Uncle Sam more money than he takes from them. By the same token, Uncle must take more from the richer States than he will return to them. The net result will be that some States will have more mony available for school purposes, while others will have less. Then arises the overriding question: Will this federally disgorged money be put to the improvement of schools?

Without Federal control, there can be no assurance that it will. With Federal control, there is the assumption that the bureaucrats in Washington, political and educational, know better how to improve our schools than do the persons on the scene.

True, congressional appropriations can be tied up with conditions as to how the money will be spent, but who can guarantee that the receipt of Federal funds will not mean the release of State and local funds for purposes other than education?

But let's assume that all Federal aid will be used for education, and that it will be in addition to school funds already being raised on State and local levels. What then?

A great deal of the criticism of American schools is directed at education in the teeming population centers of the Nation. These, mind you, are located in States where per capita income is high, where total wealth and taxable property are great, and which will lose rather than gain revenues under the redistribution device of Federal aid.

Is it reasonable to expect that a State or city now tolerates inferior schools will immediately correct them under a program of Federal aid? Can we expect them to do more for their schools when they have less money with which to do it? The only guarantee of improved conditions would be through the imposition of Federal control, assuming that the improvement must be to national standards. This would give the lie to the chant, "Federal aid without Federal control."

Federal aid without control would be ineffective. With Federal control, Federal aid inevitably would lead to nationalization of education, further erosion of local self-government, and mass conditioning of youthful minds according to uniform standards prescribed from Washington. Actually, this is precisely what is desired by more and more professional educators who yearn to take over the Nation's schools—lock, stock, and barrel.

This frightening state of affairs is evidenced on every hand. It is documented, with chapter and verse, in Roger A. Freeman's new book, "Taxes for the Schools." That work, a companion to his earlier "School Needs in the Decade Ahead," should be required reading for both the proponents and the opponents of Federal aid to education.

It is worth the price for one chapter alone, "Powers and Responsibilities in Education," a thought-provoking exploration of all facets of Federal aid, and of the trend of professional educators to grasp the reins of school authority through Federal aid.

On this particular score, Mr. Freeman has served posterity by puting down in permanent form Paul Woodring's paraphrase of the Clemenceau axiom:

"Just as war is too important to be left to the generals, education is too important to be left to the educators."

Salute to Africa

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1961

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to add a few words as a member of the Subcommittee on Africa consistent with the unanimously passed House Resolution 232:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that April 15, 1961, be recognized as African Freedom Day; and that we extend to the independent countries of Africa our congratulations and assure them of our continued good will.

The German philosopher, Immanuel Kant, wrote in his "Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals":

Nothing can possibly be conceived in the world, or even out of it, which can be called good without qualification, except a good will.

I subscribe to his thesis that power, riches, honor, even happiness, "inspire pride, and often presumption, if there is not a good will to correct the influence of these on the mind, and with this also to rectify the whole principle of acting, and adapt it to its end."

My American heritage and my official position vouchsafe the purity and the sincerity of this expression of good wishes and honor. Should additional unmistakable proof be required, let it be found in my African descent.

In this effort to salute these 26 sovereign states of Africa, I am keenly conscious of every one of the 122 million individual citizens of those states, of their dreams of freedom, of their desire to live in the highest state of human dignity.

History attests the cost in blood of all revolutions whether they ended in frustrations or liberations. Some have always had to die that others might be free. It is a source of exceeding joy that during these last 8 years the world has witnessed so many gain so much in independence at no greater cost of human life. I regret the loss of any life, but surely all must concede that the carnage and chaos would have been infinitely worse had no good will existed as the number of African independent states rose from 3 in 1953, to 26 in 1961.

Staggering indeed are the needs and problems that confront each of these African states. They would defy any effort of mine to merely list them. But I suggest that they are all human problems, and therefore, soluble through the application of intelligence.

And we do see intelligence demonstrated in each of these several states as they seek to build sound economies and thriving industries. It is my anticipation and understanding Africa's hopes and efforts we will undergird our moral help and encouragement with material assistance in strict accordance with the protocol of free and independent states.

No expression of good will would suggest relieveing free man from the responsibilities of self-government though we know full well the hazards, intrigue, connivance, and duplicity, inherent therein. In the experiments, is to be found the substance of which great states and able statesmen are made.

New nations and new men making over and refashioning the old to meet the needs of the day and more in keeping with the excellence of the heart's desire, these I salute this day.

At the turn of the century there lived here in the United States a poet of African descent, Paul Lawrence Dunbar.

In the closing stanza of his "Ode to Ethiopia" he expressed a sentiment I here submit. I am confident that the word "Ethiopia," because of that nation's antiquity and continuing sovereignty, will be acceptable as quite applicable to all the independent countries of Africa we are saluting today:

Go on and up! Our souls and eyes
Shall follow thy continuous rise;
Our ears shall list their story
From bards who from thy root shall spring,
And proudly tune their lyres to sing
Of Ethiopia's glory.

Foreign Tax Havens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, America has faced a serious crisis during the past months because of the flow of gold from the United States. One of the causes for the unfavorable balance of payments is the large investments abroad by American interests. This is not necessarily a bad thing. But when American money flows out of the country to avoid taxes, that is another matter. Mr. Ed Kandlik, in an article appearing in the Washington Post, April 24, 1961, describes the way in which some tax-dodging funds operate. This is a serious matter and could destroy further the confidence of the people in the integrity of our tax system.

I commend to my congressional colleagues the article by Mr. Kandlik.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1961]

GLOBAL TRADE—BERMUDA NOW TAX SHELTER FOR BIG MUTUAL FUND

(By Ed Kandlik)

Foreign tax havens are no longer exclusive hideaways.

They are getting big entrances on Wall Street, La Salle Street, and in major Pacific coast markets.

The latest invitation for U.S. dollars to seek tax shelter abroad is found in offering of $25 million of United International Fund, Ltd. shares. This is a Bermuda corporation.

As such it may escape many of the taxes that would be levied if it were formed in the United States.

The two things foreign about United International Fund are the place of incorporation and the intention to invest 85 percent of its assets abroad.

The underwriters are in the United States. The group is headed by Kidder, Peabody & Co., Bache & Co., and Francis I. du Pont & Co.

The assets will be held by the Chase Manhattan Bank, New York.

Although Intercontinental Advisory Corp. Ltd., a Bermuda corporation, is being set up as investment adviser, the officials are principally Americans. Several principals in the new fund are associated with Waddell & Reed, distributor of United Funds.

"The fund is designed to afford certain tax advantages under existing laws to its U.S.-resident shareholders," the prospectus states.

In Bermuda the fund is subject to no income, capital gains or other tax, except for a $650 flat annual fee.

The fund will be subject to withholding taxes imposed by countries in which its income originates.

Operating as a foreign corporation it expects to be subject to only a 30 percent withholding tax on income received from the United States. No taxes would be payable on capital gains made in the United States.

United International Fund does not propose to pay cash dividends, which could become taxable income to United States residents. It intends to build a tax-free pile abroad through the medium of corporate gains and accumulated income.

From time to time the fund may pay stock dividends. Stockholders could sell these or sell their shares to cash their profits, paying only the 25 percent maximum capital gains tax.

Originally United International Fund is being set up as a closed-end fund but it will convert to an open-end mutual fund at the end of 3 months. Then shares will be redeemable at net assets value upon demand.

The initial offering is being made at a series of underwriting discounts ranging from 8.8 percent down to 2 percent on amounts of $500,000 or over. This same schedule of underwriting discounts will prevail after the conversion to an open-end mutual fund.

National Little League Baseball Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, our young people, dedicated to the highest ideals of citizenship and teamwork, sportsmanship and character, form the backbone of our country. Today more than a million boys in every corner of our Nation are developing these qualities through participation in the Little League Baseball program.

Representing as I do the congressional district which embraces the national headquarters of Little League Baseball, I am particularly proud to call to the attention of my colleagues the Presidental proclamation establishing "National Little League Baseball Week" in response to a concurrent resolution enacted by the 86th Congress:

THE WHITE HOUSE.

NATIONAL LITTLE LEAGUE BASEBALL WEEK

Whereas active participation by youth in appropriate physical activities contributes to their fitness and to the maintenance of our national vigor and vitality; and

Whereas little leagues in communities throughout the Nation have made it possible for thousands of young boys to take an active part in our national game of baseball; and

Whereas Little League baseball not only promotes the physical well-being of the players, but also instills into them the qualities of fairness, cooperation, and discipline—qualities which contribute to the development of good citizenship; and

Whereas the Congress, by House Concurrent Resolution 17, agreed to June 1, 1959, has requested the President to designate the week beginning the second Monday in June of each year as "National Little League Baseball Week," in recognition of the national and community benefits resulting from Little League activity: Now, therefore,

I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning the second Monday in June of 1961 and the week beginning the second Monday in June of each succeeding year as "National Little League Baseball Week."

And I invite the people of the United States to observe that week in schools, parks, athletic fields, and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities designed to emphasize the importance of the physical development of our Nation's youth.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 18th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1961, and of the independence of the United States of America the 185th.

[SEAL] JOHN F. KENNEDY.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

Rural Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have been most pleased to note the increased interest of the Department of Agriculture in the development of our rural areas. It has been most heartening to me. Secretary Freeman is to be congratulated for his initiative in reorganizing the present rural development program of the Department. He has appointed Mr. John A. Baker, Director of Agricultural Credit, as head of the Rural Areas Development Board and is hoping to be designated the responsibility for the rural aspects of the soon-to-be enacted depressed areas legislation. I certainly hope he is given this responsibility, for he has shown a capacity and interest in the program that should carry it to a successful conclusion.

My own district, the 10th Congressional of Ohio, is predominately rural in character and should benefit greatly from a vigorous redevelopment effort assisted by the Federal Government. I am happy that we are now taking a more than passing interest in the economic development of our vitally important rural areas, and I congratulate my colleagues for turning down the Republican-sponsored Widnall amendment to eliminate the rural development section from the House-passed version of the depressed areas bill.

In this connection, I would like to insert in the RECORD two excellent articles from recent editions of the Washington Post which describe and analyze this new effort to bring industrial development to the rural areas of our Nation. I commend them to all, and I hope that this new program will gain the publicity and support of every conscientious citizen.

The Washington Post articles follow:

RURAL INDUSTRY AGENCY IS FREEMAN OBJECTIVE

(By Julius Duscha)

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman is trying to turn his Department into an agency for rural industrial development.

Freeman is vigorously seeking the responsibility for administering the sections of the depressed areas bill that would affect rural areas.

He also is making plans to expand the existing rural development program which has been quietly underway in the Agriculture Department for almost 4 years.

The Secretary's efforts to include all aspects of rural life within his province could have far-reaching effects on cities as well as on the countryside.

COULD SLOW MOVEMENT

If substantial industry were brought to rural areas where farming is declining, the farm-to-city movement could be considerably slowed down.

This would mean that the urban problems of overcrowding, crime, and assimilation that have resulted from this migration would diminish.

The shaky economies of many small towns would be helped, too, by an influx of industry to the towns and the surrounding rural areas.

Freeman does not plan, however, to downgrade the importance of farming in rural America. Under his leadership the Department will continue to be a champion of farmers and farming.

What Freeman is doing is recognizing the facts of life in rural areas, where the mechanization of farming, the economic necessity for larger and larger farms and the lack of nearby industrial jobs drive more and more young men and women from farms to the cities.

The Secretary's immediate objective is a large share in the administration of the area redevelopment, or depressed areas, legislation.

Both the Senate and the House have passed redevelopment bills, and a congressional conference committee is trying to resolve differences between the two measures.

The legislation provides that administration of the $300 million loan program and the $89 million in grants provided by the legislation would be centered in the Commerce Department.

ONE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS IN LOANS

Freeman hopes that the rural development aspects of the legislation would be operated by the Agriculture Department.

A total of $100 million in loan authority would be used to attract industry to rural areas. A substantial part of the $100 million in loans provided for the improvement of water supplies, sewer systems, and other community facilities would also go to rural areas.

The Agriculture Department argues that its experience with the 4-year-old rural development program qualifies the Department for administering the rural parts of the depressed areas bill.

Nor is there any opposition from powerful farm State legislators on Capitol Hill to Agriculture Department administration of much of the depressed areas bill.

Freeman recently reorganized the present rural development program by establishing a Rural Areas Development Board under the chairmanship of John A. Baker, director of agricultural credit.

Operating on a budget of less than $1 million a year, the present program has concentrated on technical assistance to rural areas that are seeking industry.

RURAL INDUSTRY

Secretary Freeman's efforts to stimulate industrial development in rural areas have far-reaching possibilities. The immediate objective of this movement is to relieve underemployment of farmers, but if it is successful it can have a salutary effect on urban life as well.

A recent report showed that 45 out of every 100 farmer operators did some nonfarm work in 1959 and 36 percent of them earned more from their off-farm jobs than from the sale of agricultural products. Even so, a vast number are seeking new opportunities for part-time work off the farm, and aid for these people must be considered an important part of any general agricultural program. The stimulation of rural industries has been found to be the most effective and practical answer.

Cities have a direct interest in the movement because many of them are now being virtually overwhelmed with new population that they cannot readily absorb. Recent Census Bureau studies show that approximately 84 percent of the increase in the total population of the United States in the last 10 years was concentrated in cities of 50,000 or more and their surrounding areas. The movement is proceeding at a fantastic pace, with consequent overcrowding, transportation chaos, crime, and urban sprawl.

From the viewpoint of the Nation as well as that of the cities it would be desirable to slow down this frantic concentration of population in a relatively few large centers. A national policy of decentralizing industrial growth thus seems to be in order. The location of industrial plants in rural areas, where feasible, would serve the double purpose of relieving shaky economics of many small towns while easing the growth problems of the big cities.

The idea is not, of course, a new one. For some years the Department of Agriculture under Secretary Benson promoted the Rural Development program, and some 200 projects in 40 States are now underway. The present administration has modified the objectives somewhat and added the word "Areas" to the name, but the basic idea continues to be the location of more industry within reach of part-time farmers. Secretary Freeman would like to steer the agricultural end of the depressed-areas program in the same direction.

From these beginnings a new national policy may well emerge. As farms increase in size and still less manpower is needed to produce food, there are many advantages in taking factories to the country instead of luring more people into the large cities. Congress may well conclude that this is the only practical way of maintaining some degree of balance between rural and urban life in these changing times.

Role of Agriculture in Our National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration should be given credit for clarifying, to a considerable degree, the role of agriculture in our national economy. Farmers have performed a magnificent service in supplying the food and fiber necessary for our population and our industry, and I believe the general public not familiar with agriculture has sometimes come to believe that farming is a highly subsidized operation and that the farmer as a class always has his hand out for any benefits which may be offered. This is not true, as I have pointed out on many occasions. Most farmers are only looking for a fair opportunity to make themselves a decent living in our tremendously complicated and competitive economy.

Sometimes some of the spokesmen for this administration have, I fear, left an erroneous picture with the general public in regard to what was happening to our farm population. It is sometimes inferred, perhaps unintentionally, that the independent farmer is fast disappearing from the scene and corporate-type farming operations are taking over the production of farm commodities. This is not true. The family-type farm seems to remain a predominant type of farm operation in this country. There is no indication of corporate-type or industrialized farm operation taking over.

Mr. Speaker, the May issue of Successful Farming contains an editorial by Dick Hanson, which I believe does an excellent job of clarifying what has happened to family farming operations. Mr. Hanson takes facts and figures from the 1959 agricultural census and also from a recent study by the USDA's Agricultural Research Service, which I believe factually refutes the proposition that the family-type farm is disappearing from the scene.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial will be included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From Successful Farming, May 1961]

ACROSS THE EDITOR'S DESK

(By Dick Hanson)

The 1959 Census of Agriculture has heaped more fuel on an already smoldering question. The census shows fewer but larger farms in this country. And, this trend to fewer but larger farms will continue for some time in the future, apparently. To many people this trend means only one thing—family farms will eventually be gobbled up by a few giant operators who will then control agriculture.

To me, this line of thinking just doesn't hold water. Two factors will prevent a few from buying up the many. These factors are capital and labor. More and more colleges are studying the problem of optimum size of farm. What is the best, most economical size farm for the many different agricultural areas of the country? The size varies, of course. What may be the right size in Illinois would be far too small in Wyoming.

So far, the studies show that many of our present so-called family farms are already the right size to make optimum use of land, labor, and capital. In other words, there's no point in these farm getting any bigger.

A recent study by the USDA's Agricultural Research Service dispels some of the shadows hanging over the future of the family farm. Here are some of the findings in the report:

Family farms will be bigger and more highly specialized in 1975—and they will continue to dominate our Nation's agriculture.

Findings indicate that farmers will continue to step up adoption of laborsaving and output-increasing techniques. They will purchase additional equipment needed for more complete mechanization of crop production and livestock feeding operations. They will also hire more services, such as spraying, dusting, and fertilizing, and obtain more professional management assistance, including help in buying and selling livestock.

Dairy farms will continue to increase in size and decrease in number. Even so, the report states that dairying in 1975 will still be largely a family operated business. Average number of cows on family operated dairy farms may increase 25 to 30 percent by 1975. This is about the same percentage increase that occurred during the past 15 years.

Unit costs on a large-scale livestock farm are only 5 percent lower than such costs on a comparable one-man farm. In an Illinois survey optimum use of land, labor, and capital was found on farms of 260 to 339 acres.

In the Corn Belt, limited forage supplies will encourage some livestock farmers to expand hog production rather than beef production. Labor requirements, as well as capital and mangerial limitations, will prevent expansion to the 1,000 or more hogs that one man can raise. But 500 to 600 hogs per farm—compared to an average of 170 today—may be commonplace by 1975.

Family size feeding operations will continue to predominate in the Midwest because of the availability of farmgrown feeds and otherwise unmarketable operator and family labor.

I'm convinced that family farming, as we think of it, is going to be around for a long time. We'll need to make changes and use new methods in this highly competitive agricultural industry. But then, what growing industry doesn't?

Otsego County: One of America's Most Important Agricultural Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be the Representative in Congress of an area which is one of the most important agricultural areas in our country, Otsego County, N.Y. As an indication of the extent of agricultural activity in this great country, I include herewith an editorial from the Oneonta Star of April 19, 1961. This editorial appeared in the annual agricultural issue of this great newspaper and pays suitable tribute to the fine hard-working farmers of Otsego County who have been responsible for this extensive agricultural activity:

AGRICULTURE STILL OUR BIG INDUSTRY

Every Oneonta businessman knows that agriculture is this area's most important industry.

It will undoubtedly remain so, although like all other American industries, it is in a process of change.

The Bureau of the Census has just released its 1959 census of agriculture for Otsego County, which shows the current trend of change in this county.

There are fewer farms. The number of farms dropped from 2,823 to 2,391 between 1954 and 1959. That is a loss of actually only 313 farms, because the census points out that 119 of the difference lies in the change of definition of a farm.

But the farms that remain are bigger farms. True, in both years there were only 9 farms with 1,000 or more acres. But in 1959 there were 74 farms between 500 and 1,000 acres, compared with 63 5 years earlier. And there were only 103 farms of less than 10 acres, compared with 208 in 1954.

The census classed 1,934 farms as commercial. Of these, 65 had annual sales of $40,000 or more; 164 had sales of $20,000 to $39,999; 610 reported annual sales of $10,000 to $19,999; 645 farms had sales of $5,000 to $9,999. Only 370 farms had sales as low as $2,500, and only 80, sales below $2,500.

Otsego remains, and will continue to do so, predominantly a dairy county, but other agricultural enterprises are showing a sustained and important growth.

For example, in 1954, only 413,319 chickens, including broilers, were sold in Otsego County. But in 1959, sales of chickens were more than 1 million higher—a total of 1,476,316 sales reported. In 1954, Otsego farmers sold 3,698,365 eggs. Five years later, egg sales soared to 4,127,017.

Lesser farm enterprises also showed significant increases. Sheep and lamb sales rose slightly, nearly 4,000 more pounds of wool were produced, and although fewer farmers raised hogs for sale, they sold more hogs.

Otsego did not contribute materially to the Nation's biggest agricultural headache—the wheat surplus. Whereas in 1954, a total of 154 Otsego farms produced and sold 28,648 bushels of wheat; in 1959, only 46 farms produced wheat, and they sold only 5,032 bushels.

The census has a long list of equipment purchased by farmers, ranging from feeds and fertilizers to farm machinery and home freezers.

The cold figures of the census, however, do not reflect one of the most important aspects of area agriculture—the fact that we in Oneonta know the farmers of the area not only as good customers, but as good friends and good neighbors.

We on the Star hope that this Farmers Yearbook will reflect this newspaper's conviction that our farm readers are also our good friends and neighbors.

Textile Industry Must Be Safeguarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I have said in the past that the American textile industry was somewhat in the predicament of a man drowning in a swimming pool. The management has carefully provided lifesaver rings for use in just such an emergency, but the lifeguard will not toss one to the distraught victim.

Floods of imported textile goods have had the domestic industry awash for some time. Congress has carefully provided safeguards in the law to help industries in such a condition. But in the past the administration had always declined to use the safeguards we have established.

The section 22 case of a year ago is a case in point. Congress wrote that section into the Agriculture Adjustment Act to provide relief against imports whenever it is found that they tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with the agricultural programs of the Federal Government.

We asked the Secretary of Agriculture last year to seek relief under this provision for cotton products. We had a precedent in a 1941 Tariff Commission decision on wheat and flour.

The Secretary looked into it and recommended that the President take some action. But when President Eisenhower requested an investigation, he coupled it with an implication that the Tariff Commission could impose no more than an 8-cent-a-pound fee on the cotton content of imported articles.

This in itself was a misinterpretation of the act passed by Congress. The section in the law was predicated on the assumption that the Tariff Commission would recommend the relief it deemed necessary when it was determined that imports materially interfered with the domestic cotton program. Certainly it was not the intent of Congress to limit the considerations involved in one of these cases, or to do anything prejudicial to full and complete relief where it is indicated.

We recall the results of that appeal. With President Eisenhower's restrictive statement as a guide, the Tariff Commission voted against the textile industry. They chose to wait and see if the drowning man in the swimming pool went under for the third time.

Following these developments last year, I stated that there was something of futility in the repeated efforts of those of us here interested and concerned with the textile import problem to keep providing laws, lifesaver rings, which were not used. I said then that maybe it was time we got a new lifeguard.

The American people, in their wisdom, chose a new leader in the great election of last November. I can tell you that a lot of us from textile areas sent up a mighty cheer when this happened. We did not expect the new President immediately to rearrange all the existing trade agreements to give the textile industry a choice position in the world market, but we did believe that we would finally get off the buckpassing merry-go-round, and be given a full, fair, impartial, and unprejudicial hearing of our problem.

We have not been disappointed in this belief. The new President, who, by the way, has fought this fight in Congress for his native Massachusetts textile mills, put the textile industry's problems right at the top of his work agenda.

He appointed as Secretary of Commerce the Honorable Luther Hodges, a man with a distinguished background in the textile industry. He was Governor of North Carolina, the largest textile-producing State in the Nation. I can report personally of Secretary Hodges' deep and abiding interest in the welfare of the American textile industry. Last week, I paid a visit to Secretary Hodges, and took with me Mr. Hugh M. Comer, the chairman of the board of Avondale Mills, the great textile industry in my native State. The Secretary was cordial, attentive, and showed that he was well aware of the situation of the textile industry. I notice in the recent issue of U.S. News & World Report, that Secretary Hodges believes that American textiles are harder hit by import problems than any other industry in this country at the moment.

President Kennedy further evidenced his immediate concern with the import problem by appointing a Cabinet Textile Committee, chaired by Secretary Hodges. This Committee is due to report very shortly, it is my understanding.

Along with others, I urged Secretary Hodges' committee to make recommendations in line with those of the Pastore

Textile Committee in the Senate, calling for a country-by-country, category-by-category quota system. This recommendation reflects the position held by leaders of all segments of the textile industry, regardless of fiber or product. It is the only fair and equitable way for American textiles to compete on the world market and in this country.

We are already grateful for the immediate attention of the new administration to this problem. We desperately hope that we will not be disappointed in the action taken on textile imports.

The domestic textile industry must be delivered from the death blow which continued unfair imports surely will bring. Since 1947, 838 textile mills have been forced to shut down, throwing out of work more than 200,000 employees. We must have protection now for the 925,000 textile workers in this country today, including some 38,000 in my State of Alabama, who realize that their very jobs and the economic welfare of their communities are at stake.

Interior Department Program for Lower Colorado River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to inform all the Members of the House of the program announced by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall in his approach to the solution of the multiple problems that have been with us along the lower Colorado River ever since the Parker Dam was constructed in the 1930's.

One of the most vexing problems, which has been of continuing concern to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of this body, is the presence of trespassers and squatters whose occupancy precludes development for public purposes. In addition to the loss of revenue to the Government from unauthorized use, law abiding citizens, following authorized procedures, have been denied rights of occupancy and entry on the lands. Those of us interested in respect for law and order therefore supported the move of the United States, in June 1959, to evict trespassers; this having been offered as the only way to restore governmental authority over the area.

Institution of further eviction proceedings has been halted and the Department of the Interior has now moved to try to work out the problems without forcefully evicting unlawful occupants now on the ground. However, regardless of whether proceedings have previously been instituted, occupants will be required to acknowledge Federal ownership and enter into agreements for use of the lands on a rental basis for a 2-year period during which the Department will be establishing permanent land-use patterns. Where proceedings have been started, such arrangements will form the basis for settlement of the litigation by the Department of Justice. In any event, no new occupancy will be permitted unless it is in accordance with the master plan, and new trespassers will be evicted.

I hope that the squatter trespassers agree to cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior. If they do, it will reestablish Federal control over the area and provide a peaceful solution to the difficulties that have plagued the area along the lower Colorado River these many years. We will have to wait and see; your Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will continue to be watchful of developments.

In the meantime, I congratulate our former colleague, Secretary Udall, on his efforts to find a statesmanlike solution. Under leave to extend my remarks, the complete text of the Department's announcement is inserted at this point in the RECORD:

COLORADO RIVER LAND USE AND TRESPASS PROGRAM ANNOUNCED

The Department of the Interior's plan for settling the troublesome problem of land use along the Colorado River from Davis Dam to the Mexican border was announced today by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall.

Land along the river was withdrawn many years ago for reclamation purposes, but some of these lands have been occupied by unauthorized squatters who have used various lands for agricultural, recreational, business, and residential purposes.

"In formulating this plan," said the Secretary, "the Department has kept three considerations in sharp focus:

"1. The lands constitute property of the United States and Federal ownership must be recognized;

"2. The locations of the lands along the banks of the only great river in the great Southwest require their integration in any master land-use plan; and

"3. The public interest requires that the lands be administered for the benefit of all the people of the Nation."

Udall's announcement was in two parts: First, there will be established in Yuma, Ariz., effective May 1, a land-use office to supervise implementation of the plan, and, second, details of how the land will be put to use. The latter includes instructions on a transition plan under which the squatters who cooperate can continue to use the lands for a period of at least 2 years while the land-use plan is put into effect.

"Some of the Government-owned land along the Colorado," Udall said, "offers an opportunity to salvage a major national recreational and scenic asset." The land will be classified in four categories:

1. Areas suitable for national recreational development.

2. Areas suitable for national game refuges.

3. Areas suitable for State parks and recreational uses.

4. Areas which should remain under State game and fish agencies as refuges. (Most of the river is bounded by Arizona or California, but to the north, Nevada controls a sizable stretch.)

The Secretary stated that Federal ownership must be acknowledged by the squatters if they are to participate in the transition program.

Udall's plan for present users of the Federal lands—some 20,000 acres of which are devoted to agriculture—includes the following requirements:

1. The squatters will be expected to sign a disclaimer statement acknowledging Federal ownership.

2. Those who do so will be given permits to use the lands they now occupy for approximately 2 years, subject to acreage limitation in case of agricultural use, if they acknowledge Federal ownership and if they agree to pay reasonable rent for past and future use. They will acquire no interest in the land and no preferential treatment will be accorded them in the administration of the program.

"Our program," Udall said, "will restore Federal control and management and at the same time offer the squatters a reasonable course of action to close out their investments. If present unauthorized users refuse to cooperate, we will have no alternative but to commence summary court proceedings to evict and recover full damages for all past use."

Permits for continued occupancy will be offered to persons who were on the land before the date of this announcement (April 20, 1961). Any persons occupying Federal lands along the river subsequently will be evicted and prosecuted for trespass, Udall declared.

The Yuma office will be opened under general supervision of Graham Hollister of Genoa, Nev., Special Assistant to the Secretary. It will administer the permit system, conduct further land use studies, and advise the Secretary in determining the best use, from the public's standpoint, of each parcel of land in the affected area.

Thirteenth Anniversary of the Rebirth of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday the 13th anniversary of the birth of the State of Israel was observed in Independence Square, Philadelphia, by a great number of Philadelphians under the auspices of the Philadelphia Zionist Council and the city of Philadelphia. One of the speakers was the Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Honorable John Morgan Davis. His talk so impressed the audience and Congressmen WILLIAM A. BARRETT and JAMES A. BYRNE, who attended in addition to myself that I include a copy of same for the benefit of all Members of the Congress:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN MORGAN DAVIS, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR, 13TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REBIRTH OF ISRAEL, APRIL 23, 1961

We gather here today, at the shrine of American independence, to celebrate the birthday of one of the world's newest democracies—the 13th anniversary of the rebirth of Israel.

Here where men declared that "all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"—here, we come to recognize the reaching of the majority age of the Republic of Israel.

For Israel in this 13th year has come to its bar mitzvah, and has in actuality, reached the age of maturity.

And having done so, Israel becomes spotlighted during this year, and in the court at Jerusalem, shows to all the world—at this very moment—that it has indeed reached manhood in the community of nations.

How similar is the situation in this 13th year of independence for Israel, to our own 13th year as a nation—the first of the world's peoples to declare freedom and liberty before all the world.

For between the year of independence of this nation—between the hallowed Declaration at this very place, and our own 13th year—came revolution, war, and victory.

And in our 13th year, finally, in 1789, sprang forth, out of the minds and hearts of men, a foundation of law, a statement of purpose—the Constitution of the United States of America.

This was the culmination of 13 years of Valley Forge, Ticonderoga, Savannah, Brandywine, and Trenton—out of the Declaration had come turmoil and trial.

And out of turmoil and trial came the Constitution which stated:

"We the people of the United States—in order to form a more perfect union—establish justice."

Today in the spotlight of the world's glare, Israel—in its national manhood—establishes justice for all the world to see—establishes justice on behalf of the world's people—focuses the eye of mankind on the scales of justice in its dedicated effort to keep in men's mind a story of man's inhumanity to man.

Our own Constitution, founded on a Bill of Rights, weighed what had gone before in world governments and produced—in view of all the world—a document dedicated to provide the fundamental bases of man's humanity to man.

So, in a courtroom in Israel today, a young nation rivets the eyes of the world on the monstrous tragedy of men's recent past, in an attempt to insure that such inhumanity will never again take place in our world.

Although there is irony in the trial now taking place, it is an altogether fitting irony. Never before in the history of the civilized world has the magnificent concept of justice been held so high for mankind to look upon.

Never before has any government been so determined that justice shall be conducted fairly and without prejudice to the defense.

It will be impossible to erase the image of this trial from the memory of man.

Yet, remembering back through the years since Dachau and Buchenwald and Auschwitz, there is no more important page in history that man should rewrite. And Israel presents today, a rewriting of that history—no, rather a commentary on the history—a vividly true presentation of the facts of a time when men were inhumane to other men; when one man, or one people, or one nation, permitted genocide to be perpetrated.

Without this turning back of the pages of history; without this spotlighting of the horrible death of 6 million Jews and countless number of other peoples the world would little remember; it has already begun to forget.

It has been all too common in the years since nazidom's maniacal brigades ran rampant, to whitewash the actions of these horrible men.

Children have come of age in this decade who do not realize that a Nazi Germany existed. Instead of the harsh truth, we have seen, through popular novels and our photographic media, a blurred picture of military men who acted "on orders," and "noble leaders" who had no taste for the brutality, but who were forced to slaughter millions on orders from "someone higher up."

In the history of mankind; the history fashioned from the creation of man; the history which brought the exodus of the Jewish people out of the house of bondage—there was, is, and always will be, only one Higher Up.

And it is His moral law, given to Moses on Sinai, which commands in four strong words: "Thou shalt not kill."

And this law and nine others are the basis of the Judeo-Christian philosophy; the basis of our moral law; the basis on which the trial at Jerusalem must come to its final conclusion.

Israel is not seeking revenge upon one man or one group of men—or even one nation. This is not a question of revenge.

This is a matter of justice.

This is not even the payment of a debt.

For one life—created in the image of God—can never be fully paid.

The case in Jerusalem is the case against a political system utterly devoid in moral values; a system so amoral and brutal that it could accept the complete extermination of a people without any argument or equivocation.

At this time in the world's history—at this moment in the 13th year of Israel's freedom—the world sits in judgment upon itself in the courtroom at Jerusalem.

It is truly—this 13th year—a year of truth; a year of maturity; a year of emergence for the Republic of Israel.

It is, like our own 13th year, a year of national conscience—in 1789 as in 1961, America emerged to insure, through its Constitution, the rights, under God, of all men.

That year was, in our history, as in Israel's history, the year of emergence.

Both nations were created by those who sought a haven from persecution, and a free life in a new land.

A century and a half of history has seen peoples find freedom in this land; 13 years of history has seen peoples flock to the ancient land of milk and honey, to find freedom in Israel.

We take great pride in the fact that the first nation to recognize the independence of the infant Israel 13 years ago was the United States.

And during this infancy, more than 2 million people have found refuge in this haven of hope—Israel.

In all history—there has not been recorded a greater lesson in man's inhumanity to man as will be recorded in the courtroom at Jerusalem.

And in all history—there has never been recorded a greater lesson in charity—man's humanity to man—than has been recorded in Israel—for that young nation has accepted more homeless people in this short time than any other nation in world history.

We must never forget that Israel is the fount of human charity; that Israel was given to men by a benificent God; that Israel was chosen for His people, that Israel is dedicated to His way of life.

Israel, out of its ancient foundings, cannot be anything but charitable.

Israel, out of God's promise cannot be anything but just.

The land of Canaan was the result of God's promise.

The democracy of Israel is the result of man's genius.

Men only under God can achieve miracles, and in Israel, we have seen the miracle of man's genius, guided by the omnipotent hand of God.

A review of the past 13 years brings undeniable proof of God's handiwork on the earth of Israel.

And in this bar mitzvah, celebration of this great democracy, we stand shoulder to shoulder with this neighbor in the world's community, and extend a heartfelt "mazel."

May we foresee the day, in the not too distant future, when the world can be joyful as the result of the prophecy foretold in Israel that:

"They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they know war any more."

This is the lesson we must learn during Israel's 13th year; and if it is learned, no bar mitzvah will ever have been so glorious.

The Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Senator TALMADGE for many years warned the country about the danger of uncontrolled, low wage, textile imports. The following are excerpts from the Senator's very excellent speech before the Atlanta Rotary Club on April 3:

EXCERPTS FROM A SPEECH BY SENATOR HERMAN TALMADGE, OF GEORGIA, TO THE ATLANTA ROTARY CLUB AND THE ATLANTA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON APRIL 3, 1961

As you know, for a period of more than 10 years now, I have been seeking corrective action to remedy the plight of the American textile industry.

Defense officials tell us that the textile industry is second only to steel in its importance to the security of our country. Yet, since the conclusion of World War II, we have seen more than 800 textile mills forced out of business in the United States, and more than 400,000 textile workers lose their jobs.

The wage scale in the United States—and in Georgia where we have about 100,000 people employed in the textile industry—is approximately 10 times what it is in Hong Kong, several times what it is in Indonesia and India, and far higher than it is in Portugal, France, and Italy. To compound that situation, a bale of cotton sells anywhere in the world for $42.50 less than it sells where it is grown in this country.

Now with odds such as that—where the wage scale is 10 to 1, and raw material is 8½ cents a pound cheaper—how can the American textile industry be expected to survive, particularly when we are welcoming the importation of competing products from other countries.

Some 5 years ago the textile industry of this country and allied countries were faced with competition primarily from the Japanese. And, let me say, it was the American taxpayers who rebuilt the Japanese textile industry with new equipment, and made it just as modern as it is anywhere in these United States.

When it became apparent that Congress otherwise would take action, the Japanese textile industry entered into a voluntary quota arrangement to limit the importation of Japanese textiles into the United States.

Since that time, however, competition has developed in Hong Kong, the Philippines, Indonesia, India, Portugal, Italy, and many other cheap-labor countries. It has become so severe that even the Japanese are being undercut. As a result they are now petitioning their government to increase the export quotas to the United States.

In recent years we have gone from a net exporter of textiles to a net importer. As I have noted some 400,000 jobs have been liquidated. There are only 900,000 jobs remaining in that industry in this country.

Senator PASTORE of Rhode Island, ably assisted by Senators THURMOND of South Carolina and COTTON of New Hampshire served as a special subcommittee of the Senate Com-

merce Committee to investigate this matter. They held hearings throughout the country and have submitted urgent recommendations for action to the Senate.

The only way the textile industry can survive in Georgia and in the United States will be through the imposition of some form of quotas limiting the amounts of all kind of textile products which can be shipped into this country.

Many people have said that we must have free trade. But I submit that there is no way that we can have free trade when our competitors' wage level is 10 percent of ours and their raw material cost is 8½ cents per pound lower. When Cordull Hull and Franklin D. Roosevelt devised the reciprocal trade policies which have been in existence since that time, it was their view then that we would export products we had in surplus and that would not import such products. Today's situation is far cry from that. We are importing more textiles into the United States of America than we are exporting. In many of the department stores here in Atlanta, Ga., you can find textiles imported from many countries and, in most instances, selling at retail cheaper than our own Georgia textile mills can manufacture them.

We have discussed this on the floor of the Senate. A House delegation with Congressmen VINSON as chairman called on the President a few days ago and a delegation from the Senate will meet with him in the not too distant future.

I have discussed this matter on several occasions with Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges. I have discussed it on two different occasions with the President of the United States. I am hopeful that we can get some affirmative action taken.

If we fail in that regard we will, in my judgment, see the complete liquidation of the textile industry in our country in the not too distant future.

Disturbing Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under the heading "Disturbing Proposal", an editorial appears in the April issue of the American Cattle Producer, the publication of the American National Cattlemen's Association, which I am sure reflects the sentiments of not only the vast majority of the cattle producers in this country, but the sentiments of a great many operating farmers.

To me, the President's farm message and the omnibus farm bill introduced in Congress last week contained some exceedingly disturbing proposals which seemed to stem from a belief that only through government intervention can all segments of our agricultural economy remain prosperous. I think the record refutes this assumption in that there are many agricultural commodities, including cattle, which are enjoying a rather satisfactory price relationship. Rather than leaving these commodities alone to enjoy their prosperity, this administration seems bent on extending Federal regulation to every farmer and every farm commodity. There are some problems that do exist in agriculture which need the immediate attention of Congress and the Department of Agriculture. It would seem only practical that the immediate attention of Congress should be given to dealing with these known problems that do exist rather than dealing with a piece of legislation which has so many indeterminate possibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is unfortunate that this administration has seen fit to introduce legislation which serves more to disturb a large segment of our agriculture economy than to deal with problems that are known to exist in specific segments of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include this editorial from the American Cattle Producer with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DISTURBING PROPOSAL

A disturbing proposal in President John F. Kennedy's special farm message to Congress is one which calls for referendums under which a two-thirds vote of farmers could put a commodity under Federal controls.

Included in the proposals are production and marketing quotas which, as we have seen in the instances where they have already been used, readily become capital assets which are valuable and salable.

Once started, therefore, these quotas become permanent and hang over the commodity like a straitjacket, impeding any movement of an industry toward expansion or adjustment to changing times.

The administration's proposals would offer this program to any or all of the various agricultural commodities, including, of course, cattle.

Agriculture, like business, is continually adjusting itself to changing conditions. For instance, the recent census of agriculture shows that enormous adjustments have been taking place in recent years within the agricultural economy.

In 5 years, the number of farms counted by the census declined from 4.8 million to 3.7 million—down 1,078,774 farms. This was a 23 percent reduction. Even after allowing for the change in the census definition of a farm, the number still dropped by 846,912, or 17 percent.

And within these figures were many other important changes. The number of farms producing $10,000 or more of sales increased 211,053, or 36 percent. The number producing between $5,000 and $10,000 of sales declined 54,000, or 8 percent. The number of part time and residential farms went down 167,000, or 12 percent, and the number of uneconomic, inadequate, small farms producing less than $5,000 of sales (commercial farms, too small to support a family) went down 1,072,519—a 53-percent decrease.

Thus the most important of these adjustments is a significant increase of adequate and quite successful commercial farms and a sharp decrease in the number of inadequate units on which families cannot make a satisfactory living.

The truly depressed segment of agriculture is the 965,000 farms in the 1959 census that produced less than $5,000 of gross sales. They constitute agriculture's underprivileged, poverty-stricken families. But the fact still remains that 5 years earlier there were 2,037,740 such farms.

It seems almost tragic to ignore these adjustments within agriculture and while adjustments are so rapidly advancing to suggest that the more productive, commercial segment of agriculture should be brought under control in order to provide benefits primarily to the 1 million farm families on unproductive farms.

The President's farm message ignores these adjustments. It would move us in the direction of high-cost control, increased food prices to consumers, expanded bureaucracy to run the programs, and it would block many of the adjustments that have been going forward at an all-time record rate.

Perhaps least of all can the beef cattle industry afford to let itself be brought into such a program. In the past 20 years the production of beef has doubled. This has been accomplished through improvement in the product. The market has been responding by wanting more beef. The industry has been able to expand in recent years even with rising prices.

A quota system for beef output would be an inevitable brake on further expansion. Quotas on amounts of beef marketed would merely hand some of the market for beef over to other meats and thus be an unnecessary ceiling over the cattle industry.

And under the administration's proposal, any small but vocal group of producers could request the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a quota program for cattle production. When this would be put to referendum it could be people rather than cattle that would vote. The producer who sells a half-dozen head a year would have as much voice as the man who runs several hundred head.

Not only stockmen and farmers but the Nation as a whole should pause long and look hard before we make such a fundamental change in economic policy as is requested in the President's farm message.

Destiny of Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, one of our most urgent concerns is the destiny of Latin America. Robert B. Dresser, writing in Economic Council Papers, volume XVI, No. 3, March 15, 1961, makes some splendid points which should be of interest to all Americans:

COMMUNISM AND THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE—WE ARE LOSING THE COLD WAR

(By Robert B. Dresser)

Beginning with the loss of China to the Communists in 1949, the Communists have made steady gains in the Far East and the Middle East, and even in the Western Hemisphere where their stooge, Castro, helped to power by our own State Department, is now in complete control of Cuba, an island within 90 miles of the Florida coast. Communist control of Cuba constitutes a most serious threat to the safety of the United States.

How has this come about?

LETTER TO THE EDITOR BY ROBERT B. DRESSER
DECEMBER 26, 1951

In December 1951 I wrote a letter to the editor of the Providence Journal, which was published in that paper on December 26, 1951, from which I quote as follows:

"DANGERS FROM WITHOUT

"On November 30, 1950, President Truman, in a statement to the public on the intervention of Communist China in Korea, said:

"'If aggression is successful in Korea, we can expect it to spread through Asia and Europe to this hemisphere. We are fighting in Korea for our own national security and survival.'

• • • • •

"It is the opinion of many competent observers (1) that the key to the successful achievement of Russia's manifest objective of world conquest is China, and not Europe or any other area, (2) that Russian control of China located in the center of Asia, with its 450 million people, the greatest reservoir of manpower in the world, would undoubtedly lead in the end to Russian control of all Asia with one-half the world's population, and (3) that with Russia in complete control of Asia the subjugation of Western Europe would quickly follow, and the United States without allies of appreciable strength, would face the rest of the world alone with but little chance of survival.

"That this is the Russian view is abundantly clear. Why it should not have been ours is far from clear. For years we recognized the importance of maintaining the independence and territorial integrity of China and her friendship for us. We even fought World War II against Japan for this very purpose. Successful in that war, we proceeded upon its termination to relinquish the fruits of our victory and to turn control of China over to our arch enemy, Russia, an infinitely more dangerous foe than Japan.

"Six years ago William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in this country, said:

" 'The war in China is the key of all problems on the international front.'

"In his radio address to the American people on April 11, 1951, President Truman said:

" 'The attack on Korea was part of a greater plan for conquering all of Asia.' In the same address President Truman quoted a Communist officer in the Far East as saying, 'In order to successfully undertake the long-awaited world revolution, we must first unify Asia.' Mr. Truman then stated, 'That is what the Communist leaders are telling their people, and that is what they have been trying to do. They want to control all Asia from the Kremlin.'

"Could anything be plainer? Despite this clear evidence of Russian intention, our Government has pursued in Asia a policy of appeasement with Russia, and by its betrayal of Nationalist China has put in Russia's hands the means of conquering all Asia, which Russia regards as the first step toward achieving her ambition of world conquest.

"That Chiang and his Nationalist government were deliberately betrayed by our own Government and prevented from waging a successful fight against the Communists would seem to be conclusively established by the evidence.

"Even after the 80th Congress in the spring of 1948, sought to repair the damage done by the State Department's policy regarding Chiang by authorizing substantial aid to Nationalist China, including much-needed military arms and equipment, the shipments were held up so that they did not arrive in time to save Chiang. In the opinion of Vice Adm. Russell S. Berkey, Navy director of public information, expressed in a speech made on May 15, 1950, had they arrived on time, the Chinese Communists 'would still be north of the Great Wall.'

"It should be noted that what Chiang needed was not our men, but our guns and ammunition. He had the men.

"With China in friendly hands, there would have been no Korean War and the 100,000 casualties suffered by us to date (now 150,000) would not have occurred. These casualties, therefore, are the direct result of the betrayal of Chiang.

"The high-minded 'agrarian reformers,' as representatives of our State Department chose to call the Chinese Communists, whom our State Department favored, won the war and drove Chiang out of China. For the past year these agrarian reformers, acting under the orders of Moscow, have been killing our American boys by the thousands in Korea.

"Meantime, our Government, in concert with the United Nations, has placed important limitations on our military commanders in the field by prohibiting the bombing of Chinese Communist bases across the boundary in Manchuria, and by forbidding the use of the half million troops which Chiang has on the island of Formosa. This has led our commanders, or certain of them, at least, to state that with such limitations it will be impossible to end the war in Korea. Meanwhile, we continue to furnish 90 percent of the outside troops in Korea and to suffer 90 percent of the casualties.

"Despite this incredible mishandling (to put it mildly) of our foreign affairs, the men responsible for it are still in office and directing such affairs.

"Are we as a people content to let these men continue to manage our affairs? Are we content to let the senseless slaughter of our boys in Korea continue in a war we are forbidden to win? If not, Mr. Citizen, what are you going to do about it?

"ROBERT B. DRESSER."

ARTICLE IN AMERICAN LEGION MAGAZINE FOR MAY 1951

In an article published in the American Legion magazine for May 1951, under the title "Who is Letting Our GI's Down?", written after a tour of the battlelines in Korea, Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion, wrote as follows:

"Our present-day Benedict Arnolds may glibly argue that it is necessary to keep Chiang and his armies blockaded on Formosa, but these arguments make no sense to our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who have to do the fighting and dying. They see in Chiang's vast armies a way of saving some of the 250 lives that are being needlessly sacrificed each week because certain furtive people expound that Chiang isn't the right sort of person, and, therefore, we cannot accept his aid. Our fighting men are not impressed by these false prophets because they haven't forgotten that these same people not long ago were lauding Mao's murdering hordes as 'agrarian reformers.'

"For the life of them—and 'life' is meant in a very literal sense—they can't understand why our State Department and the United Nations make it necessary for them to be slaughtered by red armies which swarm down on them from territory which our own heads of Government make sacrosanct.

"Agents of the Kremlin, sitting in the councils of the United Nations, in Washington and elsewhere, must laugh up their sleeves at our utter idiocy. But you may be sure that our GI's are not amused. They see the picture as clearly as the Soviet agents do, but, unlike our stateside leaders, they see the results of this criminal skulldruggery in the blood they shed and in the mangled corpses of their buddies.

"What they cannot understand, though, is the strange apathy of the people back home. As they listen to radio reports of what is happening thousands of miles to the east of them, they are puzzled. Isn't the American public aware of what is going on? Don't they realize that their sons and husbands and sweethearts are fighting a ruthless enemy who has them at a terrible disadvantage, thanks to stupid or traitorous advisers and inept diplomacy?"

STATEMENT OF SENATOR TAFT IN 1957

On June 25, 1952, Senator Robert A. Taft repeated his demand for allied air smashes against Chinese Communist bases in Manchuria, stating that "all through the Korean war, 2 years old today, targets in Chinese Manchuria have been out of bounds to allied airmen."

STATEMENT OF GENERAL CLARK IN 1957

On September 17, 1957, Gen. Mark W. Clark, president of The Citadel, the military college of South Carolina, and former allied commander in Korea, made an address at the American Legion's National Commander's Dinner in Atlantic City after receiving the Distinguished Service Medal. I quote from his address the following:

"Imagine in Korea where our airmen could go up to the Yalu River and there look down and across it—see bridges that we were unable to destroy; see airfields loaded with Mig 15's and see ammunition dumps and other kinds of storage places piled to the sky with paraphernalia designed by the Communists to kill our men. Their killers came across the river with these weapons of war and I was not permitted to take out those bridges. Certainly we should have done it. If I'd had the authority and they had let me, I would have bombed Manchuria and North China.

* * * * *

"Let's not fight another war like we fought in Korea with our hands tied behind our backs. May God forbid that we ever have to fight another war, but when the authorities of our country decide that to protect our vital interests, it is essential, then let's do it with every means that we've got at our disposal and we will win it fast."

WE LOST THE KOREAN WAR

We lost the Korean war, a war which it was so important for us to win and which we could so easily have wone, as every commander in the field and other competent critic, I believe, will testify.

Our winning the Korean war would have led to the downfall of the Communist regime in China, and would have changed completely the world situation in our favor.

CUBA

Cuba has become a Communist satellite within 90 miles of the Florida coast. To permit this condition to continue is to jeopardize the independence and safety of the United States.

It is difficult to understand why our Government has permitted this situation to develop. Is it possible that we are going to continue our policy of vacillation and appeasement to a point where Communist Russia will be so firmly entrenched that she cannot be driven from the island without a war with the Soviet Union?

We have before us the tragic case of China where, because of the incredible errors and blundering of our Government (to put it mildly), a country with 450 million people was turned over to Communist rule. As a direct result, the United States and the entire free world have been placed in a position of dire peril.

ARTICLE IN PROVIDENCE JOURNAL, SEPTEMBER 11, 1960

In the Providence Sunday Journal for September 11, 1960, there was a news article headed, "Two Senators Say State Department Aided Castro."

I quote from this article as follows:

"Two Democratic Senators said yesterday that 'unknown policy planners' in the State Department cleared the way for assumption of power in Cuba by the Fidel Castro regime. They said this handed the island over to the Communists.

* * * * *

"Earl E. T. Smith and Arthur Gardiner, former Ambassadors to Cuba, told the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security last month that State Department policies, and some U.S. newspapers, misguided U.S. public opinion about the situation preceding Castro's rise to power in Cuba.

"The testimony was made public yesterday by the subcommittee. Senators EASTLAND and DODD commented on it in a joint statement.

"They said Cuba, 'was handed to Castro and the Communists by a combination of

Americans in the same way that China was handed to the Communists.' They said unknown policy planners 'worked with pro-Castro elements in the American press to make Castro appear as Robin Hood.'

* * * * *

"The Senators said the testimony of the two former Ambassadors—both political appointees of President Eisenhower—demonstrate that American foreign policy is not made by top officials, but by 'unknown policy planners and memo makers who fill the Secretary's "in" basket.'

* * * * *

"The two Senators said that low level officials 'misguided American opinion' with the aid of the U.S. press."

STATEMENT OF DR. RUFO LOPEZ-FRESQUET

At a meeting in Sarasota, Fla., on January 17 of this year, Dr. Rufo Lopez-Frequet, the guest speaker, stated that Castro was a Communist from the beginning and that the decisions in Cuba at the present time are not made in Cuba but in Moscow. Dr. Lopez-Fresquet, a patriotic, well-educated Cuban, was former Minister of Finance for Castro. He fled to the United States when he found out that Castro was a Communist and was converting Cuba into a Soviet satellite.

PANAMA

Cuba is not the only danger spot in the Western Hemisphere. Another of equal importance is Panama.

On September 17, 1960, on the eve of Premier Khrushchev's arrival in this country, President Eisenhower ordered the flag of Panama to be flown with the flag of the United States in the Canal Zone.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES is quoted as having said that he was "surprised and deeply shocked" and that he saw "absolutely no valid reason" for the flag-flying order.

In the language of Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, in a statement issued September 21, 1960:

"It is a cowardly yielding on the part of the Executive to the pressure of mob rule in Panama comparable to hoisting the Soviet flag on U.S. territory. The ill-advised step, taken with the hope of placating Panamanian radicals, can only incite them to increase their demands.

* * * * *

"The Congress has been long aware of the fact that subversive influences are in control of important areas in our Department of State. It is the gradual growth and spread of this subversive influence that has alarmed the Congress.

* * * * *

"In this connection, we should recognize that an inexcusable policy of compromise and placation has made our Canal Zone the tinderbox of the Caribbean. We are dealing with a Soviet-organized plan for conquest of the Caribbean, which has the Panama Canal as its key objective. Such conquest by the Soviet would be but a prelude to their intended conquest of the United States.

* * * * *

"The congressional inquiries into subversive activities in the Department of State, which are now underway, should be pressed with increased vigor to the end that these influences may be identified and corrective actions taken by the Congress to repudiate the President's ill-advised action of surrender."

It should be noted that in 1903 the United States acquired by treaty exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone. This is a right which can be surrendered or modified only by renegotiation of the treaty and ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

MONROE DOCTRINE

In 1823 President James Monroe announced as a policy of the United States that we would regard as an unfriendly act dangerous to our peace and safety any attempt by a European power to oppress or control in any way any country in this hemisphere that had declared and maintained its independence. This meant that we would resist any such action. In the opinion of competent students of the subject, the Monroe Doctrine may properly be construed to include penetration and subversion.

RESOLUTION INTRODUCED IN CONGRESS

Last year a resolution was introduced in Congress stating that the United States would be "justified * * * in taking steps to forestall intervention, domination, control and colonization by international communism in the New World." The resolution was opposed by the State Department and as far as I am aware, no hearings were held upon it.

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

In August, 1960, the United States broke off diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic. The form of government we thought needed to be changed. It was a dictatorship under the control of one Trujillo, so we decided with a lot of Latin American countries that Trujillo must go. Incidentally, it happens Trujillo had some time ago severed diplomatic relations with Russia—the only head of a government in the Western Hemisphere, I believe, that has had the courage to do this. He was a friend of the United States and had never, I understand, caused us any trouble.

If we are successful in our undertaking, the chances are good that Trujillo will be succeeded by someone of the Castro type.

While we severed diplomatic relations with Trujillo, no thought was given to such action with respect to Castro. His government, you know, was not a dictatorship, but a democracy. And, of course, Russia and her satellite nations have a democratic form of government and therefore must be recognized.

How absurd can our Government get.

It was not until January 3 of this year that we broke off diplomatic relations with Castro.

HOUSE CLEANING IN STATE DEPARTMENT OVERDUE

Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, stated on January 9, 1961, that the State Department should be swept clean from top to bottom.

A very revealing book on this subject entitled, "Inside the State Department," has been written by Bryton Barron, a former member of the Department, and is well worth reading.

THREE-STAR EXTRA BROADCAST, OCTOBER 16, 1957

On October 16, 1957, Ray Henle in the Three-Star Extra radio broadcast said:

"Three-Star Extra feels that it should pass along to you this opinion, namely, that the international noose is tightening around our necks, and to all outward appearances nothing is being done to let us slip out.

"We are facing serious reversals in three important areas of the world—in the Far East, where no effective measures are being taken to overthrow the Chinese Communists; in the Middle East, where Russia, after centuries of trying, is on the verge of getting a firm, unshakable foothold; in Europe, where we are losing our battle to gain unification of Germany, with all that means to the strengthening of our European frontiers.

* * * * *

"But in Washington, no top official gives voice to an effective course of action and, indeed, powerful elements in the State Department advocate reaching an accommodation with the Communists on the three problems just mentioned.

"The very groups which now want an accommodation were in the forefront advocating, in the Far East, not to let MacArthur bring Red China to her knees, which could have been done in the Korean war, not to have a strong effective policy in the Middle East in order to keep the Russians out, not to force our way into Berlin during the airlife blockade. In each case, appeasement policies were advocated and adopted officially by our Government.

"The fruits of such appeasement now bring chickens home to roost. In our opinion, only the strongest leadership will get us out of our difficulties."

CONCLUSION

Yes, we are losing the cold war, and rapidly.

Meanwhile, we spend our time trying to destroy those who are seeking to save us from the Communists.

Does this make sense?

Bacone College Choir Charms Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, some Members of this body, along with several hundred others who were passing by, enjoyed a rare treat on last Thursday afternoon, April 20. They had the pleasure of hearing Oklahoma's famous Bacone College Choir sing for the "Voice of America" on the Capitol steps.

The choir had not scheduled the "Voice of America" broadcast as a regular part of its annual nationwide tour, but cheerfully performed on very short notice in order to spread the word of the great work being done at Bacone College.

Founded in 1880 before Oklahoma was a State, Bacone was initially known as Indian University, and has always been primarily interested in the education of Indian youths. More than 40 different tribes from every corner of the United States, and from Mexico and Panama as well, are represented in its student body.

An accredited junior college sponsored by the American Baptist Home Mission Societies, Bacone sends its students to senior colleges and universities all over the United States. Its campus, on the outskirts of Muskogee, Okla., is one of the most beautiful in the southwest.

In its current tour, the college choir is singing in Missouri, Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, in addition to two scheduled appearances already completed in Washington, D.C. Directed by Miss Jeannine Rainwater and accompanied by Mrs. Dick West, the choir features a splendid range of selections, and is aided in its colorful presentation by dances performed by the Wauhillau Indian Club.

Because the list of members of the choir provides a splendid picture of the tribal and State representation in it, I am listing the names of the members who performed in Washington:

Judy Onon Anquoe, Onondaga, New York; Joe Brown Bennett, Seminole-Creek, California; Freeda Blair, Oklahoma; Louie Brown, Cherokee, Oklahoma; Tony Buck, Creek, Oklahoma;

John Clements, Cherokee, Oklahoma; Gilbert Cosen, Apache, Arizona; Johnny Edwards, Cherokee, Arkansas; Bernadine George, Onondaga, New York; Will Getz, Oklahoma; Jo Ann Gibson, Shoshone, Nevada; William Givens, Creek, Oklahoma; Kelly Haney, Seminole, Oklahoma; Mary Hill, Delaware-Shawnee, Oklahoma; Joanna Ketcher, Cherokee, Oklahoma; Lance Lujan, Kiowa-Taos, Kansas; Jeanette Mandel, Paiute, Nevada; Mary Jane Miles, Nez Perces, Idaho; Thelma Murr, Oklahoma; James Palmer, Seminole-Creek, Oklahoma; Jenelle Poemoceah, Comanche, Oklahoma; Barbara Richards, Oklahoma; Melva Richardson, Cherokee-Saponi-Tuskarora, North Carolina; Patti Richardson, Cherokee-Sapony-Tuskarora, North Carolina; Shari Skenandore, Oneida, Wisconsin; Robert Soontay, Kiowa-Apache, Oklahoma; Telma Thomas, Nez Perce, Idaho; Russell Tsoodle, Kiowa, Oklahoma; Sam Warnock, Oklahoma; Antonwine Warrior, Sac and Fox, Oklahoma; Arch Henry White, Shawnee, California; Clara White Hip, Crow, Montana; Lou Ella Whiteman, Crow, Montana; David Williams, Tonkawa-Kiowa, Oklahoma.

While it is obvious that Indians predominate in the choir, it is also apparent that five choir members are non-Indian students. In its rapidly growing student body of today, Bacone includes many students who belong to no Indian tribe but have been drawn to the beautiful Oklahoma college by its splendid curriculum and its rich tradition.

Almon C. Bacone, who founded the college 81 years ago, summed up its mission in these words:

A Christian school planted in the midst of a people becomes one of the most powerful agencies in the work of civilization.

Bacone College goes about its important job of advancing the work of civilization in this turbulent century, and the choir which it sends across the Nation is a splendid group of ambassadors.

Twenty Thousand Relatives Still To Be Reunited Under Public Law 363

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Remo Zuecca, a representative of Il Popolo Italiano in Philadelphia, which is the only independent weekly in both English and Italian with a national circulation, sent me the following article on immigration taken from the March–April issue of the ACIM Dispatch published by the American Committee on Italian Migration.

The article is excellent and confirms my contention that the Visa Office of the Department of State and our consular authorities in Italy and throughout the world are dragging their feet in administering the law and reuniting families here in America.

I urge my colleagues to carefully read this article and then take appropriate action:

TWENTY THOUSAND RELATIVES STILL TO BE REUNITED UNDER PUBLIC LAW 363

In the 17 months since the enactment of legislation that allowed the entry of some 30,000 Italians into the United States, only 9,684 have been reunited with their families here. This figure was announced by the U.S. Visa Office on March 15, 1961.

The bill, signed into law by President Eisenhower on September 22, 1959 (Public Law 86–363), was designed to assist in the reunion of parents and spouses, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters of American citizens who had filed registration for migration to the United States before December 31, 1953.

The passage of the law was hailed by the American Committee on Italian Migration as a major advance in its efforts to bring about the complete reunion of all family units.

Assurances were received months ago from the Department of State Visa Office that visa petitions of those eligible would be accelerated, and though there has been a slight step-up in the processing of applications, ACIM sincerely hopes that immediate action will be taken by the authorities to insure a quicker reunion of those families who have been patiently waiting for years, and who benefit by Public Law 363.

Address by Mr. Richard Kulze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Richard Kulze, president of the American Seafood Distributors Association, entitled "Foreign Trade Today and the Future of the American Fishing Industry":

ADDRESS OF RICHARD KULZE, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN SEAFOOD DISTRIBUTORS ASSOCIATION AT ITS ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING, APRIL 15, 1961

The United States is on the verge of a historic change in its trade policy. We are either about to revert to a form of protectionism that we have not seen since Smoot-Hawley days, or—and I hope this is so—we are about to enter into a challenging program whereby this country can increase its exports abroad, preserve our domestic economy and our defense, and aid the free world. The status quo of U.S. trade policy can no longer be preserved in today's world; we must go one way or the other. It is vital to the country—and to us individually and as members of the fishing industry—that we choose the right way.

I need not emphasize to you those signs which point up the efforts of some who would lead us down the path of retreat to a high tariff wall. They have been highlighted in our newspapers: the U.S. balance of payments deficit, our gold loss, unemployment, threatened boycotts by labor against imported raw material. Of course these are not signs which indicate that the United States should head toward a protectionist policy. But they are new factors being used by those who favor high tariffs in an attempt to rush this country into a new and drastic trade policy.

Some 50 resolutions have been introduced in the 87th Congress which would declare it to be the sense of Congress that the United States should grant no further tariff reductions in the forthcoming GATT negotiations. Various bills have been introduced embodying the so-called flexible tariff principle, whereby some form of tariff adjustment is proposed based upon the difference between production costs here and abroad. Import labeling bills—pocket vetoed by President Eisenhower—have been reintroduced in this Congress. And individual commodity bills have been introduced providing for tariffs or quotas on bread, meat, iron ore, charcoal, plywood, chocolatas, and shrimp, among other items.

Our balance of payments deficit and the resultant gold drain are matters of grave concern to this country, even though the United States still has nearly one-half of the free world's monetary gold stock. Steps are being taken by our Government in an endeavor to better this situation, primarily by having the industrialized nations play a stronger role in foreign economic aid and free world defense programing, as well as continuing their relaxation of import restrictions that hinder broadened U.S. exports. But we cannot deny that the payments deficit has provided a strong vehicle for revival of protectionist thinking.

We can never emphasize enough that the payments deficit is the net difference of the funds that go out of this country—for imports, military installations abroad, U.S. tourists abroad, and foreign aid—and the funds that come to the United States—for our exports, foreign visitors, and income on foreign investments. It is not a trade deficit we are talking about, for we have had a healthy surplus of exports over imports for years and years, and in fact since 1894. In 1960, for example, our export trade exceeded import trade by roughly $4.7 billion, the third highest trade surplus of the decade.

There are those, however, who believe that so long as we have any deficit in our balance of payments, the remedy lies in trade restrictions and a decrease in our imports. So what really is at stake with those who seek to better our balance of payments situation by trade restrictions is not at all a trade deficit, but rather the magnitude of the trade surplus which could serve to cover in part the deficit in other payments categories. This is like saying that the Federal cigarette tax should pay the cost of operating the Department of the Interior; the payments deficit and the trade surplus are that unrelated.

On this new development of trade boycotts, because of unemployment, electrical workers in Chicago have threatened to boycott imports of Japanese radio, phonograph, and television parts. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers have threatened a boycott against Japanese fabrics to force the establishment of a quota on imported men's suits from Japan. Yet, imports of electronic parts amount to three-tenths of 1 percent of U.S. production, and imports of men's suits constitute two-tenths of 1 percent of American production. But this threat by certain labor groups to refuse to handle imported materials in the manufacturing process is an ominous development. If the threats become reality, it would have disasterous effect on the U.S. and world trade. Such boycotts would create a situation whereby U.S. trade policy would be determined by the unilateral and unofficial actions of particular segments of the population.

The payments deficit and unemployment are two serious problems for our country. Their cause is not imports, and their cure is not in import restrictions. This is no time for fear; this is a time for challenge. American industry did not become great by being sheltered; it achieved its greatness because of intelligence, pioneering spirit, research, new and imaginative ideas, and the one sure road to success—giving the consumer the best possible product for the best possible value.

This is a time of great challenge for U.S. industry and U.S. trade policy, particularly with the formation of trade blocs abroad, primarily in Europe. Over half of the U.S. exports go to 15 industrialized nations of the world, most of whom are members of trade blocs. These blocs, now mostly in the formative stage, are the groundwork for an economic system making possible the production and distribution efficiencies, the high wage rates, and the massive purchasing power which heretofore have been associated only with the United States.

Whether the United States will continue to maintain its large export volume with these countries depends upon which trade road we decide to take at this crucial intersection. A trade study group of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in a report issued last month said:

"American decisions regarding international trade can topple or strengthen the government of an undeveloped state, cleave or cement an international alliance, confound or contribute to Communist expansionism. It can raise or lower standards of life, increase or decrease job opportunities, make or break industries in places as far apart as Karachi and Chicago."

Not only is the direction we take vital in relation to maintaining our existing export market and vital in determining the role which our exports will play in the tremendous markets that will rapidly be created in the now underdeveloped countries, but it is vital in relation to your freedom, that of your children, and that of millions throughout the world, particularly because of the challenge posed by the trading tactics and techniques of the Communist bloc.

Today is the time that flexibility and resourcefulness are essential in our Nation's economic life. Instead, U.S. foreign trade policy has moved toward increasing rigidity. Up to now, we have not provided incentives for American producers to adjust to change. By legislation or administrative regulation, we have tightened the escape clause in the Trade Agreements Act, the Buy-American Act, and the Anti-Dumping Act.

Now is the time for a new import policy, one that rejects the concept that international trade should be largely an exchange of noncompeting surpluses. Our past thinking has tended to encourage the export of manufactured goods and the import of raw materials, but to discourage the export of capital equipment and the import of manufactured goods. And yet in 1960, 79 percent of what we sold abroad was manufactured or semimanufactured goods. Trade thrives when we exchange that which we make best for that which other nations make better than we.

The Trade Agreements Acts, under which we negotiate item-by-item tariff reductions under the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, expires in 1962. A very basic change required in our trade policy, and which should be included in reenactment of that legislation, is a shift from item-by-item negotiations to an across-the-board method by which we would be offering to reduce national tariff averages by a given percentage over a given period of 3 to 5 years. This we must do, because the across-the-board approach is being used by the European trade blocs. Since one of our major concerns is maintaining our very sizable export trade with those countries, our negotiating effort must be in step with the pace and the approach those countries are following.

Such a proposal will not be well received by those who have apprehension at the ability of American industry to compete with countries that pay wages far lower than those earned by American labor. Yet as I mentioned before, U.S. exports of finished manufactures, produced by the highest wage industries in the world, have consistently been well in excess of U.S. imports of finished manufactures. Scores of American industries, big and little, consistently have been able to outsell Europeans in their home markets, as well as here in the U.S. market, and in third countries.

Given an equal chance in the world marketplace, most American consumer goods are well able to hold their own despite the wage gap. This is so because the ability to compete is determined not by national wage levels, but by total costs per unit of production. In comparing labor costs, the important standard is not wage rates but unit labor costs, which take into account not only wages, but also fringe benefits, volume of production, the number of workers required to put it out, and the amount of time it takes. Fringe benefits constitute a larger part of total labor costs in foreign countries than here. In some Western European countries, they run more than 40 percent of total labor costs. Capital, power, and raw materials are usually more expensive abroad than here. The wage gap seems to be narrowing. Labor costs per hour have risen more abroad since 1953 than here in the United States. Labor unions abroad are gaining strength and are beginning to push for higher wages.

The degree of displacement of American jobs by cheap foreign labor has been grossly exaggerated. Imports that are more or less competitive with U.S. production amount to about a fourth of our total imports. A study by the Library of Congress in combination with the Department of Labor in 1958 indicated that if all U.S. tariffs were suspended, the labor displacement that might result from such a free trade expansion of imports would range between 18,000 and 45,000 manufacturing workers. If this figure were doubled as a safety factor, it would represent less than half of 1 percent of our labor force.

Another figure is interesting: The peak total employment since 1948 in all industries in which the Tariff Commission has found serious injury under the escape clause was less than 150,000 workers. The lowest total employment in these industries since 1948 was slightly less than 100,000. If the apparent gross reduction in employment of about 50,000 is attributed solely to imports, without consideration to the effects of the recession, automation, and competition from other domestic products, the displacement is still a very, very small part of our total labor force. To those 50,000 who became unemployed, it was a very personal and harsh matter, for as we know, the national interest means different things to different people.

On the whole, however, American business has made and is making a successful response to foreign competition. How well American business faces up to the new competitive forces which have developed hinges on how well it applies the wide array of policies and methods at its disposal. The combined effect of foreign competition and high wage rates has forced most U.S. industries to find new and better ways of doing things. A major factor has been that cost of production and price policies have been subjected to meticulous reappraisal.

A second vital factor which must be included in the new U.S. trade policy is that of adjustment. Where we have injurious dislocation caused by imports, it should be promptly dealt with, in the first instance, by domestic economic policy, not through foreign trade machinery. Today the first step taken by any group alleging import injury is to restrict imports. The escape clause is in reality only an attempted evasion of the problem faced by the complaining parties, not a significant step toward its solution. The American economy needs a stimulus to adapt, not a relief or escape from the need to do so. Legislation that tells American producers that they would be protected against dislocation and hence against the need to adjust is bad economics and bad political science.

Thus, our Federal policy's response to the dislocating effects of imports should emphasize adjustment, rather than preservation of the status quo. If these dislocating problems are important enough to require Government assistance, they deserve the kind of assistance that assures success, not that which camouflages the real issue. Management inefficiencies are no reason for tariff assistance by the Government, nor should the Government be committed to the preservation of every industry or of its existing industrial structure.

A Federal adjustment program need not mean, and should not mean, greater Federal control over the economy, nor should it mean an uprooting of people from their home areas. A Federal adjustment program could include such measures as loans at low interest rates to finance new equipment with which to improve production of existing products or to embark on new lines of production. There could be special amortization privileges on equipment depreciation for tax purposes.

There could be tax breaks for research and development expenditures. There could be labor retraining programs. There could be technical assistance to local governments, labor, and industry. There could be stimulation of new investment in problem areas.

Only when these adjustment measures have been used as a matter of domestic economic policy, and have failed, should there be an approach to correcting the matter through our foreign trade policy. In effect, then, the Tariff Commission and trade restrictions should be the last step, and not the first.

In discussing these two major changes proposed for U.S. trade policy, I have not once specifically mentioned the American fishing industry. But the problems and the cures are as applicable to our industry as to any other. There is no room in today's economy for an industry that does not fit the pattern. Our foreign trade policy cannot be tailored to meet the needs of a handicraft industry any more than our national economy can. And our foreign trade policy cannot be tailored to meet the needs of a high-production-cost industry. We have a peculiar problem in our industry and we all know it: An unlimited number of vessels are fishing relatively stabilized resources and the unit cost of production is high. We will never meet our basic problem until we find the means of overcoming the many obstacles to putting the knowledge of our peculiar problem into practice. Otherwise, as they tone up their flabby marketing muscles, intensify their efforts to get out ahead of competition, and reduce the fat everywhere possible, the rest of American industry and the American economy will pass us by.

Labor Unions Invest in Real Estate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, mindful of the fact that existing welfare and pension funds are being outdistanced by the serious problem of spiraling inflation, union leaders are focusing their attention on a broad, new avenue of investment, real estate syndication.

From initial indications, it appears that millions of dollars each year will be invested in a myriad of sound, conservative syndications, ranging from commercial properties and apartment house developments, to hospitals and nursing homes.

Perhaps the prime factor in unions' consideration of syndications as an area of investment is the necessity to cover members' medical care and life insurance. The fact that the yield on syndications of often more than double that of bonds and savings banks has also served to spark widespread union interest.

This new avenue of investment was opened last fall, when the welfare fund of local 220 of the Food Packers, Cannery & Miscellaneous Workers Union, Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, invested in the Clinton Hill Associates syndication, in Brooklyn, N.Y.

The move was made after considerable and careful study. Approval was granted by the six trustees, representing employers and employees, and the general union membership voted approval of a $100,000 investment.

This action made an enormous impact among many unions. Shortly afterward, the welfare fund of Local 445, Waste Material Union, AFL–CIO, invested $75,000 in a 34-story office building at 575 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

Sydney V. Levy, syndicator of the two projects, who guided the unions on the investments, points out that many of the larger syndication firms have established special departments devoted exclusively to providing information and maintaining contact with labor's pension and welfare funds.

On the other hand, scores of major unions have been assigning their financial advisers and pension and welfare fund trustees to careful analysis of the many syndications available to them.

In pioneering this new area of investment for unions, Mr. Levy has displayed extreme foresight. He recently communicated with AFL–CIO President George Meany, and suggested that labor, within its department of investment, create a special advisory council to study real estate syndications, and provide information on a regular basis to the thousands of locals across the Nation.

By participating in various worthwhile real estate syndication projects, a vast partnership will be created between union members and other investors in the ownership of real estate throughout the country.

Administration Moves To Strengthen REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in a speech before the Western Farmers Electric Cooperative in Anadarko, Okla., on April 14, Rural Electrification Administrator Norman Clapp spelled out details of the administration's program for strengthening America's rural electric cooperative.

The program has two principal goals. First, it would guarantee a secure power supply for cooperatives through insistence on fair power supply contracts or the use of REA's generation and transmission authority to give the cooperatives their own supply. Second, it would link the development of rural power to the broad rural areas development program as an essential factor for creation of new industries. Mr. Clapp also issued another assurance that the question of interregional transmission ties would be fully explored by Federal agencies and the electric industry.

Meeting the demand for rural power is, as Mr. Clapp emphasized, one of our new frontiers and it is most reassuring to see the administration approach this frontier with imagination and above all the determination to preserve and develop the distinctive contribution of the REA and its cooperative borrowers.

I would like to share with my colleagues the April 14 address by Mr. Clapp, who is, I am happy to say, a resident of my own State of Wisconsin:

A SECURE SUPPLY OF POWER

(Remarks of Norman M. Clapp, REA Administrator, at annual meeting, Western Farmers Electric Cooperative, Anadarko, Okla., April 14, 1961)

I appreciate the opportunity to join you here in Anadarko, to meet so many of you for the first time, and to receive the benefit of your long experience with rural electrification. Western Farmers Electric Cooperative is a fine example of the dynamic results that can be obtained through the cooperative approach. You and other federated power cooperatives have proved beyond question that it is sound and feasible for distribution cooperatives to join together to meet a common need for more power and lower cost power.

You have built something here that is tremendously valuable, not only to your member cooperatives, and your consumers, but to our whole Nation. The cooperatives financed by REA have accomplished something more than the physical fact of producing power and delivering it to rural people. I refer to the way in which you did the job. You showed your fellow Americans that it is possible to give reliable electric service, while keeping the public interest paramount. You proved that you could enjoy the benefits of Federal financing, while retaining grassroots control of your cooperatives. The course you followed represents the middle road between commercial power companies, organized for profit, and Government ownership of power facilities. By taking this middle road, REA and its borrowers have made a distinctive contribution to the American economy. It is a contribution that is in the best democratic tradition, and it is a contribution which must be preserved at all cost.

From President Kennedy on down, this administration recognizes the importance of the REA mission. We are solidly behind the REA programs. We already have taken a firm position on a number of important issues affecting the conduct of our agency and the future of our borrowers:

Full and complete authority to make REA loans has been restored to the REA Administrator by Secretary Freeman.

We have made it clear that we oppose any change in the present 2-percent interest rate on REA loans.

President Kennedy, in order to make adequate loan funds available for both the electric and telephone programs, has revised the 1962 budget request to increase the amount of funds for REA lending purposes by $100 million.

In all these ways, and more, this administration is moving toward fulfillment of the President's pledge to "restore REA to its former role of preeminence—freeing it from constant concern over political interference, higher rates of interest, and budgetary starvation * * *."

On February 3, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman translated the President's mandate into a significant set of guiding principles governing the Department of Agriculture's policy toward the REA programs. I endorse these principles, and I assure you that this administration is going to speak as a single voice on matters concerning REA.

Last month, following my confirmation by the Senate as REA Administrator, I announced that we would give power supply problems top priority in the REA electric program. I said that we would make sure that an increasing power supply is developed to meet the rapidly rising demand for rural electricity.

Let me give you some idea of the magnitude of this demand. In 1960, the power requirements of REA-financed systems totaled 29 billion kilowatt-hours. REA power experts estimate that in 1970, these requirements will rise to 68.6 billion kilowatt-hours. In 1985, they say, the demand will climb to 196 billion kilowatt-hours. This is one of the new frontiers this administration is talking about, and we intend to meet it head on.

How are we going to do it?

We are going to pursue an aggressive policy leading toward more abundant power and lower cost power for all rural Americans.

You know that in the past, REA has approved generation and transmission loans under two general conditions:

When no adequate and dependable source of power is available in the area to meet the needs of the distribution system; or

When the rates offered by existing power sources would result in a higher cost of power to the system than the cost from facilities financed by REA.

Personally, I believe that there are many factors which need to be considered in making decisions on G. & T. loans. This whole question of power supply is too complex to be reduced to easy formulas or copybook maxims. With this in mind, we are discussing our power supply policies at REA to make sure they take into consideration all the factors which we believe are significant today.

We do not believe that it is enough to judge the desirability of new generation and transmission starts from the standpoints of

adequacy, dependability, and lower cost alone. We also must be sure that cooperatives enjoy a supply of power—now and in the years ahead—that will guarantee the cooperative device a permanent place in the American power industry. One way you can obtain this guarantee is through power supply contracts that are fair and are negotiated in good faith. The other way is by generating your own power, as you people here are doing. We intend to use our generation and transmission authority when our borrowers are unable to obtain the security they need through power contracts.

I think we have no choice but to apply this criterion—the security criterion. As long as cooperative across the Nation are under fire from commercial power suppliers, as long as there are tricky twists in wholesale power contracts, as long as territorial integrity is threatened, we are going to have to concern ourselves with the security aspects of each power supply proposal we receive. Will it guarantee the continued existence of the cooperative? It is not enough for a supplier to claim that it will not be undersold, if, at the same time, it remains in a position to pull the rug out from under a cooperative.

We all know some of the ways power suppliers have threatened the existence of cooperatives. There is a cooperative in a State adjoining Oklahoma which asked its power supplier for an additional 300 kilowatts to serve a new industrial load in its area. The company declined, saying that its transmission line didn't have enough capacity. You can guess what happened next. The supplier built a tap off the same transmission line to serve the new load itself.

There are many variations on this tiresome theme. Sometimes the supplier puts a dual rate clause in its contract with the cooperative. Sometimes it reserves the right to approve the rates a cooperative charges certain types of consumers. Sometimes companies deliberately underbid our borrowers to secure a big load, even at the risk of suffering a loss. In a few cases, suppliers have offered industries lower retail rates than their wholesale rates to cooperatives.

From this day forward, when an REA borrower negotiates with a wholesale power supplier we want to see a contract emerge from those negotiations which guarantees our borrower adequate power to serve all consumers within its service area at reasonable rates and also provide the necessary guarantees that these benefits cannot be withdrawn at the whim of an unfriendly supplier.

You can put us down on the record now as opposed to any power contracts which call for dual rates or any other type of limitation aimed at denying a cooperative any legitimate consumer. If a cooperative can't get a fair contract, and it asks REA for help, then we are going to have to take a look at the possibilities of generation.

We also pledge that you will be pressured into no more unwilling alliances with commercial power companies as long as this administration holds office.

The trouble with almost all these "partnership" arrangements is that they have tended to bring more benefits to the power companies involved than to the cooperative. Sometimes they seem to start well, but when the honeymoon is over the company gets unreasonable, starts telling the cooperative how to operate, and uses the marriage to apply a little unfair leverage to its partner. Too often the partnership also tends to restrict a cooperative's future planning.

From now on, when we receive a generation and transmission loan application from a cooperative, we are going to examine the proposal you people make on its own merits. We are not going to make you swallow any suicidal counter proposals. If REA makes you a G. & T. loan, we want you to be able to control the power supply without getting the OK from a so-called partner who doesn't share your ideals of low-cost service.

REA is going to be in the fight to help cooperatives maintain their territorial integrity. We know that protecting your territories is becoming a critical problem in many States, and we are going to assist you in solving these problems in every way possible.

We recognize the fact that an abundant supply of low-cost power will not be achieved by REA alone. This administration has stated that the development of natural resources in our Nation and the generation and transmission of electric power in federally owned facilities has had a direct and important impact on the rural electrification program. We favor strict enforcement of the public preference clause in power marketing for power generated at Federal plants.

Upon taking office, I announced that REA will explore, in conjunction with other agencies of the Government and the electric industry, the means and methods of interregional transmission ties so that surplus or secondary power of one area can be used in other areas of power shortage and so that the benefits of low-cost hydropower can be shared more widely by consumers generally.

As President Kennedy made clear in a preelection address at Billings, Mont., this administration wants Federal interties constructed to link power areas served by the big Federal hydro projects. We have an interest in this plan, for we are convinced that interties will help relieve peak load problems and make more electricity available to our borrowers in areas where they have been chronically short of power. The new Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Power, Kenneth Holum, has indicated a desire to work closely with REA and its representatives in planning for these interties.

These backbone Federal interties could well be the first important step toward a concept that has excited the enthusiasm of some Americans—and indignation of others—for a number of years. I refer to the idea of giant power, which envisions interconnecting all of the power pools in the Nation with giant transmission lines. If the idea still seems novel to some, let me say that the concept has no novelty in Europe, where the major industrial nations have enjoyed the benefits of widespread interconnection for years. If the concept continues to arouse protest in this country, it is because the present inefficient method of transmitting power, the lack of interties, has proved extremely profitable for a number of power companies.

We have a number of reasons for being so interested in giant power and the lower-cost power that we believe will result from such a nationwide transmission system. Late last month, Secretary Freeman established a Rural Areas Development Board, with membership from 11 Department of Agriculture agencies, including REA. John A. Baker, the Director of Agricultural Credit over both REA and the Farmers Home Administration, was named Chairman of the new Board.

The objective of rural areas development is to promote more off-the-farm employment for the unemployed and underemployed in agricultural areas today. In 1959, the amount of underemployment on our farms alone was equivalent to 1,400,000 unemployed workers.

Cheap abundant electric power is one of the major factors that can help attract the growth and development of new commerce and industry. You can have a good labor supply, you can have water and transportation, you can have communications—but high electric rates still can turn an industry away. When you have low-cost power—and plenty of it—you see miracles occur in an area. We need look no further than the area of the Tennessee Valley Authority for proof of that.

The REA approach, the cooperative approach, already has proved a sound approach in three different areas. You people proved that a rural cooperative can build lines and distribute electricity. Then you proved that rural cooperatives can join hands and generate and transmit their own power. More recently, the cooperative approach has been used to bring modern dial telephone service to more than 200 rural communities. One of the most successful of these is here in Oklahoma, at Kingfisher.

Now we are faced with new problems—underemployment and a short deal on the food and fiber dollar. I hope that REA and people like you will have a chance to pioneer at least one demonstration project to prove that the cooperative approach—the middle road—can be applied to creating new kinds of community enterprise.

In closing, let me thank your president, Doyle Pope, and his associates on the board of directors, for inviting me here today. Your very active officers and directors, and the aggressive leadership of Elbert Karns, have helped western farmers to keep growing bigger and better with each passing year. Also contributing to your cooperative's getting started and building a substantial system was the fact that you were able to work out contract arrangements with the Southwestern Power Administration, headed by Douglas Wright. All of you are to be congratulated on your achievements.

In all the matters that I have touched on today, and in any other matters affecting REA, I shall welcome your ideas, your counsel, your suggestions and your criticism. The tasks before us will require the best efforts of all of us.

Paying the U.N.'s Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the Hearst newspapers on April 16, 1961. Mr. Hearst points up what are certainly some serious problems—ones which we are all deeply concerned with. A particularly unfortunate situation is that concerning the United Nations:

EDITOR'S REPORT: WE'LL CATCH UP IN SPACE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Sad as it is to relate, the big news of the week—in fact of the century—was Russia's successful orbiting of a man in space.

Yuri Gagarin has become as familiar a name to us in April 1961 as Charles A. Lindbergh was to the Russians in May 1927.

By his solo flight across the Atlantic to Paris, Lindy opened up a whole new era in aviation. By his solo orbit around the world, Yuri has opened up a whole new era in space.

And a column like this, which tries to comment on the significance of the news, cannot ignore either the achievement or its implications.

A nation that has developed (1) the huge booster power to launch a 5-ton vehicle carrying a man and (2) the technological competence to bring him back in buoyant health must be credited with a tremendous breakthrough in the dawning of the new era.

But there is no reason for us to push the panic button. We will catch up. Of that I am certain.

In the first place we have not been caught this time with our space suits down as we were when the Russians put up their first sputnik October 4, 1957. That was a real shocker. The present exploit was expected; it was almost a sure thing.

After sputnik, the Eisenhower administration made a remarkable comeback both in missiles and space satellites. The effort will—I hope—be redoubled in the Kennedy administration. We have achieved at least a standoff in missiles. We have put up more satellites than the Russians, but while more sophisticated they have been much smaller.

The one area—and one only—where we are behind is in developing the big bang. We have gone in for fancy pistol shooting in space. The Russians have concentrated on high-powered artillery.

All this does not let us off from having fuddled and fumbled, and having lost vital time in failing to recognize soon enough the prestige-propaganda-military importance of big space vehicles, and the thrust to get them up.

I notice that Gagarin speaks with almost schoolboy awe of the Russian prophet of rocketry, Konstantin Tsiolkovski (1857–1935), who evolved some of the first theories of multistage missiles. In fact, Gagarin said he studied the works of the prophet in school.

We have our own scientist-prophet, Dr. Robert H. Goddard, who fired a liquid fuel rocket from the farm of a relative at Auburn, Mass., March 16, 1926, and whose findings were the groundwork for the German V–2 rockets at the end of World War II.

Our military men were not impressed in 1926 and the townspeople, thinking him a litle touched in the head, called him Dr. Moony—a nickname that has sardonic connotations now. As far as I can determine, the only publication that did take him seriously was the Hearst "American Weekly," then edited by the late and great Morrill G. Goddard—no relative—but an editor who was also a pioneer in his field.

This is water over the dam, but it illustrates the challenge that now faces us, and one we had better do our best to meet.

For it is only on a basis of strength in space that we can hope to get the Russians to negotiate seriously on the control of space or to take any serious interest in the U.N. Outer Space Committee, which ironically enough they themselves proposed.

Which reminds me of a better-than-usual quip of U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson: "Now that the Soviet scientists have put a man into space and brought him back alive, I hope they will also help to bring the U.N. back alive."

Adlai's phrase is singularly appropriate, because there is serious danger, in my opinion, that the very life of the U.N. may in time be drained away by economic malnutrition.

Certainly the world organization is being subjected to steady starvation by refusal or neglect to pay dues and assessments. In the case of the Communist bloc this is a deliberate rule-or-ruin campaign.

But the Reds are not alone. There are fair weather friends of the U.N. like President de Gaulle of France and the chiefs of the Arab States. They pay only if U.N. actions fit their aims. The Arabs renege on assessments for UNEF, the U.N. force which is in the Gaza strip to prevent outbreak of Egyptian-Israeli shooting. De Gaulle has just announced he won't let French money be used for activities of the U.N., calling it a disorganization.

As if refusals to meet obligations were not enough, there are many nations which make token payments, pleading poverty. Our friends the Latin nations—18 of them now on a growing list—have been delinquent that way.

Call it a hunch if you wish, but my feeling is that—if the U.N. meets its end (and that's concededly a big "if")—it will be via the money-starvation route. I don't like to think of that possibility because I have been stanchly hopeful for the world organization from the start.

When the U.N. was formed back in 1945, many of my associates were skeptical. Although aware of my father's irreconcilable opposition to the League of Nations, I felt differently about the U.N. I shared the U.N.'s aspirations, no matter how dreamy or unattainable some of them may now seem.

But in time it might become quite another story with the American people. The Soviet has welched on at least $17 million it owes the U.N. (without counting 1961) although its assessed share is only 13.62 percent.

The United States not only pays a whopping 32.5 percent assessment, but in addition has picked up some 45 percent of the tab so far for the Congo operation. Plus writing off the costly job we did in airlifting U.N. troops to the Congo.

It is bad for the U.N. to have the United States become virtually a half shareholder. It opens the way to charges that we run the U.N.

Under such continuing circumstances, I am afraid, Americans could start wondering whether we need the U.N. and perhaps turn more in the direction of regional alliances.

Without the United States, the U.N. would be a hollow mockery.

With yesterday's developments the imminence of the Cuban patriots' revolt against Fidel Castro's Communist dictatorship, mentioned here last week, now seems to have gained substance. President Kennedy has considered it diplomatic to say that under no circumstances will U.S. Armed Forces get involved. He has also pledged that the United States won't allow our soil to be used as a takeoff for Cuban exiles to land a revolt force on their native island.

Let's hope this doesn't mean our Government is getting cold feet on the question of getting rid of Castro. In his successful campaign for the Presidency, Jack Kennedy attacked the previous administration for having done too little about Castro.

I believe our Government and our people should do everything necessary to help the Cuban people reclaim their revolution from Castro's Reds. And, disagreeing with the President, I still believe we should use U.S. forces if the Cubans can't handle the job themselves.

We'll be accused in any case of helping the eventual Cuban uprising against Castro.

Sure, some will contend that helping the Cubans oust Castro will embarrass our relations with other nations, perhaps some of our Latin friends who are blind to the peril to themselves.

The answer to them is that we'll be a lot worse than embarrassed if we let Castro go on building his Communist bridgehead off our coast. How can anybody—anywhere in the world—have confidence in our pledges to defend them against the Reds if we stand still while the Commies inhabit a nest just 90 miles away?

When and if the Russians cry "lie" to our pledge of nonaggression my answer is—the Reds respect liars, but never fools.

Senate Resolution 109

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to submit, for the attention of my colleagues, Senate Resolution 109, sent me from the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of the 21st District, Westmoreland County, Pa.:

SENATE RESOLUTION 109

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland and that the people of all Ireland, including the people of Eire and the people of Northern Ireland, should have a free opportunity to express their will for union and that this be attained by an election of the people of all Ireland under the auspices of a United Nations Commission for Ireland, to be designated by the General Assembly pursuant to articles 11 and 35 of the charter, which shall establish the terms and conditions of such election.

(NOTE.—This has been reproduced and forwarded to members and units of our order for the purpose of their soliciting the support of their respective Congressmen and U.S. Senators for this resolution.)

JOHN F. GEOGHAN,
National Secretary,
Ancient Order of Hibernians in America.

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—XV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the 15th in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter:

NOT ALL BAD—CREW LEADERS

"Well, some of the crew leaders they are good. But the majority of them are bad. They are so bad that they are the worst they can be. They try to skin alive the migrants. They take every dime they make."—"Harvest of Shame."

"It seems to me that there are attempts being made to control or punish the migrant crew leader on the assumption that he is not a very desirable person. I would question that philosophy, very seriously."

The speaker was Robert Browning, a serious young man who was health educator in a 5-year migrant project which is one of the most concentrated and unusual sociological studies ever made in the United States.

Browning and others of the migrant project staff utilized crew leaders in one of the significant experiments made during the study.

"We felt that if crew leaders could be interested in passing on health information to members of their crews we could deal with some 500 individuals, rather than 10,000 to 15,000 individual migrants," Browning said.

Project personnel met with crew leaders at night for 2 years.

The crew leaders were volunteering their own time, with no possibility of financial gain, in an effort to learn how better to care for the workers in their crews.

"We had very good cooperation and very high attendance," Browning reported.

In a study of 60 migrants, selected by sampling techniques from five crews on the Eastern Shore of Maryland last summer, Browning discovered that half were involved in some sort of health and medical problem in a 2-week period.

In all but two of these cases, the migrant went to the crew leader, who was involved in some way in getting health and medical care.

Browning says he has heard of crew leaders who take advantage of migrants, but believes they are a small minority.

Work with crew leaders has been only one small phase of the 5-year migrant project, financed by the U.S. Children's Bureau and administered through the Florida State Board of Health.

Project personnel worked closely with other agencies, and occasionally with individual employers of migrants.

"We got cooperation whenever we felt the need for it, and wherever we asked for it," Browning said.

"Because of the existing desire in community agencies for teamwork, it has been possible to work with them toward achievement of desired goals," says a migrant project report.

"One of many examples that could be given is that of a 52-year-old woman who has been referred to vocational rehabilitation for physical restoration. She has no income and is not able to work at present. It is necessary for her physical condition to improve before she will be ready for recommended surgery.

"She receives a food allowance from from county welfare.

"She has special dietary needs, hence the amount she gets from the welfare department is supplemented by the migrant committee.

"The nutritionist helps her plan a medically approved diet.

"The migrant committee also pays this patient's rent. Thus, a voluntary group, by its flexible policy, prevents a farm laborer from suffering because of a gap in resources."

The migrant project has been of special interest in sociological studies because of the design of the study, which stresses throughout the importance of bringing the insights of several different scientific disciplines to bear on the problems of migrant workers.

The day-to-day project staff included a medical social supervisor, public health educator, public health nutritionist, two public health nurses, sanitarian, secretary and liaison worker.

Of particular interest is the role of the liaison worker, a person who is able to mix freely with the migrants on occasion going into the fields to work with them, and who is also trained well enough in the different scientific disciplines to be able to communicate freely with other staff members.

The project, which will be concluded this summer unless current plans for its being carried on for another term are successful, has demonstrated that public health activities can be carried on successfully within the migrant group.

It demonstrates that such generalizations as "you can't do anything with those people" are far from being true.

It also has demonstrated, in action, the genuine concern of the Public Health Service, and thus the country at large, in problems facing the migrant agricultural worker.

Space-Mapping Collegians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the people of Iowa are deeply proud of the role which the State University of Iowa has played in building instruments for our satellites and other space vehicles.

The importance of this work under the direction of Dr. James Van Allen has been reemphasized in an article which appears in the current issue of Transmission, a quarterly magazine published by the Northern Natural Gas Co.

Because I feel that all Members of Congress will be interested in the account of this work at the State University of Iowa, I am asking that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to present this fine report:

SPACE-MAPPING COLLEGIANS

Bankers think it's true; farmers agree. Politicians won't argue the point.

Every plumber will swear by it. Housewives take it for granted. Boys in the street would bet their rusty jackknives on it.

Who, in fact, is naive enough to doubt the thing to get done right now is send men into space? Everybody in the country knows it—except, strangely, the scientists already exploring the great cosmos.

To them there is no race to space. Practical uses of their findings, startling as these may be to the rest of mankind, are of secondary import to the men of pure science.

Yet, because they are avidly inquisitive, space searchers have dropped the flag on a race with themselves, to discover what they can as fast as their curiosity compels them. Fortunately in the United States the runners have the legs, wind—and spurt—of youth.

One place to scout a galloping team of young space scholars is the State University of Iowa. Fifty collegians, some in their teens and early twenties, work there under the foremost specialist in his field.

The assignment: To build diminutive, dependable instruments which explore the vastness behind the wild blue yonder; and to log the facts which those instruments relay from their whirling trips above.

Prime mover of the project is Dr. James Van Allen, a native Iowan who lettered in research at Iowa Wesleyan College and SUI. He returned to Iowa City 10 years ago (at age 36) to head the school's department of physics and astronomy.

At their leader's side, pacing the complement of junior scientists, are faculty members who gained much of their own experience under his tutelage. His fame has spread so far as to attract student assistants from Korea, Bolivia, India, Argentina, Laos, Italy, Japan, and Formosa.

Dr. Van Allen's achievements, earned him the singular honor of having two space "oceans" bear his name. He discovered them * * * a feat declared the top accomplishment in space probes thus far.

These oceans, the Van Allen Belts, are bodies of radiation thousands of miles deep, almost enclosing the globe. At one time the belts were regarded as the worst hazard to space travel by earthlings. Happily now, they appear less of a threat, which can be countered by routine shielding of any manned ship.

Nevertheless work proceeds to follow the vagaries of the belts, trapped in this planet's magnetic field * * * yet bursting on occasion to fire the atmosphere with the glory of northern lights.

Iowa instruments went aloft on more than 100 International Geophysical Year space vehicles. Devices aboard Explorer satellites and Pioneer space probes detected, measured, and charted the radiation zones.

The past and future of radiation exploration have developed areas of stress and high purpose at both ends of the basement of SUI's 50-year old physics building. On one side is the rush to reduce signals, already garnered from space, to intelligible graphs, tabulations, and formulae. At the other end of the converted storage area is ceaseless development, testing, and assembling of equipment for future space rides.

Focal point of the reduction section is the radio tracking station tuned strictly now to coded reports from Explorer VII every time it comes over. The satellite went into orbit from Cape Canaveral on October 13, 1959. It was expected to talk for a year, but hasn't run down yet.

Since that date it has made more than 2,500 passes within range of the university—usually six a day. Its signals are taped each time. And the same vigilant procedure is followed at 17 other stations in such around-the-world spots as the West Indies, Chile, Hawaii, Germany, South Africa, Peru, England, Canada, Ecuador, and Australia.

Word from the celestial chatterer comes to earth like the strums of an eerie banjo, mixed generously with static. While the tones are recorded on magnetic tape they are decoded mechanically and inked on rolls of paper. Zigzag lines sketch the density of radiation through which the satellite is sailing.

Then comes the task of condensing the data to punch cards, already stacked a quarter of a million deep. Each card covers 10 seconds of the Explorer's voyage.

Although Explorer VII has been tracked just 18 months, the student recorders figure they are 7 years behind in digesting the information to a readable state. The process, once manual, has been speeded up by an automatic card-punching machine and two new giant computers.

Balancing the motion in the "reducing" section is the pace in the "producing" end of the business. In equally cramped quarters the student instrument builders have a crash program going.

They are working on more than a dozen separate satellite projects at one time. Three of these have approaching deadlines. The first one, slated for this spring, will carry the school's nickname, "Hawkeye."

The Hawkeye bundle will contain nine Iowa-made detectors: tiny Geiger counters, and transmitters assembled from transistors, diodes, resistors, and capacitors in the thousands. Designing the miniaturized packets and soldering the circuits with microscopic precision are merely the obvious steps in the task. Just as exacting is the choice of parts.

"In a piece of satellite equipment we look for the analog of a man who has such well-balanced perfection in his components that he will live to be 104," Dr. Van Allen has explained. "And we must be able to judge this state of perfection when he is only 1 year old."

Once the assembly is built and operative, it must prove its fitness for strenuous flight. The unit is shaken, slammed with sharp impacts, heated and frozen, subjected to every trial it is destined to encounter—even the noise of the rocket takeoff. After such harsh tests it must operate as accurately as before.

Dr. Van Allen satisfies his zest for knowledge with the certainty that these instru-

ments are more sensitive and reliable than a human being to supply the facts he wants.

Two years ago he tabbed man "a fabulous nuisance in space * * * not worth the cost of putting him up there and keeping him comfortable." He hasn't changed his mind.

When men venture safely into space, much credit must go to this modern-day pathfinder and his youthful, indefatigable proteges. But they won't be after the victory wreath for a race they didn't run.

Increase in Cost of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, neglect of the consumer by various agencies of the Federal Government has become far too common in recent years. This neglect is nowhere more conspicuous than in the manner in which natural gas rates have been permitted to get out of hand. Natural gas prices have risen by more than 40 percent since 1951, during which time the cost of retail goods on the average rose but 14 percent. Even more striking, since January 1958, through September 1960, the price of natural gas to the consumer has gone up 20 percent, whereas in the same period of less than 3 years, consumer prices generally have gone up less than 4 percent.

While a number of factors undoubtedly contribute to this soaring of the price of natural gas to the consumer, a major responsibility must rest on the doorstep of the Federal Power Commission. Its regulatory powers have been exercised in a dilatory fashion, and apparently with a flagrant disregard of the welfare of the ultimate consumer. Testimony before the House Committee on Legislative Oversight last spring revealed constant conferences, meetings, and other negotiations between individual commissioners of the Federal Power Commission and representatives of the various natural gas pipeline companies, but no comparable degree of contact between the commissioners and representatives of consumers of natural gas.

One of the practices of the Federal Power Commission, followed with disconcerting regularity, is that of permitting natural gas pipelines to put into effect a series of so-called temporary rate boosts, prior to final action by the Federal Power Commission. Pipelines which once were required to segregate funds collected as a result of these temporary rate increases and to hold them available for refund to consumers, are now permitted by the Federal Power Commission to use them as capital funds for expansion or similar purposes.

The number of rate increases which the major pipeline companies have promulgated, following one another in rapid succession, is quite impressive. The Tennessee Gas Transmission Co. has increased its rates six times since December 1951 and, in effect, only part of two of these rate increases have been disallowed. Since 1957 its rates have gone up by over a third. El Paso Natural Gas Co. has instituted three rate increase since the beginning of 1958, totaling about $67 million a year. United Gas Pipeline has raised its rates six times since April 1956 in an amount of $46 million annually, subject to final Federal Power Commission approval. Panhandle Eastern has put a rate increase of $22.4 million annually into effect as of September 1, 1958, which has still not been finally acted upon by the FPC. The Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. is collecting rate increases of $28 million since November 1957, still subject to refund.

These rate increases are being paid by the consumers while the Federal Power Commission is engaged in the lengthy process of deciding whether or not to allow them.

As one step, but, I believe, an important one, that will both tend to curb the number of rate increases and also prod the Federal Power Commission to act in a faster, more responsible manner, I introduced a bill recently, endorsed by the National Association of Railroad & Utility Commissioners, which would prohibit the FPC from allowing any change in rates of a natural gas pipeline company from going into effect while there is already a rate increase pending by such a company which has not been finally approved by the Commission. It is high time that this pyramiding of rate increases by natural gas pipelines is brought to a halt. It is high time that the Federal Power Commission act as a responsible efficient servant of the American consuming public.

Action Against Cuba Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, faced with the Cuban crisis, the natural reaction of all Americans is to unite behind our leaders, with President Kennedy at the helm.

Yet would it not be a tragic mistake if we thus gave up our precious right of independent judgment and through which we can benefit from past mistakes.

My own concern is heightened by the fiscally irresponsible $600,000 give away of tax money. That was the inter-American social and economic cooperation program passed by the House today where Congress was asked to vote money without justification of need to nations that may not be friendly in a showdown over Cuba.

Because of this bill, which is improper legislative activity, when this Nation should right now be moving against Castro, I place in the RECORD this editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune. It is high time that we took action against Castro, husband our resources, and learn who are our friends. This is no time to give aid to any who are not on our side and not willing to commit themselves. The editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune]

NO PUNCH, BUT NEAT FOOTWORK

No President ever got himself into a more embarrassing jam in faster time than John F. Kennedy over Cuba. And few Presidents have shown more adroit footwork in disarming the opposition. When one recalls the partisan, Democratic clamor that arose over the U–2 spy plane episode and the criticism to which Mr. Eisenhower was subjected, Republican forbearance has been remarkable.

The facts seeping out of Washington since the Cuban fiasco are to this effect: The Cuban rebel force was armed, trained, and financed by the United States. Mr. Kennedy was acquainted with the existence of the project before he was inaugurated. The responsibility of putting the operation in train was his alone.

That decision could only be reached on the basis of estimates provided by the Central Intelligence Agency. These were so mistaken as to be ludicrous. Very little consideration was given to the possibility of failure. The landing was flubbed from beginning to end. The rebel invaders were put ashore in a swamp, and Castro's forces were waiting to bag them. The dictator may have been tipped off in advance.

The landing party consisted of some 540 men, without air support or covering fire from naval guns. The enterprise proceeded in total disregard of the military axiom that no assault can hope to succeed unless all necessary power is concentrated on a given point. The result was complete failure, with the Communists having a field day reviling the United States.

It is only necessary to recall the Democratic outcry of "brinkmanship" against the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and the unrestrained criticism of President Eisenhower when the U–2 came down in Russia to appraise the vulnerability of Mr. Kennedy's position. Mr. Dulles never took the country over the brink, and the U–2 flights for 4 years provided much useful information.

Mr. Kennedy reacted rapidly. He covered the flop with a speech containing some tough talk before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, managing to enlist considerable sympathy and support.

He then arranged meetings with former President Eisenhower, former Vice President Nixon, Senator Goldwater, and Governor Rockefeller, to plant the implication that there was bipartisan responsibility for the disastrous results of an undertaking which could only be launched on his initiative. He recalled Gen. Maxwell Taylor from retirement to investigate the CIA and review deficiencies in guerrilla warfare methods.

Mr. Eisenhower, as a good soldier, was obliged to say that the man carrying responsibility for foreign affairs must be supported. Mr. Nixon, who had planned soon to make a series of speeches publicly appraising the Kennedy record to date, may have been left with the impression that national unity decreed discretion.

No American enjoys the discomfiture of his country and none will fail to stand fast against the abhorrent designs of the Communists. These facts are not altered by past Democratic attempts to make political capital at the expense of Mr. Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles. Mr. Kennedy is necessarily in charge if the peril mounts.

We were impressed by Mr. Kennedy's forthright statement in Washington. Probably to our Democratic friends' surprise we said that we liked what he said. We still do. But we think the time is rapidly approaching when Mr. Kennedy's strong words, blunt and forthright, must be backed by action just as blunt and forthright. As we are

sure the whole country feels, we are praying that he will be a man of action as well as a man of good speech.

Every administration makes mistakes. Every administration has its embarrassments. It does the country no good to harp on them. But neither does it do the country any good to continue to fumble the ball when you are playing a highly professional outfit such as Khrushchev puts on the field. It's an axiom of professional football that you can't afford many fumbles if you want to win.

Kansas Centennial World Food Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a concurrent resolution adopted by the Kansas State Legislature, extending an invitation for State, National, and international participation in the Kansas Centennial World Food Fair, which is to be held in Topeka, Kans., June 13–25, 1961:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 33

Concurrent resolution extending an invitation for State, National, and international participation in the Kansas Centennial World Food Fair

Whereas Kansas is recognized among the States of this Nation as a leading producer of wheat, has won the popular acclaim of "breadbasket of the world," is a major producer also of other grains, beef, poultry, dairy, and other food products; and

Whereas food production and food trade are common goals of all nations as sustainers of life and industry, benefiting the welfare of all peoples, and contributing to the cause for peace; and

Whereas Kansas is this year observing its centennial of statehood, inviting all its citizens and visitors to celebrate 100 years of achievement; and

Whereas it is most fitting that Kansas, "Midway U.S.A.," invite other countries and other States to join in displaying food and allied products in a large international marketplace provided for this purpose as a feature of the State's centennial celebration; and

Whereas the Kansas centennial world food fair has been certified by the U.S. Department of Commerce for temporary duty-free entry of foreign exhibits under the Trade Fair Act of 1959: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That Kansas extend the hand of welcome and friendship to the countries of the world and to the peoples of other States through the Kansas Centennial World Food Fair to be held at Mid-America Fairgrounds in Topeka, June 13 to June 25, 1961, as a recognized trade show and public exhibition; and be it further

Resolved, That Kansas citizens and organizations, cities, counties, and State, join together in supporting this means of displaying the productive resources of this great State, and the hospitality and friendship of its people; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to send enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, U.S. Secretary of Commerce, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Secretary of State, embassies of foreign nations, to each member of the Kansas congressional delegation, and to the Governors of the other 49 States.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house, and was adopted by that body.

MARCH 20, 1961.

WILLIAM L. MITCHELL,
Speaker of the House.
A. E. ANDERSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Adopted by the senate April 4, 1961.

HAROLD H. CASE,
President of the Senate.
RALPH E. ZARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Are We Giving Up?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that communism poses a real threat to our way of life. The insidious character of this threat is pointed out in the following editorial from the Progress-Bulletin, a leading newspaper of the city of Pomona, Calif. Under unanimous consent I include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ARE WE GIVING UP?

Communistic sentiment is spreading in this country with such amazing speed that it behooves us all to be frightened.

After watching the picture, "Communism on the Map," a prominent Pomona couple went home agreeing that it was time to get ready to live differently, for according to their opinion, we would be under Communist rule within 5 years.

Is it possible that such opinions are justified? Right here in our own valley some educators appear to go out of their way to criticize unmercilessly anybody that has a word to say against Communist activities. Five years ago, had these educators expressed such sentiments, they would have been thrown in jail or at least run out of town. Their statements would not have been tolerated in Pomona or any other city in the land.

Where is the appeal in communism that seems to arouse support right here in this country? Are Americans dissatisfied with their freedoms? Is it a lust for power? Are they craving for the power that the few secure in a dictatorial government? There are plenty of things to be dissatisfied with in this country, but are Americans ignorant of the fact that no other country in the world has such prosperity or gives its individual citizens such pleasurable living?

Recently Adm. H. B. Miller, a retired U.S. Naval officer who is now director of public relations of Pan American World Airways, made a talk before the Public Relations Society of America in which he gave some thought-provoking comments on the crises America is facing. His words were aimed primarily at the professionals making up the membership of the society, but they have significance for everyone who is concerned with the present world crises.

Admiral Miller told of a conversation he had with an American businessman while returning by air from West Berlin. They discused a multitude of world problems. These, the businessman felt, were deeply distressing. Yet he said, "Things could be worse. If Khrushchev weren't in power, we might have someone even more dangerous. Perhaps we ought to be grateful for small blessings."

This, said Admiral Miller, "revealed in terrifying starkness an all-too-familiar American point of view concerning, the challenge of communism." Things could be worse. What do these words mean? It seems to me that they represent an almost childlike desire to believe that this is a world which is not as menacing as surely we must know in our hearts it really is.

"Not for one moment do I believe that my companion and the people who often unconsciously echo him are willing to compromise honor. Unfortunately, however, they appear willing to pass beyond the bounds of reasonableness in yearning for a dream world that does not—and cannot—exist under present conditions." They are, in a sense, victims of their own feeling of good will for mankind. They think, consciously or otherwise, that if we make concessions in the name of peace, the Communists will do likewise.

Unhappily, the high strategists of communism have no intention whatsoever of doing that, for all of their diversionary tactics and their occasional use of seductive and honeyed words. Admiral Miller traces what has been going on in recent months—in Cuba, in Venezuela, and other Central and South American countries, in the Middle East, in Africa, and elsewhere. The pattern is always essentially the same—"riot, subversion and revolution." And, all too often, we are confused, we fail to orient ourselves with events, and we miss their tremendous and ominous significance.

One amazing part of all this is the rapidity with which it has happened. As Admiral Miller recalls, "43 years ago the Communists had nothing—nothing except an idea, a handful of leaders, and a devastated country." Now they control a third of mankind; they are undermining the will to resist of another third, and their drive for world domination continues at full speed.

What, then, has been our basic fault in dealing with this menace. Admiral Miller says this in the course of an extensive discussion: "Communism has provided the only case in the history of the United States with which we have attempted to deal by defensive measures. This is not the way in which we built our Nation. This is not the way we dealt with the Barbary pirates. This was not the objective of the Monroe Doctrine. This is not the way we spread our ideals to the Philippines, or to Liberia. We shall not preserve freedom in a threatened world by politely retreating rather than boldly challenging."

In sum, we must face and fully realize the hazards that confront us. We must move from the defensive to the offensive, to the positive approach. In a phrase, to quote him once more, we need to "breathe life, and vitality, and vigor, into the spiritual pride and heroic traditions that made America great."

Not Our Fight? We Can Lose It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, of the millions of words that have been written concerning what has happened and is happening with respect to the Communist takeover of Cuba and the position of the United States with reference

thereto, the lead editorial in the Cincinnati Enquirer of Thursday, April 20, 1961, states the case more clearly, more understandably and more effectively than anything I have heard or read. It has impressed me so much that I have sent a copy to the President. It is my feeling that every Member of the Congress before he makes up his mind as to what course we should follow with respect to the situation in Cuba should read this editorial:

NOT OUR FIGHT? WE CAN LOSE IT

These are blunt words. They are meant to be. The time has come for them.

The United States cannot afford to let Cuba's freedom fighters be overwhelmed by Russian MIG's, Czechoslovakian arms, and the skills of Red Chinese "technicians."

This is not a campaign that we ordered. We have no quarrel whatever with the admirable people of Cuba. We shed blood in helping them gain their freedom a scant half century ago. We have shared our commercial enterprises with them, been the best customer for their principal product. We stood silently by while a bearded clown expropriated—stole—countless millions of American investments.

We endured his insults. We listened in silence to the ridiculous mouthings of his Communist satrapy, at home and before the forums of the world.

We stood by and heard him denounce the Monroe Doctrine, which has been the basis of peace in this hemisphere for a century and a quarter.

We watched while he imported communism—and functioned as a ready escapehatch for spies and traitors.

It was not our business—we said—to attempt the restoration of freedom to the Cuban people.

But certain things have been made our business.

Despite our denials, despite our disheartening disavowal of support for those who would unseat the small coterie of professional Communists now in control of Cuba, we are being charged in every corner of the globe with having provoked and conducted the almost pitiful invasion efforts.

We are getting the blame for this attempt at Cuban independence, whatever the facts may be. No attention whatever is being paid to our little set speeches, our notes.

The so-called uncommitted nations of the world—and many of our allies—are watching the beaches of Cuba. They are taking note as a dozen Mig's—piloted almost certainly by those Red "technicians"—are straf-ing and blasting away the ill-equipped forces of the tattered army of liberation.

We're worrying—in official quarters—about what may be said in the United Nations and elsewhere if we so much as crook a finger in behalf of the anti-Castroites.

We needn't.

In every corner of the world we're coming to be recognized as the paper tiger reviled by the Red Chinese.

The Red Chinese called us that, and laughed in the faces of our armistice representatives at Panmunjon.

How much harder will they laugh if the supposedly mighty Uncle Sam is frustrated on an island 90 miles from our shores—by the bluster of Communists 4,000 miles away.

Our President, with an army of maps, and all the Nation's radio and television systems in attendance, recently showed how important to our survival was a strip of jungle on the far side of the world, and demanded that Russia forthwith stop furnishing supplies and equipment to the aggressors. We watched. We listened. We agreed with him.

Nikita Khrushchev, it seems, was otherwise engaged. The supplying of the Communist forces in Laos has been stepped up—not stopped. By the time the conference table is reached—if it ever is—Laos will be lost.

This is the Khrushchev who now warns us not to send any supplies or help to the freedom fighters in Cuba.

Well, he told us not to help the freedom fighters in Hungary, and we didn't. All around the world he has been calling the tune—and we've been dancing.

But now it is very late.

By various estimates, between $30 and $50 million worth of military hardware has been shipped into Castro's Cuba.

If resolute action is not taken soon—if we continue to allow the debating society in the United Nations to obscure our national interests—Castro's Cuba will increase in importance as a mighty military base. It will be made into a launching pad for rockets aimed at America's heartland.

How long do you suppose it will take for the triumphant Communists to put the torch to the remnants of the Monroe Doctrine if the MIGs and the 80-ton tanks have the final word in Cuba? How many independent governments of any kind will remain in Central or South America a year or two hence? How many men in public life will dare stand by the side of the "paper tiger," against the devilishly crafty and cruel Communists?

How brightly will the flame of independence continue to burn in places much farther away from this onetime "arsenal of democracy?"

We said, long before it was popular to do so, that with the abdication of Cuba to Castro the Communists had established a beachhead 90 miles from our shores.

Now we say something must be done about it. Before it is too late. If it isn't too late already.

In the Nation—A Check on CIA That Worked Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, my continuing interest in the efficiency and adequacy of our intelligence activities prompts me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Arthur Krock which appeared in the New York Times of April 25, 1961.

The article points out the renewed interest in the need for a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence Matters to evaluate and utilize all intelligence. Since this is my original resolution and as I have sponsored this resolution since 1953, I hope the new task study group appointed by President Kennedy will correct the shortcomings which prompted me to sponsor this resolution.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 25, 1961]

IN THE NATION—A CHECK ON CIA THAT WORKED WELL

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 24.—What the President has officially designated as "a Government-wide study of para-military operations within the Government" will be heavily concentrated on the Central Intelligence Agency, especially on its operating function that many observers think should not be allowed to an intelligence-collecting group. But in the course of the study the four distinguished persons the President appointed to conduct it may also find something of value in the record of a formal supervising committee for the agency that existed in its early period and is remembered as having worked well.

This committee was composed of three high officials—the Under Secretaries of State and Defense and the Director of the CIA. According to those familiar with the committee's history, it reviewed all proposed projects of the Agency, decided whether to approve or disapprove them, reported its judgments to the National Security Council and kept key members of Congress informally advised of CIA operations. One day a week was assigned to the review with whatever additional time was necessary for the reports to the NSC and at the Capitol necessary for the relays.

This check on CIA projects, and the informatory meetings with congressional leaders, must be assumed to have worked well because in this period the agency was not involved in any disastrous failure, such as that recently in the rebel landings in Cuba. Also, the recurrent moves in Congress for a CIA watchdog committee made no headway. Whether a formal supervisory group, constituted as was this previous Government committee, would have vetoed the concept or the timing of the disastrous Cuban adventure, or both, and advised the NSC and the President against it must remain forever in the impenetrable cloudland of speculation.

But some still in Washington believe that if a counterpart of the old committee had been in existence in the last few weeks, and with the same assignment of responsibility for the CIA, the faults of the concept and the timing of the anti-Castro landings would not have been approved, as they were, by all officials of the administration on the top level.

If this opinion is accepted as reasonable speculation, on the basis that the defects of the project would have been urged with the authority and prestige of two members, or even one, of an official supervising group of the CIA, then there is room for the further speculation that the President would have returned the project to the agency for more deliberation and repairs. And, since developments subsequent to the failure in Cuba at least suggest that no definite program was laid out for immediate and positive steps to be taken in event of the failure which occurred, it may be that this program would have been in readiness if a strong dissent had been registered in advance of the expedition by members of a CIA supervising committee.

REVIVAL OF CALL FOR A "WATCHDOG"

At any rate, an inspection of the committee's record would appear to commend itself to the four Presidential appointees to make the forthcoming study—Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Attorney General Kennedy, Admiral Burke and CIA Director Dulles. Findings should be highly pertinent to the expected renewal of proposals that the agency, like the Atomic Energy Commission, be supervised by a joint congressional committee. This relation of Congress to the AEC is established in law. And, though secrecy of projects and operations is as indispensable to the AEC as it is to the CIA, there has been only one congressional leak of any consequence at the expense of the Commission, and that was unimportant in consequences.

The vital element of secrecy in agency activities, however, has been successfully urged thus far against proposals that Congress assume to it a similar legal relation. Though a law to this effect was favored by

Gen. W. Bedell Smith when he was in charge of the CIA, Director Dulles has always opposed it. As a counterpart, he, as did General Smith, frequently briefs key Members of Congress. But this information process is not comparable to that of the AEC to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

The old CIA supervising committee of three took the middle position and regularly though informally kept certain leaders of Congress generally informed. The new study group might profit by reviewing this period.

Hail to Italy and Its Great People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the 100th anniversary of the rebirth of the great and illustrious nation of Italy is an event that will be noted throughout the world with acclaim, enthusiasm, and gratitude.

The proclamation of Turin climaxed the rebirth of Italy under the constitutional rule of Victor Emmanuel the Second.

The great Italian philosopher and historian, Croce, observed that this event might more appropriately have been called a birth, because it was the first time in Italian history in which there was an Italian state with all and only its own people and molded by an idea.

Thus, Italy is no longer the Italy of the Romans, or the Italy of the middle ages, but the Italy of the Italians. But it would be quite impossible to try to separate modern Italy, and the Italy of the Italians, from the glorious ages of Italian history where high orders of civilization fluorished, where art, literature, science and culture were nurtured, where fundamental principles of government and law were originated and developed.

That the unification of Italy under the Risorgimento brought desirable independence, liberty and unity to this great historic nation cannot be doubted, and this movement and its happy consequences constitute valuable milestones in the progress of man toward self-determination and individual liberty.

It would be a colossal task, however, to try even to outline the glorious, momentous contributions of Italy and the Italian people to the enlightenment and high state of civilization which we of the Western World enjoy today.

It would be equally formidable to try to describe the enduring effects of the great, invaluable contributions in war and peace which leaders and people of Italian blood have made to America and its progress. The American people can be very thankful for the truly monumental contributions of past and present generations of Italian blood, especially those that relate to the building and development of this country, which, in all our States, and in thousands of communities throughout the land, are so patently visible, and evoke the gratitude of our people for the gallantry and spirit of sacrifice in war and the long-sustained loyalty, steadfastness, and enlightened leadership and work in peacetime of Italians and Italo-Americans, to develop the strength and promote the progress of our Nation.

Italy is bound to us by many ties of blood, of kinship, of religion, of common law, and culture. It is a loyal and dedicated ally in the struggle to preserve human freedom, an integral and vital part of the free world, the beloved native land of very many noble, devoted American citizens, whose children, like themselves, are increasingly and influentially a meaningful part of the American dream.

I am very proud indeed as a Member of this great legislative body who represents here many fine Americans of Italian blood to join in the tributes that are being paid to Italy on its 100th birthday. My own bonds with the Italian people are deep and very dear. From early boyhood the Italian people have been among my closest and warmest friends and I dearly cherish them. They have sustained and inspired me in ways I could never forget.

I am indeed honored to express my words of congratulations and best wishes to the Italian nation and its wonderful people, on the occasion of Italy's centennial, and I hope and pray that the great Italian nation will continue to grow, prosper, and flower as it has throughout history in the arts, culture, and enlightenment for which it is famous, and in the ways of prosperity and individual liberty so fittingly symbolized by and worthy of its unity and independence.

The Italian people fill an honored place in this Nation and in the world. Their talents, zeal, courage and humane warmth are qualities this Nation and the whole wide world urgently need.

Here in our own land we will continue to hold them close to our hearts, just as they hold others who have won their trust and affection.

I rejoice with Italy and the Italian people on its 100th birthday and pray God that this beautiful, great land and its cherished people may go forward in good health, ever-growing prosperity and happiness and very many happy returns of the day.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include a recent editorial entitled "Risorgimento Saluted," printed in the Worcester, Mass, Telegram Gazette, in the RECORD.

I thank the distinguished editor who wrote this brilliant piece for his inspiration and ideas:

RISORGIMENTO SALUTED

("If it were possible in political history to speak of masterpieces as we do in dealing with works of art, the process of Italy's independence, liberty and unity would deserve to be called the masterpiece of the liberal-national movements of the 19th century in Europe."—B. Croce, in his History of Europe of the XIX Century.)

One hundred years ago, Italy climaxed its "risorgimento," its "rebirth," with the proclamation in Turin, by the first Italian Parliament, of the Kingdom of Italy under the constitutional rule of Victor Emmanuel II.

Croce observed that it might more accurately have been called a sorgimento, a birth, because for the first time in all the ages there was born an Italian state "with all and only its own people, and molded by an idea." Italy, as Victor Emmanuel said, was no longer the Italy of the Romans or the Italy of the Middle Ages, but "the Italy of the Italians."

But whether a risorgimento or a sorgimento, Italy's unification under Victor Emmanuel was part of that same wave of humane enlightenment which swept Europe beginning in the 17th century and had its finest 18th century flowering in the American Revolution.

It is significant in this regard that the book "On Crimes and Punishments," by the Italian humanist Cesare Beccaria was read and annotated by Jefferson, who knew and spoke Italian, and was cited by John Adams in his defense of the English soldiers who were tried for the Boston massacre.

This year, we in America observe the centennial of a war in which our own national unity was preserved. It is therefore all the more fitting that we honor, also, the centennial of Italy's unity. A stanch free world ally—and the country of origin of so many fine Americans—deserves no less.

Promotion of Area Redevelopment in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I thought the Members would be interested in the interpretation of the area redevelopment legislation as outlined by Mr. Solomon Barkin, secretary-treasurer of the area employment expansion committee in New York:

PROMOTION OF AREA REDEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Solomon Barkin, address before the American Society for Public Administration, Apr. 6, 1961)

The United States is on the threshold of pursuing a completely new approach to the problem on area redevelopment. After a battle of some 10 years for establishing new machinery and resources to assist the depressed and underdeveloped areas in the United States, bills have been passed in both Houses of Congress, and an agreed measure will shortly be sent to the President for his signature. Unlike President Eisenhower, whose administration gave lip service to the ideal of helping distressed areas but was philosophically opposed to this undertaking, the present administration is committed to this program and has already initiated plans for the vigorous implementation of the resources made available under the new legislation. The area redevelopment bill will probably become law before the end of the month, and the new administrative organization will be launched immediately. The United States will then join the ranks of other highly developed nations in aiding all areas within its boundaries to share in national prosperity.

The opponents of this legislation have been the political and economic conservatives who have resisted all forms of Government stimulation of local enterprises. They have favored incentives to all business but not specific aids toward local economic

redevelopment. The formal spokesmen have been the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and hundreds of local chambers of commerce, and the National Association of Manufacturers. They have spoken glowingly of the need for community activity and interest.

But the record of the 14,000 local development groups sponsored and serviced in part by these chambers is regretfully uninspiring.

The skeptics of the proposed legislation have largely been the academicians. By digging into the past records of local development groups, State credit corporations and other local and private improvisations, they despairingly concluded that development is an arduous and perhaps futile undertaking. Having been reared in the atmosphere of academic reflection, they counseled an emphasis, if not exclusive preoccupation, on inducements and aids to stranded workers and families to move out of the depressed areas. To them, the new emphasis on development of local areas in order to bring jobs to the areas was untried and reflected extravagant optimism if it was not an outright absurdity. This skepticism was echoed even among some economists who have themselves participated enthusiastically in assisting foreign development programs sponsored by the American Government. They saw no parallel between the two types of activities.

OPPONENTS AND SKEPTICS BYPASSED BY EVENTS

To the opponents, the answer was quite evident. Continued high unemployment, waste, and underdevelopment were intolerable. Local efforts needed the stimulation, guidance, assistance and financial help from the Federal Government. To the skeptic the response was equally clear. Population and labor mobility were already of high order in this country. During the last few years, few areas with a true shortage had developed in this country. Moreover, the displacement from the rural areas was continuing at very high levels and would persist in being the country's most challenging social and economic problem of labor mobility for the next decade or two. Finally, the chapters of economic history written by billions of dollars of American aid in foreign underdeveloped and distressed countries provided promising texts for American domestic endeavors at redevelopment. The point 4 program for the American economy is aid and stimulation of our distressed and underdeveloped communities.

The new American program for area economic redevelopment differs markedly from that presently evident in the United States and in operation in the various European countries. It arises from the peculiar nature of the American governmental and economic system.

AMERICAN AREA REDEVELOPMENT DOES NOT BUILD ON LABOR OUTMIGRATION OR DIRECTED RELOCATION OF ENTERPRISES

Unlike the emphasis in Sweden in area redevelopment, and to a minor extent in England which is trying to relieve distressed and labor surplus areas through outmigration, the new act will place quite incidental stress upon this phase of the program. Provision is made for retraining the unemployed for new jobs and these retrainees may thereafter move out. But the objective is primarily to prepare people to work in the community. It seeks fundamentally to redevelop the existing area, to create new jobs in it, and to fit people to them.

One basic justification for this approach is that unemployment has been widespread since 1957. As noted, there are few areas with real labor shortage eagerly seeking to absorb labor surpluses of other districts. In contrast, the above two countries have had full employment economies and are eagerly looking for people to direct to the many labor shortage areas. Migration to these areas would, as expected by the leaders of these nations, also moderate the inflationary pressures by permitting higher total national output.

In England the aid to distressed areas has been actively tied in with the administration of the permits for new industrial and commercial construction. Intent on preventing overcrowding and overbuilt areas, the Government denied permits to companies which sought to expand in these proscripted areas. It compensated this deterrent with active inducements for relocation in depressed areas.

This approach is, of course, quite strange to the American system of administration and our philosophy of appropriate Federal activity.

The greater number of European programs provide financial aids and inducements for business to locate in specific depressed and underdeveloped areas. The aids consist of outright grants, tax exemptions, low interest rates, and subsidies. In most of these countries these special assists and guarantees supplement an already existing system of highly articulated programs designed to guide the flow of investments and to stimulate industrial development. This governmental program for stabilizing the economy and stimulating growth, through the control of private and public investments, has no doubt been carried furthest in Sweden, which also has the most advanced program for dealing with the problem of labor surpluses.

In nations where governments intimately control, guide, and tax business enterprises to stabilize the economic cycle and to direct their growth patterns, financial aids, and subsidies have helped to reallocate industries to areas designated for special development.

AMERICAN EMPHASIS ON REGIONAL, PHYSICAL, COMMUNITY, AND HUMAN REDEVELOPMENT RATHER THAN FINANCIAL INCENTIVES TO BUSINESS

In the United States we have in the course of the formulation of the current legislation, evolved a very different philosophy of the appropriate function of the Federal Government. The legislation contemplates no far-reaching assists to private industry to locate plants in the distressed areas. In fact, the new legislation specifically discourages movement of existing industry from one area to another. It has an explicit "antipirating" provision which denies aid for this purpose. Moreover, most States frown upon tax exemptions. Only the most underdeveloped areas have spoken of financing construction of new industrial and commercial structures. In the new legislation there are no Federal funds for these subsidies or grants.

The Federal Government will made credit available for such structures at lower rates of interest than are available in the commercial market. But it will be no less than that currently paid by the Federal Government, plus one-half of 1 percent for overhead costs or the 4¾ percent for a 20-year loan. It is hoped that this differential in interest will be sufficient support to the major forms of aid. The primary contribution is, therefore, a lower interest rate to redevelop these areas.

Additional evidence that these programs for the construction of buildings are not the foundation of the new program is provided by the limited sums available; namely, $100 million for the 108 identified distressed labor markets, and another $100 million for the more than 600 rural counties which are likely to be classified immediately as redevelopment areas. Further credit to small private entrepreneurs continues to be available from the Small Business Administration. This agency has set its rate for small business in distressed areas at 4 percent.

The program of providing cheaper credit for industrial and commercial structures is designed primarily for the poorer areas, where funds are not now locally available and where the ultimate in local inducements have to be provided. Larger communities generally have funds to finance local projects. Moreover, the availability of these funds provides tangible evidence of the Federal Government's interest in the program and also are an assurance to the local community that if some pilot projects are necessary to start the redevelopment process, such cheaper credit will be available.

PURPOSE

The goal of the new legislation is not to force the location of industry in the depressed or underdeveloped areas, but to help improve the physical, communal, and human resources to enable them to share in the process of national economic growth. Their competitive position will thereby be improved by determining the line of long-range economic development and the strongest impulse for growth.

By rebuilding the physical surroundings and facilities in the community and upgrading the work population, these areas will be able to participate fully in the national economic advances. Their redevelopment will make the presently dormant or wasted social, private capital, and human resources available to the national growth process, and permit them to stimulate expansion in other areas. Their revival would also enable the Nation to reduce its minimal level of unemployment to below the 3-percent mark reached in the early fifties.

PROGRAMING GROWTH

The first emphasis in the new program of assistance to these areas should be a clear formulation of an economic program for redevelopment and growth. The Federal program will provide an immediate annual fund of $4.5 million for technical assistance to these areas for the preparation of programs. In addition, the distressed areas, regardless of size, will become eligible for assistance with funds for planning under the urban renewal law. The stress will, therefore, be upon helping the local areas diagnose their problems and future, and to formulate a rationale for their future economic growth.

Programing, therefore, becomes one of the key factors in the new area redevelopment movement. The importance of such plans is repeatedly noted in the prerequisite for supporting every submission for assistance with evidence that it will be consistent and conform with these plans. The individual projects will not be hit-or-miss undertakings; they must be blocks in the construction of a new economic pattern which will generate its own growth and expansion. Only through careful preliminary studies and programs will this objective be achieved.

PHYSICAL AND FACILITY REDEVELOPMENT

The second and very crucial provision is the aid to be provided for the physical redevelopment of distressed areas to make them better suited for economic redevelopment.

Throughout the testimony, the witnesses enumerated the barriers to local growth. Programs to remove these barriers could unleash a new vitality within the community; sewage systems, water pollution programs, waterworks, highways, and various community facilities considered essential to preparing the sites and areas for new industry.

These areas have generally lacked adequate public services. Their public expenditures had declined and services have been starved. Even if they were adequately maintained, they would often be insufficient for the newer industries looking for varied modern services. To attract employees of the more technologically advanced industries, there must

be good schools, libraries, cultural facilities, parks, recreation areas, and other similar opportunities. Communities must be made attractive and modern.

These improvements could not be easily undertaken by the depressed communities. Their low incomes and tax revenues acted as a brake on their growth. Another difficulty encountered in these communities is the absence of vacant land for expansion. The older useful land areas are occupied by slums or obsolete industrial and commercial properties. To allow for expansion, these would have to be removed. Present urban renewal laws also limit the development almost exclusively to residential purposes.

The most serious attention was, therefore, focused upon these provisions in the law. The act will provide for loans of $100 million for public facilities and in addition, most importantly, $75 million for grants to communities unable to finance the construction of such public facilities through loans. These sums will be available, in addition to the existing liberalized provisions, for financing community facilities in smaller areas under the Housing Act. In addition, the urban renewal provision of the Housing Act is being amended to permit the establishment or improvement of industrial plants and facilities in redevelopment areas. A serious bottleneck, the absence of vacant land in industrial areas, would thereby be removed.

It is also hoped that other agencies of the Federal Government will be helpful in this undertaking. Specifically, the forestry, highway, park, agricultural conservation, fuels and mineral programs and other public works agencies will be urged to focus specifically on these depressed communities, so that their cumulative impact might hasten the redevelopment plan.

UPGRADING HUMAN SKILLS

The third major part of this program is the provision for the retraining of people for the new occupations and the payment of subsistence grants for the training period, if these people had already exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits. The House bill provides $4.5 million annually for retraining and $10 million for retraining subsistence grants.

A RURAL REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM NOW TO BE ROUNDED OUT

The outlook guiding the program is dramatically illustrated by the additions which the new legislation makes to the unfolding of the rural redevelopment program now being administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This undertaking to help the low-income rural counties has been in operation since 1955. It has been meagerly financed and has depended upon voluntary local groups, colleges, and existing Federal agencies to assign personnel. Its primary achievement to date has been to establish redevelopment committees in over 100 counties. The second step has been to arrange for studies for the understanding of the local problems. Most groups ended their activity with these reports. But others ventured into more practical but modest undertakings to encourage some outlet for or processing of local agricultural products. The tangible results have been meager and the number of new employment opportunities is not impressive.

Now this venture can be reinvigorated. The committees can be revitalized and their horizons broadened. Their planning can become more venturesome. They now can see ahead of them, if needed, funds for the public facilities and credit for industrial and commercial structures, and also funds for retraining local labor resources.

ADMINISTRATION WILL EMPHASIZE PLANNING FOR SUCCESSFUL REDEVELOPMENT

As announced by the Secretary of Commerce, the new administration in the Department of Commerce will act as a leader in the implementation of this program. Its task is to stimulate the communities into action, proselytize the belief in redevelopment and help them in their planning. This is a truly cooperative endeavor, in which the Federal Government aids but does not substitute for local initiative. It is to assist areas in the preparation of the master economic plans which will guide their future program. The creation of the blueprints of growth will be their foremost responsibility.

Upon the completion and approval of this plan, the local groups will have to agree on specific projects which can then be submitted to operating agencies already in existence, for study and recommendations and finally for approval by the Secretary of Commerce. The Housing and Home Finance Agency will review the applications for credit for commercial and industrial structures and community facilities. The Urban Renewal Administration will cover the applications for land use for such renewal projects and for urban renewal planning. The Small Business Administration will deal with applications for financing projects of industrial development agencies. The Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments will deal with the retraining programs. The Agricultural Department will handle the problems of rural communities. These project agencies will be coordinated and guided in their activities by policies and prescriptions set down by the Secretary of Commerce as the responsible head of this activity. In addition, the Secretary is directed to use the facilities and services of other departments, particularly idle or partially idle military installations.

CONCLUSION

The sponsors of the new legislation recognized that area redevelopment legislation is directed toward solving structural dislocations in the economy. Therefore, long-term programs of redevelopment and construction are necessary. The affected communities, industries, physical sites, and the persons involved have to be carefully rehabilitated and redirected in order to fit into the new industrial and economic environment. Merely providing inducements for industry to move into the area have proven inadequate if not largely unproductive. The task is to make the areas attractive to the newer industries seeking sites and areas for location. At times, the stigma of depression has to be removed or the evidence of locational advantages of the area have to be confirmed, and pilot industrial and commercial structures will have to be built to initiate the long-term economic upturn. But there is an underlying conviction that the goal is to create self-generating growth nucleuses and economic complexes which would feed their own growth process.

The major purpose of the legislation is to aid communities to initiate a local program of community physical and human redevelopment so that the capital and human resources may be preserved and utilized; and that the people in these communities will find the solution to their problems through careful study, diligent application, abundant investment and, where necessary, with the encouragement, advice, and the helping hand of the Federal Government.

The new program can make only a minor contribution to the efforts at bringing this Nation out of the depression. It is not designed to provide immediate aids to people in these communities. Other agencies will still retain this responsibility, though it will be helpful to the common effort if they coordinate these efforts with those undertaken for area redevelopment. Moreover, the actual economic prosperity of these communities will in large measure depend upon the realization of a high rate of national economic growth. Only as these areas begin to share substantially in the Nation's prosperity will they contribute significantly to the momentum of the overall growth itself.

Area redevelopment is a program for assuring the fullest participation of all areas in the national economy and the utilization of all human and natural resources, and capital in the promotion of the highest level of production, the standard of living, and employment in the United States. It is a long-term undertaking for maximum national prosperity.

A Century of MIT—A Dream Fulfilled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to extend to the president, teaching staff, student body, and alumni of the illustrious and world famous Massachusetts Institute of Technology my very heartiest congratulations upon the 100th anniversary of its establishment.

This institution started from very humble beginnings 100 years ago. As it grew through the years it changed its base of operations, first, from Summer Street and then, Back Bay, Boston, to the present extensive facilities on Memorial Drive, Cambridge, and it is continuing to grow, not only in physical plant, but in rapidly increasing usefulness to the Government, American industry and the scientific world.

So renowned have been the contributions of this great institution in the fields of engineering, technology, research, and development, science and industry, that I would not venture to try to evaluate the most beneficient and deeprooted impact it has exerted upon the growth and development of modern civilization.

The history of this truly great Massachusetts institution has, indeed, been a saga of accomplishment far beyond the wildest dreams of its founder, Dr. William Barton Rogers, a record of achievement so vital and crucial in many respects as to defy full analysis, a shining epic in shaping the life of men and affairs in the 20th century.

MIT has been an admirably organized team operation in the best sense of the word, and outstanding leadership, outstanding teachers, outstanding scientists, engineers and administrators have played effective roles in the work and expansion of this great scientific institution.

MIT has produced many great leaders who have taken their place in the topmost ranks of American educators, engineers, scientists, and businessmen. It

has reared generation after generation of the most valuable and useful technically trained experts. It has greatly benefited our economic system and industrial structure and has contributed inestimably to the Government both in war and peace in remarkable and fabulous ways through extending the horizons and boundaries of scientific knowledge and bringing it into play industrially and practically in implementing the miracles and marvels of the space age.

On MIT's 100th birthday many dignitaries of science and technology gathered from all corners of the earth to hail the occasion and to participate in the various programs of celebration and enlightening scientific discussion.

From Europe, the Near East and Asia and elsewhere outstanding scientists, political leaders and other great minds have come to celebrate the occasion. The distinguished Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the distinguished American Secretary of State, a notable member of the British Parliament and others joined in some of the programs.

The American people and Government entertain highest admiration and deepest gratitude for the magnificent contributions of MIT throughout the years.

It is my hope and prayer that these contributions will continue to grow, and that they will, as in the past, be directed toward the building of a greater, free, humane, scientific community in our great country and in the world, which in the space age will greatly help to bring the choicest blessings of peace, plenty, and happiness to mankind, and exalt the free spirit of man.

Import Quotas on Textile Imports: Brief Affirmative Statement

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I hope consideration will be given to imposing country by country, category by category quotas on textile imports. In my opinion the American textile industry finds itself in a critical position. Something must be done to improve the situation if the industry is to survive.

May I point out that imports of textiles have grown from about 73 percent of exports in 1954 to 170 percent of exports today. Meanwhile textile consumption has declined; cotton goods, to cite one example, from 30.9 pounds per capita in 1950 to 23.8 pounds in 1960.

As a result, 838 cotton textile mills were liquidated between 1947 and 1960. Unemployment in the textile industry resulting in large measure from import competition is estimated at 225,000.

Hourly earnings in textiles average about 30 percent under those of manufacturing workers in general, yet they cannot be increased because our textile industry already finds it impossible to compete with low-wage, modern industries from other countries in our domestic and in many foreign markets.

Textile industry profits continually range below the average for manufacturing as a whole. They were 3 percent lower in the third quarter of 1960.

Small wonder that we cannot compete when one realizes that in foreign countries our cotton can be purchased at 8 cents a pound advantage over our domestic mills.

Foreign nations are establishing textile industries geared not to their own markets, but to the lush American market. It is uneconomic and unfair even to them not to limit the quantity of textiles they can export to us. I say this because it is to the longrun advantage of such countries to establish industries which contribute more to their own development than to rely on industries which contribute only temporarily to solving their own economic problems.

Our textile industry ranks next to steel as essential for our defense. It is mandatory that we keep it strong.

It seems to me that import quotas would not be unfair. They would tend to equalize the position of our domestic textile industry in competition with those of other countries.

At present there is little incentive for increased investment and modernization in the industry. Research and development are falling behind. It is imperative that something must be done to remedy this situation.

Although other actions might be taken to alleviate the serious financial condition of our textile industry, the real solution is country by country, and category by category quotas on imports. My belief is that we should establish such quotas by country and by category.

The Cabinet Committee appointed to consider this problem has been studying the matter and it is hoped that action soon will be taken to help assist the textile industry. It seems to me that the remedy which I have suggested is the course that we should follow. There should not be a delay in adopting a country-by-country, category-by-category quota system in the textile field. This I am sure will be of benefit to all concerned.

Maj. Gen. R. L. Vittrup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, for the past 20 months the Congress has been most fortunate in having Maj. Gen. R. L. Vittrup as Chief of the Army's Office of Legislative Liaison. The outstanding service rendered by General Vittrup have proved invaluable to the individual Members and committees of the House of Representatives in obtaining a clearer understanding of the roles, missions, and requirements of the Army. Also he has been of great assistance in providing answers to inquiries posed by our constituents concerning Army policies, procedures, and operation. I am sincerely sorry to see General Vittrup leave but I am pleased to note that on April 1, 1961, he was designated the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel where his distinctive capabilities will continue to be utilized by the Army and our country. I am also pleased to note that he received a well-deserved promotion to lieutenant general on the same date.

General Vittrup has had a truly outstanding career. He entered the U.S. Military Academy from Texas and graduated with the class of 1929. Prior to World War II, he served as an infantry company officer for 63 months, student and instructor at the infantry and tank school, student at the command and general staff college, and instructor at the U.S. Military Academy.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor, General Vittrup was assigned as Assistant Secretary of the Army General Staff. A short time later he became Assistant Secretary to the Joint and Combined Chiefs of Staff where he worked on the overall planning and operations of World War II. He also was the first Secretary of the Joint Strategic Survey Committee. In 1943 he was assigned to the Allied Force Headquarters, first in North Africa, and then in Italy. He participated in the planning and execution of the Allied invasion of Italy, southern France, and Germany during 1944 and 1945.

After the war General Vittrup progressed through a variety of assignments of ever increasing responsibility. In 1945, he was assigned to the Operations Division of the Army General Staff serving first as liaison officer between the War Department and the State Department and then as Chief of the Policy Section of the Strategic and Policy Group. During the later assignment he traveled about the Far East negotiating disposal of military materiel in the Western Pacific. Upon completion of his studies at the National War College in 1948, General Vittrup served as G3, U.S. Army Caribbean and Command of the 33d Infantry stationed in the Panama Canal Zone. After a tour as instructor at the Army War College he became Chief of the Army Section of the Joint U.S. Military Advisory Group in Greece. On his return to the United States, he served as Chief of the Operations Division, G3, Army General Staff from October 1953 to August 1955. In August 1955 he became Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff of Military Operations—International Affairs—and concurrently the U.S. Army Delegate to Inter-American Defense Board; the Permanent Joint Board of Defense-United States/Canada; and the Army member of the Mexican-United States Defense Commission and the Brazilian-United States Defense Commission. These duties provided a wealth of experience in worldwide Army operations and in international relations.

In 1956 General Vittrup became Commanding General of the 24th Infantry Division in Korea and subsequently

Chief of Staff of the Army Forces Far East, 8th Army. Then in 1957, he was designated Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Operations for the U.S. Army Pacific. While in this capacity he was sent to Indonesia to negotiate sale and delivery of certain military supplies and equipment to that country. In July 1959, General Vittrup left Hawaii to assume his duties as Chief of the Office of Legislative Liaison in which capacity he served with such distinction.

I know that all my colleagues in the House will join me in expressing our warm thanks to Lieutenant General Vittrup for his past services in our behalf and to wish him every success in his new assignment.

A Military Code of Ethics and a Step in the Right Direction by Secretary of Defense McNamara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the directive of Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, issued April 14, 1960, No. 1000.8, concerning the acceptance of gifts; use of Government facilities, and use of official representation funds, be printed in the RECORD.

I have long sought to see a code of ethics for guidance of officers and employees of the Department of Defense which would be enforced. As chairman of the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the Committee on Armed Services of the House, I have conducted many inquiries into this general area.

Congress has been promised time and again that there would be a code of conduct set up; that action would be taken to curtail abuses; that direction would be given; and that there would be restored a standard of ethical values which could be clearly understood and enforced.

The standards contained in this directive reflect the Secretary's own personal high ethical standards. They are a decent set of rules by which the personal integrity and the official responsibility of members of his Department can live.

I am gratified at the spirit which prompts this directive. It follows soon upon the Secretary's assumption of office. I look forward, as I am sure do the Members of Congress and a waiting public, for the cure which it is intended to effect; and for the standard of personal integrity which it will create.

There is little time to be lost. Many excesses, in the past, have gone unchallenged and unpunished because there seemed to be a vacuum which personal standards did not always fill—sometimes at very high level.

Now there is a code of ethics.

I think, however, this code should be considered only as a beginning. Conscientious administration and observance will make it meaningful.

I congratulate the Secretary for this prompt and discerning action:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE

(Subject: Acceptance of gifts; use of Government facilities, and use of official representation funds)

I. Purpose:

This directive sets forth standards of conduct for Defense personnel with respect to the acceptance of gifts, the use of Government facilities, property and manpower, and the use of official representation funds. Its provisions apply to all military personnel on active duty and to all civilian personnel.

II. Acceptance of gifts and use of Government property:

(A) Defense personnel shall not—

(1) Accept any gift, favor or hosiptality for themselves or their families from any enterprise or person doing business or seeking to do business with the Department of Defense which might reasonably be interpreted by others as being of such nature that it could affect their impartiality;

(2) Personally use or permit the use by others of Government facilities, property, manpower or funds for other than official Government business.

(B) The tender of any gift, favor, or hospitality which might be considered to be in the nature of bribery shall be reported immediately through departmental procedures to the Department of Justice and the General Counsel of the Department of Defense. Any questions concerning what might be construed as bribery shall be resolved in favor of reporting the incident.

(C) Gifts from foreign governments shall be handled in accordance with DOD Directive 1005.3.

III. Official representation funds: Use of official representation funds shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, or the Secretaries of the military departments. Funds are to be utilized only for official entertainment to maintain the standing and prestige of the United States by extending official courtesies to certain officials and dignitaries of the United States and foreign countries.

IV. Use of Government facilities, property, and manpower:

(A) Government facilities, property, and manpower, such as stenographic and typing assistance, mimeograph services, and chauffeur services, shall be used only for official Government business.

(B) Special mission aircraft shall be used only for official purposes and such use shall be approved by the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chiefs of Staff, Army and Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, or the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

(C) Motor vehicles:

(1) Full-time assignment of official vehicles to officials of the Department of Defense at the seat of government shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense or the Deputy Secretary of Defense. Full-time assignments at field installations will be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the military department concerned. (2) Defense personnel authorized full-time use of official vehicles shall not use such vehicles for other than the actual performance of official duties. Vehicles authorized on a full-time basis shall not be reassigned to others not entitled to such use.

(3) Other administrative use of motor vehicles shall be authorized only when official transportation is essential to the successful operation of activities of the Government.

(4) Use of motor vehicles, whether authorized on a full-time or trip basis, is not authorized for the official concerned, members of his family, or others, for private business or personal social engagements. Questions with regard to the official nature of a particular use shall be resolved in favor of strict compliance with statutory restrictions.

V. Implemention: Two copies of instructions in implementation of this directive will be forwarded to the Secretary of Defense within 30 days after the effective date of this directive for approval prior to promulgation.

VI. Effective date: The provisions of this directive are effective immediately.

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense.

The Honorable Virginia Duff, Lady Legislator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include an article which appeared recently in the Dallas Morning News relative to Miss Virginia Duff, of Ferris, Tex. Miss Duff is a member of the Texas State Legislature since 1950. I have counted her as one of my close friends since that time, and it gives me great pleasure to be able to have these few words inserted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

OWNS ONE HERSELF—FERRIS' LADY LAWMAKER KNOWS FARM PROBLEMS

(By Eddie Hughes, News staff writer)

FERRIS, TEX.—A little lady lawmaker from Ellis holds no fear of political rivals slinging mud at her.

In fact, Miss Virginia Duff, a State representative for 11 years, has a deep love for the soil.

And ever since she first decided to throw her bonnet in the political ring, she has been throwing male political opponents for a loss.

She estimates that she travels 4,000 miles a year around the county, talking with farmers so that she can better cope with all sorts of problems—real or imaginative—that face the residents of her district.

For this, and her straightforwardness in supporting or opposing bills that come before the Texas Legislature, the 40-year-old lady farmer and lawyer owns the respect of all her fellow representatives.

Miss Duff believes women are naturals for politics. She is one of three serving as representatives in the 57th legislature.

"Special groups hesitate to put pressure on women," she declares.

Miss Duff lives in a comfortable white home smack in the middle of her 50-acre farm west of Ferris, where she raises a yearly crop of cotton, wheat, and maize.

With a firsthand knowledge of farm problems she has served on many agriculture committees during her six terms and recently headed a study committee which proposed a closer state check upon local water projects.

She is fiercely proud of her great-great-grandfather, a pioneer who attended the first Texas Legislature and helped found Ellis County.

Miss Duff entered her first political race in 1950 for State representative of Ellis County. "I was elected on my 30th birthday, and my life's ambition was realized."

In that first try, she defeated two men—one in a runoff—then in her second go she beat another male. During one election, the citizens of Ferris gave her 93 percent of their votes.

In the 1960 election last spring, Miss Duff was opposed by four men. Three were eliminated in the regular election, and the remaining opponent was defeated in the runoff.

During her off moments—if there is such a thing—Miss Duff practices a little law in Ferris, digs a few potatoes at the family farm, and personally tries to answer some 100 letters a week from voters who regard their lady lawmakers as a 24-hour public servant.

The Dutch Need Our Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy is currently engaged in conversations with President Sukarno, of Indonesia. All of us are aware, I am sure, that these discussions include the disposition of West New Guinea.

The situation simply is that Dr. Sukarno wants the Netherlands to get out so that Indonesia can move in. Up to this point the United States has remained on the fence. Personally, I think it is about time that we stood by our friends, the Dutch.

The Dutch, we know, fought beside us in World War I and in World War II. And, because the United States was an ally of the Dutch during World War II, Dr. Sukarno has criticized us. He believes that we should have forced the Dutch to yield West New Guinea to Indonesia. Influenced by Marxism, he has also been motivated by the doctrine that a big capitalist power must of necessity be imperialist. However, the record shows that in the case of West New Guinea this is not true.

The Dutch spend $27 million each year to give West New Guinea its government. Their 10-year program has produced a largely native legislative council. The Dutch, because of this expense, is willing to leave this island, but they desire that the Papuans, the natives of West New Guinea, have a chance to determine their own fate. In fact, the Dutch welcomed a recent Malayan proposal to hand over this possession to a three-nation United Nations trusteeship, but Dr. Sukarno continues to block this move.

Mr. Speaker, I have been using the title "doctor" in my references to Sukarno. Well, he calls himself "doctor" on the strength of a degree in engineering at the University of Bandung. But, his engineering skills have never been in building bridges. It has been in crossing them.

The first major opportunity for Sukarno to cross a political bridge was in March 1943 when the Japanese promised Indonesia independence to gain his support. The Japanese made him president of an appointed council, which they were supposed to consult. Sukarno shortly went to Tokyo to thank Japan for this so-called step toward self-government. Meanwhile, Netherland soldiers, sailors, and airmen were bitterly engaged in a war of survival against the Japanese. Japan's esteem for this collaborator was shown when it decorated Sukarno with the Order of the Sacred Treasure for his wartime service.

Sukarno is regarded as an Asian uncommitted to either the Western democracies or the Communist bloc. He believes in dealing with both and with getting aid from any source. But, the similarity between Sukarno's conception of government and the Communist pattern has not been lost to observers. In fact, the Communists have performed the function of agitators and propagandists for Sukarno. This is surprising when one considers that he called on his people to put down a Communist revolt in 1948.

Sukarno, Mr. Speaker, stresses that "democracy is not merely government by the people; democracy is also government for the people." Perhaps this is why his government is infiltrated by Communists. Recently he banned four political parties including the pro-Western nationalist PIR. But, he allowed the Communist PKI and the Communist Murba to exist.

In January of this year, Gen. Abdul Haris Nasution, Indonesia's defense minister, went to Moscow and came back with $450 million in military aid after U.S.S.R. officials had publicly pledged themselves to help Indonesia take over West New Guinea.

The Netherlands want self-determination for the Papuans, who, by the way, are not Indonesian. The fate of West New Guinea was undecided by the Indonesian Treaty of 1949 because its people and problems are extraordinary. Sukarno claims it on the grounds that Indonesia is the legal heir of all the Dutch Indonesian possessions. This is a dubious claim, and although the Dutch are willing to go to the World Court to settle the dispute, Sukarno refuses this or any other logical solution.

What he wants is to distract the attention of his people away from the failure of his own government.

Mr. Speaker, Sukarno served Japan when we were at war with that country. He has been friendly wth the Communists and has openly accepted their aid. He has refused to accept the result of a plebiscite in West New Guinea, probably because he is afraid of the results. As long ago as 1950, two Papuan leaders, Nicolaas Jouwe and Markus Kasieppo, speaking for their countrymen, said they preferred to remain under the Dutch. The dominate attitude of Papuan leaders today—though sometimes critical—is loyal to the Dutch.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that President Kennedy does not encourage Sukarno's pretention and I hope we can be able to take a positive position on behalf of the Dutch. Also, Mr. Speaker, I am happy that Sukarno was not asked to address this Congress, for if he had been asked I, for one, would not have been present.

Committee on Consumer Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the pleasure of testifying before the House Rules Committee on behalf of my House Concurrent Resolution 15 and House Resolution 42. I would like to commend to the attention of our colleagues my remarks at that time:

STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT OF NEW YORK; IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 15 AND HOUSE RESOLUTION 42, BEFORE THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE, APRIL 25, 1961

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the opportunity to appear here this morning on behalf of House Concurrent Resolution 15 and House Resolution 42, which I introduced on January 3.

These resolutions are both designed to accomplish the same end, the protection of the interests of the consumer.

House Resolution 42 would provide for the creation of a select committee of the House to be composed of 15 Members appointed by the Speaker. House Concurrent Resolution 15 would provide for a joint committee composed of 7 Members of the House and 7 Members of the Senate. I have introduced measures similar to these in every Congress since the 83d.

A committee such as that proposed by either resolution would be impowered to investigate, conduct studies and report to the Congress on the status of the consumer in the American economy.

Many observers have often thought that strict regulation of the monetary policies affecting our economy would alone achieve economic stability and provide the consumer with adequate protection of his interests. We have seen the sad results of such narrow thinking in the inability of the American business community and the Federal Government to prevent either inflation or deflation. It has become obvious that many other factors must be dealt with to prevent inadequacies and imbalances which periodically occur.

It is generally recognized that the monetary and credit policy instruments of the Federal Reserve System played an important role in the efforts to make the impact of the 1954 recession easier to absorb. Similarly they performed this service in the inflationary movement of the 1955–57 period and in the recession of 1958. They did not, however, prevent these economic crises from occurring, nor did these policies in themselves correct the situations.

It appears clear that a full investigation is urgently needed of wages, prices, employment, and the other factors which affect the consumer if we are to avoid this continuing cycle of inflation-recession that we have experienced in the fifties.

Some of the tasks of a committee such as is called for in my resolution would be the

study of classical inflation and deflation caused by decreases in the effective supply of money and credit and an investigation of the effect of monopolistic or quasi-monopolistic practices on prices, production, and employment. We have seen exposed recently an aspect of this latter problem in the conviction for price fixing of officers and directors of some of our largest electrical manufacturing companies.

Other matters we would hope the proposed committee would study are the effect upon prices, profits, production, and employment of increases in wages, of government expenditures, taxation, monetary and debt management policies, and international influences.

From the consumer's viewpoint the prices charged for cost-of-living items such as food, fuel, and clothing, and the availability of these items, are of utmost importance and the special function of the committee would be to attempt to determine the variables which influence these aspects of the consumer interest.

The results of an investigation and study of these problems would immeasurably increase the effectiveness of the Federal Government and the business community in guiding us along a path of continuing prosperity and progrress.

I strongly urge this committee to favorably report either House Concurrent Resolution 15 or House Resolution 42, or in the alternative, my resolution, House Resolution 62, which would give to the Banking and Currency Committee jurisdiction over these problems, in which event that committee could conduct the necessary investigations and studies.

Big Little Town in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, a tornado struck the small town of Italy, Tex., located in my congressional district. I immediately wired the city council and the editor of the local newspaper advising of the President's disaster fund and how they could apply for assistance. The mayor replied to the effect that the Federal Government needed the money more than the town of Italy and that it should be applied to reducing the public debt.

The editor of the paper, Mr. Russell W. Bryant, wrote several editorials with respect to the courage of the people of Italy in turning down Federal assistance. I think they are to be commended and personally wish to pay my respects to the mayor, the Honorable Robert Windham.

[From the Italy (Tex.) News-Herald]

WERE WE SURPRISED

Naturally, city officials and the editor of this newspaper expected some attention for the community when the offer of Federal disaster funds was turned down, but no one could possibly have anticipated the tremendous nationwide response it touched off.

Telephone calls began coming in a few hours after the telegram was sent Congressman TEAGUE. Then telegrams, and then an avalanche of mail that caused the Italy post office to look like Christmas last Friday and Saturday mornings as they opened sack after sack of first-class mail. It was still coming in Wednesday of this week.

The expression of surprise on the face of Little Italy in the cartoon appearing on this page could not have been more accurately depicted had Harold Maples, the Fort Worth Star-Telegram artist who drew it, been here to see the faces of those who brought about the whole thing. The cartoon appeared in the Star-Telegram last Thursday morning.

The offer of aid was turned down in all sincerity because it had already been determined that, while total damage was high individual losses were relatively low and for the most part covered by insurance. It was felt that a disaster area designation would be of more harm than benefit.

There was absolutely no doubt about Italy being better off financially than the Federal Treasury because during the time the Federal debt has increased $30 billion, the city of Italy has increased services to its citizens, reduced the tax rate 25 cents on the $100 valuation, and created a surplus more than sufficient to retire all bonded indebtedness.

At the time of rejection it was not known whether the aid might amount to a few hundred dollars or several million. It now appears that there wasn't much turned down after all—except an opportunity for the Federal Government to send in bureaucrats to do a lot of dictating to us. The city might have gotten some money to repair the city hall. It is doubtful if 1 cent could have been obtained by private citizens. Little better is the offer of small business loans that were made available after rejection of the first offer. No loan will be approved for doing any more than rebuilding exactly like the original structure, except where building codes prohibit it.

The Federal Government has been working a cruel hoax on the people of this Nation. It takes their money through excessive taxes on the pretext of offering greater service, and then when aid is needed or wanted it is doled back in most meager amounts and under degrading conditions.

Congress might well send a committee to Italy to read the wonderful letters from all over this United States of America. (Many letters show carbon copies to the President and various Congressmen.) They would find that Americans, from 12-year-old youngsters to men and women whose writing is so quavery as to be almost illegible, are deeply concerned about Federal spending and Federal debt; that they have been fooled about just how much the Federal Government pretends to do for its people.

Italy has apparently not rejected nearly as much as it, and others throughout the country, thought. It has stirred the American people by its action, however, and—as so many expressed hope—may prove a turning point in Federal giveaway programs. Although Italy's action was not mentioned, there was a report this week of a Dallas veteran returning three compensation checks for a minor World War II disability to Congressman OLIN TEAGUE.

Regardless of what may have come to Italy under the Federal program, it appears we stand to gain more by turning it down. One company wrote that Italy will be considered in an upcoming plant expansion program, and two men were here the rest of the week to discuss locating a new plant here.

[From the Italy (Tex.) News-Herald]

CREDIT WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

On May 21, 1947, the citizens of Italy closed up shop, donned their work clothes, cleaned, scrubbed, and repainted their store fronts in their first "Good Neighbor Day"—an appellation given the event by the late Raymond Vanlandingham. Everybody helped everybody else without thought of credit, pay, or praise.

Sunday night this same spirit was again in evidence as they joined hands to lay plans for a gigantic cleanup of tornado damage.

Possibly some of the experience gained in that big publicity promotion 14 years ago was unconsciously applied to the present situation. Possibly it was just levelheaded leadership on the part of some who hold positions of leadership and others who do not.

Obviously, it is a physical impossibility for the News-Herald to learn the names of all who worked through the night Sunday and Monday and Tuesday—or who did not work—so names of local people are being eliminated from all accounts as much as possible. It is assumed that everyone did all they could do—it is known that some exceeded all reasonable expectations—and it is likewise assumed that those who were not observed shouldering their part of the load were either not seen or had good reason for not helping.

Some have received attention in out-of-town newspapers and on radio and television, while others who did equally as much, or more, went unrecognized. This is not due to self-seeking, but rather to having been at a given place at the time a reporter happened to be there. Some errors were made in giving credit—even as the News-Herald would make some if it tried to give credit where credit is due—but the News-Herald will not attempt to correct stories appearing in other papers.

Mayor Robert D. Windham has been extensively quoted, much to his embarrassment, and he has asked that it be explained it is the office being recognized and not he personally. The same holds true for the editor of this paper who has been contacted by newsmen acquaintances and used as a source of information.

An attempt will be made to list outside groups who have assisted, with the certainty that some will be omitted because they were not known to have been here or have been forgotten in all the confusion.

They are as follows: Constable Herschel Smith, of Avalon, who was able to pick up a radio plea for help and retransmit it to the sheriff's department in Waxahachie; the sheriff's department which was on the scene within 30 minutes after the tornado hit, accompanied by ambulances from the two Waxahachie funeral homes and the Ellis County Emergency Corps with its firetruck, power generator, portable lights, shortwave radio, and a wrecker unit; State highway patrol units; ambulances from Frost & Cleburne funeral homes; wreckers from a number of garages; Salvation Army personnel from Waxahachie, Corsicana, and Dallas, the latter setting up a canteen truck within an hour and a half; the Waxahachie National Guard unit with floodlights, portable generators, jeeps, walkie-talkie radios, guardsmen to patrol the streets, and a field kitchen that prepared and served breakfast about 5:30 a.m.; Hillsboro fire department emergency truck with fire extinguishers, portable generators, and floodlights; the American Red Cross, which set up emergency headquarters in the American Legion auditorium about midnight and had a canteen truck here Monday morning; all four county commissioners who furnished men, trucks, loaders, and cranes; State highway department men and trucks from Waxahachie and Ennis; city of Waco, with two trucks and six men; eight power company crews with full equipment, including two large generators; telephone and gas company crews.

Numerous communities radioed offers of help Sunday night but were told all was under control.

The News-Herald wishes it had the name of every person, local and out of town, who helped; the space in which to list them and their deeds. Many of these people worked without letup from the time the tornado hit

until darkness closed in Monday night. Many returned Tuesday morning for another full day, and again Wednesday.

May we say only that the most minute act of assistance is as highly appreciated as the most sacrificial, and that credit can only be given where due by each individual who knows what he did.

Smithsonian Institution's Hall of Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today I have written to Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, to request information on plans for the exhibits on coal, steel, and related industries at the new Museum of History and Technology.

Some time ago I received a press release from the National Coal Association calling attention of residents of mining communities to the need for tools and equipment to be displayed in the new Hall of Coal. I am interested in learning whether adequate material has been obtained by those in charge at Smithsonian; if not, Members of Congress from mining regions could undoubtedly perform an important service by giving publicity to the project.

The people of Pennsylvania have a basic interest in the proposed exhibits on coal, steel, and related industries. Our history is closely associated with the early use of the ironmaking process developed by William Kelly. Some of the earliest commercial coal mines in the United States were operated in Pennsylvania.

The exhibits at the Museum of History and Technology will give American and foreign visitors alike an opportunity to understand the outstanding advances that have taken place in these industries. The building can be one of the most effective media of pointing up the progressive nature of the U.S. coal and steel industries.

For some time coal has been accused of being a backward industry. Critics have found it convenient to blame many of the industry's problems on lack of foresight. The fact is that the coal industry has an outstanding record in improvement of productivity through research and technology. With the cooperation of a progressive union, the United Mine Workers of America, coal management has installed such highly mechanized mining processes that today coal is selling at the mine on an average of 26 cents per ton lower than the price a decade or more ago.

This is the information that needs to be brought to public attention. Coupled with data on coal reserves, it will serve to provide assurance of a continued energy supply for centuries to come. It will also notify visitors from abroad that America has a vast storehouse of energy that can be utilized either as an ingredient in the production of an enormous war machine or in the manufacture of materials that will contribute to a better life now and in the years to come.

After meeting with representatives of the Smithsonian Institution, I shall relay to Congress the information that I have obtained on the new Museum of History and Technology. I am certain that all my colleagues will want to have a progress report of this nature from time to time.

The Future of the Private College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, a crisis is developing in higher education where rising costs could quite easily force great numbers of deserving young people to forgo a college education. I have long felt that in an attempt to help solve this threat, serious consideration should be given to the allowance of a Federal income tax deduction or credit for tuition expenses paid for the college education of our children.

In this regard, I am favorably impressed with a recent article by Virgil C. Blum, S.J., associate professor of political science at Marquette University, which appeared in a recent issue of Our Sunday Visitor. Under unanimous consent, I ask that Father Blum's article be printed at this point in the RECORD:

THE FUTURE OF THE PRIVATE COLLEGE—IN THIS TIME OF CRISIS NEW METHODS OF FINANCING MUST BE DEVELOPED

(By Virgil C. Blum, S.J.)

You may be planning to send your son or daughter to a private college or university. There are strong indications, however, that you may not have the opportunity. In the years ahead many private institutions of higher education are likely to collapse financially; others will, as experts predict, boost their tuition by more than 100 percent and thus price themselves beyond your financial reach.

But the demise of our private college is not inevitable. Nor is a tuition level beyond your reach inevitable. Private institutions can be saved. But it is a task to which every citizen who believes in diversity in education, academic freedom in the pursuit of truth, free enterprise in education, and the best interests of the taxpayer must take a personal interest. In this time of crisis for education, new methods of financing private education must be found.

The rapid increase in the cost of classroom buildings, laboratories and operations is at the heart of the problem of financing private education. The problem cannot be solved simply by raising tuition. Such an approach might well aggravate the problem.

The private college, however, cannot fix the price of the product it is selling—education—on the basis of production costs. It does not operate in a free market. It operates in the context of a State-subsidized educational system. Under present conditions of high-cost education, the high public institutional discount rate of 80 to 90 percent on the full cost of education spells destruction for most private institutions.

This fact was underscored by Dr. Lawrence A. Kimpton, former chancellor of the University of Chicago, when he spoke of this destructive situation. "To put it in the crassest terms possible," he said, "it is hard to market a product at a fair price when down the street someone is giving it away."

Private colleges are like private grocery stores which, even while selling their products at a substantial loss, would be forced out of business by State-owned and operated supermarkets that sell their products at an 80- to 90-percent discount.

In such a competitive situation the private college cannot raise its tuition to meet necessary costs. If it does, it simply prices itself out of the education market. Some students, to be sure, will continue to attend private schools, even if they must borrow money to pay tuition.

But the typical student (and his parents) will not incur large debts to pay tuition when he can get a college education at the taxpayer's expense. The typical student will not borrow $1,000 or $1,500 a year to pay tuition when he can get an education "free."

The impact of the growing gap between tuition in public and private institutions is clearly demonstrated by the rapid shift of students from private to public institutions. As recently as 1950 more than 50 percent of our college students attended private institutions. Today it is less than 40 percent.

Experts predict that, if present trends continue, 80 percent of our students will be in tax-supported colleges and universities by 1970. The tuition-imbalance is one big reason why there are thousands of vacancies in private colleges while tax-supported institutions are asking for hundreds of millions of dollars to expand facilities.

It costs a minimum of $3,600 to supply classroom facilities for a student. Hence, it is in the taxpayer's interest that existing private school facilities be used to the fullest extent possible. This is not being done. A year ago there were 709 private colleges with fewer than 500 students each. Their average enrollment was only 226. It is a fair estimate that these colleges have available many hundreds of millions of dollars of unused facilities. In Wisconsin alone the private colleges have $17 million worth of unused space.

Why do students bypass small private colleges for large State institutions? Dean Martin Quanbeck, of Minnesota's Augsburg College, says that this preference "can be explained largely in terms of differences in quality, prestige, and tuition costs." Relatively high tuition costs are a deterrent to attendance at private colleges. Yet, it is precisely because tuition cannot begin to cover the full cost of quality education that many of our small colleges are short on quality and prestige.

Under present conditions the faculties of most private colleges are terribly underpaid and overworked. "What all this amounts to," said Dr. Barnaby Keeney, president of Brown University, "is that every student at almost every private college in the country is on a scholarship from the faculty, whether he needs one or not, indeed whether he wants one or not. This scholarship is paid by the faculty of the institution, out of their hides."

But it is true, nevertheless, that most parents cannot afford to pay a tuition that covers a greater portion of the full cost of education. For one thing, taxes are too high. And the larger the proportion of students in tax-supported institutions, the higher the taxes.

How then can private colleges and universities be saved and enabled to render a valuable service to American society? A number of proposals are now receiving serious consideration.

Direct Federal matching grants to public and private institutions for classroom buildings and laboratories are being proposed. Such direct grants would, however, be of little help to the vast majority of the Nation's 1,300 private institutions. Since additional students increase the operating deficit, private schools are reluctant to spend meager resources to match Federal funds to expand their facilities.

Some way must be found to increase the income of private schools for operating purposes. "Otherwise," predicts Dr. Louis T. Benezet, president of Colorado College, "we may expect to see the monumental construction of State university metropolises on the one hand and on the other the disappearance of most of the private colleges."

A Federal tax credit against tuition or fees deserves serious consideration. It would enable parents to pay a greater portion of the full cost of education, thus making higher tuition feasible. A 40-percent tax credit on a tuition of $1,000 would enable the taxpayer, parent or other, to claim a credit of $400 against his Federal income tax. If his income tax is $900, he pays only $500. If a parent sends his son to a State university where tuition is $200, he could claim a credit of $80.

There is nothing revolutionary about the tax credit. The Federal Government makes innumerable tax concessions to business and the professions to promote some particular aspects of the public interest.

If the tax credit would induce student attendance at private schools, it would result in substantial savings for the taxpayers. Since it costs the taxpayers from $1,600 to $2,000 a year per student in a State university (less in a State college), a tax credit of $400 to a parent who sends his son or daughter to a private institution would constitute a large saving in tax dollars.

It is sometimes objected that a tax credit would not greatly aid low income families. This is true. But it must be emphasized that with or without a tax credit these families cannot send their children to private colleges. They need scholarship help. The adoption of the tax credit plan would enable private colleges to give more scholarships to needy students. This would aid low income families. Moreover, an increasing number of States are adopting extensive scholarship programs, and the U.S. Office of Education has proposed an extensive Federal scholarship program.

In early December representatives of the major educational associations, meeting in Washington, adopted a package recommendation in support of Federal scholarships, Federal matching grants for classroom buildings and laboratories, and a tax credit plan. There was a feeling, however, that support of the tax credit plan would be controversial.

Although the major educational associations have repeatedly adopted resolutions supporting the tax-credit plan, State universities and land-grant colleges have in recent years publicly opposed the plan. The reason is not difficult to discover. Since all their in-State students enjoy a hidden tax-provided scholarship that covers most of the cost of their education, tuition is nominal. Hence the dollar value of a 40-percent tax credit to these students is not high. Consequently, public institutions, if they desired to absorb the tax-credit benefit by raising tuition by 40 percent, would receive less in increased tuition-income than private institutions.

Public institutions want direct Federal matching grants for capital construction, rather than tax credit. It seems to me, however, that the best interest of America, as well as the best interest of both public and private higher education, would be served by the adoption of both the matching grant proposal and the tax-credit proposal, together with a scholarship program with grants weighted in favor of the low income group.

Academic freedom, the need for diversity in education, equity and economy strongly urge the adoption of the 40-percent-tax-credit plan. Such a Federal program would enable parents to pay a greater portion of the full cost of education. This would enable private schools to raise their tuition substantially without pricing themselves out of business.

Almost 100 Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing and reading a lot about the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration. In the near future, a member of the Republican Party is scheduled to comment on the Kennedy administration's record to date.

I should like to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post for April 20 entitled "3 Months of Kennedy," that I found to be most interesting reading. I came to the Congress with Mr. Kennedy, and as he steadily rose to the position which he now occupies today, I have had nothing but praise and admiration for him. I, like others, may not always agree with him, but no one can detract from the method in which he has handled himself, his display of determination, and his sincere dedication to his position, and more important, to his country:

THREE MONTHS OF KENNEDY

President Kennedy's address to the editors today will mark the completion of his first 3 months as Chief Executive. He has presented an impression to the country and to the world of broad intellectual grasp, poise, vigor, and quiet competence. But it is fair to say that this period has been occupied more with sizing up problems than with moving boldly to surmount them.

No doubt this was inevitable in the situation. The new President inherited a host of deferred decisions and neglected needs. Perhaps he also found that some issues did not seem so simple, once he was in the White House, as they had seemed when he was an aspirant to office.

Moreover, Mr. Kennedy was confronted with an exteremely delicate electoral balance. Not only was the popular vote in the presidential election last November very close; the divisions in Congress have proved to be much narrower than the superficial party statistics would indicate.

This factor alone makes Mr. Kennedy's situation very different from that which attended Franklin Roosevelt's first months in office. It was fashionable on the eve of the inauguration to predict a burst of activity similar to that of the Roosevelt 100 days. There is indeed something of the same intellectual ferment and creativity. But on deeper analysis the comparison was misleading.

In 1933 the country was at the bottom of a grim depression. Legislators and citizens were eager to grasp at any measure, including social innovation and experimentation, that might hold promise of some relief. In 1961 the country is, to be sure, in a recession; but it is fortunately miniscule by contrast with the great trauma of 28 years ago. There are ugly pockets of poverty and unemployment which worry some Americans and ought to worry more, but the major uncertainty probably concerns the country's position in the world. There are complaints of considerable complacency.

In foreign affairs Mr. Kennedy has made the most visible impact. His conferences with major allied leaders have gone well, and he has given impetus to a broader design for Atlantic unity. He has faced ugly reality in Laos. His willingness to accept a genuinely neutral government plus his determination to intervene militarily if necessary are essential to a stabilization. It is too soon to say whether his handling of the Cuban situation has been wise, but he has taken commendable initiative in Latin America generally. He has looked coolly at issues with the Soviet Union, assuring firmness but avoiding provocation.

His appointments have for the most part been highly meritorious. His changes in the structure and routine of the executive branch have shown that he intends to be his own chief of staff; but he also delegates authority to capable men. He has evidenced his intention to use Executive powers in the field of civil rights. He has placed notable emphasis upon flexibility in the Defense Establishment, though what happened to the missile gap remains something of a mystery.

In domestic legislative affairs the President's pace has been substantially slower. Members friendly to him won the fight on House rules at the beginning of the congressional session, but the big tests are still ahead. In most areas of concern from antirecession measures to housing, health, agriculture, and the overall national budget, Mr. Kennedy has proposed an essentially cautious program. It has been criticized by some as inadequate to stimulate revitalized economic growth. It may represent less what the President thinks desirable than what he thinks he can get.

No one is yet in an authoritative position to dispute this approach. Mr. Kennedy has the counsel of some able and experienced men in legislative affairs, including Vice President JOHNSON. Moreover, it probably is useful for the new President to demonstrate to the country that his approach is moderate rather than radical.

But it also is accurate to say that the country has not yet been called upon for the sacrifices that Mr. Kennedy envisaged during the campaign. The response to the Peace Corps has dramatized the willingness of Americans to identify themselves with a national cause. But the people can hardly respond to such needs unless they are asked.

The question is whether the President has talked directly to the people on enough occasions. Mr. Kennedy is an extraordinarily accessible Chief Executive, but his accessibility is seen more through reflection than through direct contact. Apart from his news conferences, which are difficult to focus despite his sense of command, he has not yet made major appeals to public opinion.

And here is something of the conundrum that confronted President Eisenhower. The Gallup Poll shows Mr. Kennedy having an even higher percentage of public approval in his initial months than his predecessor had. But how can this approval be translated into legislative support? Returning Congressmen report that their constituents applaud Mr. Kennedy but not his program. This reaction may be superficial, but the question remains how popularity can be used to influence congressional action.

Mr. Kennedy is said to view his task as partly one of education. There have been many suggestions for renewal of the fireside chat technique. Understandably the President may want to use any such devices sparingly so as not to waste his ammunition. The quintessential foreign aid appropriation.

or affairs in Cuba, may prompt him to additional action. The point he always must consider is that by delaying he runs the risk of not mustering public opinion in time to influence the results.

The President may well be a better judge of appropriate timing than some of the second-guessers. What has been seen of his performance so far displays a distinctive and in some ways dazzling style of operation. But much of the New Frontier, in domestic affairs at least, remains on the far horizon.

Castro's Cuba: A Revolution Betrayed?—An Article by Theodore Draper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, because of the unhappy events of recent days in Cuba, I should like to call to the attention of Members of Congress an extremely valuable article entitled "Castro's Cuba: A Revolution Betrayed?" by Theodore Draper, which was published in the March 27, 1961, issue of the New Leader.

Although the article is a more lengthy one than I like normally to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I believe it contains such a useful analysis of the rise of Fidel Castro and the way in which he has betrayed the revolution which he originally promised to the Cuban people that students of our relations with Cuba will consult it with advantage.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Mr. Draper is a distinguished authority on the Communist movement, and at this point I include a brief biographical sketch of him:

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Theodore Draper has spent the last 25 years as a journalist, historian, and editor who has specialized in international affairs and American foreign policy, with extended excursions into the history of the American labor movement in general and the American Communist movement in particular. He has worked in and written about France, Germany, Morocco, Haiti, Guatemala, Mexico, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, and other countries.

The author of four books, his first, "The Six Weeks' War—a study of the French defeat of 1940—appeared in 1944. His second, "The Battle of Germany," published in 1946, was the official history of the 84th Infantry Division, the unit with which he served in World War II. When the project on communism in American life was formed by the Fund for the Republic, Draper was asked to write the history of the Communist Party of the United States from its beginnings to 1945. His first volume in this series, "The Roots of American Communism," came out in 1957; the second, "American Communism and Soviet Russia," was issued in May of last year. He plans to start working on the third and final volume, dealing with the period 1930–45, next fall.

The article follows:

CASTRO'S CUBA: A REVOLUTION BETRAYED?

(By Theodore Draper)

Who is Fidel Castro? What is he? After 2 years in power, he still evades both his defenders and detractors. In the first months of his regime, Castro used to speak of "humanism," which he defined as "liberty with bread without terror"—hardly a political or social program. But after trying it out a few times, he dropped it in favor of even more ambiguous formulas. When he or his associates were asked what kind of society they were building or what it should be called, they usually answered that they were building "a reality, not a theory," or that they were interested "in deeds, not words," or that their revolution was "indigenously Cuban." Castro still refuses to be pinned down to anything more definite and, until he commits himself, the question officially remains open.

At a youth congress in Havana last August, however, Ernesto Guevara, Minister of Industry and former president of the National Bank of Cuba—whose bank notes are signed with his nickname, "Ché," nothing more—took a long step toward giving the regime an ideology and a name. Since Guevara is the ideological éminence gris of Castro's regime, he has a habit of saying today what Castro will say tomorrow. He said: "What is our ideology? If I were asked whether our revolution is Communist, I would define it as Marxist. Our revolution has discovered by its methods the paths that Marx pointed out." In "Notes for the Study of the Ideology of the Cuban Revolution," published last October in the magazine Verde Olivo, Guevara wrote: "The principal actors of this revolution had no coherent theoretical criteria; but it cannot be said that they were ignorant of the various concepts of history, society, economics and revolution which are being discussed in the world today." Then he declared: "We, practical revolutionaries, initiating our own struggle, simply fulfill laws foreseen by Marx the scientist."

These statements raise more intriguing questions than they pretend to answer. Did Guevara mean to imply that the ideology was Marxist but not Communist? Was it the Marxism of the Communists or some other Marxism? Did Fidel, Guevara and the others really come upon Marxism as if they were bright but naive children rediscovering the roundness of the earth? Could the laws of Marx the scientist, which have not been fulfilled anywhere else, be fulfilled in the little island of Cuba by those who did not know what they were doing until after they had done it?

Guevara's explanation obviously explains too little or too much. But Castro, Guevara, and other Cuban leaders have spoken much more freely and at far greater length to a chosen few who have become their foreign interpreters and apologists. This growing band, however, has not had an easy time of it, and has been forced to do much of the theorizing that the Cubans have refused to do for themselves. In time, every revolution has created its own mythology but, in this case, these foreign sympathizers, in lieu of embracing one readymade, have had to produce their own. Each of these sympathizers has made his own characteristic contribution to this mythology which, if nothing else, tells us what those who feel closest to Castro make of him. The situation is undoubtedly an oddity but, then, the Cuban revolution is an odd one.

1. THE MYTHMAKERS

One of the first and favorite myths has been that of Castro's peasant revolution.

It turned up in the articles written and interviews given by the French writers, Jean-Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir, who spent March 1960 in Cuba. After the usual hectic round of short trips and long talks, Sartre wrote a series of 16 articles in Francesoir. In one of them he related how he had informed the Cubans that, like the Chinese, they had made a peasant revolution. The Cuban reaction, he reported, was divided: the bearded ones (those who had fought in the mountains) agreed with him; the unbearded ones (those who had fought in the resistance movements in the cities) maintained that the peasants had fought little or badly and that the revolution had sprung from the cities.

Mme. de Beauvoir gave a somewhat different version in an interview in France Observateur. She said that the petty bourgeoisie had begun by stirring up the urban revolution while the peasants had held back; then, bit by bit, the peasants had joined in, the immediate interests of the victorious revolution had become those of the peasant class, and thus despite its origins, the urban revolution can be considered a peasant revolution.

As a full-fledged theory, however, the Cuban peasant revolution made its appearance in the book, "Cuba, Anatomy of a Revolution," by Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy, editors of the magazine, Monthly Review. After 3 weeks in Cuba, they were persuaded that the revolution had succeeded because the peasants as a class had actively joined the rebels and had become one with the revolutionary army. Fidel Castro appeared to them to be the embodiment of the revolutionary will and energy of the peasantry. As for the kind of system that this peasant revolution had brought forth, Huberman and Sweezy have no hesitation in answering: the new Cuba is a Socialist Cuba.

Six months later, they paid another 3-week visit to Cuba. By this time, the Castro regime had nationalized a large part of the Cuban economy. This development caused them to revise their previous estimate—the Cuban revolution was no longer essentially a peasant revolution because the working class had finally been swept into it. Castro himself had not yet reached the point of calling himself a Marxist, but the two visitors conferred on him the distinction of having arrived, by virtue of his own rich experience and sharp and fertile mind, at an unmistakably Marxist interpretation in a way that would have made Marx himself "proud to acknowledge him as a disciple." Despite Castro's modesty, however, they heard so much about a Socialist Cuba that it had become a commonplace, in contrast to their first trip, during which no one had spoken to them of Cuba as a Socialist country, and socialism was not even included among the revolution's ultimate goals.

And so, in the spring of 1960, a new path to socialism was discovered—a peasant revolution led by the middle-class son of a wealthy landowner. And in the fall of 1960, there was more certainty than ever of the Socialist revolution in Cuba because the working class had at last caught up with it.[1]

Other Castro sympathizers have gone farther. Paul Johnson of the British weekly, "New Statesman," took a quick look at Cuba and reported that Castro had come to power through a peasant revolution but governs through a genuine dictatorship of the proletariat, expressed through the arbitrary rule of one man. In the "New Republic" Prof. Samuel Schapiro, an American academic advocate for Castro, merely limited himself to commenting that "the heart of the revolution, the land reform program, is essentially Marxist." And C. Wright Mills of Columbia University, has made an anthology of all the things that Castro and his closest associates say of themselves, at least as of last August.

Professor Mills' recently published book, "Listen, Yankee," is a peculiarly useful and exasperating work. It purports to be the voice of the Cuban revolutionary, not that of its author. From the conversations I had in Cuba last April, I can testify that the Castro leaders talk much in the way Mills had recorded them. Sometimes the words in the book were so close to those I had heard

Footnotes at end of speech.

that I felt I knew the name of the source. To this extent, Mills had made himself the vehicle of the purest and most direct propaganda, unlike the others who talked to more or less the same people but passed on in their own name what they had been told. No one ever said "Listen, Yankee" or "Yankee this" and "Yankee that" to me, but except for this touch of artistic license, I consider these long monologues more or less authentic. Anyone who wants to get the Castro party line most nakedly can get it here.

Nevertheless, Mills has put his name to the book and in the last few pages gives the Castro case his personal endorsement. He says that he leaves it to the reader to agree or disagree with the points in it, as if there might be one non-Cuban reader in a hundred or a thousand with the necessary background. A reader has a right to expect that the author should do some work of his own beyond listening only to one side, and that a sociologist would at least be able to give a reasonably accurate report of the social structure of the country. The book as a whole is just as honest and dishonest as any unrelieved propaganda is likely to be, and if Mills merely sought to be a front man for the Castro propaganda machine, he has succeeded brilliantly. But is that all that should be expected of C. Wright Mills?

Mills' Cubans—one never knows where they end and he begins—are not altogether in agreement with Sweezy and Huberman. First, Mills tells what the revolution was not—"not a fight between peasants and landowners, or between wageworkers and capitalists—either Cuban or Yankee; nor was it a direct nationalist battle between Cubans and foreigners." It was "not an economically determined revolution—either in its origins or in its sources." Nor was it "a revolution by labor unions or wageworkers in the city, or by labor parties, or by anything like that." What was it then? The leaders were "young intellectuals and students from the University of Havana"—they are also called a few middle-class students and intellectuals—who made "a lot of false moves for a long time before some of their moves began to pay off." The revolution "really began" when, in one of these moves, "a handful of these young intellectuals really got together with the peasants."

Thus Mills' version contains no nonsense about a "peasant revolution"; it merely claims that the decisive forces in the insurrectionary period were the intellectuals and the peasants, with the former in total command. There is also no nonsense about the workers making the revolution; they are said to have joined in after the victory, and their "revolutionary consciousness" has allegedly been aroused only in recent months. At this point, however, mythology takes over and Mills also has the workers superseding the peasants as a revolutionary force. But the greatest nonsense is written about the middle class. The original "handful" of leaders admittedly came exclusively from that class. Nevertheless, the mythology requires that "the middle classes generally supported the revolution, at least in a passive way, during the insurrectionary period, although as a class they had little to do with making it." I take it this means that most members of the middle class supported the revolution passively or not at all.

Mills has also compiled a number of programmatic statements by Castro's group. There is still the old reluctance to be pinned down to anything definite, because a political system would hamper the leaders, because very few people care about it anyway, or because the very lack of a system proves that it is democratic. But this motif slides gently into another one: "We ourselves don't quite know what to call what we are building, and we don't care. It is, of course, socialism of a sort." Or, whatever the system is, the Cubans discovered it all by themselves: "Insofar as we are Marxist or leftist (or Communist, if you will) in our revolutionary development and thought, it is not due to any prior commitment in our ideology. It is because of our own development." Still later in the book, Castro's Cuba becomes "a dictatorship of, by and for the peasants and the workers of Cuba" or "a dictatorship of the people." Mills himself considers Castro's regime to be a revolutionary dictatorship of the peasants and workers of Cuba in which one man possesses virtually absolute power.

All these theories by Sartre and de Beauvoir, Huberman and Sweezy, Johnson and Schapiro, Mills' Cubans and Mills, cannot be true but they have one thing in common—they serve the purpose of concealing the fact that the Cuban revolution was essentially a middle-class revolution which has been used to destroy the middle class. And without understanding this apparent contradiction, very little can be understood of Castro's Cuba as a social system.

2. TERROR AND COUNTERTERROR

To begin with, what truth is there in Castro's "peasant revolution?" The 82 men under Castro who invaded Cuba from Mexico in December 1956 and the 12 who survived to fight in the mountainous Sierra Maestra at the eastern end of the island all came from the middle class. Castro himself was their ideal representative—son of a rich landowner, university graduate, lawyer. The guajiros, or peasants, in the mountains were utterly alien to most of them. But they had to win the confidence of the peasants to obtain food, to protect themselves from dictator Fulgencio Batista's spies and soldiers, to gain new recruits. As the months passed, the relations between them and the peasants took on a new dimension. The crying poverty, illiteracy, disease and primitivism of the outcast peasants appalled the young city-bred ex-students. Out of this experience, partly practical and partly emotional, came a determination to revolutionize Cuban society by raising the lowest and most neglected sector to a civilized level of well-being and human dignity.

But, for over a year, Castro's fighting force was so small that he did not expect to overthrow Batista from the mountains.[2] Victory was foreseen through the vastly larger resistance movement in the cities, overwhelmingly middle class in composition. This calculation was behind the ill-fated general strike of April 9, 1958.[3] It failed because the middle class could not carry off a general strike. Only the workers and trade unions could do so, and they refused mainly for two reasons: they were doing too well under Batista to take the risk, and the official Cuban Communists deliberately sabotaged the strike because they had not been consulted and no attempt was made to reach an agreement with them in advance. Without the key transport workers under Communist leadership, the strike was doomed. The national committee of the Communist Party, known since the last war as the Partido Socialista Popular, issued a statement (on April 12, 1958), a copy of which I have seen, blaming the fiasco on the "unilateral call" for the strike by the leadership of Castro's 26th of July movement in Havana under Faustino Pérez.[4]

In the mountains at this time, Mills was told, the armed men under Castro numbered only about 300. Four months later, in August 1958, the two columns commanded by Majors Guevara and Camilo Cienfuegos, entrusted with the mission of cutting the island in two, the biggest single rebel operation of the entire struggle, amounted, according to Guevara, to 220 men.[5] Sartre was informed that the total number of barbudos in all Cuba from beginning to end was only 3,000. Castro's fighting force was until the end so minute that it hardly deserves to be called an army, let alone a peasant army, and even the influx of the last 4 or 5 months failed to give it anything like a mass character. In any case, the character of an army is established by its leadership and cadres, which remained exclusively middle class throughout, and not by its common soldiers—or every army in the world would similarly be an army of the peasantry and proletariat.

How could such a small band defeat Batista's Army of over 40,000?

The answer is that it did not defeat Batista's Army in any military sense. It succeeded in making Batista destroy himself. Until the spring of 1958 life in most of Cuba went on much as usual. But the fiasco of the April strike forced Castro to change his tactics. Disappointed in his hopes of a mass uprising, he shifted over to full-scale guerrilla warfare—bombings, sabotage, hit-and-run raids. Batista's answer to the terror was counterterror. The Army and secret police struck back blindly, indiscriminately, senselessly. The students, blamed as the main troublemakers, were their chief victims. It became safer for young men to take to the hills than to walk in the streets. The orgy of murders, tortures, and brutalities sent tremors of fear and horror through the entire Cuban people and especially the middle-class parents of the middle-class students.

This universal revulsion in the last 6 months of Batista's rule penetrated and permeated his own army and made it incapable of carrying out the offensive which it launched in May against Castro's hideout. As Mills' book says, Batista's army "just evaporated." The engagements between the two sides were so few and inconclusive that Batista's abdication caught Castro by surprise. The real victor in this struggle was not Castro's peasant army but the entire Cuban people. The heaviest losses were suffered by the largely middle-class urban resistance movement, which secreted the political and psychological acids that ate into Batista's fighting force; Sartre was told that Batista's Army and police killed 1,000 barbudos in the last clashes in the mountains and 19,000 in the urban resistance movement.

Castro's guerrilla tactics, then, aimed not so much at defeating the enemy as at inducing him to lose his head, fight terror with counterterror on the largest possible scale, and make life intolerable for the ordinary citizen. These tactics can be employed by even a few hundred rebels, and they are now being applied against the democratic government of Romulo Betancourt in Venezuela. The same terror that Castro used against Batista is now being used against Castro. And Castro has responded with counterterror, just as Batista did.

3. THE PROMISED LAND

The struggle for power also helps to answer the question: Was the Cuban revolution "betrayed?" The answer obviously depends on what revolution one has in mind—the revolution that Castro promised before taking power, or the one he has made since taking power.

Huberman and Sweezy have written: "Fidel had made his promises and was determined to carry them out, faithfully and to the letter." But neither they, nor Mills, nor Sartre, ever say what these promises were. The oversight has been a necessary part of the mythology.

I have made a brief inventory of the promises, political and economic, made by Castro from his "History Will Absolve Me" speech (at his trial in 1953) to the end of 1958. These promises have already become so embarrassing that some of his literary champions have begun to rewrite history (after

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

less than 2 years) by avoiding all mention of them.[8]

Political

(a) Castro's 1953 speech predicted that the first revolutionary law would be restoration of the 1940 constitution and made an allusion to a "government of popular election."

(b) Castro's manifesto of July 1957, his first political declaration from the Sierra Maestra, contained a formal promise of general elections at the end of 1 year and an "absolute guarantee" of freedom of information, press, and all individual and political rights guaranteed by the 1940 constitution.

(c) Castro's letter of December 14, 1957, to the Cuban exiles upheld the prime duty of the post-Batista provisional government to hold general elections and the right of political parties, even during the provisional government to put forward programs, organize, and participate in the elections.

(d) In an article in Coronet magazine of February 1958, Castro wrote of fighting for a genuine representative government, truly honest, general elections within 12 months, full and untrammelled freedom of public information and all communication media, and reestablishment of all personal and political rights set forth in the 1940 constitution. The greatest irony is that he defended himself against the accusation "of plotting to replace military dictatorship with revolutionary dictatorship."

(e) In his answers to Jules Dubois of May 1958, Castro pledged full enforcement of the 1940 constitution and "a provisional government of entirely civilian character that will return the country to normality and hold general elections within a period of no more than 1 year."

(f) In the unity manifesto of July 1958, Castro agreed "to guide our nation, after the fall of the tyrant, to normality by instituting a brief provisional government that will lead the country to full constitutional and democratic procedures."

Economic

(a) In the 1953 speech, Castro supported grants of land to small planters and peasants, with indemnification to the former owners; the rights of workers to share in profits; a greater share of the cane crop to all planters; and confiscation of all illegally obtained property. His land reform advocated maximum holdings for agricultural enterprises and the distribution of remaining land to farming families; it also provided for encouragement of "agricultural cooperatives for the common use of costly equipment, cold storage plants, and a single professional technical direction in cultivation and breeding." In addition, the speech expressed the intention of nationalizing the electric and telephone companies.

(b) The manifesto of July 1957 defined the agrarian reform as distribution of barren lands, with prior indemnification, and conversion of sharecroppers and squatters into proprietors of the lands worked on.

(c) The Coronet article favored a land reform to give peasants clear title to the land, with "just compensation of expropriated owners." It declared that Castro had no plans for expropriating or nationalizing foreign investments and that he had suspended an earlier program to extend government ownership to public utilities. On nationalization, he wrote:

"I personally have come to feel that nationalization is, at best, a cumbersome instrument. It does not seem to make the state any stronger, yet it enfeebles private enterprise. Even more importantly, any attempt at wholesale nationalization would obviously hamper the principal point of our economic platform—industrialization at the fastest possible rate. For this purpose, foreign investments will always be welcome and secure here."

(d) In May 1958 he assured his biographer, Jules Dubois:

"Never has the 26th of July Movement talked about socializing or nationalizing the industries. This is simply stupid fear of our revolution. We have proclaimed from the first day that we fight for the full enforcement of the constitution of 1940, whose norms establish guarantees, rights, and obligations for all the elements that have a part in production. Comprised therein is free enterprise and invested capital as well as many other economic, civic, and political rights."

(e) The unity manifesto of July 1958, which was written by Castro, merely called for:

"A minimum governmental program that will guarantee the punishment of the guilty ones, the rights of the workers, the fulfillment of international commitments, public order, peace, freedom, as well as the economic, social, and political progress of the Cuban people."

Such were the promises that Fidel had made. The near-unanimity with which Castro's victory was accepted in January 1959 was the result not merely of his heroic struggle and glamorous beard but of the political consensus which he appeared to embody. This consensus had resulted from the democratic disappointments of 1944–52 and the Batista despotism of 1952–58. There was broad agreement that Cuba could never go back to the corrupt brand of democracy of the past, and the Cuban middle class was ready for deepgoing social and political reforms to make impossible another Prio Socarras and another Batista. Castro promised to restore Cuban democracy and make it work, not a direct or people's democracy but the one associated with the 1940 constitution which was so radical that much of it, especially the provision for agrarian reform, was never implemented.

It is, moreover, unthinkable that Castro could have won power if he had given the Cuban people the slightest forewarning of what he has presented them with—a wholly government-controlled press and all other means of communication, ridicule of elections, wholesale confiscation and socialization, cooperatives that are (as Huberman and Sweezy admit) virtually state farms, or a dictatorship of any kind, including that of the proletariat. It was precisely the kind of promises Castro made that enabled him to win the support of the overwhelming majority of the Cuban middle and other classes; a peasant revolution would hardly have been expressed in quite the same way.

The least that can be said, therefore, is that Castro promised one kind of revolution and made another. The revolution Castro promised was unquestionably betrayed.

4. THE SOCIOLOGICAL IMAGINATION

The Castro mythology tends to distort not only the original nature of the Cuban revolution but also the character of Cuban society.

Pages are written by Huberman and Sweezy about the peasantry, a single paragraph about the working class, and almost nothing about the middle class. Mills never seems to have made up his mind which Cubans were speaking through him. Judging by his own list of the Cubans who spoke to him, there was not a worker, and certainly not a peasant, in the lot. Without exception, his informants were middle-class intellectuals and professionals of the type in power. Sometimes he makes them speak in their own name; more often they masquerade as the most impoverished and miserable of Cuban peasants. They say, "We squatted on the edge of the road in our filthy huts," as if they were the "we" and as if this was typical of all Cubans. The average reader might imagine that Cuba was nothing but "a place of misery and filth, illiteracy and exploitation and sloth." This may be a triumph of propaganda but it is a travesty of sociology.

Cuba before Castro was, indeed, a country with serious social problems, but it was far from being a peasant country or even a typically "underdeveloped" one. Its population was more urban than rural: 57 percent in the urban areas and 43 percent in the rural, with the trend strongly in favor of the former (according to the Geografia de Cuba written by Antonio Núñez Jiménez, the present director of the Agrarian Reform Institute). The people dependent on agriculture for a living made up about 40 percent, and of these over one-quarter were classified as farmers and ranchers. In 1954, the national income was divided as follows: The sugar industry, agricultural, and industrial, 25 percent; other agriculture, 13 percent; other industry and commerce, 40 percent; everything else, 21 percent.

The standard of living, low by United States and West European standards, was comparatively high by Latin American; only three countries, Venezuela, Argentina, and Chile, rated above Cuba in per capita income; Cuba's was almost as high as Italy's and much higher than Japan's. Cuba ranked fifth in Latin America in manufacturing, behind Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, and Chile. Cuba had 1 automobile for every 39 inhabitants (in Argentina, 60; Mexico, 91; Brazil, 158), and 1 radio for every 5 inhabitants (second to Argentina, with 1 out of 3). Cuban tourists were able to spend more in the United States than American tourists spent in Cuba. After World War II, Cuban interests were strong enough to buy a substantial share of U.S.-owned sugar production which fell from 70 to 80 percent of the total at its high point in the 1930's to about 35 percent in 1958. Government encouragement of Cubanization would easily have cut the figure in half again in a short time under a post-Batista democratic regime.

I am not trying to suggest that Cuba's economy was a healthy one. It was precariously dependent on the fluctuations of a single crop, sugar, which accounted for more than 80 percent of Cuban exports and employed about a half-million workers for only 3 to 4 months a year. As the rates of illiteracy show—41.7 percent in the rural areas and only 11.6 percent in the urban areas—the social development of Cuba was shockingly unbalanced in favor of the cities and towns, and Castro's crusade for the peasantry has repaid the Cuban upper and middle classes for decades of indifference to the welfare of the land workers.

But this is not the same thing as implying (as Mills often does) that Cuba was nothing but a land of backward, illiterate, diseased, starving peasants. When he writes, "We speak Spanish, we are mainly rural, and we are poor," the first statement is undoubtedly correct, the second is demonstrably false, and the third is partly true. Cuba was one of the most middle-class countries in Latin America.

In effect, this mythology of the Cuban social structure makes Castro's victory inexplicable. If a handful of middle-class students and intellectuals had the active support of only a few hundred or even a few thousand peasants, without either the working or middle classes (as Mills maintains), the Batista regime would never have toppled. It was the desertion of the middle class, on which Batista's power was based, that caused his regime to disintegrate from within and his army to evaporate.

5. ECLIPSE OF A MOVEMENT

Castro's betrayal of the Cuban revolution has also taken another form.

Footnotes at end of speech.

When Batista fell, two movements entered into competition—Castro's 26th of July movement (named after the date of his first unsuccessful attempt in 1953) and the official Communist Party, the Partido Socialista Popular. The odds seemed to favor the former overwhelmingly. In his first victory address at Camp Liberty, Castro spoke of the popular sympathy and almost unanimous support of the Cuban youth which the 26th of July movement enjoyed, and he appeared to argue that there was no need for any other movement.

But a different fate soon awaited the 26th of July movement. The reason, as it was explained to Mme. de Beauvoir, is most revealing:

"The 26th of July movement, from which the revolution issued, had an apparatus, but a petty-bourgeois one, which could not follow the revolution in the radicalization that has been proceeding since the taking of power; it was not capable of going along with the advance of the agrarian reform. So it was permitted to fall away."

Mme. de Beauvoir passes on this information without the slightest indication that there might have been something unwholesome in this procedure. But apart from the justification for Castro's decision to eviscerate his own movement, she confirms the middle class character of that movement and Castro's political reason for condemning it to a nominal existence—the difference between its revolution and his.

Not so long ago also, there was no higher honor in Castro's Cuba than to belong to the rebel army. It was the chief basis of Castro's rule; army men actually ran the country through ostensibly civilian organizations, such as the Agrarian Reform Institute. When Huberman and Sweezy first visited Cuba last March, they reported that "from January 1, 1959, to this day the real power has always been in the revolutionary army, manned and nourished by as radical a social class as any in the world today"—the Cuban peasantry. But on their second visit 6 months later, they noted the relative eclipse of the rebel army and the officially inspired rise of the large, amorphous militia. Indeed, in their December 1960 article, they no longer refer to it as the rebel army; it had become the regular army. Instead of the "truly most remarkable relations of solidarity, trust, and understanding" between Castro and the army at the time of their book, they intimated that it had become a potential counterrevolutionary force, typical of Latin American "standing armies." Once the rebel army's peasant character had been its greatest glory; now it had apparently become a serious drawback. Bohemia Libre, the edition in exile of Cuba's most famous magazine, has gone so far as to say editorially that the rebel army "already does not exist." In any case, it has gone the way of the 26th of July movement.

The fate of David Salvador, the outstanding labor leader of the 26th of July movement, tells the same story. Before Batista fell, Salvador represented the underground group, Labor Unity, and coordinated the resistance within the working class. At a time when the official Cuban Communists opposed Castro as a putschist, Salvador believed in him and in the last period of Batista's rule went to jail for his underground activity. After the victory, he took over the leadership of the Cuban labor movement for the 26th of July movement and served as secretary general of the Cuban trade union federation. At its national congress in November 1959, however, Salvador's fortunes suddenly changed. The 26th of July movement would have scored an overwhelming victory over the Communists, if Fidel Castro himself had not unexpectedly appeared at the congress, berated the delegates for having given proof neither of prudence, nor of unity, nor of anything, and demanded, in effect, the installation of a triumvirate in the federation's leadership, including pro-Communist candidate, Jesús Soto. The real leader soon became Soto, not Salvador, whom the Communist organ, Hoy, began to attack openly for his strange attitude.

With his family, David Salvador was caught in November 1960 trying to escape from Cuba in a small boat, and he has again been cast into prison, this time by Batista's successor, Fidel Castro. The trade unions have lost even the bargaining power they had under Bastista; they have become propaganda appendages of the Ministry of Labor which makes all decisions on wages and conditions, Soviet style.

What does all this mean? In his own 26th of July movement, in the rebel army and in the labor movement, Castro has shunted aside the very ones who helped him in the struggle for power. He has done so, as Mme. de Beauvoir has hinted, because they were led to expect a different revolution from the one he is making. The 26th of July movement was sacrificed first because it was the embryo of a political party. It could grow into a full-fledged party or become an empty shell. The rebel army has never recovered from the shock of Castro's persecution of one of his closest former comrades-in-arms, Maj. Hubert Matos, who was sentenced to 20 years' imprisonment for having protested against the favoritism shown to Communists in the army. As Mills remarks in "Listen, Yankee," "that was the biggest blow."

The mass assemblies and amorphous militias now suit Castro's purposes better because they are so impersonal and anonymous. The individuals in the outdoor spectacles have a direct relationship only to Castro personally, not to each other. The demonstrations are as democratic as Hitler's Nuremberg rallies and Mussolini's balcony speeches once were.

The 26th of July movement and the rebel army were more than Castro's personal emanations; their members were bound by a cause for which they had fought and sacrificed together. That cause went back to a period before Castro's personal rule and to a revolution waged against personal rule. That Castro could not live with the 26th of July movement and the rebel army is more than faintly reminiscent of Stalin's need to abolish the Society of Old Bolsheviks.

6. THE TWO REVOLUTIONS

Lukewarm lemonade helped Jean-Paul Sartre to understand the nature of Castro's democracy.

One day, as he tells the story, Castro invited Mme. de Beauvoir and himself on an inspection tour of the Veradero Beach. Soon the party stopped at a little refreshment stand. Castro offered them some lemonade. He started to drink some himself, put down his glass, and said loudly: "It's lukewarm." Then the following dialogue ensued:

"Don't you have refrigerators?" Castro asked.

"Sure we do," the waitress said. "But they don't work."

"Have you reported it to your superior?"

"Of course, last week. And it isn't a big job," she added familiarly. "An electrician could do it in 2 hours of work."

"And no one has been ordered to make the repairs?"

She shrugged her shoulders. "You know how it is," she added.

And this is Sartre's comment on the scene:

"It was the first time that I understood—still somewhat vaguely—what I called the other day 'direct democracy.' Between the waitress and Castro, an immediate secret understanding (connivence) was established."

Castro was not yet satisfied. Sartre relates how Castro insisted on going over to the delinquent refrigerator and vainly tried to fix it himself. At length, Castro turned to the young waitress and muttered: "Tell your superiors that if they don't get busy on their problems, they will have problems with me."

One reads and wonders. Could it really be that this banal and somewhat embarrassing little scene convinced the famous and worldly French philosopher that Castro's Cuba was—not an ordinary kind of democracy but—a "direct democracy"? Involuntarily, my mind went back to some experiences in the Dominican Republic a few years ago. There, too, the Líder Máximo, who prefers being called El Jefe, liked to visit his domain, see his subjects personally and settle problems on the spot.[7] To my dismay, I discovered that there was much to be said for his regime in purely physical terms, that the peasants worshipped him, that he could have won honest elections quite as overwhelmingly as his fixed elections, and that the only ones who seemed disturbed were a few intellectuals and other dubious middle-class characters. It was easy to imagine the same scene played by El Jefe, the young waitress, lukewarm lemonade, and the refrigerator that wouldn't work, except perhaps that El Jefe, having had much more time, no longer permitted lukewarm lemonade under any circumstances. But the greatest blow of all came one day when I entered into a philosophical discussion with a leading official and asked whether El Jefe's unique system had a name. Gravely and courteously, he answered: "neodemocracy." I must have flushed in anger. If only they would leave democracy alone. If Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo was the leader of a democracy, even a neodemocracy, who was not?

At bottom, all these neo and direct democracies rest on a simple proposition: that the leader and his people are one and indivisible. Hence they need no representative institutions, no elections, no loyal or disloyal opposition, no free or partially critical press, none of the rights and safeguards traditionally associated with a democracy.

The horror of this thinking is that it wipes out the lessons to be learned from the most desperate and tragic experiences of our time. If there is anything that should have burned itself into our consciousness, it is the excruciating evil of the popular despot, the beloved dictator, the mass leader. The connivance which Sartre imagined between Castro and the waitress existed between Hitler and a too large portion of the German people and between Trujillo and an even larger portion of the Dominican people. More horrible still is the fact that, with the whole modern machinery of propaganda at their disposal, the leaders can manufacture a reasonable facsimile of popular consent even if they may not have it to start out with. Is it necessary at this late date to recall these terrible lessons to Jean-Paul Sartre? Could he have survived the direct democracy that he recommends to the Cubans?

Castro's democracy poses awkward problems for all his apologists. Their argument runs: (a) Castro could win any election overwhelmingly and, therefore, (b) elections are unnecessary or harmful and, anyway, (c) all previous Cuban elections were crooked. Here, again, it seems necessary to recall the A B C of democracy to people who pride themselves on being the only real democrats. The democratic mandate is not one that once given cannot be revoked; it is of the essence of democratic consent that it must be periodically renewed. Most observers estimated Castro's popular support at 90 percent or more in January 1959, and at 75 percent or more a year later, but it may well be, as some claim, that the figure has been cut to 50 percent or less at the present time. It is no longer certain that he could win any election overwhelmingly or at all.

Footnotes at end of speech.

There have been three stages in Castro's attitude toward elections. First, he promised them. Then he said they were not immediately feasible. Now he ridicules them. In effect, he once said: "Cuba has never had an honest election and a truly free press. I will show Cuba how to have them." Now he says: "Cuba has never had an honest election and a truly free press. Therefore, Cuba has no right to have them under me." Here, in essence, are the two revolutions of Fidel Castro.

The problem of elections is evaded by the counteroffer of something even better. Huberman and Sweezy write: "What we do maintain is that the revolution itself gives the Government a far more democratic mandate than the freest of free elections ever could, and that it is the sacred duty of the Government to carry out the oft-announced platform of the revolution before it comes back to the people asking for either approval or further instructions." What revolution? What platform? The revolution to restore the constitution of 1940 and hold elections in 12 to 18 months? Or the revolution against the constitution and against elections for an indefinite period? How can the Government come back to the people for approval and further instructions when it has never once gone to them for approval or instructions?

The reference to the "oft-announced platform of the revolution" is simply incredible. Huberman and Sweezy might have been less tempted to make it if they had not successfully avoided stating that platform. They themselves tell a story which belies it. According to them, the first draft of the agrarian reform law contained no provision for cooperatives. All the revolutionaries around Castro believed that the peasants were not ready for them. The decision to have them was made by Castro alone against the better judgment of his closest advisers and adherents. By Huberman and Sweezy's own admission, then, Castro did not carry out the oft-announced platform of the revolution as anyone else had understood it in this key area; he carried out a basic revision of that platform to the surprise of everyone but Fidel Castro.[8]

But there is something even more deeply objectionable to this reasoning. It implies that anyone who claims to possess the true idea of the revolution confers on himself a more democratic mandate than any of the people, even in the freest of free elections, can give him. The next step—and revolutionists have taken it—is to say that it is democratic to make the revolution without the people or despite the people—in, of course, the people's interest. Out of such revolutions have invariably come the worst tyrannies.

7. SCAPEGOAT HISTORY

While some writers see everything but communism in Castro, others see nothing but communism. The most extreme version of this second school of thought may be found in the book, "Red Star Over Cuba," by Nathaniel Weyl. Weyl knew the international Communist movement from the inside during the 1930's—he has testified that he once belonged to the same American party unit as Alger Hiss—and he has also written a book on Mexico's agrarian reform under ex-President Lázaro Cárdenas. There is no indication, however, that he has had a personal knowledge of Cuba in the last 2 years or at any other time.

Much of Weyl's book is based on police and intelligence sources, such as the Batista regime's Bureau of the Repression of Communist Activities (BRAC). A lurid series of articles in a sensation-mongering New York tabloid is treated as if it were a serious historical source. The recklessness with which Weyl uses his materials, good, bad, and dubious, is matched by that of his views. These range from the conviction that Fidel Castro has been a trusted Soviet agent since 1948, when he was little more than 21 years old, to the imputation that Cuba was lost to communism by appeasement-oriented officials of the State Department. The implicit thesis of the book was stated by Senators JAMES EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi and THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, whom Weyl quotes: "Cuba was handed to Castro and the Communists by a combination of Americans in the same way that China was handed to the Communists." In effect, this is the extreme rightwing case against Castro and those who allegedly put him into power.

Weyl's methods hardly inspire confidence in his results. He makes some members of the State Department the butt of his indignation for having failed to accept the evidence that Castro has been a Communist and Soviet agent for a dozen years. But, for some reason, he fails to mention that Gen. C. P. Cabell, Deputy Director of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, testified in November 1959, before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (one of his favorite sources) that "we believe that Castro is not a member of the Communist Party, and does not consider himself to be a Communist." Presumably the CIA had gone to some trouble to find out all about Castro's past political allegiances and was less riddled than the State Department with appeasement-minded subordinates (Weyl's phrase for then Under Secretary Christian Herter, Assistant Secretary for Latin American Affairs, Roy R. Rubottom, and Director of the Caribbean Division William A. Wieland). The CIA may have been wrong, but its evaluation of the evidence certainly has a bearing on Weyl's case against members of the State Department with a similar view.

Weyl, however, cites the testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee of Raphael Díaz Balart (Castro's former brother-in-law), who worked for Batista to the end. He writes that Díaz Balart gave "basically the same account" as that of Dr. Emilio Núñez Portuondo, Batista's former Prime Minister, who declared that "Fidel Castro subordinated himself to Communist Party discipline during his first year at the university (1945–46) and used his party name of Fidelio." Weyl then quotes those portions of Díaz Balart's testimony which indicate that Castro and the Communist students had had a very nice understanding about helping each other. But he does not quote Díaz Balart's direct assertion: "No, he was not in that moment a member. He was just in that moment an opportunist leader who wanted to promote himself." Basically Díaz Balart gave anything but the same account as Núñez Portuondo.

Weyl also plays fast and loose in his references to Communist money allegedly put at Castro's disposal in the Sierra Maestra. He quotes from the articles by two newspapermen in the New York Daily News: "Once, said a man who was close to Fidel, Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, an active member of the Communist Party in Cuba, arrived with a dozen men loaded with money. It came to $800,000 and Fidel hugged him and shouted, 'Now we're ready to win the war.'" Thus Weyl quotes two newspapermen who quote "a man who was close to Fidel." But some 30 pages later, Weyl writes: "We have seen that Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, who was not only a member of the Political Bureau of the Cuban Communist Party, but its brains, went to the Sierra Maestra to bring Fidel Castro almost a million dollars." There is no doubt about Rafael Rodriguez' journey to the Sierra Maestra in June 1958—he readily admitted it to me when I talked to him last spring—but only a reader with a short memory would have seen that Rafael Rodriguez had brought Fidel Castro almost a million dollars. Perhaps he did, but the evidence is third-hand at best. Nevertheless, Weyl goes on to assert that "Fidel Castro's forces won primarily because they had almost unlimited supplies of money."

How much more complex Cuban politics can be than Weyl appears to make it may be gathered from his reference to Raúl Roa. Weyl writes that one of the Cuban Communist Party's "charter members and early leaders was Raúl Roa, whom Fidel Castro would later appoint Foreign Minister of Cuba." That is all. From this a reader might suppose that Roa was just another Communist functionary in Castro's entourage. But Roa has had a rather more varied political career. He wrote an article in Mexico in 1956 denouncing the crimes, disasters and outrages perpetrated by the Soviet invaders in Hungary. This article, together with other uncomplimentary references to communism, were reprinted in his book, "En Pie," issued by an official publishing house in Cuba in October 1959. The Communist leader, Blas Roca, in the official Communist organ, Hoy, of March 11, 1959, denounced Roa as a plattista—the historical equivalent of an "agent of American imperialism."[9] Yet Roa has become a servile spokesman of the communism and Soviet Union which he had many times condemned. He has never, however, completely won the trust of the Communists, one of whom has been put in as his under secretary.

Weyl also identifies Faustino Pérez as a Communist on the basis of Batista's sources. The official Cuban Communists have always blamed Pérez (the leader of the former Havana underground) for the failure of the April 1958 strike on the ground that he refused to make a deal with them. They took their revenge in November 1959 when he was ousted from Castro's government for protesting against the treatment of Maj. Hubert Matos. Weyl even cites a Cuban underground report that Matos worked for the Communists as early as 1957, without saying a word about the price Matos has paid for his anticommunism. Such blunders are inevitable in a book which accepts Batista's and Trujillo's sources uncritically. Communists, ex-Communists, non-Communists and opportunists are indiscriminately lumped together. Every bit of evidence that does not fit the book's thesis is ruthlessly suppressed or glossed over. All the hard problems of Castro's political developments are oversimplified and vulgarized.

Sometimes a reader of both the Mills and Weyl books might be hopelessly puzzled. Mills' Yankee is taunted with the question, "What did you do—about the weapons, for example, the Yankee government kept sending—and sending—and sending—to Batista?" But in Weyl's book, former Ambassador Earl E. T. Smith says of the U.S. decision to stop sending arms to Batista in March 1958, that "the psychological impact on the morale of the government was crippling." In his recent book, "Respuesta" (Reply), published in Mexico, Fulgencio Batista also complains bitterly against the harmful effect of the U.S. embargo on arms. A reader of Mills' book would never know that the arms had ever been cut off. A reader of Weyl's book would never know that the effect of the arms embargo was partially undone by the failure to withdraw the military mission.

Weyl's chief American scapegoat is Herbert L. Matthews of the New York Times. In February 1957, Matthews published three articles and photographs which proved that Castro was alive, and he vouched for his idealism, courage, and innocence of communism. The chief count against William Wieland seems to be that he advised the newly appointed Ambassador Smith to be briefed by Matthews before assuming his post. Rubottom's main misdeed appears to have been that he told a Senate subcommittee on De-

Footnotes at end of speech.

cember 31, 1958, the day before Batista's flight, that "there was no evidence of any organized Communist element within the Castro movement or that Senor Castro himself was under Communist influence." As if this were not trouble enough for Rubottom, he also stands accused of having been the protege of Dr. Milton Eisenhower, whom Weyl brushes off as "a well-intentioned, vaguely leftist, former New Deal bureaucrat."

Ambassador Smith's briefing by Matthews, which promises to become a minor cause celèbre in some circles of American politics, runs true to form in Weyl's book. On checking, I found that Ambassador Smith had testified: "I spent 6 weeks in Washington, approximately 4 days of each week, visiting various agencies and being briefed by the State Department and those whom the State Department designated." He also said that "in the course of 6 weeks I was briefed by numbers of people in the usual course as every Ambassador is briefed." One of these people, suggested by Wieland, was Matthews. Weyl converts this testimony to: "Ambassador Smith made the remarkable disclosure that Wieland sent him to none other than Herbert Matthews to get his briefing on Cuban affairs before departing for his post in Havana." Thus a briefing is transformed into his briefing, as if Matthews were the only one to brief Smith. And it is hard to understand what is remarkable about the recommendation of Matthews in May 1957, among many others, since at the time he was one of the very few Americans who had talked to Fidel Castro.

Some other testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which Weyl does not quote, might not have been irrelevant. According to Batista's commander in the Sierra Maestra area, Col. Ugalde Carrillo, his forces there numbered 6,000 to 7,000. He estimated Castro's men at 700 to 800. In addition, Batista's army contained more than 33,000 men elsewhere. This force of over 40,000 had for years obtained as much arms as it had wanted from the United States and elsewhere. The American Ambassador from 1953 to the middle of 1957, Arthur Gardner, was so pro-Batista that, as Mrs. Ruby Hart Phillips (the longtime New York Times correspondent in Havana) has written in her recent book, the dictator was embarrassed, because he thought that the Ambassador was overdoing it. Despite Matthews' remarkable briefing, Gardner's successor, Earl Smith, was so anti-Castro that his subordinates pleaded with him in vain to be less partisan. And despite Matthews' pro-Castro articles of February 1957, Castro's entire force 14 months later numbered only 300 (according to Mills) and at most 800 (according to Ugalde).

The forces at Batista's disposal were to the very end so superior in numbers and weapons that only a vast popular revulsion can account for Batista's debacle. Batista's chief of staff, Gen. Francisco Tabernilla, came much closer to the truth when he was asked whether the army could have successfully resisted Castro's march on Havana. "It could," he replied, "but not for a long time, because by that time, the people of Cuba were already against the regime of Batista, and there is no army, once the people get up in arms, that can suppress it."

Herbert Matthews has expressed his latest views in the "Hispanic American Report" (August 29, 1960, Stanford University). He has evidently been saddened by the development of Castro's regime into a dictatorship, without freedom, under the control of one man. He maintains: "Despite strong resemblances, it is not Marxism, communism, or fascism, but it is getting close to a totalitarian structure of some sort." Yet, even as Matthews wrote these words, Guevara was characterizing the Cuban revolution as implicitly Marxist. Matthews also continues to resist the evidence of Castro's deliberate policy of aid and comfort to the official Communists. For example, he declares that "Fidel played into their hands unwittingly from the beginning by allowing his 26th of July movement, which had made and won the revolution, to wither away. This left a vacuum into which the Reds naturally moved." Unwittingly? It was, as has been admitted, a coldblooded decision, no more unwitting than the more recent one to allow the rebel army to wither away. Unlike some pro-Castro apologists, however, Matthews does not pooh-pooh the possibility of Communist domination. On the contrary, he regards it as so far advanced that the point of no return does not seem far away. But in his anxiety to absolve Castro himself of the prime responsibility, he sometimes argues that Castro's pro-Communist policy was logical, sometimes that he blundered into it, and sometimes that he was pushed into it. In effect, Matthews' faith in Castro has dimmed but not died, and he is still capable of writing: "Paradoxical though it may seem, Americans should be praying that nothing happens to Fidel Castro. Any hope of changing the situation for the better lies with him."

8. WHOSE REVOLUTION?

On one thing Mills, Johnson, and Weyl almost agree. For Mills, Castro's regime is "a revolutionary dictatorship of the peasants and workers." For Johnson, it is a "genuine dictatorship of the proletariat." For Weyl, it is "a dictatorship of the proletariat." What can these long-suffering, ill-defined words mean in relation to Cuba today?

When I visited Cuba last spring, the Cabinet—a fair sampling of the top leadership—was made up of eight lawyers, three former students, two professors, one architect, one engineer and the like. Most of them still hold the same offices or have been replaced by people of the same type. Everyone attended a university (some in the United States), came from upper- or middle-class homes, and became or aspired to become a professional or intellectual. Not a single one represents in any conceivable sense the peasantry or proletariat, or owes his position to its organized strength or pressure. What they are they owe solely to Fidel Castro, and they are responsible to him alone. This much is recognized by Mills who flatly states that Castro possesses "virtually absolute power" in Cuba today. But where does that leave the "dictatorship of the peasants and workers?"

Reflecting on the situation as they saw it in the spring of 1960, Huberman and Sweezy gave the peasantry the decisive role in the victorious revolution, made Castro the "embodiment of the revolutionary will and energy of the peasantry," and extolled the Cuban peasantry as "perhaps one of the world's most deeply revolutionary classes" and "as radical a social class as any in the world today." Six months later they returned to Cuba and discovered that the peasantry had been superseded as the "most revolutionary class" by the working class and that the peasant manned and nourished rebel army had suffered a relative eclipse. They were delighted in the spring and they were enchanted in the fall; the peasant revolution was wonderful and the swift dispossession of the peasant revolution was even more so. But why the peasantry should have been superseded if it really was "as radical a social class as any in the world today," they do not try to explain. It is conceivable that the class which had really made the revolution, which the Lider Máximo embodied, and which was perhaps the most deeply revolutionary class in the world today, would permit itself to be pushed into the background without a word of protest or token of resistance? Is this the behavior of a class toward its revolution?

The process thus conjured up is clearly mythological. Those who gave the revolution to the peasantry could also take it away. The peasantry never had in its hands any of the levers of command of the revolution, before or after the victory. The revolution was made and always controlled by declassed sons and daughters of the middle class, first in the name of the entire people, then of the peasants, and now of the workers and peasants. At most the revolution is doing things for and to the peasants and workers. The good and evil in these things may be open to debate, but who decides these things and to what class they belong are not. For Marx, the notion that the peasants would have been the driving force of a socialistic revolution would have been simply unthinkable; the idea that the working class would have to be swept into a socialist revolution after it had been made by another class and as a mechanical result of nationalization from above, equally so.

The alleged role of the working class in this revolution is just as fanciful as that attributed to the peasantry. In December a few hundred authentic proletarians employed by the Cuban Electric Co. staged a protest march from union headquarters to the Presidential Palace. The rank and file was discontented because the new management of the nationalized electric company had cracked down on privileges long tolerated under the dictatorship and thereby had reduced its standard of living. The leadership, headed by an old 26th of July militant, was enraged because the central Trade Union Federation (now completely controlled by the Communists) had moved to oust it. The rebellion was quelled by the flight of the union leaders to foreign embassies and a long, angry speech by Prime Minister Castro. He admitted that a large part not only of the electric workers but of the mass of workers in general was confused. He scorned those who would exchange the right of the working class to govern and direct the country for a plate of lentils. At one point, he declared: "Do you know what is the first goal for which the working class should fight, the only goal for which a working class in a modern country should fight fundamentally? For the conquest of political power."

This speech was noteworthy for the political vocabulary employed for the first time by Castro, but it told much more about him than about the Cuban proletariat. Would it be necessary to exhort the proletariat to take power in a dictatorship of the proletariat? And if it followed his advice, would all the lawyers in Castro's government remain in power? Of all the dictatorships of the proletariat which have been bestowed on us in this century, Castro's is surely the least convincing.

Events have also dealt unkindly with Jean-Paul Sartre's clairvoyance. In the introduction (dated September 12, 1960) to the Brazilian editon of his series of articles on Cuba, he wrote: "No, if Cuba desires to separate from the Western bloc, it is not through the crazy ambition of linking itself to the Eastern bloc." He also communicated his certainty that its objective is not to strengthen one bloc to the detriment of the other. On December 10, Major Guevara was crazy enough to announce publicly in Moscow: "We wholeheartedly support the statement adopted by this conference [of 81 Communist parties]." It would be hard to imagine any way of linking Cuba more closely to the Eastern bloc or of strengthening that bloc to the detriment of the West than the wholehearted support of this statement.

The attitude of Paul Johnson in the New Statesman toward Latin America in general and Cuba in particular smacks of a peculiar

kind of anticolonial colonialism. For him, their basic economic problems cannot be solved through mere electoral victories, since effective legislation requires the assent of the armed forces. Therefore, only Fidelismo or communism—which he regards as natural enemies—remain as practical alternatives. In the case of Cuba, he seems to have cut the ground under his own argument, since the armed forces disappeared and the need for their assent vanished with them. The main theme of Castro's "History Will Absolve Me" speech of 1953 and of all his statements until he assumed power was that Cuba's social and economic problems could be solved within the framework of the constitution of 1940. But there was one thing the constitution excluded—the dictatorship of a Líder Máximo and his junta. The colonialists used to say that some peoples were not fit for anything but some form of imperialism. The anticolonial colonialists say that some peoples are not fit for anything but some form of totalitarianism.

In the end, one wonders how far such words as "socialism," "democracy," "Marxism," and "dictatorship of the proletariat" can be stretched. For some of Castro s admirers, they can be stretched to the point of meaninglessness.

Five years ago, for example, Huberman and Sweezy were shocked by Nikita Khrushchev's expose at the Soviet Communist Party's 20th Congress of his predecessor's vices. After a suitable period of reflection and repentance, they came up with a theory of Stalinism as "good ends with bad means." They explained that Stalinism "became the instrument of the advance to socialism" but, unhappily, "incorporated the methods of oriental despotism—murder, mendacity, duplicity, brutality, and above all arbitrariness." [10] This view of Stalinism has its roots in a certain conception of socialism. In this conception all that essentially matters is that the economy should be nationalized. The nationalizing state may be murderous, mendacious, guilty of duplicity, brutal and arbitrary, but it is still "socialist." And by separating the ends from the means, the political from the economic, what the state controls from who controls the state, socialism can be arrived at through oriental despotisms of pseudopeasant revolutions.

9. THE CUBAN VARIANT

Marxian socialism was predicated not merely on a nationalized economy but on the harmonious development of several factors. The achievement of economic democracy by the socialist revolution presupposed the achievement of political democracy by the bourgeois-democratic revolution. For this reason, the classical Marxists took political democracy for granted, as we no longer can, and they assumed that economic democracy would be built on it. They conceived of socialism as the culmination of capitalist development, without which the prerequsites of socialism—an advanced industrial economy and a preponderant, impoverished, class-conscious proletariat—could not be fulfilled.

History has not worked out that way. Where capitalism has been successful, the prerequsite of a preponderant, impoverished, class-conscious proletariat has not been fulfilled; and where capitalism has not been successful, the prerequsite of an advanced industrial economy has also not been fulfilled. Either the middle class has not been strong enough to achieve a viable capitalist economy or it has been strong enough to bar the way to a socialist economy.

This familiar dilemma of modern socialism has spawned all sorts of bastard and spurious socialisms. Instead of the proletariat, they issue out of the middle class, but of that portion in revolt against the failure of the middle class. These sons and daughters of the bourgeoisie gravitate irresistibly toward the ideology of socialism, but they can make use only of those aspects of socialism which conditions permit them to utilize. They cannot be faithful to the fundamental ideas of the socialist tradition—that the proletariat should liberate itself, that there are prerequisites of socialism, especially an advanced industrial economy, and that socialism must fulfill and complement political democracy.

But there is one aspect of socialism on which they can seize without delay or restraint. They can find in Marxism an ideological sanction for the unrestricted and unlimited use of the state to change the social order, and they can find in Leninism a sanction for their unrestricted and unlimited power over the state. In classical Marxism, the role of the socialist state was conditioned by the stage of development at which it was put into effect and by the class relationships which governed its realization. In this caricature of socialism, however, the only prerequisite that really matters is the seizure of power, no matter by whom, how, when, or where. Thus we live in a time not only of Cuban socialism but of Indonesian socialism and even of African socialism.

This phenomenon indicates that we are badly in need of new words to assume some of the burden that has been thrust on socialism. The order of development cannot be inverted—first the revolution, then the prerequisites of socialism—without resulting in a totally different kind of social order, alien to the letter and, infinitely more, to the spirit of socialism. These inverted revolutions from above belong to what, for want of a better word, we must call the Communist family of revolutions, which, in practice, serve to industrialize the peasantry rather than to liberate the proletariat. But even this family has grown so large and now covers so much ground that its name does not necessarily guarantee full understanding.

For about 30 years, the only communism was Russian communism and, in effect, communism was whatever the Russians said it was. Then, in 1948, came the Titoist variant—a small Communist state in rebellion against Russian domination—and, at the end of 1949, the Chinese variant—a Communist state so vast that it could rival Soviet Russia in power. But both the Yugoslav and Chinese Communist leaderships derived from a common source, the Comintern, which from 1919 to 1943 was tightly controlled by and wholly dependent on the Russian Communists. Thus far the line of decent was clear and direct.

Now a new branch of the family has begun to emerge. It is related to the national-revolutionary movements which the world Communist movement long before Khrushchev had recognized as a distinct force and with which it had sometimes collaborated and sometimes competed. As late as 1954, the Soviet press attacked Ghana's President Kwame Nkrumah and his party as a screen for British imperialism. Under Khrushchev, however, the pendulum has swung over to the outermost limits of collaboration. This policy, apparently one of the points at issue between the Russian and Chinese Communist parties, reflects the undeniable fact of the last few years that no Communist has been a match for Nkrumah in Ghana, Sékou Touré in Guinea, or Fidel Castro in Cuba. The local Communists were, therefore, advised to bide their time and achieve their goal in two stages instead of one. First the national-revolutionary movement could win power, then the Communists could win power in the national-revolutionary movements.

This strategy owes its success to a shrewd assessment of the national-revolutionary movements. They are far more capable than the Communists of achieving national unity against the common enemy. But the common enemy, not a social and political program, gives them their raison d'être. As a result, they are much more inspiring and effective, before taking power than they are afterward. Filling the political and social vacuum the day after the revolution gives the Communists greater opportunities than they had during the revolution. Above all, the nationalist leaders are usually men whose magnetic mass appeal is combined with intellectual fuzziness, adventurist temperaments, and insatiable egos. Their strong point makes them indispensable and their weak points vulnerable to the Communists. They serve the Communists only on condition that the Communists should appear to be serving them. Their political school was nothing like the Comintern, and they represent a variant still farther away from the Russian prototype than Marshal Tito or Mao Tse-tung.

This variant has gone farther in Cuba than anywhere else, though the story is far from finished there, too. For this reason, Fidel Castro has cast such a large shadow from such a small island.

The phenomenon of Fidel Castro has, as yet, received little serious study. His revolution may not be the one that he promised to make, but it is for all that a genuine revolution. It is related to other upheavals in countries with similar national and social resentments and inequalities. It cannot be dismissed as nothing more than a diabolical aberration because it is not what it claims to be. It belongs to a new type of system, neither capitalist nor socialist, that emerges where capitalism has not succeeded and socialism cannot succeed. In most pro- and anti-Castro propaganda, the revolution that brought him into power is so ruthlessly distorted that his entire political development begins and ends in fantasy. The serious student will seek answers to questions that the mythologists of "Left" and "Right" do not even ask. How could a revolution basically middle-class in nature be turned against that class? How could a revolution made without the official Communists and for the most part despite them become so intimately linked with them? How, in short, could Fidel Castro promise one revolution and make another, and what consequences flowed from this revolutionary schizophrenia?

The answers, as I have suggested, take us into territory that has been as yet hardly explored. For the Communists and the Fidelistas to meet, both had to travel some distance from their starting points. The Communists had to make up their minds that they could win power, not against Fidel but only through Fidel. In all probability, this decision was made after an internal struggle in the first half of 1958 between the old guard Stalinist leadership headed by the general secretary, Blas Roca, and a more flexible Khrushchevite group represented by the editor of the party organ, Carlos Rafael Rodriguez. Some competent observers believe that the deal was made in the Sierra Maestra before Castro took power and that all his moves have been determined by this pact. Others think that he went through a period of wavering and vacillation in the first months of his regime. In any case, his major decisions were made so secretively and within such a small group that even former members of his government profess to be uncertain of his commitments and motives.

The inner history of Castro's regime remains to be told. Its main lines, however, have become increasingly clear. Fidel Castro—as much demagog as idealist, as much adventurer as revolutionary, as much anarchist as Communist or anything else—was suddenly and unexpectedly catapulted into

Footnotes at end of speech.

power without a real party, a real army, or a real program. In the struggle for power, he had put forward no original economic or political ideas and had stayed well within the limits of traditional democratic reform and idiom in Cuba. He differed from Batista's other enemies chiefly in the tactics he was willing to employ, in his faith in armed struggle and his willingness to organize it. But once power came into his hands, he refused to permit anything that might lessen or restrict it. He would not tolerate the functioning of a government which was not the facade of his personal rule or of a party which might develop a life of its own. His power and his promises were from the first incompatible, and this contradiction forced him to seek a basis for his regime wholly at variance with that of the anti-Batista revolution. He did not have the disciplined and experienced cadres, the ideology, and the international support to switch revolutions in full view of the audience. Only the Cuban and Russian Communists could make them available to him. Having formerly collaborated with Batista (whose government once contained both Juan Marinello and Carlos Rafael Rodriguez), the Cuban Communists were easily capable of collaborating with Castro. The united front of Communists and Fidelistas is heading, as Guevara recently intimated in Moscow, toward a united party, and if it materializes, Fidel Castro will certainly go down in history not as the Líder Máximo of a new movement but as the Pied Piper of an old one. Still, as long as the Communists need him at least as much as he needs them, further surprises cannot be ruled out; Fidel's ego may give the Communists as much trouble as it has given many others.

When I returned from Cuba last spring, I wrote: "Castro once spoke of his revolution as 'liberty with bread and without terror.' If he continues to push too hard, too fast, and too far, Cuba may yet have more terror without either bread or liberty."[11] Unfortunately, my worst apprehensions have come true, and Fidel Castro has given Cuba not a national revolution but an international civil war.

---

[1] In their book, Huberman and Sweezy devote less than a page to the working class, compared to pages about the peasantry, and they vaguely suggest far more working-class support for the revolution before 1959 than was actually the case. In part of one sentence elsewhere in the book, however, they admit that growing support among urban workers came to Castro after he took power. In the subsequent article in the Monthly Review of December 1960, they imply the peculiar backwardness of the Cuban workers by writing that "the nationalizations of the summer and fall have swept the working class into the revolutionary process."

[2] Castro himself described his isolated and near-desperate situation in his letter of Dec. 31, 1957, to the so-called Council of Liberation: "For those who are fighting against an army incomparable in number and in arms, without any support during a whole year other than the dignity with which we are fighting for a cause which we love sincerely and the conviction that it is worth while to die for it, bitterly forgotten by fellow countrymen who, in spite of having all the ways and means, have systematically (not to say criminally) denied us their help." The entire document is contained in Jules Dubois' "Fidel Castro" (1959), to this date the best documentary source, though its pro-Castro bias has been regretted and repudiated by its author.

[3] Castro's manifesto of Mar. 12, 1958, reads in part: "2. That the strategy of the final stroke should be based on the general revolutionary strike, to be seconded by military action."

[4] Declaraciónes del P.S.P., 12 de abril de 1958.

[5] Verde Olivo, Oct. 8, 1960.

[6] Castro's pre-1959 promises are dealt with by Huberman and Sweezy in a peculiar way. Twelve-and-a-half pages of the 1953 speech are cited, but omitted is the five-point program on which he said the revolution was based. This program began: "The first revolutionary law would have restored sovereignty to the people and proclaimed the constitution of 1940 as the true supreme law of the state, until such time as the people should decide to modify it or to change it." The others provided for grants of land to small planters and peasants, with indemnification to the former owners; the right of workers to share in profits; a greater share of the cane crop to all planters; and confiscation of all illegally obtained property.

While the speech makes other important points, this is the only itemized program in it, and it is hard to see how its omission can be justified. The unity pact of July 1958 is handled in the same way. It contained three points: a common strategy, postwar normality, and a minimum governmental program. I have quoted the second point in full in the text. Huberman and Sweezy cite a paragraph in this unity pact which asked the United States to cease all military and other types of aid to Batista, but ignore the three-point program, which might have put Castro's promises in a somewhat different light.

Mills simply ignores the whole collection of Castro's prepower pledges.

[7] One of Castro's titles is also "El Jefe de la Revolución," as on the front page of the leading semiofficial newspaper, Revolución, December 16, 1960. The same issue contains two "líder máximo."

[8] The present-day Cuban cooperatives are usually traced back to Castro's "History Will Absolve Me" speech in 1953. A careful reading of the key passage in that speech hardly bears this out:

"A revolutionary government, after transferring the ownership of parcels of land to the 100,000 small farmers who today pay rent, would proceed to a definite solution of the land problem by, first, establishing as the constitution orders, a maximum acreage for each type of agricultural enterprise and acquiring the excess acreage by means of expropriation, recovering lands usurped from the state, filling in swamp and marsh lands, planting vast tracts and reserving zones for reforestation; second, distributing the remaining land among farming families with preference given to the largest ones, encouraging agricultural cooperatives for the common use of costly equipment, cold storage, and a uniform professional direction in cultivation and breeding, and, finally, to facilitate assistance, equipment, protection, and useful knowledge to the farming population" ("Pensamiento Político, Económico y Social de Fidel Castro," Editorial Lex, Havana, 1959, pp. 44–45).

I have purposely translated this passage in its literal form in order to give the reader a sense of where cooperatives belonged in the total scheme of Castro's 1953 agricultural policy. They obviously occupied a minor place in the general scheme; they were intended, in the traditional meaning of cooperatives, to service independent landowners. These 1953 cooperatives were clearly not the state farms of 1959. In addition, Castro seems to have dropped or rarely mentioned cooperatives after 1953.

The version of this passage in the Huberman-Sweezy book (p. 41) is taken from the official English translation of this speech, published by the Liberal Press, New York. For some reason, the phrase "for the common use of costly equipment, cold storage" was omitted from this translation, as a result of which the whole section on cooperatives is somewhat distorted. In 1953, Castro's "agrarian reform" meant what it has usually meant: land for landless peasants. But, then, Huberman and Sweezy discovered, via a translation, that Cuban peasants do not want their own land; they did not even understand the question of owning their own land "until it had been repeatedly rephrased and explained" (p. 116, note). Huberman and Sweezy add that this incident set them off on their entire interpretation of the Cuban revolution. If so, the Cuban peasants are truly unique, and no one apparently ever understood them before—certainly not Fidel Castro who put so much emphasis on giving them their own land in 1953 and after.

[9] Senator Orville H. Platt gave his name to the famous amendment which empowered the United States to intervene in Cuba; it was revoked in 1934. The Platt amendment was written into the Cuban Constitution as an appendix in 1901 and embodied in the United States-Cuban Treaty of 1903. Weyl manages in a single sentence (p. 55, note) to get Senator Platt's first name and the date of his amendment wrong—a curious feat for a student of Cuba.

[10] Monthly Review, July-August 1956, pp. 71–72.

[11] Theodore Draper, "The Runaway Revolution," "The Reporter," May 12, 1960.

Hon. A. R. Stout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have just finished in this body debate on the judgeship bill. I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Wexahachie Daily Light which I feel sets forth my concept of a Federal judge. Like the editorial states, I personally feel that the Honorable A. R. Stout, present district judge for the 40th district of Texas. Judge Stout has been a friend of mine of long standing, and the following editorial is, indeed, a tribute to his abilities.

JUDGE STOUT MERITS APPOINTMENT

A Federal judgeship has become a position of increased importance, because of the ever increasing number of cases which come under the jurisdiction of the Federal courts. Soon two, and perhaps three, new Federal judges will be appointed to serve the northern district of Texas.

Citizens and lawyers alike are vitally interested that the imminent appointments to Federal judgeships be made with due regard to demonstrated competence on the bench, and our national leaders are to be commended for their public statements that competence, rather than politics, will control the appointments.

Competence on the bench requires a careful blending of scholarship in the law, experience as a trial judge, and a wide knowledge of human experience and human frailties which lead to lawsuits. These qualifications can only be attained by years of intelligent devotion to duty. Success in attaining the goal can only be judged by a man's accomplishments in the related fields of legal scholarship and trial experience.

In weighing competence, Ellis County can be proud that it offers a potential Federal district judge in the person of A. R. Stout

who satisfies the rigid requirements. His legal research, published works, and addresses at legal institutes have demonstrated his scholarly approach to the law, with due and proper regard for legal precedent. His 23 years as a trial judge have demonstrated his practical applications of law in an ever-changing era. But, most vital of all, his unquestioned integrity as a judge would maintain the high level of confidence which this country has always had in the fairness of its Federal courts.

Ellis County is right in urging that the said A. R. Stout be given foremost consideration for appointment as a Federal judge.

Holders of Prime Government Contracts Urged To Spread Work Out Among Small Firms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address delivered by Hon. Irving Maness, Deputy Director of the Small Business Administration before the Small Business Symposium at Chicago on April 5.

Mr. Maness' remarks are cogent and contain advice that holders of prime contracts should heed:

ADDRESS BY IRVING MANESS, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION FOR PROCUREMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, BEFORE THE SMALL BUSINESS SYMPOSIUM, CHICAGO, ILL., APRIL 5, 1961

I am happy to be here in Chicago to take part in this important symposium. It is good for small and large business to get together for such a constructive purpose.

The SBA is very glad to participate in this meeting, bringing together as it does, small business concerns, high officials of the Air Force and Navy, political leaders and officials of the Flight Propulsion Division of the General Electric Co.

As you gentlemen know, the SBA is continuously interested in insuring that small business concerns obtain a fair share of the total Government purchases. The Small Business Act also enunciates this principle as the declared policy of the Congress. When one considers that the total Government procurement expenditures amount to $29 billion a year—that the U.S. Government is by far the largest single consumer of goods and services in our economy—then it readily becomes apparent that it is important for small firms to have an opportunity to share equitably in this continuing investment in our national security.

If I may be permitted to paraphrase Lincoln, "God must love small business, otherwise he would not have made so many of them." The fact of the matter is that about 96 percent of the business enterprises in our Nation are small and the maintenance of a healthy and vigorous small business community is essential to continued economic growth. While I do not believe that a business concern, small or large, should be dependent solely on Government contract work, I do subscribe to the premise that the continued welfare of our economy depends in keeping open the avenues of opportunity and competition for small business.

I shall tell you why I believe this. Small business has played a vital role as innovators in the development of new ideas, new products, and new processes. These are the elements that continuously stimulate economic development.

We in the SBA know, and the facts bear us out, that increased small business participation in Government procurement means more competition and more competition means better prices and improved quality.

Large business firms are very important to our economy and to the defense production program. No one, I think, would deny this. Defense procurement has shifted toward highly complex weapons and materiel which sometimes cannot be produced in their entirety by small business concerns. The trend is also toward the weapons system type of procurement, under which the prime contractor furnishes all the components for end items. These factors create a situation where the largest percentage of the dollar value of Government contracts go to large business concerns, and that is why the Congress has been concerned that the small firms be given a fair opportunity to share in the purchases and sales of the Federal Government. Many small business concerns do not have the opportunity to take on Government prime contract work. For them, the only possibility to participate in Government procurement is through the subcontract route.

The SBA believes in the type of cooperation that brings together the large prime contractor and the prospective small business subcontractor. In its subcontracting assistance program the Small Business Administration guides small business concerns in obtaining subcontract opportunities. Through its facilities the SBA is able to provide assistance to all parties at all levels. We are in a position to locate qualified small business concerns that can bid on specific items or services.

As part of this program, the Agency is contacting those prime contractors who have the largest Government contracts to arrange a cooperative program of subcontracting to small business concerns. Although some of the principal prime contractors contacted have not agreed to participate in such a program, 47 arrangements with primes have been concluded. These agreements are not limited to defense contracts, but include commercial production as well. All of these agreements are on a voluntary basis and additional informal arrangements are in effect with other prime contractors. We urgently hope that the SBA subcontracting program will be utilized more extensively because it can be of material assistance to large and small business and the Government procurement program.

The SBA is equally concerned in obtaining prime contract opportunities for small business concerns. SBA representatives continuously screen proposed purchases at the principal Government purchasing offices to set aside suitable procurements exclusively for small business bidding. The decision to set aside for small business all or part of a purchase, or class of purchases, is made jointly by the SBA and the purchasing agency.

Small firms that want to sell to the Government should obtain listing on all appropriate bidders lists in order to gain the opportunity to bid on purchases set aside for small business.

An important service of the SBA is that of referring prime contract opportunities to small firms. Under this program the SBA arranges with Government purchasing offices for its field offices to receive bid sets of many procurements which are susceptible to participation by small business concerns.

The SBA then notifies small business concerns which have come to it for assistance in selling to the Government, of the bidding opportunities suitable to their facilities. This service is provided until the firms have time to obtain placement on bidders lists of the procurement offices suggested by the SBA. Notices of future purchases are then received direct from the purchasing installations involved. This procedure enables the SBA to bring bidding opportunities to the attention of many small business concerns of which they otherwise would be unaware.

I have explained in some detail the programs developed by SBA to carry out its important assignment to help small firms gain a fair share of Government purchases and sales.

How effective have these programs been? From 1953 through December 1960, under this program small firms were awarded 105,559 Government contracts for slightly more than $4 billion.

But what is disturbing to the SBA, and to many Members of Congress as well, is that in the fiscal year 1960, for the first time, there was a decrease in the number and value of joint set-asides.

Even more significantly, the small business share of total military purchases of goods and services has been declining from 25.3 percent in 1954 to the low of 16.1 percent in fiscal year 1960. The loss amounts to a proportionate reduction of one-third in the small business share of defense work in the short space of 6 years.

So, it is apparent from these figures that although much has been accomplished, much remains to be done. I can assure you small business proprietors that we in the SBA are determined to make our procurement assistance program as effective as we possibly can.

In this we have the active support of President Kennedy who just recently issued instructions that small busineses, particularly in depressed areas, be given an opportunity to obtain a greater share of defense work.

President Kennedy has announced that his administration is going to try to increase by at least 10 percent the $3,440 million in military contracts allotted to small companies in the 1960 fiscal year.

Immediately upon taking office, our new SBA Administrator, John E. Horne, directed all SBA offices to concentrate their efforts on reducing the heavy backlog of business loan applications and to step up activities in Government procurement set-asides, giving priority to small firms seeking assistance in surplus labor areas.

In line with a Presidential directive, special action was ordered in surplus labor areas. The regional offices of SBA have been advised of the urgency of the situation and directed to give high priority to SBA activities in these areas.

The accelerated SBA program in labor surplus areas calls for the closest cooperation with procurement officers of other agencies to increase the number of procurement contracts for small business, to expand small business procurement set-asides and to secure additional prime subcontracting for small firms.

I can assure you that this much-needed cooperation is being obtained, and that the SBA is determined, in cooperation with other Government agencies, to increase the flow of Government contracts to qualified small firms.

Let me say, in closing, that symposiums such as this are of the highest value, and offer the strongest evidence that Government and business are natural allies. Our interests are closely intertwined.

This symposium, sponsored by General Electric's flight propulsion division, is a great forward step. I hope that in the months to come many other large firms follow this example. This teamwork between General Electric, the SBA, the various branches of the Armed Services and small business community in this great industrial area will, I am sure, pay great dividends.

For my part, I pledge that the SBA will work ceaselessly with and give full cooperation to all businesses, large and small, to the end that enterprising small producers will always have a chance to devote their ingenuity and their energies to helping build a stronger America.

Communists and Clergy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Pilot, Boston, Mass., on April 22, 1961, with reference to the book "Communism and the Churches," by Ralph Lord Roy:

COMMUNISTS AND CLERGY

Last year a very exceptional book was published which can still be read with great profit by thoughtful Americans. It was entitled "Communism and the Churches" and its author was Ralph Lord Roy. The aim of the study—almost 500 pages long—was to measure the involvement of the American churches in the Communist movement in this country and to weigh Communist influence in the religious area generally.

The topic is one that has at once a strange kind of fascination, since the two forces involved seem to be natural enemies. Communism is atheistic, materialistic, and antireligious; the churches by presupposition are concerned primarily with the spiritual life of man and his salvation. Between these two there is plainly an irreconcilable difference which makes anything like cooperation or long coexistence impossible. However, the fact is that a number of churchmen in America themselves joined the Communist Party, a larger number were plainly fellow travelers, and many more allowed themselves to be used unwittingly by the party for its own purposes. How explain all of this?

Mr. Roy in a very painstaking and patient way tells the story of these involvements, attempting to put each one into an appropriate context and striving to stay within the facts as they are known. It is possible to understand the "social gospel" and "social action" reasons why many fervent young ministers, for example, espoused leftwing causes which paraded under appeals to peace, democracy, social justice, civil rights, and human liberty. The Communists made adroit use of these appeals and, especially during the thirties, surrounded themselves with respectability in a manner that made deception easy.

It is possible to sift the evidence with objectivity and to discover certain patterns which expose the motives of those involved and the depth of their commitment. Mr. Roy suggests in summary, for example, that the number of Protestant ministers who actually joined the Communist Party may have been as small as 50 and certainly never more than 200. When one considers that there are half a million clergymen in the United States, this is a tiny percentage. But even for this group there must be an explanation and a careful study like this one helps us to understand the strange phenomenon of the churchman-Communist. More difficult to analyze was the very successful use of the front, where prominent names were carelessly given in support of the most dubious causes. Here some people were what are now called dupes, unwittingly taken in, others apparently knew the nature of the activity but still wished to be associated with it. Each person must be considered separately and his other actions weighed to get the full picture. Mr. Roy's book does this quietly, firmly, and without excitement.

We mention this study at this time because once again there are wild and inexact statements making the rounds on this subject. Although it is never possible to give precise figures on matters of this kind, it is possible to choose reasonable estimates based on the evidence. Everyone who likes to see a careful use of fact and evidence in a difficult and emotional context should read Mr. Roy's book and draw his own conclusions on its intelligence and fairmindedness. It will be hard to avoid the conclusion that his deductions are the final and valid ones in this case.

We may add a postscript which will be of special interest to Catholics. Although some Catholics in the labor movement were wooed, and even won, by the Communists the number was always minuscule. The clergy were apparently never involved in any way and the Catholic opposition to communism was always well known. This is not something about which we should feel superior but rather grateful to the church leadership which had so early diagnosed and condemned the ideology and tactics of the Communists.

Imports on Textiles and Apparels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have stood on this floor and expressed my opinion and the majority opinion of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to seek some relief for the domestic coal and glass producers of Pennsylvania and the rest of the country.

I would now like to speak in behalf of the apparel manufacturers of my district and of the State as a whole. As some of the basic industries of my district have been forced to go out of business due to unfair competition, other industries have come in to help take up the slack. One of these industries is the apparel manufacturing group. My district enjoys a happy relationship with the Phillips-Van Heusen Shirt Corp. and we hope and are working for a larger employment by this company and for similar companies.

I am no isolationist. I recognize that foreign trade is a positive instrument in the assistance in raising living standards of workers throughout the world. But this does not blind me to the scramble for American markets from countries where wages, including all possible fringe benefits, are only a fraction of American wage rates. We have recently voted an increase in the minimum wage from $1 to $1.15. The Senate has voted a similar proposal with escalators to $1.25 an hour.

One does not have to be a trained economist to understand that the American manufacturer who must pay a minimum of $1.15 an hour cannot compete with industries in the Orient that pay from 10 to 29 cents per hour.

Let me take a simple mathematical formula carefully prepared by one of the largest apparel manufacturers in the country who buys exclusively from American mills. His actual cost breakdown per dollar of sales is as follows:

Materials	$0.60
Labor and overhead	.35
Taxes	.03
Profit	0.02
Total	1.00

Foreign apparel manufacturers who operate in low-wage countries pay only a fraction of what the American manufacturer has to pay and that breakdown runs:

Materials	$0.51
Labor and overhead	.03
Taxes	.02
Profit	.02
Total	.58

How does this come about? The great discrepancy between the American and oriental costs of labor and overhead are obvious, but this is compounded by the fact that the foreign manufacturer can buy American cotton at a subsidy of from 6 to 8½ cents a pound, depending on quality. This is roughly a subsidy of 25 percent of the total cost of raw material for the foreign manufacturer.

What kind of a policy is this that subsidizes foreign manufacturers at the cost to American taxpayers and in the last analysis, exports jobs that rightfully belong to American workers?

This is no narrow concept. As a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have a deep and abiding interest in the National Defense Establishment. It is a matter of record that next to steel, apparel and textiles rank next in importance to national defense. This Nation cannot allow itself to slip into a position where it is dependent on foreign sources of supply for clothing and equipment for our Military Establishment. We know the disasters that befell Germany and Japan because they could not supply their armies with sufficient clothing.

I listened the other day to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON], point out that 40 percent of the budget for Camp Lejeune, the base of the 2d Marine Division for the Atlantic Fleet, is for equipment and supplies classified in the category of textiles. Mr. HENDERSON said that this was not just a matter of clothing of all types, but the essentiality of web equipment for such things as cartridge belts, rifle slings, and the hundreds of other military items of which textiles are an essential component.

We must not simply cling to old ideas because at one time or another we thought they were right. They were right at the time we expressed them, but in this rapidly changing world we must be alert to change our ideas with the changing world. I make no plea, nor do the apparel and textile industries of my State make any plea, to ban or prohibit imports. We know this is

impossible in the world in which we live, but we are also fully aware that laissez faire in foreign trade is no more reliable than laissez faire economics in the domestic scene. Adjustments must be made.

Some of us would go further in adjustments in many respects than others, but we should not blink the fact that unless imports of apparel and textiles are controlled on a quota basis, country by country and category by category, we are only increasing the hard core unemployment problem that our country faces.

This is especially true for my State.

We have a hard-core unemployment problem in the bituminous and anthracite coalfields and in glass-producing districts. The specialist on unemployment from the Labor Department said the other day the danger is that hard-core unemployment will increase. He made it clear that the increase in hard-core unemployment came from the unskilled and semiskilled. The vast number of people in the apparel industry would qualify as semiskilled. If they are dumped on the heap of the unemployed because we fail to regulate imports which gobble their jobs, then we have failed in our duty.

Many areas of the country, and this is true in my State, are hard pressed to find tax money to keep our communities running at a high level.

Gentlemen, if we force industries to close and lose the corporate income, and at the same time create unemployment, which loses individual income, where are we heading? It is my opinion that you know.

Let us not be derelict in our duty.

Operation California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of our colleagues are very familiar with the excellent work being done by junior achievement programs throughout the country. By providing the necessary guidance and facilities, junior achievement makes possible a unique opportunity for young people to obtain a direct and personal understanding of the problems, procedures and rewards of business under the American free-enterprise system.

By operating their own junior achievement companies, under the auspices of a parent company, young people are introduced to the complexities of modern and highly competitive business. Accepting full responsibility for all aspects of business management, sales, distribution, production, cost control, and so forth, they learn by doing—not only the specific operations of business but the real value of developing the virtues of initiative, teamwork, reliability, hard work, and imagination.

Although my knowledge of individual junior achievement programs is limited, I can imagine no program anywhere in the country which surpasses that offered by Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc., in scope, numbers of young people participating, in the ambition and originality of its programs, and in the success of its operations. Credit for their outstanding record must go to the dozens of outstanding industrialists and businessmen who give so much of their time and experience to junior achievement and to J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president of the Union County organization.

During the past junior achievement year, a special youth incentive program, called Operation California, was developed and executed. The winning participants are now enjoying the fruits of their achievements during a weeklong trip to California.

In order to acquaint our colleagues with the major features of this unusual and highly successful program, I include as a part of my remarks, first, the winning essay, entitled "Why I Believe in Our Free Enterprise System," submitted by William Christer of 702 Bayway Avenue, Elizabeth, as a part of Operation California, and an outline of the operations and objectives of Operation California prepared by Mr. Roden.

The essay and the outline follow:

JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT
OF UNION COUNTY, INC.,
Elizabeth, N.J., September 12, 1960.

To: Junior Achievement Advisers.
From: J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president.
Subject: Operation California.

Operation California is a three-pronged public relations, youth incentive, and youth educational project, planned, and developed by Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc. Pending final approval by the junior achievement board of directors, Operation California is tentatively scheduled for April 24 through April 29, 1961.

OBJECTIVES OF OPERATION CALIFORNIA

(1) To provide junior achievers and advisers with a positive, effective incentive program designed to stimulate a clear, complete understanding of the benefits and rewards of the American free enterprise system. The program will demonstrate that every individual, whether employee, manager, or community leader, must always be aware that the American way of life, the free enterprise system, depends upon personal initiative, creative thinking, responsible leadership, teamwork, and that each individual must carry his share of the load and discharge his responsibilities to the best of his ability. The program will further demonstrate that each individual's contribution, if properly utilized, will result in a profit to the individual, to the employer, to the community, and to the Nation; and that corporate profits will assure us of continued growth, prosperity and stability, all of which are more valuable and desirable than security through handout or a welfare state.

(2) To reverse the emphasis teenagers are placing on benefits and security in employment. Such attitudes contribute to a preference for a welfare state economy and fail to develop the full potential of the individual as an employee, manager, and community leader.

(3) To maintain the high standards of performance, productivity and prestige of the Junior Achievement program. Special emphasis will be placed on stimulating and developing personal initiative, creative thinking, responsible leadership, high attendance, punctuality on the individual and total company level, improved production techniques to result in reduction of operating costs, and aggressive and continuing safety programs.

(4) To expand the "learn by doing" principle of Junior Achievement. The experience of jet air transportation will demonstrate to the junior achievers how, under the free enterprise system, research and development in the transportation industry have aided overall industrial development by bringing all segments of the Nation closer together. We believe that this type of incentive program will develop in the achievers full understanding of the teamwork and responsible, cooperative leadership necessary to the continued growth and strength of the Nation and the individual.

(5) To demonstrate to junior achievers, parents, educators, and the community at large the degree of interest which local businessmen have in our young people. The program will demonstrate to the community that local business and industrial organizations are good neighbors, willing to help prepare young people for the day when they must accept responsibilities of business, professional and international leadership.

SUMMARY OF OPERATION CALIFORNIA

Operation California will be a 6-day project. A group of Achievers, accompanied by adult advisers, will be flown to California via American Airlines jet aircraft. The program during their stay in California contemplates visits to historical and educational cities, and visits to west-coast industries, including the motion picture studios. A meeting at Disneyland with Mr. Walt Disney is planned. Mr. Disney's accomplishments and contributions to education and this important industry are an excellent example of individual success under the free-enterprise system. Meetings with other prominent leaders in the motion picture industry are also being arranged. (These plans are presently in the discussion stage. The program and itinerary will be distributed by January 16, 1961.)

PLANNING BY ADVISERS

Operation California is an incentive program to encourage each Junior Achievement company, as well as each individual Junior Achiever, to maintain high standards in all phases of operations. Only Junior Achievement companies which meet or exceed the performance standards outlined below will qualify to nominate company members for participation in Operation California.

Advisers should prepare now to maintain standards in company operations which will assure that their companies will qualify, and also prepare to select outstanding Achievers for nomination to participate in Operation California.

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

(1) Attendance: Each Junior Achievement company must maintain a monthly attendance rating of not less than 85 percent. In order to be counted present, each Achiever must have punched his timecard and reported to his company work area no later than 7 p.m. Attendance record sheets signed by the company secretary and an adviser must be turned in to the program director at the end of each company meeting. In the case of Merck, White Laboratories, Bristol-Myers, Lockheed, and Mineral Products which do not meet at the Elizabeth Business Center, attendance forms must be mailed to Junior Achievement headquarters in Elizabeth the day following the company meeting. Reports received by mail will be checked as to the time and date stamped on the envelope by the post office.

Achievers who fail to attend the first company meeting will be contacted by telephone. If the notice of the first meeting was received, and unless the achiever was ill, the absent achiever will be dropped from the company and a replacement assigned by Junior Achievement.

In the event of dropouts, and if the junior company wishes to maintain its total membership at its beginning number, replacements will be made by Junior Achievement up until December 1, 1960.

(2) Company meeting schedules: Each company must meet one night a week from 7 to 9 p.m. The first company meeting should be scheduled as soon as possible after Junior Achievement issues the membership list.

There will be no company meeting on November 24, Thanksgiving Day. Companies which wish to make up lost production and sales time may request an extra work night by contacting the program director.

There will be no official company meetings from December 23 through January 1. Regular company meetings will be held starting January 2, 1961. During this Christmas vacation period it is strongly recommended that advisers stress the need for achievers to continue to sell their products and to maintain high individual and company sales. This is also a period during which advisers can plan plant tours and other special events.

Official company meetings cannot be canceled because of special school events such as shows, athletic tournaments, etc., or for any operating reasons such as lack of raw materials, low production schedules, or other operating difficulties which reflect poor planning or lack of achiever interest.

In the event of extremely bad weather, cancellation of a company meeting must be cleared with Junior Achievement headquarters in Elizabeth.

(3) Production: The junior company must be in production not later than the fourth company meeting.

(4) Operating plan and budget: The company must submit to Junior Achievement headquarters not later than the eighth company meeting, a copy of its operating budget and profit plan which must provide for fixed company payments as outlined in the bulletin dated September 12, 1960, entitled "Operating Procedures—Fiscal Practices."

(5) Special credits for outstanding performance: Special consideration will be given to nominees of Junior Achievement companies which have shown evidence of outstanding performance in any of the following areas:

(a) Exceptional improvement in any phase of company performance, through increased efficiency, cost reduction programs, sales incentive plans, safety programs, 100 percent attendance, punctuality, good housekeeping, etc.

(b) Originality in any phase of company operations.

(c) Outstanding teamwork among company members.

(d) Unusually good management by company officers.

(6) Penalties: Although it is not anticipated that there will be any reason for imposing a penalty upon any junior achievement company for any reason, it must be emphasized that a severe penalty will be imposed upon a company in the event of an accident caused by carelessness or horseplay.

NOMINATION OF ACHIEVERS

Each Junior Achievement company which qualifies will have the privilege of nominating two members, one boy and one girl, for participation in Operation California. Consideration should be given only to outstanding achievers.

Advisers should take into consideration qualities of leadership, personal initiative, appearance, poise, ability to get along well with young people and with adults, Junior Achievement attendance, punctuality, attitude toward safety regulations, knowledge of Junior Achievement company operations, and general knowledge of the sponsoring company's operations.

Advisers must bear in mind that junior achievers who are selected to participate in Operation California will be good-will ambassadors of our industrial and educational community, and will be guests of California businessmen and governmental leaders.

SELECTION OF ACHIEVERS

Nominations will be made on a nomination form provided by Junior Achievement. Four signed copies must be returned to Junior Achievement headquarters prior to a deadline date which will be specified by Junior Achievement staff.

All nominees will be interviewed by a committee of Junior Achievement officials and a member of the Junior Achievers Association. They will be notified by Junior Achievement of the time and place of the interview.

Selection of achievers who will participate will be announced several weeks in advance of the trip dates. At that time arrangements will be made to obtain written permission of parents or guardians for those achievers who will make the trip to California.

TRANSPORTATION

Transportation to California will be arranged by Junior Achievement. Advisers will be requested to assist in making satisfactory arrangements for transportation of achievers to and from the Junior Achievement business center. The Elizabeth Daily Journal will furnish transportation to and from Idlewild Airport.

PREPARATION OF ACHIEVERS

If an achiever from your company is selected to participate in Operation California, you should take full responsibility for his or her preparation to participate actively in all phases of the program.

Remember: The impression our junior achievers make upon the press, the California officials, representatives of the motion picture industry, and other businessmen, will reflect upon Junior Achievement of Union County, upon our advisers, and upon our sponsoring industries.

The following points are essential. You will think of others.

(1) Be sure your achiever is thoroughly prepared to discuss the operation of his junior achievement company and, in a general way, his sponsoring company.

(2) Explain carefully to the achiever that he will be the guest of Californians, and will have a unique opportunity to leave with those he meets a fine impression of American youth.

(3) Review the questions which have been prepared for the guidance of the achievers.

(4) Impress upon the achiever that it is common courtesy to show a sincere interest in his host's community and activities. The achiever should ask questions.

(5) Explain the importance of good grooming. Advise the achiever to follow instructions which will be given to him in writing with regard to dress.

(6) Explain the importance of courtesy and punctuality. Ask the achiever to keep in mind that press, magazine, newsreel and television photographers and cameramen will be invited to take photographs throughout the trip. The achievers must remember that these men and women have a job to do and should help them by being cooperative, punctual and courteous.

INCENTIVE PROGRAM COMMITTEE

The committee in charge of the planning and execution of Operation California includes: William M. Bristol III, president, Bristol-Myers Products Division; John J. Conlon, vice-president, Phelps Dodge Copper Products Corp.; Harry Frank, publisher, Elizabeth Daily Journal; James L. Macwithey, president, American Publics Relations Association, New Jersey Chapter; G. Ross Murrell, manager, Esso Standard Division, Humble Oil & Refining Co.; J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president, Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc.

As part of our youth incentive program, Operation California, each junior achiever was invited to submit an essay titled "Why I Believe in Our Free Enterprise System." The following is the essay which was awarded first place by the committee of judges. The winner was William Christer of 702 Bayway Avenue, Elizabeth, N.J. He is a junior at St. Mary's High School in Elizabeth and a member of Jay-Vern Co., the Junior Achievement company sponsored by S.E. & M. Vernon, Inc.

WHY I BELIEVE IN OUR FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

(By William Christer)

There is one outstanding reason why I firmly believe in our free enterprise system, it works. All we have to do is to look around, and we can see the advantages of our system everywhere, in the school, in the factory, and in the home. The people in the United States have the highest standard of living in the world. What is Russia's? Our Government does not control industry, and yet it is willing to help industry when it needs it. Our factories have no fear that if production doesn't go too well the Government will close down the factory and say: "Heads will roll." Socialism just doesn't work. It kills incentive, stifles initiative and destroys ambition. How can such a system hope to last? It can't. Socialism only intends to take over what our system has already created.

We Americans have never had it so good—but we can and will do better. Our system has developed us into the powerful and influential country that we are today. And yet, free enterprise is not stopping—it is constantly going forward, striving toward new and better goals. There is no doubt in my mind that we can achieve these goals—in time. We have not evolved to our present position overnight. It has taken many years and much hard work. Our forefathers were not afraid to work and certainly if there has been no change in this spirit of the American people, there is no limit to what we can do, to what we will do.

It makes no difference to us who believes and who doesn't believe in free enterprise. We know it works. It provides incentive, encourages initiative and spurs ambition. It has provided more benefits for more people than any other system yet devised by man, and it will for years to come, for as long as man's desire to better himself remains with us.

Business Ethics in 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech by Henry Ford II which was made before the Minneapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce on Thursday, April 20, 1960. I also include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post on April 21 be printed after the text of the speech.

Mr. Ford's speech on "Business Ethics in 1961" is a notable and responsible contribution to public understanding. It is refreshing in its honest approach to a solution for the problems of corporate violations of the various antitrust laws on price fixing, collusive bidding, and illegal marketing practices.

The speech and editorial follow:

BUSINESS ETHICS IN 1961

I want to speak this evening on a subject that I believe merits our immediate and serious attention.

Our American industrial system has long been one of the most outstanding accomplishments of our society. We started out as a pioneer people, fervently independent and individualistic, and we built an economic system to match. With time there came increasingly complexity in our society and certain excesses in our corporate behavior. Laws were passed and the untrammeled freedom of business action was restricted. On the whole, it was wisely restricted, so that America was able to enjoy the benefits of substantially free competition, risk capital and profit incentive without the social and human abuses that often attended early-day capitalism.

Because of its early excesses, as we all know, business fell under a cloud and for long years became the scapegoat for many of the Nation's problems, a whipping boy for most of its griefs. Chastened by antitrust laws, squeezed in the giant wringer of the great depression, and restricted by the emergence of huge and powerful labor unions, the American corporation painfully learned that it must assume responsibilities beyond its traditional function of making money for the stockholders.

It learned that, however legal and proper its actions, to act in terms of profit and loss alone was not quite good enough. Something more was required—a positive awareness of national goals and objectives, social as well as economic, and an effort to make its actions conform as much as possible with the prevailing tides of public opinion.

In the past 20 years there has been a material change in the whole outlook of our larger business enterprises, a change toward far greater social maturity and responsibility. Business today understands well how its actions may impinge not only on the lives of individuals but also upon the goals and the policies of our Nation both at home and abroad.

This maturing process did not take place in a vacuum. The business corporation is a mirror of society. It exists at the sufferance of society to serve the broad purposes of society. It reflects at most times the prevailing ethical, moral, and even cultural values of society. More particularly, it tends to reflect the values of the people at the top levels of management.

One of the many fascinating things about a business corporation is that—in its daily life, and not merely in the legal sense—it does take on many of the attributes of a person. It may have quite a distinct personality. It may be liked or hated with real emotion. It may be venal and greedy, negative and reactionary, pompous and self-righteous, just like some people; or it may be full of good will and a sense of public service, adventurous and confident, open and forthright—just like some other people. It may be corrupt, shady, and dishonest, like a few people; or honest and law abiding—to the best of its ability—like most people.

One thing that most corporations—like most people—cannot do is to succeed in creating the impression that they are something other than what they really are. No amount of false front will keep the real character of your company or mine from showing through.

Another important similarity between people and corporations is that both tend to behave as people expect them to behave. Though the business enterprise, like any person, must earn and deserve the respect of society, it too can be discouraged and disheartened by an atmosphere of constant hostility, suspicion, and criticism.

I am concerned, as I am sure many of you are, at a recent chain of events that could arouse broad popular distrust and that could revive old and wornout hostilities toward American business and industry. Too fast and too close together for comfort we have had a series of falls from grace involving some of our oldest and most respected business firms. As a director of one of the electrical goods manufacturers, and as the chief executive officer of an automotive manufacturing business, my concern is more than academic. In addition to price-fixing convictions in the one industry and conflict-of-interest charges in the other, congressional committees, in still other industries, have turned up evidence of widespread collusion between corrupt unions and equally corrupt management. Let me note that, whatever differences our company may have had with the UAW, we have developed a genuine respect for the determination of its leadership to keep it free of corruption.

It would indeed be a sad thing, if the good will and confidence that business has laboriously built up over the years should now be washed away at this very critical juncture in our history.

I am sure all responsible people would hate to see a return of that national pastime of the 1930's—business baiting—or for the matter, an outbreak of labor baiting or any other kind of divisive attacks on American solidarity.

We have vast national problems to solve at home and abroad, problems of chronic unemployment and economic breakthrough, problems of competing more effectively in world trade, problems of leading the free world in strengthening freedom and economic progress in vast continents being courted by international çommunism.

I think it may be no exaggeration to project the 1960's as the most critical and far-reaching 10 years in the history of the world. In such a decade, America needs more than ever before an atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence among such major elements of our society as industry, labor, and Government. Without that confidence, we will not only be far less effective in meeting the goals of our country, we will present to the world at large the image of a quarrelsome, divided and possibly corrupt society. World communism could not ask for a better gift than this.

When I say this, I am not suggesting for a moment that we should abandon the real benefits of vigorous competition. Neither am I suggesting that American businessmen—or unionists or farmers or any other element in our society—should suddenly play dead, that we should transform ourselves from a society of freemen to a country of docile followers. Freedom to compete, to differ, to dissent, to criticize, to urge change—these all are a cherished part of our heritage as Americans, of the values that we seek to defend against the onslaughts of communism. Most of the world, I believe, understands these basic things about our country, and multitudes of its people long for them. But there is a difference between the kind of earnest, healthy, rational debate that forwards America's interests—indeed, is essential to the workings of the American system—and the kind of internal warfare that can weaken it.

No doubt there are those who will say that it is neither necessary nor wise for us to wash our business linen in public, that by talking about these things we will draw attention to them and, by so doing foster the impression that things are much worse than they actually are.

I don't agree. I think what has happened has very grave implications for all of us in business. I believe we need to think very hard about what we can do, individually and collectively, to reduce the likelihood of such things continuing to happen. If they still should happen now and then—since sin has never been entirely eliminated—we need to think about how business can handle itself so as to minimize the unfavorable impressions that result. Of one thing I am sure, the confidence and faith of the American people in business—particularly in the big corporations that play so vital a role in our whole life—will not be strengthened by alibis, excuses, or counterrecriminations.

If we are to preserve the good name of our respective companies, we must be sure that management does everything reasonable in prudence and good sense to prevent such things happening, and takes swift and sure corrective action when the occasional misdeed does occur. At the very least, the top operating executives are responsible for establishing strong and explicit policies concerning the conduct of employees under the law and in conformance with high ethical standards.

These executives also are responsible for communicating these policies to their employees and making sure they are understood. Let me emphasize that this is not a simple or a routine matter. It must be carried out with the utmost thoroughness and intensity. Employees at all levels must be made to feel in their bones that their company's codes and policies mean exactly what they purport to mean.

Finally, it is the responsibility of the executives to punish swiftly and impartially violations of those policies at whatever level of the business they may occur. If they are firm in this, there will be far less danger that subordinate officials will apply their own standards of judgment and conduct in place of the company's.

In other words, it is the job of our corporate executives to keep their own houses in order. If and when they fail to do so, the house-cleaning job certainly will be put in less friendly hands.

I believe these recent happenings should alert outside directors to the need to be aware of the pertinent codes and policies of the companies on whose boards they sit. Normally, the outside director has only a broad picture of the business and cannot be completely familiar with the day-to-day operating details. But, when serious improprieties occur, all companies, whole industries and individuals, whether legally responsible or not, suffer the consequences of an inflamed and properly outraged public opinion.

Comforting as it may seem, and true as it may be, I'm afraid it is little use—for instance—to drag out the old bad-apple alibi to explain away things—the idea that there are always a few bad ones in every barrel. In my opinion, it is up to business to find the bad apples in the barrel, if there be any and clean them out before they contaminate the whole.

And it does even less good to yell foul and blame all our troubles on those so-and-so's in Washington, out to smear business all over again. Like all of you, I read the newspapers and I have recently read that the Kennedy administration is now showing its true colors and that the honeymoon with business is over, that the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, of which I am a member, is a Trojan horse devised to impose wage and price controls on the economy.

I don't happen to believe this is true. Thus far, I have seen no reason to draw such a conclusion. President Kennedy in a talk to the National Industrial Conference

Board, said—and I certainly agree with him—that the revenues and the successes of his administration depend on business profits and business success, that far from being natural enemies, business and government are necessary allies. He pointed out that the 1960 drop of $6- to $7-billion in corporate profits cost the Government enough taxes to pay—and I quote the President—"the Federal share of all our antirecesssion, health, and education proposals for the next fiscal year, and still have enough left over to start closing what the Democrats and this administration used to call the missile gap."

The President also said this: "If business and Government are necessarily partners, what kind of partnership is it going to be? Will it be marked by mutual suspicion and recrimination, or by mutual understanding and fruitful collaboration?"

I, for one, don't believe America can afford the ludicrous spectacle of old-fashioned guerrilla warfare between business and Government; certainly not in this moment in history. We need all the energy we can muster to fight Communist economic aggression. Without ceasing to uphold the things we in business believe are right, we have got to learn to live in decent dignity and mutual respect with our Government.

There is really only one thing for top executives to do at such a time as this. That is to forget the alibis and the explanations and have the fortitude—the plain guts—to stand up and say: "This is our failure. We are chagrined and sorry. It will not happen again."

Since it has happened, I think that we now run a serious risk of having codes with sharp teeth imposed on business, not by chambers of commerce, or associations of manufacturers, but by a Federal legislature. Because such codes would further restrict the areas of free business action and decision, it is up to us in our various companies and industries to see to the establishment of our own formal principles of ethical practice, plus the effective means of selfpolicing those principles.

I recognize that no amount of law, no amount of written codes of ethics, or plus promise will take the place of a rigorous and unshakeable integrity in the total conduct and in the ideals of industrial management.

I do not agree that the time has come, or is likely ever to come, when a corporation should assume social or political or other nonbusiness roles. I believe business corporations will continue to serve society best as individual companies vie to achieve maximum long-range profitability consistent with the public interest.

Nor do I believe that industry should submit supinely to domination by the ideas of other groups in the society with which it may not concur.

Let me by specific. It is a fact well known to most businessmen and lawyers, but often not to laymen, that there are many areas of law, and particularly of antitrust and monopoly law, that it is highly difficult to be sure not to violate in the normal course of business.

Along with most businessmen, I believe that strong and effective antitrust law is essential, that it preserves competition and over the years has benefited all groups in our society, business included. But it is important that we understand that, in broad areas of action, the law is far from a clear guide.

As our General Counsel explains it, the Sherman Act, which has cast a long shadow over American industry for 70 years, has worked mainly as a kind of enabling legislation. It has allowed "judges—in the particular economic and social climate of their particular days—to apply the brakes to a course or trend of conduct that—in its context—looked unhealthful * * * antitrust laws in America are never in a state of being; they are constantly in a process of becoming. You can never close the book and say that now we know what we cannot do."

That is a lawyer's view. I could add that in numerous specific actions involving matters of pricing, dealer relations, acquisitions, or mergers, you simply can't expect to get in all cases a consensus from lawyers as to whether what you want to do is lawful or unlawful.

Business must often act in a legal no man's land, moving on the advice of counsel—if indeed it is aware of the need for counsel—and not knowing whether at some future time it may be found in violation of antitrust or other laws.

Through sheer excellence of performance, superiority of product, efficiency and aggressiveness a company may come to so dominate a market as to bring itself in violation of the law for monopolizing, under section 2 of the Sherman Act.

In industries where there are large complex sales organizations, distributors and franchised dealers you walk a constant legal tightrope. A few months ago Ford Motor Co. entered a plea of nolo contendere in an antitrust pricing case where, unfortunately, a subordinate district sales employee of ours did not realize that he had legal problems on his hands, and did not clear it with counsel. His was not the only fault. It was also the fault of our management for failing to communicate effectively with the field, for failing to instruct the field personnel fully on the details of proper conduct.

Unfortunately, whenever you are hailed into court, or asked to testify before a committee of Congress, the popular supposition is likely to be that you are up to no good, probably guilty of willful wrongdoing, and very possibly a bunch of crooks.

Great caution should be exercised by the courts, legislatures, and press, particularly in vague areas of antitrust and monopoly, to let it be understood that the mere fact that you are sued, investigated, or even indicted—or that Senator KEFAUVER's committee disagrees with how you price your products—that all this does not necessarily mean that you are crooked, unethical, or even wrong. A distinction should be made between the obviously criminal situation and that in which the court's purpose is to define, clarify, or correct a situation. Otherwise, irreparable harm may be done to ethical firms and their management acting, to the best of their understanding, within the law and in the best interests of stockholders and the public at large.

But in making this comment, I do not mean to offer business a loophole through which to escape the requirement to deal fairly and ethically.

There is one and only one way for business to keep its skirts clear; that is to insist that top management maintain the highest standards of integrity in all aspects of business operation.

Perhaps more than anything else, our integrity will be reflected in the products we offer. I believe today, more deeply than ever before, that the future of the company I represent, indeed of our whole industry, depends directly on our ability to produce products that perform exactly as we say they will perform, products that establish their own standards of integrity—of quality, durability, and dependability.

Indeed, gentlemen, all American industry will be judged before the court of world opinion on the basis of its success or failure in maintaining high integrity in its actions, its products, and its services. We live in a world that is bigger than our own world and must compete with products from all over the globe—many of them of the highest integrity of manufacturer. We must compete also with a way of life, an ideology, an imperialist system that seeks every opportunity to hold us and our economic way of life up to scorn.

Around the world, we are often described as a corporate society. If that is so, and if it is judged that the corporations are corrupt, then it will be assumed that the society itself is corrupt.

So I would like to suggest that all of us in business management take a new long look at ourselves and all our business practices. I suggest we look not only at the obvious areas of danger, where we may run afoul of the law, but also at those borderline areas of corporate action which might have unfortunate social consequences for our fellow man.

Morality is not just avoiding price fixing or conflict of interest. Obedience to the law is not enough. The law is negative. It tells us only what we must not do. As Crawford Greenewalt, president of DuPont, has suggested: "We in industry must be concerned more specifically with 'obedience to the unenforceable'—the things we do, not because they are required but because they are right. This strength is more potent and compelling than the law."

A corporation may be primarily a producer of goods, but it is more than just that; it is a small society within society, one with motivations, with rules and principles of its own. It is a purposeful organization that can and must give more than just money to those who serve it, and those it serves. It should reflect in its daily actions the principles and aspirations of our society in its finest tradition. If it does so, I have no fear for America's ability to stand strong and free before the world for long and good years to come.

NEW BUSINESS CONSCIENCE

Henry Ford II has laid down a stiff challenge to American business. Alarmed by the recent price-fixing convictions in the electrical-goods industry, the conflict-of-interest charges in the automobile industry and the congressional findings of "widespread collusion between corrupt unions and equally corrupt management," he has called upon corporate executives "to keep their own houses in order." His candid and hard-hitting address to the Minneapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce contains some of the best advice offered by a big-business spokesman in recent years.

Especially pointed was his call upon corporation heads to face the ugly consequences of laying morality on the shelf. "There is only one thing for top executives to do at such a time as this," he said. "That is to forget the alibis and the explanations and have the fortitude—the plain guts—to stand up and say: 'This is our failure. We are chagrined and sorry. It will not happen again.'"

In sharp contrast to Ralph Cordiner, head of the General Electric Co. who denied personal knowledge of the criminal conspiracy to which his company had pleaded guilty, Mr. Ford sees positive virtue in washing the dirty linen of business in public. Only in this way can industry in general be alerted to pitfalls and build within itself the necessary safeguards against crumbling ethical standards.

As a director of one of the electrical companies, Mr. Ford called upon "outside directors" to exercise a special vigilance to avoid the growth of corrupt practices in the companies on whose boards they sit. If this corrosion is to continue, all business will suffer, and extreme legislative remedies will be sought. The only safe course is for top executives and directors to insist, not merely on the avoidance of scandal and convictions in the courts, but on adherence to high standards of conduct because they are right.

Mr. Ford acknowledged that the antitrust laws are vague and that it is impossible to

know in advance whether some business practices are legal or illegal. Likewise he noted that some firms are unjustly maligned because of investigations or indictments for allegedly monopolistic practices that may have little substance. A distinction needs to be made between clearly criminal conduct and the correction of practices in the twilight zone of the Sherman Act.

This in no way restrains the thrust of Mr. Ford's argument for business management that can see social obligations as well as profits—that holds fast to a respected place in a free society. A new era of business-baiting or labor-baiting would be tragic, as Mr. Ford suggests. Even more tragic would be a disintegration of our free society because of crass misuse of free enterprise to serve the selfish ends of a few men who have lost their sense of values.

Can We Meet the Challenge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished jury of awards of the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., has awarded for the second time its coveted George Washington Honor Medal and $100 to the Sacred Heart High School of Elizabeth, N.J.

Sacred Heart High School also won the award in 1959.

The 1960 award was made for the editorial which appeared in the school's paper, the Crier, entitled "Can We Meet the Challenge? Its author was Miss Mary C. Feehan, 749 Van Buren Avenue, Elizabeth, editor in chief of the school newspaper and salutatorian of the class of 1960. The award also honored Sacred Heart High School for its work in helping to encourage a better understanding of the American way of life in 1960.

Through the courtesy of Mr. George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, N.J., secretary of the board of trustees of the Freedoms Foundation, a copy of the award-winning editorial has been made available to me. Because it is evidence of the encouragement Freedoms Foundation is offering young people to think through the significance of their heritage as American citizens, and because the editorial itself is an impressive example of the values and ideals motivating many of our younger people, I take special pleasure in calling the attention of our colleagues to Miss Feehan's excellent work.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the editorial follows:

CAN WE MEET THE CHALLENGE?

We, the class of 1960, shall join more than a million high school graduates on June 16. This is rightly called a commencement exercise, for so it is. Graduation marks the beginning of a brandnew chapter in our lives—a chapter in which we must put to use the education we have received.

We are blessed that we are living in a country where all men can receive the same education and have equal opportunity for success in life. There is no caste system here where only the wealthy are educated, nor is there anyone telling us how we shall use our education. It is ours to do with as we choose. Perhaps we shall further it and become scientists or teachers, or we may use it immediately and become members of the American "9-to-5 club."

Though education gives us the right to improve our condition in life, it also imposes a duty, a responsibility we should be proud to bear; namely, to preserve the freedoms of our country, making secure our American way of life. We may not have to sacrifice our lives to preserve these freedoms as did the heroes at Bull Run, Okinawa, and Pork Chop Ridge. However, in a time when our love for freedom is being challenged daily, and our President and his Cabinet are being insulted and ridiculed by our Communist enemy, we, the younger generation, possessing strong American ideals, must fight and fight hard in our own private way to prove to ourselves and the world that we are a nation under God, striving for liberty and justice for all men.

We are a nation under God. In Him lies our strongest weapon. If He should ever forsake us, we would be nothing; therefore, if for this reason alone, we must be true to our faith. If we are, we will be a moral people, and history has proved that a morally sound nation is a secure nation.

We have always been a nation loyal to traditions, and we must continue to be so. Traditions and customs are important to a nation for they instill patriotism in her people. Take our flag, for example. This demands respect for it is a symbol of America herself. Yet how many Americans today have the regard they should have for Old Glory? Lack of patriotism is a dangerous thing. Let us remind our indifferent fellow Americans of this.

America has always defended the individual dignity and freedom of man. The basic freedoms in our Bill of Rights insure our security, but we must not misinterpret the idea of security by demanding excessive benefits from our government or our employers. We seniors will be starting work soon. Let us not become part of the crowd who advocate strikes in order to obtain a coffee break, a Christmas bonus, or other fringe benefits.

There were no coffee breaks or 40-hour weeks on the blood-dyed fields of two World Wars and the Korean war where our freedoms were defended with lives, though dearly bought, these freedoms were not permanently insured. It is our turn to keep them intact. We may never be called upon to shed our blood, but we must support our Government, respect our country's leaders, love our flag and all that it symbolizes, be loyal and honest in our dealings with our fellow men, be ready to give rather than to receive. In this way we shall do our part to keep America a morally sound nation as well as a gloriously free nation.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N.J*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N.C*
Alford, Dale, *Ark*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn* 4501 Conn. Ave.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Andrews, George W., *Ala* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N.Y*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N.J* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.

Avery, William H., *Kans*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Barry, Robert R., *N.Y* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N.H*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont* 9 Dearborn Dr., Falls Church, Va.

Becker, Frank J., *N.Y*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Beermann, Ralph F., *Nebr*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo E., Jr., *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* 118 Schotts Court NE.

Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala* The Washington
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*
Bromwell, James E., *Iowa*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Brooks, Overton, *La* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* Alban Towers
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Bruce, Donald C., *Ind*
Buckley, Charles A., *N.Y*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.

Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio* 5540 Colfax Ave., Alexandria, Va.
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.

Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn* 4611 Butterworth Pl.

Davis, James C., *Ga*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derounian, Steven B., *N.Y*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio* 800 4th St. SW.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* 2816 N. Jefferson Arlington, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N.Y*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* 319 Third St., SE.

Durno, Edwin R., *Oreg*
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* 5044 Klingle St.

Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa* 3725 Macomb St.
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Finnegan, Edward R., *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* 1133 House Office Building
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.

Forrester, E. L., *Ga*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* The Congressional
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N.J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*

Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garland, Peter A., *Maine*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa* The Congressional
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Glenn, Milton W., *N.J* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* 3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George, *Ala* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*

Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Harding, Ralph R., *Idaho*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*
Harsha, William H., Jr., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* 1323 Barger Dr. Falls Church, Va.

Healey, James C., *N.Y*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.

Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S.C*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Holtzman, Lester, *N.Y*
Horan, Walt, *Wash*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa* 2120 16th St.
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johansen, August E., *Mich*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.* Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* 5906 Harwick Rd.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N.Y*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex* 4848 Upton St.
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N.C*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn*
Kyl, John, *Iowa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*

Appendix

Israel Independence Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent editorial from April 20, 1961, issue of the Chelsea (Mass.) Record which deals with the 13th anniversary of the State of Israel:

ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE WEEK

Israel's Bar Mitzvah anniversary, this week, represents a coming of age in a world of unparalleled progress in the fields of economic and scientific development. In the space of 13 years, Israel has many achievements to her credit: the million immigrants who have arrived, the new factories, farms, and homes that have been built, and an expanding export trade. All this has been achieved without utilizing the full potentialities of the country. The people of Israel, as they recall the wanderings of their forefathers in the ancient wilderness, are keenly conscious of the fact that the Negev Desert, comprising one-half of Israel's area, is still largely a wilderness. This year, one of their most vital activities will be the establishment of industrial towns in the Negev.

American poet, Robert Frost, recently paid tribute to Israel's achievements in absorbing and integrating immigrants from many countries. Mr. Frost, who came to Israel as a guest of the Hebrew University, told the press that he was proud of America's interest and support of Israel. He said the world must be grateful there is such a place as Israel, a refuge for immigrants from many lands.

It is interesting to note that non-Jewish students from 22 countries on all continents are studying at the Hebrew University this year. Most students from Europe and the United States are studying the humanities, particularly in the fields related to the Bible, archaeology and history. African and Asian students are concentrating on medicine, agriculture and the natural sciences. In addition many of these students are taking time off from their studies to master the Hebrew language.

The State of Israel has an important contribution to make in the newly established Peace Corps will observe that to the emerging peoples, Israel is a valid example of a country which has made rapid progress in industrialization in freedom. It furnishes a demonstration of a successful democratic way of living.

The State of Israel has made important contributions of technical assistance. For example, an Israeli medical mission under the U.N. auspices was one of the first to enter the Congo after it achieved freedom. Israel has made these contributions despite the fact that she herself faces the difficulties of boycott and blockade under an uneasy armistice.

Despite the absence of a real peace, the world can be glad that there has been in that area a period of relative calm with freedom from disturbing border incidents. The free world will hope and work for the day when peace and good will will return to that region which is the cradle of civilization and religion.

Project Hope a Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the prestige of America has been vastly improved all over Asia because of the medical mission provided by Project Hope, and it is my sincere hope that some day, the SS *Hope* will expand into a fleet of vessels bringing medical knowledge, supplies and service to people in many places throughout the world. Dr. William B. Walsh, president and founder of Project Hope has just issued a very interesting report for the first 6 months of its operation, and because of the national interest in this program, I am inserting same in the RECORD.

The report follows:

PROJECT HOPE PRESIDENT ANNOUNCES FIRST 6 MONTHS OUTSTANDING

"In its first 6 months of operation in the island nation of Indonesia the success of the SS *Hope I* has been outstanding," according to William B. Walsh, M.D., president and founder of Project Hope. The *Hope* vessel is the main vehicle of the nonprofit organization with headquarters here.

In making the 6-month report, Dr. Walsh noted that the vessel has made nine stops to help teach and train Indonesian medical personnel. American medical personnel have performed 600 operations and seen 16,000 patients, both aboard the gleaming white floating medical center and at shore-based facilities.

"One of the main purposes of the *Hope's* visit to Indonesia, and any other nation to which it will go in the future," Dr. Walsh said, "is to update the medical knowledge of the local people. In this respect, 800 classes, lectures, seminars, and meetings were held in the classrooms and lecture halls aboard the ship during this first 6 months.

"Interest in the vessel, its interior operation, and the American medical personnel has brought 30,000 shipboard visitors. A total of 4,687 diagnostic X-rays were made by the medical technicians."

Dr. Walsh noted that in the first few weeks of June the vessel will steam to Singapore from Indonesia's capital Djakarta for resupply and refitting and then it is tentatively scheduled to visit Saigon, South Vietnam's capital. The *Hope* will remain there for 2½ months before it returns to the United States to complete its successful first-year tour.

"Our expectations are that the *Hope* will leave San Francisco late next fall and steam again to one of the Asian or Southeast Asian nations which have invited us to visit," Dr. Walsh noted. "The *Hope* only visits those nations to which the government and the medical profession request it. Then, the entire tour of duty is scheduled by the local medical people, with the assistance of our medical operations department."

Besides Djakarta, the first and last Indonesian stop of the *Hope*, the ship has visited Surabaya, Bali, Sumbawa, Makassar, Ambon, Kupang, Ende, and Bima. The vessel is now serving at Lombok with Semarang the last stop before the scheduled return to Djakarta May 17, 1961.

The *Hope* is operated through the voluntary contributions of individual Americans, by donations from business and industry, labor, and interested organizations. Many of the Nation's largest firms have donated material and supplies, in addition to cash contributions, to help keep the ship in operation and to aid those people less fortunate than we at home, Dr. Walsh said.

"I want especially to commend those dedicated American doctors, nurses, dentists, pharmacists, and medical technicians who have left their practices and the comparative comfort of their homes and families to serve the mission of *Hope*. There is not enough praise anyone can give to these men and women and they deserve the commendation of their fellow Americans and their backing.

"It is the desire that with sufficient contributions we can send other floating *Hope* medical centers to Africa and South America, where the need for medical teaching and training is also as great as it is in Southeast Asia. There are additional Navy hospital ships in mothballs to serve our purposes," Dr. Walsh stated. "The *Hope* personnel have shown the people of Southeast Asia that the American people want to help them to help themselves.

"Project Hope is a success and, with the help of the American people," Dr. Walsh said, "will continue to bring medical diplomacy to all sections of the world."

Mervin P. Whitbeck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in this day of racing through the process of living, there are few men remaining who are known for a homey philosophy at the fireside, or a vigorous life close to nature, or a true brotherhood with their fellow man from all walks of life. Certainly I have known few. The following comments are appropriate to the memory of one such man, Mervin P. Whitbeck. His lasting contribution in the field of conservation to his lifelong home, the Berkshires of Massachusetts, is an example for us all. I was fortunate to know Merv Whitbeck and to be broadened in my outlook on life by him.

Mr. Speaker, I include the attached article by Theodore Giddings, from the Berkshire Eagle, Friday, April 21, 1961, in memory of Mervin P. Whitbeck:

[From the Berkshire Eagle, Apr. 21, 1961]

OUR BERKSHIRES—MERVIN P. WHITBECK

(By Theodore Giddings)

Although close friends knew that Mervin Philip Whitbeck, 55, of Mount Washington, had had a close brush with death while on the operating table last November at Deaconess Hospital in Boston, few, if any, were prepared for the shock of his untimely passing Monday afternoon. Many of them had chatted with him at the recent testimonial dinner for John E. Buckley, retired conservation officer, and had remarked that he seemed like his oldtime self again. If he wasn't feeling well, he certainly did a good job of concealing the fact.

Maybe that's not surprising, though, for Merv wasn't one for self-pity. He lived close to nature all his life and while deeply appreciative of its beauties and bounties he also knew firsthand of the cruelties and punishment that it can inflict. He could take the bitter with the sweet without yelling "foul" like some of the rest of us do.

Merv's knowledge of the outdoors and his skills as a woodsman, hunter, and trapper came in large measure from his father, the late Isaac Whitbeck. Ike, as he was widely known, established a wide reputation as a rattlesnake hunter and once received considerable publicity for catching one with a shoestring. However, his customary weapon was a pair of tongs with the pinching end covered with rubber to save bruising the necks of the reptiles. He caught many rattlers for Dr. R. L. Ditmars, curator of the Bronx Zoo, who sometimes joined him in the hunt.

Merv also was adept at capturing the rattlers but was inclined to soft-pedal this activity, especially in recent years. He would go out on a reptile hunt at the persuasion of a friend, or a friend of a friend, but didn't like to have these trips "written up" or headlined in the press. Poor publicity for Mount Washington, he felt, and gave the town an unwarranted reputation since the snake population is relatively small and limited mostly to certain areas.

Deer hunting comes first to mind when one thinks of Merv Whitbeck. The Whitbeck deer camp operated for years by Merv and his efficient wife, Vicky, has been one of the best in the East and certainly one of the most productive. No one knew better than Merv how to organize a deer hunt and, of course, his knowledge of the Mount Washington whitetail country was unsurpassed. He knew where to find the deer and the famous Whitbeck "drives" accounted for the outstanding success of the hunters in his camp season after season.

This isn't to infer that everyone in the camp got a deer. They didn't but they were seldom heard to complain. The general excellence of the camp, including the food, and, above all, the camaraderie of the hunters was its own reward for all who participated.

Gathered around the table of an evening at Merv's camp were men from all walks of life—doctors, lawyers, farmers, contractors, politicians, schoolteachers, businessmen, and just plain ordinary guys. In the swapping of stories specially of the day's hunt, no one added more to the enjoyment of the occasion than Merv. A master of the terse, clipped expression, he punctured more than one inflated ego but always in a good-natured way.

Don Stillman, late outdoor columnist for the New York Herald Tribune, and a friend of the Whitbeck family from boyhood, once referred to Ike Whitbeck as being as much a part of the Berkshire wilderness as "the shy deer, the drumming grouse, and the furtive fox." And the same could be said of Merv. He was a master of the coon and wildcat hunt and pursued these sports with his brothers, Russell, retired superintendent of Mount Everett Reservation, and Henry. For several seasons Russ and Merv bagged their limit of coon and sold the pelts to Beebe, the Canaan, Conn., dealer. Merv and Henry pursued wildcats, often on snowshoes, over the rugged mountain terrain more for the sport of it than for the $10 bounty. Their last kill, a 28-pound bobcat, was made about a week before Merv's unexpected death.

Mount Washington has lost part of its tradition in the passing of Merv Whitbeck. But the family is deeply rooted on the mountain, and it's not unreasonable to say that as long as there is a Mount Washington there will be a Whitbeck living on it. It is hoped that Vicky Whitbeck and son, Jim, will continue the deer camp. She has been the guiding genius for years of the camp operation, and he has been well-schooled by his dad in the know-how of the deer hunt.

Panama Canal: Craftsmen on the Locks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote a letter to the editor from "The Mail Box" of the Panama American, the well-known evening newspaper on the Isthmus:

THE MAIL BOX—CRAFTSMEN ON THE LOCKS

SIR: With the damage to the miter gates at Gatun locks, the Panama Canal Company's penny-pinching policies have started to catch up with it. This process will continue unless these policies are changed.

Before the penny-pinching policies were inaugurated, all U.S.-rate employees on the locks were skilled craftsmen. All had completed their apprenticeship, and many had years of background in their trade.

Along came some big brain with the idea that they were being paid too much for operating the mules. It is to be remembered that when not operating the mules, these craftsmen worked on the maintenance and inspection of the locks equipment.

So the big brains hired Tom, Dick, and Harry for less money, with the result that the skilled men were gradually reduced. The mule operators they have now, when not operating, sit on their tails doing nothing.

It seems to me that present Panama Canal policy is to add to the office and supervisory staffs at the expense of the skilled craftsmen. We only have to look around and see the population explosion of the office and administration staffs.

The Governor before last hired himself a public relations officer who has now hired himself an assistant and in the end no doubt will soon be a bureau chief like some of the others.

In the past when a man was appointed to a craftsman's job on the canal he had to produce his apprenticeship papers. That was strict policy. Now they hire any shade tree mechanic they can get especially if he is known by the right people. Not only do they hire him, but they then proceed to push him ahead.

They can say what they like, but the great engineering project which is the Panama Canal is not doing as well as it should. There must be a clean up, or there will be a bust up.

When the Panama Canal Company was formed it was stated that it should pay its way. There was nothing said about making the big profit that they now seem to want to clear every year.

In closing, I would like to ask what happened to the Booz, Allen, and Hamilton report?

CRAFTSMAN.

Critic at Large

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have championed the position of our Seneca Indians in their struggle to retain possession of their homelands on the Allegheny Reservation, instead of having this area flooded by construction of the Kinzua Dam. However, the Congress approved the construction of this dam under these unfortunate conditions.

A sensitive commentator on cultural developments of our society recently reviewed this situation in a newspaper column, entitled "Proposed Dam That Would Violate Treaty With the Senecas Poses Moral Question." Under unanimous consent I wish to have this column reprinted from the New York Times of April 21, 1961:

CRITIC AT LARGE—PROPOSED DAM THAT WOULD VIOLATE TREATY WITH THE SENECAS POSES MORAL QUESTION

(By Brooks Atkinson)

During the presidential campaign, the Democratic candidate made this statement about his Indian policy:

"There would be no change in treaty or contractual relationships without the consent of the tribes concerned." He also promised that his administration would "discharge its moral obligations to our first Americans."

But preparations carried forward from the previous administration are already far advanced to dishonor the treaty that George Washington's deputy, Timothy Pickering, signed on November 11, 1794, with the Senecas. Referring to certain lands in western New York and Pennsylvania, the deputy of our first President put the national seal to a promise that "the United States will never claim the same, nor disturb the Seneka Nation." "Never," the treaty said.

Next month, public hearings will be held by a House subcommittee on public works to consider the first major appropriation, $15 million, to build the Kinzua Dam on the Seneca Reservation. It would drown most of the lands the United States once promised that it would never claim. It would disturb about 800 Senecas by driving them from the lands their tribe has held for 167 years.

It would break a pledge made by the United States at a time when it needed the support of the Senecas against foreign enemies—very valuable in the War of 1812—and it would unilaterally scrap the oldest continuing treaty in the National Archives.

No one in the Government has faced the moral issue raised by this project. No one could without being ashamed. Numerous

public spirited organizations and individuals have protested to Members of Congress or to various departments of the Government. The replies have been uniformly bland. They say, as President Kennedy remarked on March 8 in reference to business of the last administration, that the courts have ruled that Congress has the legal right to break a treaty—something that no one has doubted. Since Congress has authorized the Kinzua Dam and started to make appropriations for it, the letters conclude that no branch of the Government has a right to stop it now.

Like a certain priest and likewise a Levite who left a man half dead on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho and passed by on the other side, so the various Government agencies pass by on the other side, hoping perhaps that no one will see them. For the moral question is one that no one dares face: Is the Kinzua Dam right or wrong? It is wrong.

In this shameful situation the Senecas have all the decency and goodwill on their side. They agree that a dam must be built in the Allegheny River to prevent floods in Pittsburgh and to conserve water. Acting on behalf of the Senecas, Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, a civil engineer with a long experience in flood control, has surveyed an area in western New York—called the Cattaraugus-Conewango project—which he believes will accomplish the same purpose more cheaply and effectively, using inferior lands, leaving the Senecas undisturbed and dislocating other people less ruthlessly.

He believed it would save the United States $100 million. He also believes that a Cattaraugus-Conewango Dam will have to be built in 25 years in any case.

The Senecas' request is modest. In a letter to President Kennedy, dated George Washington's Birthday, the President of the Seneca Nation of Indians, Basil Williams of Salamanca, N.Y., wrote:

"The Seneca Nation asks you, therefore, to make an independent investigation into the merits and comparative costs of the Kinzua Dam and Dr. Morgan's Cattaraugus-Conewango alternative, and that in the interim you direct that the work be halted on the authorized project."

When George Washington asked the Indians to meet with Timothy Pickering in Canandaigua, N.Y., to make a treaty, the Indians asked the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends (Quakers) to send delegates to advise them. Four friends, two of whom kept journals, made the difficult journey, 8 days long, through much wild country, and participated in the long negotiations.

The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends is still in existence. At a meeting last Tuesday evening the members decided to undertake an emergency program to find some satisfactory solution to this episode in jobbery. The tradition of conscience is still alive among Friends.

Money Is Not Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. FORRESTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the April 18, 1961, issue of Christian Economics carries an article entitled "Money Is Not Education." The wisdom expressed in this article entitles it to a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article reads as follows:

MONEY IS NOT EDUCATION

The February number of the First National City Bank Monthly Letter of New York is authority for the statement that "more money has been spent on schools and schooling in the past 10 years than in the entire previous history of the United States."

Obviously, more money is not the answer to the educational problem. Few will agree that more progress has been made in sound education during the past 10 years than in former times. The prodigal outpouring of money has not accomplished its purpose, and there is little reason to believe that the enormously increased expenditures contemplated by the present administration, the NEA, and others, will achieve better results.

Less elaborate educational palaces, fewer frills, and more solid, character-building subjects in the curriculum, more local control and attention to the content of textbooks and the character, integrity, and dedication of teachers are the ways to move forward in education.

Inter-American Social and Economic Cooperation Program

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 6518 making appropriations for the Inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be considerable misapprehension that the clouds on today's international horizon amount merely to intransigence on the part of the Communist countries. A lot of people believe their obstructive tactics are vexing but that somehow they will diminish and disappear. One country after another swings away from our sphere of influence and example, but many people are serenely confident that, like a pendulum, things will soon swing back the other way. Riot, brutality, strife, and plunder are epidemic in many parts of the world around us, yet many regard them as things which just somehow happen and just somehow will stop happening.

The brutal truth is that these things are made to happen, trouble will not just go away and there is no pendulum swinging. There is war today just as surely as though bullets were flying and bombs were dropping. It is a nonmilitary war, yes, but a war for the domination of the world and the struggle is deadly. It is fought on many, many fronts. Until we realize we are fighting it, until we fight on those fronts and fight the war as a coordinated whole, with the same intensive national effort as we would fight hot war, we will lose, battle by battle, front by front, until all is lost.

Today we have before us a measure dealing with just one of the many fronts of the war. Had we been a little more alert, had we been able to conceive the nature and extent of the powers of aggression against us, we might have foreseen its development long ago.

As delegates came to the United States in 1945 to take part in discussions of the formation of the United Nations, many of them toured our country, speaking before many different groups of people. One theme was common among them all: the critical need for industrialization. The position of economic and political power of the United States at the end of the Second World War was clearly due to our industrial strength. It followed, then, or seemed to follow, that less developed countries which wanted to improve their economic positions could do so by becoming industrialized, and could become industrialized by loans or gifts from the United States of capital equipment.

Here was the first open indication that the peoples of the world sought a basic change to improve their lot. That many of these countries could begin by manufacturing or extracting raw materials which were in increasingly scarce supply may have been a logical point, and may have been a valid interpretation of the principle of international division of labor, but it was emotionally unsatisfying. Gradual growth from primitive economies to industrial societies by the long process of capital accumulation seemed too slow, difficult, and frustrating. Leapfrogging to positions achieved by the more advanced nations only through centuries of capital accumulation became the unrealistic aspiration.

In the years since 1945, we have followed a policy of international good fellowship and helpfulness. We started with the attempt to keep starving people from starving. We offered the Marshall plan. We have continued, sending, under the aegis of the International Cooperation Administration, our best technicians to advise and to help. We have lent money to help less developed nations to acquire the start toward industrialization. Yet, somehow, the tremendous sums of money—sums our great grandchildren will still be paying interest on—have not touched the heart of the situation.

THE BASIS OF DISCONTENT AMONG THE LESS WELL DEVELOPED ECONOMIES

The people of a large part of the world are have-nots. To an astonishing degree, they live at a bare subsistence level, lacking both the means of bettering their lot and the political liberties to influence their governments. They live in countries where there is virtually no middle class, but where a small part of the population lives in sybaritic splendor, and the larger part lives in squalid penury.

This regrettable difference between the rich and the poor seemed to be the nature of life until we developed broader and more complete methods of communication. But when the few radios in a primitive village began telling of the wider distribution of a suitable standard of living elsewhere, the have-not's for the first time had a mirror showing them their own nakedness. Of democracy

they knew little, but of hunger and sickness they knew much. And when they learned that others were not so hungry or so ill, they felt a grievance which they burned to express.

Now, our giving aid to countries in which the people are in extremely depressed condition has not always worked out to alleviate the condition of these people. Sometimes the profits of the small entrepreneurial group have been increased, and the people themselves have had no abatement of their exploitation. Pouring more money and more equipment into such countries merely increases the discontent which is the fuel of revolutions.

Throughout much of Latin America there are wide differences between wealth and poverty. Even in Mexico, which is becoming an economically advanced country, there are a good many million people living below the monetary economy, on the crumbs of subsistence they can find. In other areas the situation is equally difficult. People who live in desperation are not political theorists—they are actionists. They will follow whoever promises them consideration, help, and food.

HUNGRY PEOPLE AS A COMMUNIST PRESSURE POINT

Throughout the world, Communists hunt for desperate people to incite them to revolution. That they ultimately learn that they have been fooled and made catspaws of does not deter them from an early and enthusiastic response to incitement. Civil affairs in various of the Latin American countries are now beset with disorder. Communist infiltration has gone quite a way—so far in fact that it would be difficult to ban it by edict in several places. The most extreme case is that of Castro in Cuba. That Castro started out as a follower of communism we suspect but cannot prove. But now there is no doubt that the Cuban Government is Communist, and that it continues to be an irritant in international relations throughout all of Latin America. The Cuban situation illustrates the difficulties in which we find ourselves.

For many years, the people of the United States have had a deep affection for the people of Cuba. Conscious of oppression of the Cuban people by Spain, this country went to war with Spain to lift tyranny from Cuba. We could have made Cuba, a rich and fertile island not a hundred miles from our shores, a part of the United States, but instead, promised the people of Cuba their freedom, and after a number of years of tutoring in government and finance, withdrew. And in the years since that time, we have paid many, many millions of dollars to the Cuban people above the world price of sugar. In 1952, Batista seized power, and subjected Cuba to a harsh dictatorship without foreseeing the consequences. Substantial numbers of people in our country wished Fidel Castro luck in his attempt to free Cuba from this dictatorship, and I am confident that many of them did much more than wish.

Out of that background, Castro has stirred up "anti-Yanqui" sentiment as the fuel for revolutions throughout all Latin America. And he has established a beachhead for communism just a pleasure cruiser day's run from Florida.

Throughout Latin America and throughout the undeveloped and the less developed countries, we are involved in a propaganda war. Those who most freely attack us are those we have most tried to help. But many are unstable and hysterical because they are hungry and hopeless.

The proposal before us, made first by former President Eisenhower and reiterated by President Kennedy, for developmental assistance throughout Latin America in proportion to the degree to which the countries needing aid have bettered their own internal problems of social justice is possibly the most constructive step we have so far taken in our relations with our hemispheric neighbors. Yet its success is by no means guaranteed. We must wait to see how willing the people of wealth in those lands will be to open the way to greater prosperity to the less well situated—peon, unskilled worker, or landless nomad.

PROBLEM OF CAPITAL FORMATION

While we seem to be confronted with a conflict of propaganda, our real and basic difficulty is the age-old problem of capital formation. To some extent in Latin America, and to a very great extent in Africa, there is need for industrial growth to support existing populations. Outside aid can introduce some food, though rarely enough to support a population. It can introduce certain kinds of equipment. And though the food and the equipment may help, capital formation must still come from an excess of production over the immediate needs for consumption.

We may send big drilling equipment, and dredging equipment and scoops and other forms of diggers into a primitive country. We may send technical missions to train the native workers to use the equipment. But the native people must work the machines, and must somehow be supported by their own inadequate economy while they do so. Not until people living in undeveloped economies have learned to save, in the economic sense, can they expect any consequential or permanent improvement in their standards of living.

It is strange that even Canada, with whom we have had closer and friendlier relations than we have had with any other country, should now be feeling slightly antagonistic toward us. Much is made of the fact that our particular culture is likely to sweep over Canada, destroying the attitudes and folkways which are typically Canadian. Our radio programs are to be heard in Canada. Our magazines can be subscribed to in Canada. Our technical achievements can influence the thinking of technicians in Canada. It is true that these ills are due to proximity. But they make Canada something less than Canada for Canadians. And behind this fear of a cultural osmosis is a different fear: the fear of the domination of Canadian industry by investment from the United States. It must be remembered that when investment funds flow to Canada, they flow in response to the promise of higher return. And this higher return is a symptom of a scarcity of investment funds in Canada. What we may realize is that the 17,442,000 people in Canada are not forming capital as rapidly as the needs of Canada or the opportunities for investment in Canada would suggest.

Summing up this train of thought:

First. The major amount of instability among the less well-developed peoples of the world is due to the depressed state of the common people and their feeling of hopelessness in the face of the richness of the few wealthy men in their countries.

Second. This discontent is fanned, wherever possible, by alert Communists, who see their opportunities enhanced by revolution and discord.

Third. The development of a greater degree of social and economic equality and justice within the less well-developed countries will improve world peace.

Fourth. The long-term remedy, however, will be the increasing rate of capital formation among the have-not nations. It will be a very difficult achievement to stretch a bare subsistence living to allow saving for capital formation, yet that must be done, and any help we can give that results in such capital formation will be real and constructive help.

In relation to my opening remarks this summary leaves three points yet to be discussed: First, how far can we go in continued giving of aid abroad, second, does the inhibition against interference in internal affairs of other nations preclude us from conditioning aid on elimination of Communist influences, and, third, can we any longer afford to operate aid and other programs abroad on the present, uncoordinated basis?

WE CANNOT ACHIEVE CAPITAL FORMATION FOR OTHERS

How much foreign aid can we give? We have just stood a run on our gold supply, a run probably originating from a number of simultaneous causes. But it gave us a fearful premonition of what could happen if we carried our national economy without frugality. We have pushed our own economy to the point at which we shall have to suffer increasing inflation as we increase our welfare expenditures. It seems clear that we are going to increase our welfare expenditures, and that we shall suffer a continued and somewhat more rapid inflation. Thus, our foreign aid—of whatever kind it may be—will be given against the increasing costs of inflation. We can give a considerable amount of technical assistance. We can give articles and commodities which we have in surplus. And we can help our friends make expenditures which we should make on our own behalf if they did not make them. Possibly much of our military aid will fall into this classification.

But it is doubtful that we should or even can give the kind of blank check we gave soon after the Second World War. Large loans which will be spent throughout the world, and ultimately tend to reduce our gold reserve are to be avoided. The kind of technical help and the gift

of what amounts to "seed corn" will surely accomplish most in the long run to help our friends raise their standards of living.

STRINGS ON FOREIGN AID

Shall we continue to hand out hundreds of millions of dollars every year and have no real voice in what happens to those funds? The propaganda against making grants with strings attached is of Soviet origin. So is the much-vaunted idea of neutralism, the whole object of which has been to put strings on America's policies and to prevent us from making effective use of the aid funds that are appropriated. The time has come to stop fooling ourselves. Not a dollar of foreign aid ought to be spent for use by any government which tolerates Communist agents or intrigue of a political party with affiliations in Moscow or Peiping.

If the countries which we are to help will rid themselves of Communist influence, we can support them to a certain extent, but we must not be expected to do that job alone. The nations aided must show some positive signs of a capacity to establish and maintain their own independence and self-governing system.

In this connection a specific showdown in Latin America is due and it must come at once, particularly in connection with this program of developmental assistance. The Monroe Doctrine warned European governments in 1823 to stay out of this hemisphere. It is still a valid doctrine today. It applies whether attempts to establish influence in the Western Hemisphere are overt or covert. Implementation of the Monroe Doctrine in the administration of this program is as much a responsibility of our government as is armed resistance to an armed intervention which might be attempted by a European power in Latin America.

WE MUST COORDINATE OUR DEFENSE AGAINST COMMUNIST NONMILITARY AGGRESSION

The simple fact is that this Nation and its free world allies are engaged in war today. Because it is a nonmilitary war many people, even in high places fail to recognize its existence. Nonetheless it is as deadly serious a war as we have ever been in. The stakes run as high as national existence itself. It is a war into which the Soviets are pouring a vast portion of their national effort. It is a war which the Soviets are fighting with the same degree of planning, intelligent attention and command decision as they would fight hot war. It is a war which we on our side are fighting with piecemeal efforts, without coordination and without actually knowing we are fighting it. The aid programs, the propaganda efforts, the intelligence services, diplomatic machinery are not combined into one coordinated defensive effort. No attention whatever is given to incorporating these and other nonmilitary weapons available in free world arsenals into an organized offensive to win the war. At a later date I will make specific recommendations in these regards. I believe their need and wisdom will be so apparent they will be adopted. Otherwise I would not support the legislation for the Latin American development program or any other expenditure abroad. For unless we start doing all the things we must do to win, there is no sense in doing just a part of them. And, unless we do well all the things we must do, there is no sense in doing them at all.

Letter to the President from Cuban Refugees in Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure and privilege to call to the attention of the Members a letter directed to the President on February 27, by a group representative of the more than 60,000 Cuban refugees in my district in Florida.

This letter expresses the Cuban exiles' profound gratitude for the effective and helpful steps directed by the President to aid them in adjusting to their life in exile, here in our country.

The letter follows:

MIAMI, FLA., *February 27, 1961.*
The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned, heads of all Cuban industrial and commercial associations that compose the economic section of the Cuban democratic revolutionary front, wish to express to Your Excellency their most heartfelt appreciation for your concern and sympathy for our countrymen in exile, as demonstrated by your appointment of Mr. Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as your personal representative to study and handle the sad plight of the Cubans, who have had to flee their homeland due to the existing Communist terror.

Here in Miami, the high moral principles of your great country have been put into action in behalf of our fellow exiles by Mayor Robert King High.

Under his early leadership, the community of Miami accepted all the problems brought to it by our countrymen in exile in a generous and friendly spirit of brotherly love and esteem. The mayor has worked unceasingly to assist us and to demonstrate to all Latin America that the United States is the true defender of the oppressed and the world's bastion against international communism. He has demonstrated this in his deeds as well as his words. The mayor truly represents here the moral and practical leadership you are giving the United States.

As human beings we have had our moments of despair and hopelessness. But reinspired by your great leadership in Washington and Mayor High's great work in Miami we realize that we are not standing alone in our hour of need. When we hear words like those pronounced by you in your inaugural address and in your state of the Union message, we know that the American people realize that the Cuban situation is not merely Cuban, but the present line of defense for all democratic and freedom-loving peoples. Thanks be to the Almighty God.

The knowledge that your soft, courteous and restrained words backed by action, fortitude and determination, based on rock-solid principles, give us new hopes for the future; and gives us added strength to keep on our fight to death against international communism.

Your words and actions to help the Cubans are of tremendous significance to all the free world. They give the millions of non-Communist inhabitants of Communist dominated countries new hopes and strength that will increase their revolt against their oppressor.

Your words will also make the millions of inhabitants of countries, which the Communists are trying to control, aware of the fact that they will not be left alone to their fate, but that the United States will help them maintain the freedom to which they are entitled to by the grace of God.

May God give you all the strength necessary to be able to perform all your duties and to bear the heavy burden imposed on the shoulders of the President of the bastion of democracy and on which the free world has set its last hopes, the United States of America.

Respectfully yours,

Bankers Committee for the Economic Rehabilitation of Cuba, Miguel Diaz, President; Cuban Home Owners Association, Ing. Rafael Garcia Bango, President; Cuban Packer Association, Guillermo Fernández Quirch, President; Cuban Association of Match Manufacturers, Andrés Carrillo, President; Cuban Association of Poultry Products, Dr. Manuel Castillo President; Cuban Association of Producers & Foodstuff Distributors, Dr. Francisco Gurri, President; Cuban Association of Candy Manufacturers, Andrés Carrillo, President; Cuban Soap & Toilet Articles Manufacturers, Dr. José M. Cuba, President; Cuban Association of Potato Growers & Other Products, Pedro Valdés, President; Cuban Independent Sugar Manufacturers, George Fowler, President; Cuban Cigar & Cigarettes Manufacturers, Dr. Tulio Diaz Rivera, President; Cuban Association of Brokers & Insurance Companies, Gaspar Contreras, Jr., President; Cuban Association of Industrial & Agricultural Equipment, Manuel Menendez, President; Chamber of Commerce of the Republic of Cuba, Roberto Suero, President; Cuban Industrialist Association, Pedro Villoldo, President; Cuban Department Stores Association, Dr. Humberto Solís, President; Committee for the Rehabilitation of the Tourist Trade, Adolfo Redolta, President; Cuban Independent Rice Growers, Julio Cadenas, President; Cuban Road Shippers Association, Agapito Amaro, President; Bus Commuter Service Association, Antonio Sánchez, President; Associated Contractors of Cuba, Ing. Antonio Tella, President; Associated Mortgage Creditors of Cuba, Adolfo Arenas, President; Cuban Laboratories & Drug Stores Owners Association, Oscar Luis Mestre, President; Road Passenger Service Association, Rodolfo González Gallardo, President; Cuban Lumbermen Association, Ramiro Fernández Moris, President; Associated Marine Agents Brokers & Ship Owners of Cuba, Jaime Villar, President.

Israel's Independence Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on the 13th anniversary of Israel's Independence Day it is well to recall that for nearly 2,000 years Jews were practically banned from

their historic homeland prior to the rise of today's State of Israel. During all that time they lived in dispersion in all parts of the world. In the course of that long period, in their misery and suffering, in times of troubles and in the face of almost unending adversity, they all cherished the dream of returning to their own ancestral home. After nursing this noble idea fervently, after clinging to it firmly and resolutely, at last Jewish leaders saw the possibility of attaining their goal soon after the First World War.

When Palestine was placed under British mandate, the safety of Jews there was assured, and the gradual return of Jews to Palestine seemed guaranteed. Then utmost efforts were made, and Jews worked for the increase of the Jewish population there. In this task they were successful; during the interwar years the number of Jews in Palestine increased from about 80,000 to nearly 500,000. Thus a real beginning was made toward the creation of Israel. In May of 1948, when the British relinquished the mandate, the Jews in Palestine, numbering more than 650,000, pooled all their moral and material forces and proclaimed their independence.

Since then the new State of Israel has gone through many ordeals, and happily has come out of them physically stronger and morally unscathed. Today she is a powerful, dynamic, democratic force in the Middle East, a decisive force to be reckoned with in all Middle Eastern affairs. On the 13th anniversary of the birth of Israel we all wish its citizens peace, prosperity and happiness.

Economic Espionage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I enclose therewith an article appearing in Bulletin No. 45, 1961, which is one of the greatest of the anti-Communist periodicals of West Germany. It has to do with the Leipzig Trade Fair. On March 1, 1961, the following was part of an interview broadcast by the North German Broadcasting Corp., with a member of the Ministry for All-German Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, there is no length to which communism would not go to infiltrate the unsuspecting minds of any person anywhere on earth. One has only to travel to Germany and listen to the endless radio broadcasts from countless stations which carry on an everlasting program in the cause of communism. The voice of freedom and of democracy has only a few voices. The representative of the Ministry for All-German Affairs is one such voice.

The article follows:

BULLETIN No. 45, 1961—ECONOMIC ESPIONAGE

Leipzig as a center, methods of agent activity during the trade fair. On March 1, 1961, the North German Broadcasting Corp. relayed the following interview on the Leipzig Trade Fair with a member of the Ministry for All-German Affairs:

"Question. Dr. Zahn, you have been acquainted with conditions at the Leipzig Trade Fair for many years from your own personal experience. And you maintain that exhibitors and visitors who come to Leipzig from the Federal Republic can easily fall a victim to Soviet Zone economic espionage and also to the activity of political agents. On what do you base this view?

"Answer. The economic espionage consists in the fact that the people of the Leipzig Trade Fair Department are instructed to obtain as much information as possible about internal conditions in the firm in question, about production, manner of production, number of employees, size of the firm, etc., on the grounds that the order one intends giving is then decided accordingly. An economic business transaction is thus used as a bribe and in order to obtain information on matters which are actually beyond the scope of a normal business deal.

"Question. Are specially trained persons used for this purpose?

"Answer. The majority of them are trained. I would say that at least 70 to 75 percent of the competent persons in this case, even down to the shorthand typists, are nowadays instructed to engage in economic espionage—for that is what it is—as part of their work.

"Question. And they are therefore also members of the intelligence services of the Soviet Zone?

"Answer. The evening training courses which are held in the Leipzig Trade Fair Department for specially selected persons undoubtedly serve this purpose.

"Question. You also said that visitors to the trade fair may easily fall a victim to agent activity. On what do you base your opinion in this respect?

"Answer. The activity of the agents consists in the fact that they call on visitors and involve them in noncommittal conversation and then want to know this and that, and try to get a bit friendly with them in order to get information which is of interest to them from these visitors to the fair. On one occasion I ascertained—and I was also assured from another quarter that this is actually the case—that special accommodation fitted up with concealed listening-in appliances is given to guests who are of particular interest to the Soviet Zone, and that any conversation carried on in such rooms is promptly recorded on a sound tape.

"Question. That would mean that the staff in such places of accommodation also belong to the intelligence service and to the network of agents?

"Answer. That can be assumed for certain, for in my opinion, and I do not hesitate to say so, Leipzig today is the center of Soviet zone or East bloc espionage. One has to be particularly on one's guard if one goes to a night club; they are usually very crowded, and the Leipzig Trade Fair Department issues tickets in advance to ensure that visitors get a seat. These places are teeming with agents and persons in the pay of the intelligence service, who try to get information out of their victims when the latter are under the influence of alcohol.

"Question. Since you are an authority, as it were, on this subject, what advice would you give exhibitors and visitors to the Leipzig Trade Fair?

"Answer. I think every person who goes to the trade fair, whether as an exhibitor or as a visitor, should realize beforehand that he runs the danger of being approached by agents and spies there, and that he should behave accordingly. A word too little is better than a word too much."

Commendation for the Czech Newspaper Ceske Listy and Its Publisher, Mr. Milos Svoboda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege this morning to interview Mr. George Brada, of Munich, Germany, who is of Czech extraction and completely dedicated to the release of his beloved homeland from the tyranny of the Communist oppressor. Our conversation served to rekindle my sympathy for these valiant people and reminded me that we must be eternally vigilant if other free peoples are not to suffer a like fate.

Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago, in April 1945, the so-called Kosice program of the Czechoslovak National Front Government under the Communist Zdenek Fierlinger, now President of the Red Parliament in Prague, was proclaimed in Kosice, Slovakia.

The pattern of the Communist takeover in Czechoslovakia was the same as in all other countries, in which the Communists seized power through infiltration and subversion. The Special Report No. 8 of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives, headed by former Congressman Charles J. Kersten, of December 31, 1954, stated on pages 17 and 18—

It should be pointed out that the Communist advance in Czechoslovakia was greatly facilitated by the behavior of the non-Communist political parties and their leaders.

Especially the naive belief in the possibility of coexistence with the Communists, shared in different degrees by practically and Czech politicians, was responsible for the extreme ease with which the Communist Party took power in 1948. The signing of the Soviet-Czechoslovak agreement on December 12, 1943, and especially the proclamation of the Kosice program of April 5, 1945, opened the door for an unobstructed drive on the part of the Communists to seize full power in the country.

Far more fateful for the people (especially in Bohemia and Moravia) was the fact that they were misinformed by many fellow-traveling intellectuals by means of newspapers, books, and through all media of communication as to the real nature of communism, cleverly described for years even prior to World War II as undergoing an evolution toward a democratic, humanitarian ideology.

The apparently easy success of the Communists in the post World War II period in which a climate of confusion and ignorance is easily understood and should also serve as a strong warning to the still free nations of the world.

We have seen that the same pattern was used also in the take-over of China and, more recently, of Cuba. Indeed, the warnings of the Kersten committee are today more timely than ever. And in this connection praise belongs to the Czech exile newspaper Ceske Listy, published in Munich, Germany, by Mr. Milos Svoboda. Mr. Svoboda has been revealing the Communist tactics and bringing these facts to the attention of the Czech exiles and refugees and old Czech settlers in the free world. His newspaper should be commended and I hope that it will successfully continue its work and reveal the truth of the Communist tactics and serve thus not only the interests of the Czech people, but also those of all nations including the United States.

Any Real Gains in J.F.K. Tax Plan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star:

ANY REAL GAINS IN J.F.K. TAX PLAN?

The Kennedy economic stimulus program, for which we held such high hopes, has turned out to be a disappointing dud.

In the proposal to quit grabbing off more than half of corporate profit where such moneys are used for expansion and new enterprise, the administration reveals that it is aware of the problem.

They seem to recognize that the notion that the excess profits tax would discourage profits and encourage business to spend those 48-cent dollars was a naive, professorial dream that ignored the facts of life.

What really happened, of course, was that to maintain its financial integrity and have a level of actual profit to serve its needs, business did not get more careless about profit, but worked all the harder to maintain the after taxes level by increasing their before taxes profits.

Instead of relaxing the pressure, the law has increased the squeeze on income dollars and intensified the fight for those dollars between the wage earner and the operators.

Part of the new program seems to recognize that experience and seeks to correct it in a way that will stimulate new enterprise and additional jobs.

But then they chicken out.

They balanced it out by negating the whole thing and proposing, at the same time, to put more pressure on via dividends.

It also, apparently, is based on the theory that increasing the taxes on dividends will cause business to put in less money for dividends and more for expansion.

That's the same mistake all over again and completely ignores the reality of human nature and the reality of business necessity.

In fact, of course, in order to maintain the level of "take home" return for investment, most business will respond with a new drive for more profits in order to absorb the tax and still have as much left over.

This is pretty simple human nature, and it is also an economic necessity.

Without a fair return for the use of money, material, machinery, tools, or any form of capital, it dries up. The business with a profit squeeze so tight it cannot accumulate money, cannot borrow money, and cannot attract investors is sunk.

So, of course, this proposal is a blow at small investors—the healthiest development on our economic scene.

In addition, the combination of a need for more profits to meet new dividend taxes, and the need for more profits to take advantage of the tax-free expansion feature, screws on a double pressure against such things as wage increases, and a double pressure on managements to find cheaper ways to operate—i.e., automation.

Thus, the something-for-everybody approach to the economic problem, actually seems to cancel itself out and would be more likely to make things worse than better.

Railroads—Truckers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Warren A. Colpo, of Cheektowaga, N.Y., I am pleased to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following: (a) an article entitled "Railroads," taken from the April 14 issue of Time magazine; (b) a letter dated April 7 from Time to Mr. Colpo; (c) a letter dated April 18 from Mr. Colpo to Time.

[From Time, Apr. 14, 1961]

RAILROADS—HOT FIGHT WITH HOFFA

In the long and bitter battle between the railroads and the truckers, the railroads are making new gains by inducing their opponents to defect. Their weapon: piggybacking, the carrying of freight-loaded truck bodies on railroad flatcars. Truck piggyback service for general freight has doubled in 2 years, become the rails' most profitable single freight operation. Last week six of the biggest U.S. trucking firms joined in a new company to cooperate with the Erie-Lackawanna Railroad in building special piggyback terminals for general freight in Jersey City and Chicago.

All this has not gone unnoticed by Teamster boss James Riddle Hoffa, a general who does not like to see his troops being ridden out of town on a rail. Piggybacking, claims Hoffa, has already cost the jobs of 20,000 teamsters. To fight the rails, he is pushing a new tax on truckers, requiring them to pay $5 into the union's welfare or pension funds, beginning next year for every truck they piggyback. Hoffa has already signed the first such contract with Midwest truckers, is pressuring other truckers to sign up. He has also launched a full-scale public relations barrage against the railroads, hoping to stir up support for an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act that would limit the rails' power to undercut freight charges on piggyback runs.

POLITE REBUTTAL

The rails have gone a step farther than piggybacking. They have developed their own 3-deck, 15-auto flatcars that are helping them win back a big slice of the new-car hauling business lost to truckers. Once, the railroads moved 75 percent of all new autos. But the truckers devised efficient trailers that undercut railroad charges, by 1959 had left the rails only 8 percent of the business. Now the rails are grabbing a bigger share by charging only half as much as truckers on long hauls. One reason: on a cross-country haul, each flatcar replaces at least three high-wage truckdrivers. By year's end, Ford expects to ship 35 percent of its cars by rail, Chrysler 40 percent, American Motors 50 percent, Studebaker 70 percent. General Motors, which has widely scattered plants close to markets, ships less by rail than the others.

Ford Motor Co., where the Teamsters stand to lose the most business, is being subjected to the biggest mail barrage emphasizing the number of drivers being thrown out of work. Ford answers with a form letter politely pointing out that the Teamsters originally threw railroad workers out of jobs when they took away the rails' auto-hauling business, assures complainants that trucks will continue to handle the majority of the volume of car shipments. On hauls of up to 300 miles, trucks are still more economical; but for anything longer, when drivers must be put up overnight, rails win hands down. Even Hoffa's $5 tax will not cut seriously into the savings on long hauls.

Hot war? The fight for auto freight may get rougher than words. The St. Louis-San Francisco Railroad, which developed the first three-level cars (Time, Oct. 24), has already run into some mysterious acts of sabotage. Acid dumped from highway overpasses ruined the paint jobs on one shipment of 29 autos and on another 150. The railroad had to pay $484,000 for the damage. Other railroads have had cars damaged by shotgun blast or peppered with rocks. To guard the shipments, Frisco's auto trains now carry an extra caboose and an extra crew.

TIME,
New York, April 7, 1961.

DEAR MR. COLPO: It is Time's view that piggybacking can be beneficial to everyone concerned: truckers, railroads, shippers, and the general public. Obviously, however, piggybacking as well as the whole general subject of rail and truck competition are complex and controversial matters. Time has examined aspects of this competition in the past and will continue to do so in the future, whenever developments in it are significant and newsworthy. In the meantime, we appreciated having your thoughtful presentation of some of the dangers inherent in the railroads' massive effort to improve their competitive position in the freight business. Excerpts from your letter were considered for publication, but unfortunately, lost out in the keen competition for space; of the hundreds of letters we receive each week, we have room in the column for only a handful. Thank you very much for letting us hear from you on a subject of great importance to the transportation industry and to the health of the economy.

Cordially yours,

ISABEL KOURI,
(For the Editors).

BUFFALO, N.Y., *April 18, 1961.*

ISABEL KOURI,
Time, Time and Life Building,
New York 20, N.Y.

DEAR MISS KOURI: In your anxiety to see Hoffa destroyed, you are rendered helpless to see the grim truth as attested to by the obvious facts. Your April 14 article infers that this is largely a battle between the railroads and Hoffa. The reader gains the impression that the conflict is one within the realm of "union busting" tactics, when in reality, it is a battle between two giant industries with Hoffa playing a comparatively minor role. Hoffa merely represents the workers in one of the two industries involved, but Time would have its readers believe otherwise. To Time, the thousands that face unemployment are not decent husbands, fathers, breadwinners, citizen taxpayers; they are rather, Hoffa henchmen, and they are about

to receive their just desserts along with Hoffa.

Re Ford's polite form letter: the contention that the truckers were the original cause of an equal loss of jobs on the railroads is nothing more than a patent lie. Even Time should be able to understand that a seven-man railroad crew is capable of moving the same amount of goods that would require 300 men using highway equipment. Along with Time, Ford contends, even before a congressional committee, that the reduced labor costs is a good thing insofar as the public welfare is concerned. But the fact is that Ford was and is still charging its dealers and the buying public for services that they are not receiving. Ford stated that it saved $40 million in 1960 by using rail, but the actual truth is that Ford profited this amount since Ford was and is charging over-the-highway rates while securing for Ford the savings afforded by the use of rail.

The public is therefore receiving a double-barreled dose of monopolistic practices. It is being charged for the services of an industry now largely nonexistent, while it must at the same time make up for the loss of taxes and employment heretofore offered by that industry.

I question the depth of your alleged investigation into the facts because the foregoing information is a matter of general knowledge within the industry, and I therefore fail to see the logic of your statement to me, that Time believes piggybacking to be a good think for all concerned.

Your April 14 article implies a certain delight over the fact that, thus far, six of the biggest trucking companies have been forced to defect to the railroads. The inference here is not that the jobs of still more thousands of decent Americans is imperiled, but rather that Hoffa and his "troops" are being ridden out of town on a rail. It seems to me that Time and other influential news sources have needlessly confused Hoffa with a truck-railroad situation; whereby the general public as well as our legislators have not had an opportunity to gain a true perspective of the overall situation.

In the resulting confusion, Ford, as well as other shippers, is busily engaged in bleeding every last penny from the public, all the while piously declaring that there at last is true competition with the transportation industry, and that the public welfare is at last being served.

Why won't Time leave Hoffa to the Attorney General, and go back to reporting the unvarnished truth to its readers? Why must it be necessary to destroy an entire industry in order to get at one man?

Sincerely yours,

WARREN A. COLPO.

Thirteenth Anniversary of Israel Independence

SPEECH
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today we join with Israel in celebration of the 13th anniversary of her independence, a milestone in the history of human freedom. In 1947, under the leadership of the United States, the General Assembly of the United Nations resolved that there would be established in Palestine an Arab and a Jewish state. A few months later the National Council of the Jewish community in Palestine proclaimed the State of Israel. Since that day the people of Israel have stood forthright as an independent state, a full member of the United Nations.

The first task of the Israelis was to rebuild their country. They reclaimed the land, turning desert and swamp into green pastures. New cities were built; old ones expanded at a fantastic rate. Factories were built, and the standard of living of the citizens soared.

Having rejuvenated their own country, the people of Israel did not stop. Their assistance was then channeled to the less developed countries. As the United States and other countries had helped Israel in her hour of need, so Israel is now helping the new nations of Asia and Africa. This year 1,000 Asian and African students are expected to study in schools throughout Israel. More than 400 Israeli technical experts have been sent abroad. In Ghana, Israel contributed 40 percent of the capital necessary to establish the country's steamship line, the Black Star Line. Trained and experienced Israelis will run the line for 5 years, and then it will be turned over to the Ghanians. A similar procedure was followed with a construction firm and Israel has provided technical personnel for a Ghana nautical academy, and to teach civil engineering. Some of the other states which Israel has helped in similar ways are Burma, Liberia, the Congo, and Sierre Leone. It is this relationship between states—a mutual give and take—which strengthens self-sufficiency and independence, and which closes the door to Communist infiltration. I salute the people of Israel on this day of their independence.

Is Freedom a Frankenstein?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Plain Speaker of Hazleton, Pa., dated April 11, 1961.

[From the Plain Speaker, Hazleton, Pa., Apr. 11, 1961]

IS FREEDOM A FRANKENSTEIN?

Having seen the motion picture "Operation Abolition" produced for the House Committee on Un-American Activities, we find it difficult to comprehend the motive behind a resolution adopted by Wyoming Valley ministers asking for an "explanation."

The resolution asks that organizations showing the film make it clear that there are objections and goes on to point out that the film has no standard credits and its producers are not identified.

This point of criticism can be quickly judged. How many film credits can you recall from motion pictures you have seen?

"Operation Abolition" is a documentary film prepared for the House Committee on Un-American Activities which is headed by Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, Easton, whose district includes Carbon County.

The film was compiled from newsreel clips of the student riots which occurred in San Francisco in May 1960 when Walter's committee attempted to hold hearings on Communist subversion in the San Francisco area.

Since its release the film has been the subject of sniping from various sources, a situation which arouses the suspicion that an organized underhand effort is being made to discredit it and the committee.

Our advice to anyone questioning the authenticity of this film is simple: See it.

It is a simple matter for the producer of an acted-out documentary to slant his script in any way desired.

But "Operation Abolition" is not an acted film. It is a photographic account of what happened. It is a frightening example of how people can be duped into attempting to destroy the very basic freedoms the Communists have as their main target.

The disgraceful demonstrations at San Francisco were purported to show the objections of students to what they are presumed to believe are the unfair tactics of the committee.

What transpired at San Francisco is fully documented by the film. The actions of the Communist rabblerousers in making a shambles of the hearing are there for anyone to see.

Any religious group questioning the authenticity of this film would do well to review the remarks of six Protestant clergymen who were witnesses to the riots.

We would like to ask any critic of the committee how such complete and chaotic disregard for national, State, and city authority could be justified even by a really sincere objector.

We would like to ask what prompts the attacks on the Walter committee from sources which ordinarily do not make news as adherents or opponents of major public issues?

We think these attacks are part of a Communist-inspired effort to discredit the Walter committee.

We do not infer that groups such as the Wyoming Valley ministers are themselves supporting communism. We believe that many sincere-minded champions of American liberty are being misled by inaccurate information.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities was recently given a tremendous vote of confidence by Congress with only 6 dissenting votes to a resolution providing for its continuance.

It has been praised by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover who said its role 'in safeguarding our freedoms is well known to every patriotic citizen, and real Americans are not going to be fooled or misled by efforts to discredit its vital task."

But it is the target for abuse from Soviet Russia and the Communists. Apparently its work is beginning to hurt.

The fellow travelers and those blind to the Communist threat scream for the rights of the individual and cry persecution. They object to each and every probe of Communist infiltration on the grounds that the rights of individuals are being violated.

See "Operation Abolition" and decide for yourself whose rights were violated.

Take the case of the John Birch Society currently under fire. It is organized to fight communism and has enlisted some of the Nation's leading citizens as members. Now it is being assailed as Fascist and neo-Nazi. A favorite tactic of the Communists is to brand any opposition as dictatorial.

As a newspaper whose very existence depends on a free press we would be the first to champion the rights of free speech, free assembly and free thinking, and the other rights of our Constitution.

But we think it is time that the people of the United States wake up to the fact that our enemies are using these very rights as weapons to destroy us.

Is freedom to become a Frankenstein monster and destroy all that America stands for? Only the American people can decide.

Goodby America and Thank You Dr. Gargiulo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am privileged to include a farewell address made by Lt. Comdr. Herbert G. Karlsruher, Dental Corps, Chilean Navy, at the naval hospital, Philadelphia, Pa., prior to his departure to his native land of Chile.

I personally recommend his speech to the membership of the House because of its sincerity and because it clearly demonstrates our good neighbor policy.

Of course, Philadelphia is known as the City of Brotherly Love, but even more important is the fact that Captain Gargiulo, who is the Chief of the Dental Service at the Philadelphia Naval Hospital, and his staff acted far beyond the call of duty to welcome Dr. Karlsruher and his family to their temporary home:

MY DEAR FRIENDS: It is not easy for me to find the proper words to express my feelings at this moment. I wish I had attended some of those toastmasters meetings with Captain Bowman. But I hope that you will understand what I will say, because I mean every word of it.

When I came to this wonderful country of yours, I was not exactly happy. I had not asked to be sent here. We were just going into summer, the children were out of school and we had planned to spend the vacation in our country house.

But that was not my only reason for not being particularly happy to be sent to the United States.

I knew that I would have to live and work with strangers, not even knowing much of their language. And I didn't know how I would be received and accepted. Well, now I know that all my fears were unwarranted.

It is true, that instead of the wonderful Chilean summer, I had one of your worst winters, with below zero temperatures, winds of 60 miles and more, rain, sleet, storms and snow, lots of snow. But I enjoyed the winter, even those 30 inches or so of snow.

And what wonderful people I met here. Everyone, everywhere was friendly, helpful, and understanding. Very soon indeed, I began to feel at ease, not being the very stranger I had feared to be, and the naval hospital became a home for me here in Philadelphia.

Captain Gargiulo, Captain Bowman, Commander Guay, Dr. Hale, Dr. Besley, Dr. Loizeaux, Mrs. Matthews, Chief Lonergan, Samford, Raub, McClain, Beech, Elkins, Robertson, Green, Surotchak, Kennett, the whole family of the dental department made every possible effort to make my being among them as nice and pleasant as possible. I was invited to official and non-official parties, I was asked to many of their homes, I met their wives, their children, other members of their families, and also their pets. I was allowed to share their interests, their happiness, and sometimes even their troubles.

All this made me very happy and I thank you very, very much for it. And I do it also in the name of Mrs. Karlsruher, to whom all your kindness and friendship was extended when she came to join me some 6 weeks ago.

I had wonderful teachers among you. I will name only two: Capt. Edward Gargiulo, the surgeon, and Capt. John Bowman, the prosthodontist. What they taught me is far more than they themselves imagine. It is a preciously guarded treasure I am taking home with me, for which I would like to express my deepest gratitude, my own as well as that of the Chilean Navy.

But all the rest of you have been wonderful teachers too. Maybe you do not even realize it. While showing me things, odd and important things, while talking with me about hundreds of subjects, you taught me that the American people are much more than just the most advanced in science and knowledge and in power in the present days, but also the most human, tolerant, and friendly. And this, maybe, is the most important thing I am taking home with me, for it is the understanding between people, the respect which one nation has for the other, not because of military power, but because of the kind of its people, that we will have peace and a better world in which to live.

In a few more days I will be on my way home. I am leaving satisfied, happy, and sorrowful. Satisfied because I have the feeling that my mission here has been happily accomplished. Happy because I had such a wonderful, unforgettable time in this country, because I was allowed to share your homes, because I met so many fine people and because I made real and good friends among you.

But I am sad too, because I know that very likely I am not going to meet many of you again. But one never knows, and it is really a small world, especially in these days of jet planes and missiles. Every year several ships of your Navy call in Valparaiso. Maybe one of you will be on board. Commander Guay is probably the first I will meet again when his ship, the U.S.S. *Midway*, docks in my home city. I want all of you to know that you will always have a friend there waiting to welcome you, to take care of you, and whose home shall be yours.

Thank you again, my good friends, thank you for all and everything and God bless you.

HERBERT KARLSRUHER.

To Avoid It, Accept It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the April 18, 1961, issue of Christian Economics carries an article entitled "To Avoid It, Accept It," which is so sound that it should appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This article reads as follows:

TO AVOID IT, ACCEPT IT

The press reports Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., special assistant to the President, as saying that the best security against communism is for the welfare state to provide food, clothing, shelter, education, and opportunity for the people. But that is communism. So Dr. Schlesinger would have us avoid communism by adopting it.

No state could make a serious attempt to provide all its people the goods and services involved in that program without controlling their education, activities, incomes, and the content of their minds.

Most people would make little effort of their own if the state were providing these things for them. Even the Soviet Union has not adopted so complete a program for the destruction of individual effort, initiative, and human personality.

Water Needs of the Nation From 1980 to 2000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma is fortunate to have in her senior Senator a man not only of great ability and experience, but vision, as well. Since first embarking on his long and distinguished career of public service, ROBERT S. KERR has been a powerful champion of the conservation and development of our Nation's natural resources. He has gained respect as an authority in the field of water resources development. He has spearheaded a national awakening of the importance of our resources. He has even authored a book entitled "Land, Wood, and Water."

On April 17, 1961, Senator KERR addressed the Eighth National Watershed Congress, an organization whose members have played an important role in the progress of the water development program. The Senator's remarks, "Water Needs of the Nation from 1980 to 2000," will be of interest to many of our colleagues, providing a clear-cut challenge which we cannot ignore.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the following and commend it to the attention of all who are concerned with America's growth and prosperity:

WATER NEEDS OF THE NATION FROM 1980 TO 2000

(Speech by Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, before the Eighth National Watershed Congress in Tucson, Ariz., April 17, 1961)

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, thank you for letting me come here and be the first speaker on your program. This bids fair to be a great congress. Considering the strength and vigor of the many organizations participating in it, I am tempted to say it promises to be the greatest congress I've ever attended. But I won't. Back in Washington we are having a Congress, the 87th, and it is composed of many fine fellows who knows theirs is going to be the greatest Congress ever. And, with the help of this Eighth Annual Watershed Congress, that Congress in session in Washington may well wind up deserving the fanciest superlatives you can think of. Certainly, this is an extremely important session of the National Congress insofar as our future water needs are concerned.

I realize the watershed congress has traditionally avoided direct action in its own name, preferring to accomplish the common aims of its member groups through the separate organizations participating in it. However, I hope the discussions and other features of this meeting will lead to positive action on many fronts aimed at the general

objective of solving the water problems we face in the next 20 to 40 years.

My subject is the water needs of the Nation in the period from 1980 to the year 2000. When considered with your general theme, "The Count-Down on Water," it strikes me as covering about the most important domestic issue the country faces insofar as its future economic growth and prosperity are concerned. This congress, and the organizations taking part in it, has been of great public service in this area in the past, and will, I am sure, contribute greatly in the future.

Arizona seems to me to be a most appropriate place to ponder just where we are in the count-down on water. Arizona, location of the pioneering reclamation project in the United States, the Salt River project, offers many object lessons for the student of water resources. Some of the lessons date back 1,300 years to the Hohokams, a prehistoric Indian tribe that first irrigated the Salt River Valley. Certainly, if we can find permanent solutions for the water problems of the arid regions of the Southwest, we can surmount the difficulties which will arise when water also grows short in the wetter areas of the Nation. Necessity is the mother of invention. Some of today's inventions for water-short lands will someday help the survival of areas where water at present is plentiful.

Arizona has had many heroes in the field of water development. Majestic, life-giving reservoirs, irrigation canals, and other facilities in this State serve as their monuments. One Arizona man, in particular, stands out, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN. We who have worked with Senator HAYDEN know well why his career, stretching all the way back to statehood in 1912, has brought him the unswerving support of his fellow citizens. We understand why the little Arizona schoolgirl, when asked to name the three separate branches of National Government, replied, "executive, judicial, and Senator HAYDEN."

Arizona also can be proud, along with members of this watershed congress, that President Kennedy named as his Secretary of Interior, the Honorable Stewart L. Udall. With Mr. Udall's genius in the Department of Interior, and Senator HAYDEN's leadership of the all-important Senate Appropriations Committee, not only Arizona but all of the Nation stands to benefit. Now—and I'm being facetious—if some of these benefits accrue to the benefit of my other distinguished colleague from Arizona, Senator GOLDWATER, I am sure Senator HAYDEN and other members of my political party will applaud the benefits despite any political reservations concerning the recipient thereof. Seriously, I have the highest personal regard for BARRY GOLDWATER and partisan political considerations must not interfere with the conservation of water and other natural resources. I hope my remarks prove the need for more bipartisan action.

Our future water needs must be considered in broad perspective. I am happy to see that your program this afternoon has the theme, "Multiple Use of Watersheds." The word "watershed" has different connotations for different people. In Webster, "watershed" is defined as the area draining into any given creek, stream, lake or river.

The "Countdown on Water" theme of this congress embodies a broader look at problems in which local watersheds are factors of varying importance. I solicit, therefore, your consideration of another concept—the basinwide interagency approach. This larger concept has been successful in my part of the country to a remarkable degree. It is interesting to note that it is gaining more and more support throughout the country. A recent publication of the U.S. Department of Agriculture points out that under Public Law 566, as amended by Public Law 1018, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Congress—the National Congress, that is—made it clear this law would be used, quote, "to supplement both our present soil and water conservation programs and our programs for development and flood protection of major river valleys."

In my home State, we are proud of the developments that are underway in the Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins. Oklahomans took the lead more than 20 years ago in establishing this approach. My first bill when I went to the U.S. Senate in 1949 created the Interagency Study Commission of these basins. This study covered 180 million acres, including all of Oklahoma and parts of Colorado, New Mexico, Kansas, Arkansas, Missouri, Texas, and Louisiana. President Truman, at the time, noted that for the first time there had been specifically recognized in such legislation the need for a broad-scale study of the multiple uses of the land and water resources of a river basin.

Since that mammoth study was completed, a coordinated system of land, wood, and water conservation has been under construction in the area. It has been labeled the "Kerr plan," a label that does injustice to a large number of inspired visionaries—starting with my dad—who taught me the value of land, wood, and water. I chose those magic words, "Land, Wood and Water," for the title of a book published last year, and I tried in the book to give credit to the many people who contributed to the dream which is fast becoming reality in Oklahoma.

My activities in this field also contributed to the publication of another book recently, a volume which the U.S. Government has made available in quantity, free, for those registered for this meeting. It is the report of the Select Committee on National Water Resources which the Senate created in 1959. This committee completed its work in January.

The committee was told repeatedly that any inquiry into the Nation's potential water supply necessarily required an appraisal of conservation programs affecting all of our natural resources. I hope that if you have not had a chance to study this report, you will pick up a copy while here.

The committee found that the Nation's water supply, in relation to demands, is shrinking rapidly. Withdrawals now are about 300 billion gallons daily. Based on medium projections of the population increase, by 1980 demands on the Nation's water resources will almost double, and they will more than triple by the year 2000. If, as the committee hoped, the Nation's growth rate is greater than the medium estimates, these increased demands for water will come upon us much faster. The committee assumed that the Nation's economy will continue to grow at the rate achieved in the past, and that there will be relatively little change in the present methods of water use—and water waste. The committee found five major categories of effort needed for meeting prospective demands on a long-range basis. I would like to recite these before I give you a few statistical details based on some charts taken from the committee report. The charts will support these general conclusions:

(1) We need to improve the regulation of streamflow through the construction of surface reservoirs and through better watershed management.

(2) We must improve the quality of our streams through more adequate pollution abatement. I prefer the term "water quality management" to pollution abatement, however.

(3) We must make better use of underground storage.

(4) More water-saving techniques must be developed in the fields of irrigation, sewage treatment, and substitution of air for water cooling should be encourage in areas of potential water shortage.

(5) Greater support must be given research programs leading to cheaper desalting methods, weather modification, or other methods of increasing natural water yield.

All of these objectives require planning now for action in the future. For this reason, I have relabeled a chart taken from page 7 of the committee report and enlarged it for your perusal. I have given the chart the label, "Why We Need More Planning Now," because it shows clearly that total withdrawals by the year 2000 will be fairly close to the total streamflow in the United States, exclusive of Alaska and Hawaii. As of 1954, the streamflow was about 1,100 billion gallons a day, and demands for withdrawals that year were about equal to 27 percent of streamflow. The withdrawals, you will note, are divided into consumptive and nonconsumptive uses, and the committee obtained a breakdown showing withdrawals for irrigation, municipal, industrial, and power cooling uses.

I want to point out also that the committee took into consideration water losses which may result in conservation practices for watershed improvement. This factor is shown at the opposite end of the bars illustrating the anticipated total withdrawals in 1980 and 2000.

The report of the committee points out that in addition to water to provide for consumptive uses or depletion, tremendous quantities of water will be needed in our flowing streams for hydroelectric power production, navigation, recreation, fish habitat, and pollution abatement—water quality management. Estimates of flow requirements for these purposes were obtained. In the second chart, it is assumed that if water requirements for navigation are met, and if water of adequate quality for fish life is maintained, the needs of recreation will be met.

This second chart, on streamflow uses, is lifted from page 10 of the committee's basic report. The most significant factor shown in it is the estimate of flows needed to maintain the water quality of our streams. No figure was available for the current dilution requirement for pollution abatement, either in 1954 or at present, but experts convinced the committee that vast quantities would be needed for this purpose in future years. The quantities shown as required for maintenance of water quality in 1980 and 2000 are projected on the basis that the desired quality will be achieved by the cheapest combination of waste treatment facilities and storage reservoirs to provide sustained flows for dilution of effluent.

With the construction of such reservoirs, there will be many opportunities to develop hydroelectric power, but since there are other sources of electric power, the quantities of flow needed for cleaning of water were assumed to be controlling.

I would like to come back to the pollution problem in a moment, but first let me show you a third chart, this one taken from the last of the 32 committee prints which were published to substantiate the committee's findings. These prints, incidentally, give in detail facts presented to the committee during its series of 26 hearings throughout the United States. More than 150,000 copies of the committee's report or prints have been sent so far to citizens requesting them.

I don't know whether you approve of the color scheme or not, but personally, I like this chart best of all. It forcefully shows how well we can meet our water problems in 1980 and 2000, based on the present outlook for the various water resource regions of the Nation. The Nation's water resources are not uniformly distributed, and full development of all of the available resources are needed before 1980 in the five regions at the bottom of the scale. These are the South Pacific which includes southern California, the upper Rio Grande and Pecos Rivers, the Colo-

rado River which includes most of Arizona plus the rest of the Colorado's watershed, the upper Missouri and the great basin area of Utah and Nevada. By the year 2000, full development will be needed in three other regions. I am confident that everyone here agrees with me that the comprehensive development of these areas must proceed with all possible speed.

This confidence in your understanding of the general problem prompts me to single out one particularly knotty problem, water quality management, for your earnest consideration.

Pollution is never a pleasant subject, particularly when we start discussing specific problems. Often, the specifics are hardly mentionable in polite company. The tragedy of the Potomac River fits this pattern to a degree. I have brought with me today a set of pictures furnished by the U.S. Public Health Service illustrating some of the problems of the Potomac where it flows past our National Capital.

In this first slide, we see rubbish stacked on the shores of this historic river upstream from the intakes that draw water into the District of Columbia Metropolitan Water District. This is a trash dump—a result of human carelessness and a lack of public understanding. The materials entering the stream from this dump are similar to those that would be emitted by a sewage pipe.

Slide No. 2: Here is another picture that is not pretty and not pleasant to look at. These are bubbles of scum filled with sewer gas rising from the bottom of Four Mile Run as it enters the Potomac River from Virginia. This gas is from decaying sewage solids that have settled on the bottom of Four Mile Run.

Slide No. 3: This is another picture of Four Mile Run a short distance above its joining with the Potomac. Blue-green algae are floating slowly downstream toward the historic grandeur of our Nation's Capital. Blue-green algae grows in polluted rivers and it decays and contributes to offensive odors.

Slide No. 4: Here is the outlet of Rock Creek sewer; normally a storm sewer but one of the major contributors to the pollution of the Potomac. After a heavy rain this huge pipe flushes tons of untreated sewage into the Potomac. The Public Health Service researcher who took this picture later analyzed the fish caught by the man standing on the bridge. He found the catfish had been feeding on sewage.

Slide No. 5: This is almost too repulsive to look at. It shows sewage solids floating in the Potomac River near our Nation's Capital. This horrible mess flows from the Rock Creek sewer.

Slide No. 6: This picture was taken a short distance below the Key Bridge which leads from the District of Columbia to Virginia just a few miles from the Capitol Building. The stuff floating on the water speaks indecently for itself.

The Potomac River, grossly contaminated by sewage, is far too typical in our Nation today. Man has perpetrated this enormous folly in every part of the country. One report to our committee advised that our cities are now receiving approximately twice as much pollutant from municipal sewage systems alone as was considered safe in 1955. Here are some slides showing other pollution problems, at random, across the Nation:

Slide No. 7: This shows blood pollution of the Jean Petit River in Arkansas caused by wastes from a small custom packing plant. Near this spot people were fishing for gar which had gathered in the area. These rough fish had been attracted by the wastes.

Slide No. 8: Here we have a scene that is far too common—showing raw sewage spilling into what would otherwise be a beautiful river. The picture was taken a few years ago at Idaho Falls where a municipal outfall discharged directly into the Snake River.

Slide No. 9: Here is evidence of industrial pollution on the Holston River, downstream from Kingsport, Tenn. Those slimy organisms grow only in water so foul nothing of value can survive in it.

Slide No. 10: Another example of industrial wastes, this time below an oil refinery in Arkansas. The oil has collected behind obstructions in the stream.

Slide No. 11: This may be destroying my buildup, but I couldn't show that series of pictures without providing some visual relief for you. Here is the way water ought to look. The picture was made at Big Falls on Henry's Fork of the Green River. The shocking pictures which preceded it more accurately, however, illustrate the peril of our position.

As I mentioned earlier, we must devote more and more of our streamflow resources in this country to pollution abatement, and to this end, I have offered legislation to the Congress this year which meets the need head on.

My proposal, Senate bill 120, also would increase Federal support for the construction of sewage disposal plants. It also would authorize an intensive 5-year program of research in developing new methods of treating sewage. We might as well face the brutal facts—we will have to achieve virtually complete storage of river flows in most of our country to meet the water needs of this century.

Most Americans will be drinking, cooking with, bathing in, and otherwise using secondhand or thirdhand water. This means water will have been used, and purified, and used again not once, or twice, but perhaps several times.

My bill would emphasize the responsibility of the Surgeon General in participating in planning reservoir capacity and releases of water where such capacity and releases might be used to aid in improving the quality of water for municipal and industrial uses, fish and wildlife, and other such purposes.

I was bitterly disappointed last year when President Eisenhower vetoed a clean water bill designed to expand a program launched in 1956. He actually rejected the advice of his own Health, Education, and Welfare Department. Since then, Public Health Service leaders have stated repeatedly our present laws are inadequate to keep up with the program. The Public Health Service told me last week the backlog of needed sewage facilities in this Nation is estimated at $1.9 billion.

Now, however, the prospects have brightened considerably for the passage and Presidential approval of legislation designed to strengthen this and other phases of our water resources program. I don't know what the weather has been like lately in Gettysburg, Pa., or Palm Springs, Calif., but I can tell you the political climate in Washington has improved tremendously. We expect our water quality management bill, as well as all other measures dealing with natural resources development, to fare much better. They certainly will if you watershed partisans really work.

During the past 8 years, we have been slowed down or stopped by an administration wedded to the "no new starts" theme. But President Kennedy in his special message on natural resources to the Congress stated: "Pollution of our country's rivers and streams has, as a result of our rapid population and industrial growth and change, reached alarming proportions. To meet all needs, domestic, agricultural, industrial, recreational, we shall have to use and reuse the same water, maintaining quality as well as quantity. In many areas of the country we need new sources of supply, but in all areas we must protect the supplies we have."

The President specifically referred to Senate bill 120 as a recommended approach to the problem.

In this same message, the President endorsed our interagency river basin concept for the development of our water resources.

Therefore, from this vantage point in Arizona, not far from the pioneering reclamation project on the Salt River, we can view our water resources picture with optimism despite the greatly increased needs of the coming decades.

As chairman of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, I have frequently heard scientists refer in recent months to the long leadtimes required for development of rockets and space vehicles. Lack of leadtime is now costing us dearly in our efforts to match Soviet Russian exploits. Insofar as our water problems are concerned, we still have the leadtime to make the countdown entirely successful if we act with sufficient vigor.

Just a few days ago, President Kennedy clearly demonstrated his vision and imagination to press forward on this new frontier. Out of the flurry of excitement over the Russian penetration of space came a calm statement from the President putting the water problem into sharp focus.

President Kennedy pointed out that "democracy is more durable in the long run," saying he hoped that the United States would be first in other areas, first in achievements that will bring more long-range benefits to mankind.

And then, perceiving the romance and drama in the crusade for conservation, President Kennedy placed the scientific conquest of water problems on a par with the historic probe into space.

Specifically, he cited the effort of American scientists to find an inexpensive way to get fresh water from salt water and said that if this succeeds it "would really dwarf any other scientific accomplishments" from the standpoint of humanity's welfare.

This new accent on water problems gives us fresh hope and enthusiasm. Conservation has often been a hard and thankless battle. Now, the water man may be coming into his own. Water men and space men may be marching shoulder to shoulder in America's legions of honor.

And while we do honor and reward America's famed astronauts, let us fashion fitting citations of merit for the "hydronauts."

The "hydronauts" of the new frontier will crack the barriers of salinity control, complete conservation control and water quality control.

Then let these heroes of conservation be given due recognition by a thankful people and a grateful Government.

Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes: President of Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House on March 13, 1961, I quoted an address by President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes, of Guatemala, over the Manion Forum Network and commended the President for his effective repelling of an invasion of his country by forces of the international revolutionary conspiracy.

It is indeed a pleasure to quote his gracious acknowledgment, which follows:

MARCH 23, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I wish to thank you very sincerely for your timed intervention at the U.S. House of Representatives and for your thoughtful courtesy of sending me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with your statements to the House, in reference to my way of handling the unhappy problem of conquest of the Americas through subversions inspired and directed by the forces of international communism.

I feel indeed very gratified and much pleased to count among the good friends of Guatemala, such a distinguished member of the U.S. House of Representatives as you, and I make fervent vows for that friendship to flourish and for the democracy of our countries to remain firm and prevail ever for the sake of peace and prosperity of our American Continent.

With kindest regards,
Cordially yours,
MIGUEL YDIGORAS FUENTES,
President of Guatemala.

What Customs Brokers, Importers, Shippers, and Public Officials Say About Building a Customhouse 22 Miles Inland From the Harbor It Serves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Government is planning to build a customs house 22 miles from the harbor it serves. This is the truth, fantastic as it may seem. This is the customhouse for the twin ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach where the General Services Administration is planning construction at the downtown Los Angeles Civic Center, 22 miles inland. Here are samples of what customs brokers, importers, shippers, and public officials are saying about it:

Earl V. Sauls, vice president of Carmichael Forwarding Service & Custom House Brokers: "Locating the office of the Collector of Customs as well as the Appraiser of Merchandise in the contemplated new Federal Building at Temple Street and the Santa Ana Freeway would appear to be politically motivated. Relatively little customs bonded freight arrives in Los Angeles via motor truck. Los Angeles International Airport is closer to the harbor area, both by time and mileage, than it is to metropolitan Los Angeles. Admittedly, it would be expensive to move our office and staff to the harbor area. However, in the interest of efficiency, with lower cost of operation benefiting both the foreign trading public and the Government, we should ultimately gain thereby."

John P. Parallieu, terminal manager for Westfal-Larsen Co.: "It would save time and money for all of us if customs were located here. Now with customs headquarters in Los Angeles, 22 miles away, we face upward of 2 days' delay before we can get our cargo cleared for pickup by receivers."

U.S. Senator CLAIR ENGLE of California: "It's ridiculous to truck merchandise 22 miles from the harbor to a customhouse. They can make up their minds to get the customhouse where it ought to be, or not get any money for construction this year."

Resolution unanimously adopted by the California State Assembly: "The General Services Administration * * * is scheduled to begin construction of a customhouse at the Civic Center of Los Angeles. This will create great hardship and inconvenience for persons dealing with the Bureau of the Customs and employees of the Bureau of Customs." The resolution urged the construction of a customs office, appraisers' store and warehouse in the harbor area.

Los Angeles County Supervisor Burton W. Chace: "A new Federal customs headquarters should be mutually convenient to the port of Long Beach and the port of Los Angeles and located within the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area."

Los Angeles County Supervisor Frank G. Bonelli: "Downtown Los Angeles interests must reconcile themselves to locating the new customs headquarters in the harbor area where it belongs, or risk losing the entire $30 million Federal office building proposed for the Los Angeles Civic Center."

Edward Frank, president of Moreddi, Inc., one of the three largest importers of quality furniture in the United States: "Since our firm brings shipments into all the leading ports in the United States, we know that the location of a customhouse within the harbor area results in far more efficient handling and clearing of shipments. To the best of my knowledge, the customhouses in all of the leading ports of the United States are located within the immediate harbor area. Nearly all the importers in the Los Angeles area are located just as far from the Los Angeles Civic Center as from the port. I strongly feel that the port location for the customhouse would be much preferred over the civic center location."

John P. Davis, president of the Long Beach Board of Harbor Commissioners: "It is absurd to conceive of customs headquarters being located 22 miles away from the ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles. If this occurred in the port of New York, it could even be located in another State.

Illinois Endorses Study of Economics of Commercial Fisheries on Mississippi River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include the following letter I received from William T. Lodge, director, State of Illinois Department of Conservation:

STATE OF ILLINOIS
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION,
Springfield, Ill., April 24, 1961.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PRICE: The Upper Mississippi River Conservation Committee unanimously passed the following resolution at the annual meeting held in St. Louis, Mo., on January 10, 1961:

"It is moved that the Upper Mississippi River Conservation Committee request the proper administrative officer of each State and the Midwest Association of Conservation Commissioners to write to their Representatives in Congress stating the need of a study of the economics of the commercial fisheries of the Mississippi River and urge that they lend their support to the assignment of this study to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries."

Official State Conservation Agencies of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Missouri, and Illinois are members of this organization. The Illinois Department of Conservation is wholeheartedly in favor of this joint resolution and ask your kind consideration and support.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM T. LODGE,
Director.

None More Honorably Distinguished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there has only this week come to my attention an address delivered at the University of Virginia nearly a year ago by Rear Adm. Lamont Pugh, Surgeon General of the U.S. Navy from 1951 to 1955.

This address represents Admiral Pugh's speech of presentation apropos the dedication of two war memorial plaques commemorating 350 alumni of his alma mater who perished while serving in the Armed Forces of their Nation during World War II—321—and in the Korean war—29.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit this address for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This desire stems from several stimuli: First, the literary quality of the offering; second, the cogency and timeliness of Admiral Pugh's remarks; and third, the author has honored the State of South Carolina by borrowing from two far-famed inscriptions that appear on monuments in my State. The first is incorporated in the opening sentence of the address, and while it is an original quotation from Milton's "Samson Agonistes," it appears on the tombstone of James Louis Pettigru, a distinguished South Carolina jurist, orator, statesman and patriot who was born at Abbeyville, S.C., May 10, 1789, and who died at Charleston March 9, 1863, and was buried there. Despite the fact that Mr. Pettigru's loyalties remained with the Union, he was held in highest esteem in Charleston. A copy of the classic Pettigru epitaph, Admiral Pugh informs me, was presented to him by Judge Lionel K. Legge of Charleston, Justice of the Supreme Court of South Carolina and a fellow member, with Admiral Pugh, of the Society of the Cincinnati.

The closing sentence of Admiral Pugh's tribute contains the opening lines of the inscription on the Confederate monument in front of the State capitol building in Columbia, S.C., and is certainly among the most beautiful

and most famous of all inscriptions of its kind in America.

COMMENTS BY REAR ADM. LAMONT PUGH, M.C., U.S. NAVY, RETIRED, APROPOS THE PRESENTATION OF TWO WAR MEMORIAL PLAQUES TO THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, AT 9:30 A.M. SATURDAY, JUNE 11, 1960

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, this is a solemn occasion, an occasion of serious import, but "nothing is here for tears, nothing to wail or knock the breast." Yet, one needs the habit of mental restraint and self control to contemplate and to comment upon the significance of observances of this kind uninfluenced by emotion.

The perpetuation of the memory and the honoring of war dead by one means, act, or device or another has, throughout the history of our country, been a highly cherished custom—in fact, something of a fetish and a faith—with us. It is therefore particularly fitting that we here take appropriate cognizance of the alumni of the University of Virginia who went out on the wings of their morning to keep their rendezvous with the destinies of war, and did not return.

The awfulness, the evil, the wastefulness, the senselessness of war has often and vigorously been decried in council halls, from pulpits, by pundits, and through editorial asseverations in the press of America. But, at the same time, in the absence of a more effective deterrent than has, as yet, been discovered, the apparent inevitability of war has also been recognized. Numerous definitive efforts have been made to establish some manner of an arrangement that would serve to prevent the wanton waste of life and of property by nations in armed conflict against each other.

Woodrow Wilson, an illustrious alumnus of this university, the 28th President of the United States, at the close of World War I, sought, through his League of Nations, to introduce a means of preventing future international conflicts. And, in an eulogy of Mr. Wilson, delivered before a combined assembly of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States in Washington, D.C., Edwin Anderson Alderman, this university's first president, said, with reference to President Wilson's League of Nations endeavor, "If there was failure, it was humanity's failure." May I now simply say that humanity has continued to fail miserably in this exceedingly important regard.

Over 100 years ago Ralph Waldo Emerson observed, and I quote, "Our culture therefore must not omit the arming of the man. Let him hear in season that he is born into the state of war, and that the commonwealth and his own well-being require that he should not go dancing in the weeds of peace, but warned, self-collected and neither defying nor dreading the thunder, let him take both reputation and life in his hand, and with perfect urbanity dare the gibbet and the mob by the absolute truth of his speech and the rectitude of his behavior." Now, if there is in the world, an institution of learning where more emphasis has been placed upon the cogency of Mr. Emerson's observation—upon the virtue inherent in his cardinal attributes, truth and integrity of character—than at the University of Virginia, I just don't know where it could be found.

Deeply imbued with these qualities, many sons of the university have participated in every war in which their country has been engaged since their alma mater was born. And inasmuch as her administrative heads remain keenly mindful of the likelihood of a resumption of open warfare at any time, the university is continuing more than ever, through such instrumentalities as her ROTC programs, to train men for all of the branches of the Armed Forces of this Nation. Also various research projects in collaboration with the Department of Defense, have been and are being pursued here. And too, several members of each graduating class in medicine enter one or another of the armed services.

In his poem, "Man Making," Edwin Markham wrote:

We are blind until we see
That in the human plan,
Nothing is worth the making,
If it does not make the man.

Why build these States glorious,
If man unbuilded goes?
In vain we build the Nation
Unless the builder also grows.

The University of Virignia has, throughout its existence, closely and ceaselessly adherred to, and has strenuously applied the principles proclaimed by Markham. Thomas Jefferson had been a stanch exponent of the doctrine preached by Edwin Markham long before that poet was born.

So long as human nature remains what it is, and I see no prospect that this fundamental frailty, attribute, instinct, trait, call it what you will, is at all likely to change, war, it appears, will undoubtedly remain the sad lot of mankind.

The smoke that arose over Hiroshima and Nagasaki did not change human nature one iota.

So long as human nature continues as it has been throughout all of the centuries or milleniums since animals began walking upright as men, and acquired the mental faculty of thought, there will remain a need for military preparedness if we, as a nation, indeed if civilization as a whole, is to survive. This need was never more pressing than right now.

There would be little point in any attempt by me, however puny or prodigious, to eulogize the alumni of the university who have given "the last full measure of their devotion" to a cause or to causes their elected leaders have considered just causes. Some of them died in the flaming wreckage of airplanes, some on the field of battle, some of them "on dune and headland where" sank "the fire," some on and beneath the waters of the world, a few in hospitals and a few of natural diseases, of course. Some had been recognized for extraordinary valor. Some had been extraordinarily valorous, but, as is not uncommonly the case, their feats and degree of bravery were known but to God. Some were officers, some enlisted men, but they are equal now, or, in my humble opinion, as nearly so as men ever are. But to them all, certainly, one common denominator is applicable. They all wore the uniform of one of the armed services of this Nation. And I will submit, without reservation, that no man or woman may be more honorably distinguished than by being so attired. I have many times averred, and I repeat it now, that service in the armed forces of this Nation should be regarded as a privilege and not as a penalty, and if there be those in the rising generations who hold an attitude at variance with this, I would strongly recommend that they take account of themselves and trim their sails at a different angle. Disdain of the military uniform on the part of the citizens of any country, to me, bespeaks of decadence in that country. I would again borrow from the sagaciousness of Mr. Emerson who stated: "The true test of civilization is not the census, nor the size of cities, nor the crops; no, but the kind of man the country turns out."

It is to those who remain and who will come after those we primarily honor here that I would speak briefly this morning. I want to pay my personal respects to the parents, the widows, the children, and other relatives, the friends and former associates of these men. I want to voice to them all the sentiments of admiration, esteem, and gratitude that is owed these alumni, by the university, by the State of Virginia (and/or whatever may have been their native State), and by the Nation for their dedication to the proposition that truth, courage, and patriotism endure forever.

There has, since its inception, been a distinct atmosphere of ancient Greece or Athens about the University of Virginia, and it occurs to me that it would be appropriate for us at this time to harken back 450 years before Christ to Pericles, and to consider his admonition to the men of Athens. This is it: "I would have you day by day fix your eyes upon the greatness of your country, until you become filled with the love of her, and when you are impressed by the spectacle of her glory, reflect that it has been acquired by men and women who knew their duty and had the courage to do it."

Mr. President, it has been a splendid act on the part of the classes of 1943 and of 1948 to have had prepared and to have provided for permanent installation on the walls of the rotunda, an impressive bronze plaque bearing the names of the 321 alumni who perished while serving in the Armed Forces of their Nation during World War II. It is equally a gracious and generous act on the part of the Seven Society to prevent a similar plaque bearing the names of the 29 alumni of the university who gave their lives for freedom during the Korean war.

Speaking in behalf of the classes of 1943 and of 1948 and in behalf of the Seven Society, the philanthropic spirit of which society has for long been traditional here, it is to me, Mr. Shannon, a treasurable honor to be privileged to present to the University of Virginia, through you as its president, sir, these two estimable and smart plaques which together contain the names of 350 of the university's sons who "true to the instincts of their birth, faithful to the teachings of their fathers," and of Mr. Jefferson's school, "and constant in their love for their country, died in the performance of their duty."

Migrant Farm Labor Problems and "Harvest of Shame"—XVI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the 16th in a series of articles presented in the public interest by the Palm Beach Post-Times to show the Members some of the progress being made in Florida to solve problems relating to migrant farm labor which were left out of the television presentation "Harvest of Shame." The omissions of all that has been, and is being done in this field did a great injustice to the Floridians who have given their time and efforts to these problems over the years. It is hoped that by reading these articles and the ones to follow the Members and public will have a better understanding of this important matter.

[From the Palm Beach Post, Feb. 3, 1961]

FLORIDA LAWS ARE EQUAL FOR ALL CHILDREN

"Most State child labor laws ignore farm children, and as far as the children of migrants are concerned, almost without exception, they leave school at the age of 16."—"Harvest of Shame."

Florida law makes no distinction between the children of residents and migrants.

Each group is governed by the same standards.

"The same educational opportunities are available to children of residents and migrants workers," according to Tom Bailey, State superintendent of public instruction.

"The influx of migrant children has created a tremendous problem for some counties to hire enough teachers during the middle of seasons—particularly in the smaller counties," he said. "But the counties are becoming familiar with the problem and are making adjustments."

Smaller counties don't have access to pools of teachers available for limited periods as do some of the larger counties, Bailey stressed.

The superintendent couldn't estimate the number of migrant children who leave school at 16.

"I don't think those figures are available," he said.

Clyde Harris, assistant superintendent of schools in Palm Beach County, agreed with Bailey.

Because the migrant families make frequent moves. Harris said school leaders have been unable to determine just how many drop out.

Florida has recognized the economic state of its migrant labor force and has made a provision not accorded to other nonresidents, Harris said.

"The law exempts the parents of these children from having to pay the school tuition fee demanded from other nonresidents."

That fee is $50.

Furthermore, Harris said, Florida does not ignore the migratory children but requires them to attend school the same as permanent residents.

Herman Close and Ruth Ervin have been appointed special teachers to aid the Glades area children who show an inclination to drop out of school.

The two have found it possible in a large number of cases to persuade the youngsters to complete high school.

Girls are given special instruction in homemaking, boys in shopwork. All get special courses in reading and arithmetic as termination work.

A report compiled by Mrs. Margaret Mosley, supervisor of migrant education in the Glades area, and Mrs. J. R. Nutt, visiting teacher, shows Palm Beach County is facing up to its responsibility.

In May 1960, they said, white schools of their area had a total enrollment of 2,862, and 434 of those were migrant children.

Negro schools, they reported, had enrollment of 3,727, with 1,715 students being migrant.

"The schools of Palm Beach County have for many years welcomed migrant children into their classrooms. It is nationally recognized that migrant children go to school while they reside in Palm Beach County," Mrs. Mosley said.

The board of public instruction has been alert to the problems and educational needs of migrant children and has made heroic efforts to provide adequate schooling, she added.

What has been done locally to further the education of the migrant children? These are some of the things the report shows:

1. Two visiting teachers work between schools and homes to relieve conditions preventing children from attending classes.

"A greater portion of time is spent with migrant families," Mrs. Mosley said.

2. Generally, the children are enrolled in permanently organized schools and are integrated with resident children.

But the Hagan Road School in Delray Beach was built to serve the particular needs of non-English-speaking children, who know only Spanish. Additional teachers are employed to care for the increased enrollment during the harvest season.

3. Additional teachers are hired at the beginning of the school year to accommodate the larger number of children who enroll later.

4. Special services in speech improvement and remedial reading are provided, as well as psychological testing for exceptional children.

5. A supervisor of migrant education is employed to work with schools and community groups on educational probelms.

6. The county shared the cost of a national research program from 1954 to 1957 to learn ways to provide improved educational opportunities.

7. In-service training programs for teachers of migrant children have been provided by the county, and each course carries three semester hours of college credit.

8. The advisory committee for the education of migrant children has been created and meets regularly to study problems and provide solutions.

"As a result of the work of this committee, several worthwhile projects have been sponsored which have not only benefited migrant children but regular resident children also," Mrs. Mosley said.

An example? A mobile dental unit provides examinations and treatment. Civic groups contribute to pay the dentist's fee.

And a special junior high school program for children overage and in need of remedial instruction in basic subjects, homemaking, and industrial arts was provided.

9. Clothing, school supplies, and free lunches for the indigent are provided.

10. The migrant children are welcomed into classes in the same manner as permanent residents.

11. Spanish-speaking children are given status by their contributions in the elementary lessons.

12. Children are welcomed into extracurricular activities such as the safety patrol, athletics, 4-H Club, Junior Red Cross, Future Homemakers, and Future Farmers of America.

A Soviet Naval Goal: Satellite Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address to the House on January 16, 1961, I discussed the critical significance of the current agitations to increase the width of territorial seas and quoted an illuminating article by George Winder on the subject of "Communist Strategy and the High Seas," published in the December 1960 issue of American Opinion.

The question of territorial water widths, however, is not the only maritime problem presented by the world revolution conspiracy. Others are attempts to establish Soviet satellite seas through securing control of key points of access.

It was, therefore, with the greatest interest that I read in the April 1961 number of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings a highly informative article by Capt. Frank M. Murphy, which deals with that significant maritime objective.

Appraising the problems involved with the realism of the experienced and thoughtful professional naval officer, Captain Murphy's article reflects a degree of strategic insight that is refreshing to encounter. I commend it for study as a sequel to the previously mentioned Winder article by all concerned with the formulation of our maritime policy.

Accompanying the article is a biographical sketch of its author:

A graduate of the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service, Captain Murphy served on U.S.S. *Zane* (DMS–14) and was commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Chandler* (DMS–9) during World War II. Subsequently, he attended the General Line School at the U.S. Naval Academy and the Naval War College, Newport, R.I. Since 1953, he has done staff duty with Commander 6th Fleet Cin-CNELM, and Commander Carrier Division 18. He is at present attached to the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.

The article follows:

A SOVIET NAVAL GOAL: SATELLITE SEAS

(By Capt. Frank M. Murphy, U.S. Navy)

"Freedom of navigation is an important objective of American foreign policy."—Cavendish W. Cannon.[1]

In our grave concern over the military subjugation of the satellite states, it is easy to overlook another dangerous and related Soviet objective—the establishment of satellite seas. Just as the Soviet Union is striving to cut off large non-Russian land areas from the free world, so is it aiming to make the Black Sea, the Baltic, and the Sea of Japan into Russian lakes.

The closing of these international highways would mean a blow to non-Communist economies, a lowering of morale in the restive satellites, and a strategic naval loss which would significantly alter our military posture.

THE DANUBE LESSON

We know what it means for all concerned when the Communists seize a land area. The lost personal liberties, the warped economies, and the increased military and political tensions need no elaboration here. Since the results of Soviet control of strategic waterways have received less attention, it will be instructive to view a laboratory case—the Danube River since World War II. For nearly a century (1856–1948), this great cultural and commercial artery was managed by an international commission. Under this arrangement, the Danube benefited the riparian states and the entire civilized world much as do the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Panama Canal. Once Soviet Russia became paramount in the Balkans, however, it ended the liberal and intelligent regulations and began a narrow, discriminatory rule of this important waterway.

Although the Soviet Union could not give its actions the force of legality, it did provide them with a screen of formality by going through the motions of an international conference at Belgrade in 1948. To this meeting, as chief Soviet delegate, came no less a personage than the Foreign Minister, Andrei Vishinsky. This was at once an indication of the importance which the Soviets attached to the Danube and an indication of the results which could be expected from the conference. The United States designated its Ambassador to Yugoslavia, Cavendish W. Cannon, as its principal delegate. The satellite regimes and Yugoslavia sent dutiful and well-rehearsed Communists. In refusing to adhere to the Soviet-drafted treaty, the U.S. representative said:

"The meetings of the conference have been characterized by Soviet dictation. The unhappy subservience of the Danubian peo-

[1] From a speech by Mr. Cannon, the U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia in Belgrade on Aug. 18, 1948, rejecting a Soviet-dictated treaty designed to restrict navigation on the Danube.

ples was never more clearly manifest than at this conference. The statements and voting of the representatives of the Danubian States reflected their lack of freedom of choice on matters of vital concern to their peoples."

During the same speech, Ambassador Cannon accurately predicted the fate of the formerly free Danube in these words:

"The actions of the Soviet delegation have made evident the determination of the Soviet Union to perpetuate its economic and political enslavement of the Danubian peoples. Its refusal to accept provisions assuring genuine freedom of commerce and nondiscrimination shows that it intends to maintain vested interests which it has established for its own benefit through extortion from governments imposed by force against the will of the peoples of its satellites."

The lesson then is clear. If the U.S.S.R. ever gains full control of an international sea, we can expect a repetition of the Danube story. With this admonitory experience in mind we should consider the significance of Soviet military and political actions relating to the Baltic, the Black Sea, and the Sea of Japan.

SOVIET TACTICS TO ACHIEVE NAVAL DOMINANCE

Russian Communist moves to achieve control of all three seas have ranged from direct military operations to subtle, almost concealed, diplomatic maneuvers. Underscoring the role of force in achieving domination of these seas are the Soviet attacks on U.S. planes, as well as those of other nations, made outside of territorial waters and in clear violation of international law. At the other end of the spectrum of Soviet instrumentalities are diplomatic chicanery and propaganda. Communist expressions such as "sea of peace" and Soviet-sponsored measures to extend territorial waters are best explained by a Kremlin drive to control three traditionally international water highways.

THE BALTIC

In the Baltic, the Soviet Navy has developed a strong fleet with supporting shore-based air. These naval forces operate from numerous excellent bases along the north, east, and south coasts from Finland to Germany. Many of these bases are sufficiently ice-free to be easily negotiable with the aid of icebreakers even under the severest conditions.

Most significantly, Russia shares naval power in the Baltic only with Sweden, whose navy, although vigorous and progressive, is not large. Germany's defeat in World War II created an inviting opening for the Soviets. And, as has become evident, the Communists are quick to fill a power vacuum, be it on land or sea.

The Soviets give no indication of being satisfied with their vastly improved military position in the Baltic. They continue to employ their international political machine to increase their relative strength by attempting to weaken their neighbors. In doing this, Moscow has shown its versatility and flexibility by skillfully alternating between the economic carrot of trade agreements and the propaganda stick of atomic threats. The Soviets have also made strident calls for "peace zones," on Communist terms, of course.

In 1957, the Soviet Foreign Office issued notes to Denmark and Norway, bluntly stating that they were inviting certain destruction if they accepted U.S. missiles on their soil. Free Germany received the same treatment with the addition of promises and threats regarding eventual reunification.

Parallel with the threatening notes, the Communists conducted a propaganda campaign aimed at pacifists and wishful thinkers. This campaign opened in December 1957, when the Polish Foreign Minister, Rapacki, called for a nuclear-free zone in central Europe. His plan, if carried out, would seriously weaken NATO and leave the Baltic open to Soviet exploitation.

Khrushchev has personally taken part in this propaganda campaign. Speaking in Riga, Latvia, on June 11, 1959, he proposed that Scandinavia and the Baltic be made a "zone free of atomic and rocket weapons." Incidentally, this offer to turn the Baltic into a Communist "sea of peace" followed soon after the concluding of a 2-year Danish-Soviet trade protocol.

Nine days after the Riga speech, on 20 July 1959, Khrushchev attempted to disquiet his neighbors by cancelling proposed visits to the Scandinavian countries. Because there exists in Scandinavia what Moscow terms an "anti-Soviet attitude," it is clear that the series of cynical and transparent actions by the U.S.S.R. has been correctly evaluated by the astute northern Europeans. These people have had long experience with the Russian Bear.

Russia may consider, however, that its programs have not failed completely, because our Scandinavian NATO allies have avoided the difficult questions which would be posed if atomic deterrents were located in their countries. In so doing they fail to achieve the maximum defense which their NATO membership could accord them. Thus the countries which are the northern bastion of NATO are resisting Soviet pressures, but the Baltic area remains in jeopardy since defenses there are weaker than they should be.

THE BLACK SEA AND THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN

The Black Sea, like the Baltic, occupies a position high on the Soviet list of military and political objectives. In comparing events relating to the Black Sea since World War II with those relating to the Baltic, one notices many striking parallels, along with a few interested differences.

A large naval construction program in the Black Sea has made Soviet Russia virtually the single naval power in this area. Having acquired Rumania and Bulgaria as satellites, the U.S.S.R. is in complete control of the western, northern, and eastern shores of the Black Sea. It is perhaps in a more dominant position here than in the Baltic.

Another similarity is that the entrance to the Black Sea is controlled by a NATO ally. Just as Denmark is astride the Öresund and the Belts, so is Turkey in direct control of the Bosporus and the Dardanelles. In the case of the Baltic, Denmark gains support from the strategic location of Free Germany and Norway; while to the south, Greece occupies a key position in relation to the Black Sea approaches and can support its NATO ally, Turkey.

Because Turkey and Greece are necessary for full control of the Black Sea they have been in the front lines of the cold war since it began. In fact, the quarrel between Russian communism and the free world was brought out into the open as a result of Soviet moves against the Turkish Straits. And cold war battlelines were drawn as a result of Soviet bloc support of the Greek guerrillas.

The pattern of Soviet diplomacy and propaganda on Black Sea matters has a familiar look when compared with that relating to the Baltic. Here again is the mixture of threatening notes and offers of "zones of peace." In fact, the timing of the Soviet notes and speeches leads to the conclusion that for the Russians, the Baltic and Black Seas are part of a single question.

There is one important difference among the many similarities. The U.S.S.R. views the Black Sea and the straits as an integral part of its drive into the eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East—a drive it has begun even before it has gained complete control of the Black Sea. To the Soviets, control of the Black Sea is the first step for achieving what appears to be their long-term goal of spreading into the Middle East. For this reason, the Soviets in June of 1959 included Italy, the Balkans, and the Adriatic in their proposal for a "peninsula of peace."

There is no reason to believe that Soviet Russia would be content if it achieved its goal of turning the Black Sea into a satellite lake. The recurring crises in the Middle East, the sale of submarines to Egypt, and the basing of submarines in Albania, all lead to the conclusion that the eastern Mediterranean would become the next body of water closed to all but "friendly" shipping and men-of-war.

The United States and its allies have stood firm in this area. Had we not done so, the Soviet Navy would now have bases on the straits and in Greece, and the U.S. Navy would never again have visited Turkish Black Sea ports or, for that matter, have operated in the eastern Mediterranean.

THE SEA OF JAPAN

It may seem like a radical change to leave the Baltic and Black Seas to discuss the Sea of Japan. From the Soviet point of view, however, no readjustment in thinking is necessary; all three seas are part of one objective. The Soviet aim of forming satellite seas is global. While the Soviets were scheming late in the last war to form satellite states and satellite seas in Europe, they were also taking measures to do the same thing in the Far East.

As a result of the Yalta agreements, the U.S.S.R. was off to a running start in the Far East at the end of World War II. In August of 1945, in accordance with those agreements, it occupied southern Sakhalin and the Kuriles. Thus the Sea of Okhotsk was largely closed off from the outside world. The U.S.S.R. was much more concerned, however, about the Sea of Japan.

Welcoming the postwar instabilities and military voids, the U.S.S.R. proceeded to develop its naval and other forces in the area at an accelerated pace. By 1950, it felt ready to have one of its puppets seize South Korea and thus gain control of the Sea of Japan. It was stopped, principally by American determination, from acquiring this neighboring sea and using it as a sure means for subjugating Japan, the principal industrial nation in Asia. With Japan as a satellite, the rest of Asia would have been unable to resist further Communist encroachments.

The global nature of Soviet naval policy is well illustrated by the Soviet-provoked incidents relating to the Sea of Japan. In this area, too, the Soviets have attacked American planes over international waters. Moreover, they have resorted to crude diplomatic intimidation of Japan, just as they have with our naval allies in Europe. For example, on May 15, 1958, the Soviet Union bluntly asked the Japanese Government if the United States were basing nuclear weapons in Japan. It was undoubtedly more than coincidence that the U.S.S.R. launched Sputnik III on this same date.

Such Soviet tactics may seem barbarous and clumsy to the civilized world of the second half of the 20th century. On the other hand, to the pragmatic leaders of Communist Russia, such measures may seem a good way to give reality to the name of the principal Soviet city on the Sea of Japan. In the Russian language "Vladivostok" means "ruler of the East." If we want more tangible evidence of Soviet intent, we can reflect on the Soviet statement of July 1957 that the vast bay leading to Vladivostok is closed.

TERRITORIAL WATERS AND SATELLITE SEAS

So far we have examined specific Soviet measures designed to restrict free world action in each of the three seas earmarked by the Communists for satellite status. Con-

currently with these actions, the Soviet Union has been conducting a cold war campaign which endangers all three seas and is therefore worthy of special attention. This campaign, which is both blatant and subtle, aims to increase the breadth of territorial waters from the traditional 3 miles to 12 miles. If the persistent Soviet efforts in this direction were ever successful, the world's naval and shipping powers would lose some of their advantage in relation to land powers. The American striking fleets could be placed under a legal ban by neutrals and others against operating in strategically important areas. If this ever happens, the Baltic, the Black Sea, and the Sea of Japan will all be a step closer to Danube status.

SOVIET NAVAL STRATEGY AND THE DRIVE FOR CLOSED SEAS

For the Soviet Navy, the neighboring seas are a constant frustration. For one thing, Western naval power has kept the Soviet fleet from spreading the Russian version of Marxism. To date, communism, an unnatural method of ordering man's life, has taken hold only in the presence of Sino-Soviet military force. This force is now being checked by a worldwide coalition of maritime powers, a coalition occasioned by Soviet aggression, centered around the United States, and based upon utilization of the worlds' oceans.

These facts take on great significance for the Soviet Navy, since the most tempting areas for Communist military expansion are related to bodies of water on which the free world maritime coalition can dispose overwhelming power. The Baltic Sea would be more vital to the Soviets for a westward military thrust than would the north European plain. The Black Sea and the eastern Mediterranean would have to be secure before the Russians could lunge into the Middle East. Japan is militarily secure behind its moat, particularly with the power of the 7th Fleet in the immediate background. Thus when Khrushchev speaks of the limited utility of cruisers, he is reflecting the frustrations of the Soviet Navy. It is true that Khrushchev's cruisers will be good for little more than diplomatic visits and salutes so long as the West maintains strong and balanced naval strength. If we lower our guard, however, the Soviet cruisers will be useful in spreading Russian communism.

Particularly troublesome to Soviet naval thinkers is the thin belt of land satellites in Europe insecurely anchored in the Baltic in the north and the Black Sea in the south. Since the satellites may be defined as a militarily occupied group of states lying between two international seas, they are in contact with the outside world through the ocean highways. As a result, they are certain to remain dissatisfied. Perhaps Soviet naval strategists sometimes reflect wryly on the words of a czar who laid the foundations of the modern Russian Navy. Peter the Great, when he founded St. Petersburg (Leningrad) in 1703 called it "a window into Europe." As long as the oppressed peoples of East Central Europe can gaze out the windows of free seas, they will have hope. The Soviet Navy has the task of closing those windows.

The bordering seas and their defenses are purely naval problems for the Soviet Union, since the Soviet Navy has a number of tasks which would normally fall to the army or another service in most countries. The long coasts of the Soviet Union are defended by naval coast artillery, naval infantry, and a naval air arm, in addition to naval forces afloat. These forces are large. In fact, in terms of manpower, the Soviets have the world's largest navy. Despite this large and growing naval strength, Soviet Navy planners know they are responsible for inadequately defended borders. The lessons of World War II have not been lost on these realistic men who fully appreciate that Western military power can be brought to bear in overwhelming force wherever there are oceans. They also appreciate the flexibility of naval power which can support a guerrilla force, a police action, or conventional land and air operations of whatever size.

Soviet naval strategy, then, is directed against the Western maritime coalition centered around the United States and its Navy. It also seeks control of the strategic straits and narrows leading into the neighboring seas. If the Soviet Navy could plant coast artillery, naval infantry, and units of the naval air arm in the vicinity of the Danish, Turkish, and Korean Straits, it would no longer have to defend the long coastlines of the Baltic, Black Sea, and Sea of Japan. With the resources thus freed, the Russian fleet could make a great impact in new areas, particularly on the high seas.

THE TASKS OF FREE WORLD NAVAL POWER AND DIPLOMACY

The principal free world naval undertaking in the three threatened seas should be to redress the military imbalance resulting from World War II. The defeat of Germany and Japan means that counterforces to Soviet expansion in the Baltic and the Sea of Japan have been greatly weakened. Soviet Russia is also relatively stronger in the Black Sea than before the war. To stabilize these areas, the Western World must give political and naval support to the free powers fronting these seas. Such support should include aid, training, and frequent naval visits.

Just as important, the free world should never surrender any of its inherent sea power advantages through ignorance or lack of interest. For example, we must be on guard when Soviet diplomacy, in an attempt to restrict freedom of the seas, speaks piously of the rights of riparian states. Such an approach in doubly specious for the Soviets. Since they militarily dominate many of the bordering states, they speak only for themselves. Any sea is of interest to the entire international community, especially maritime countries.

We enjoy a seapower advantage in these three international seas because of Western naval strength and because free world allies control the critical narrows in each case. We must never lose this advantage to Soviet bluffing. To do so would be to sacrifice our ability to project our national power to the shores of potential aggressors. It would also be a necessary step toward opening the great oceans as attack roads leading to the shores and cities of the United States.

The Late Honorable Edward J. Hart

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in tribute to the Honorable E. J. Hart, former Representative of the 14th Congressional District of the State of New Jersey.

I knew Mr. Hart as one of New Jersey's outstanding lawyers and most honored public servants. As a young lawyer, practicing in the southern end of the State, I came to know and respect Mr. Hart for his outstanding ability as an orator.

He was, during his service in Washington, one of the best known of all our representatives. His death is not only a great personal loss to his family but to all citizens of the State of New Jersey.

I express to his family my sincere sympathy and condolence.

A Layman Looks at the Survey of Dentistry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address entitled "A Layman Looks at the Survey of Dentistry." This address was delivered by me at the 38th annual session of the American Association of Dental Schools, Boston, Mass., on March 27, 1961:

A LAYMAN LOOKS AT THE SURVEY OF DENTISTRY

(By Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island)

H. G. Wells once declared that "human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." After reading the summary report issued by the Commission on the Survey of Dentistry, any thoughtful citizen will be made aware of how appropriately that statement may be applied to the future of dental health in this country. For one recurring theme in the commission's summary is the crucial importance of education to the solution of the most serious problems now confronting members of the dental profession and the public they serve.

The commission stresses again and again the extent to which sound solutions depend ultimately upon the Nation's ability to educate and to be educated, upon our knowing more and applying what we know with greater force and effectiveness. This is the theme in the discussions of manpower planning, research expansion, better utilization of available preventive measures, specialized care for the aged, and the many other topics covered in their broad-based report.

If the problems detailed by the commission had been totally unexpected, or if the burden of solving them had to be borne by any single group, we might well ask ourselves whether we have the time or the strength or the resources to assure a future of good dental health for the citizens of this country.

Fortunately, the task can be shared by many groups. Though the dental profession has both the right and the responsibility of leadership, the public, individually and through the medium of Government, also has its duty to support you in finding solutions and in making them work.

The problems demanding attention are not totally new. All of us here today have long known that a critical need exists for more dentists and for the schools in which to train them, for better utilization of auxiliary personnel, for intensified research, and for more effective health programs. Corrective action in all of these areas has been urged repeatedly by professional groups like the American Association of Dental Schools and the American Dental Association, by Government agencies like the Public Health Service, by interested laymen and Members of Congress like myself, and, most recently by the new President of the United States in his health message.

It does not detract from the importance of the commission's report to suggest that its

greatest value stems not so much from the newness of its basic findings as from the objectivity, candor, and practicality of its analyses and recommendations for action. What the commision has given us is a fresher viewpoint, a broader perspective. To consider our own problems from another's vantage point is always helpful, for often we need to be reassured that deep concern and long familiarity with the issues at hand have not blinded us to obvious solutions. Otherwise, there is always a danger of responses becoming automatic rather than thoughtful. A commission like this one, representing a variety of interests, is not likely to fall victim to such occupational hazards as dedicated nearsightedness or overactive reflexes. And since, despite the diversity of their professional backgrounds, the members have been able to reach what Dr. Adams, in his foreword, describes as a firm agreement on what needs to be done, the authority and importance of their report is even further enhanced.

I therefore find it of great significance that the commission's estimates of the seriousness of the dental manpower shortage not only substantiate what dental organizations and Government agencies have said before, but indicate that the shortage may be even greater than anticipated. In the first place, these new estimates remove any basis for denying, as some people have, that there is any manpower problem to overcome. In the second place, they assure those of us who have been deeply concerned about inadequate dentist ratios that we were right to be concerned, and that the steps we have already taken to offset them, have been well taken. We at least have gained a short headstart in the race against time.

If American dentists had not scored impressive gains in their own efficiency, if they had not begun to employ auxiliary personnel more extensively and with greater effectiveness, the manpower shortage would already be felt by the public, and critically felt. Increased efficiency, therefore, has momentarily cushioned us against the impact of shortage. But what of the future? The margin for improved efficiency is narrowing. There is a limit to the load the individual practitioner can bear. These are facts which cannot be ignored, for neither the times we live in nor the standards we live by are fixed and static.

The commission points out that currently only some 40 percent of the public are receiving anything approaching adequate dental care. This is neither as good as the country needs nor the best it can expect. In the 20th century, the entire conception of health and the health services has been changing. We look upon adequate health protection not as the special privilege of a fortunate few but as the right of all.

This modern viewpoint is reflected in the commission's concern about the Nation's manpower needs. Commission members see the future of dentistry as one of great growth and complexity, of increasing prestige and authority, and, by the same token, of greater responsibility. They see this responsibility as one which cannot be met by relying solely upon the achievement of higher technical proficiency in clinical procedures. The commission would have us realize that this Nation not only needs more schools and more dentists, it needs better schools and better dentists. We can be glad that a start has been made in this direction.

The comprehensive health program which President Kennedy has outlined in his recent message to the Congress includes specific recommendations for substantial Federal aid to education, and there are many congressional proposals which would make Federal funds available for the building of more schools and the training of more dentists. I myself have again introduced legislation providing wide-ranging support for dental and medical education. I have proposed that the Congress appropriate $100 million for the construction of new schools and $50 million for the expansion and modernization of existing schools. Passage of this bill will make it possible to produce the larger numbers of dentists so urgently needed.

I have proposed, in addition, two other measures which will not only bring us closer to the goal of more adequate supply but will also help us attain the higher standards of dental education which the commission envisions. The first of these is a scholarship bill which will permit you to fill the additional school spaces which will be created, and to fill them with applicants of greater intellectual stature. The second measure will provide operating grants to schools. Although this measure, too, includes an incentive for expanding enrollments, its real purpose is to provide schools with the funds needed to improve the quality of their instruction.

The commission has a great deal to say about the method and content of undergraduate dental training, and some of it is critical of things as they exist. I will not attempt to judge the worth of all the recommendations in the report. But many of the comments the commission makes are as applicable to other branches of education as they are to dentistry, and in this regard, I found in them a vigorous and stimulating challenge to habitual patterns of thought.

For I suggest to you that we in this country must become more constructively critical of our traditional approaches to education. We should ask some questions. Why do we teach what we teach? What is it we are educating for? And wherever we find that we are doing things just because they have always been done, we might ask whether we are educating for the 20th and 21st centuries or merely perpetuating the methods inherited from the 19th. Education, after all, is not a monument to the past; it is the architecture of the future.

If I read the report aright, the commission believes that in current dental education there is perhaps too much emphasis upon restorative dentistry, too little upon preventive. The commission assumes, and I certainly agree, that the dentist's responsibility extends far beyond the providing of treatment to the patient who knocks on his door and demands it. If this were all we expected from our dentists, restorative dentistry might be all they needed to know. But the dental profession also has a responsibility for seeing that the receipt of care more accurately reflects the actual need for it. Treating the patient who knocks on the door is only one in a progression of important activities in which the profession participates. Ideally, the first step in that progression is the development of methods for the prevention of disease itself. Therefore, if dentistry is indeed educating for the future, it should obviously be educating for research.

As the commission observes, "Of all avenues leading toward the prevention of dental disease, the one offering the most hope is research. One investigator, if he should discover a means of preventing or reducing periodontal disease, might do more for oral health than several thousand practitioners of restorative dentistry." Yet the commission finds little reason for satisfaction with the current status of dental research, although it acknowledges the substantial progress which has been made in recent years.

The Federal Government has played, and undoubtedly will continue to play, a major role in conducting and sponsoring dental research programs. I have always been deeply interested in this field, and I look upon the growth of the National Institute of Dental Research—incidentally, NIDR will soon move into its new building—and of its grants program in support of extramural activity as being among the notable contributions the Government has made to the advancement of health standards. I am glad to have had a part in making them possible. Yet I agree with the commission that while the Federal Government should increase its support of research, and I think it will, the Government cannot carry the burden alone. Financial support from other sources must be forthcoming.

There is, as you know, a codicil to the commission's recommendations for increased financial aid: the increase should be commensurate with the increase in available research personnel. Since, as the commission points out, the best source of researchers is the undergraduate student body, the availability of personnel depends to a very great extent upon the dental educator. Yet today, teachers do not have time to pursue research projects; students are given neither the scientific depth, nor the curriculum time, nor the intellectual stimulus to interest them in the field. The commission sees the result as a shortage so acute that "the recruitment for dental research is even more important than the recruitment for dental practice," and it urges the integration of research with teaching at the undergraduate level as a logical first step toward overcoming the shortage.

That stronger and better designed undergraduate programs will in time do much to strengthen the whole intricate structure of dental research in this country strikes me as a sound and practical observation. I therefore suggest that proposals which advocate Federal or private financial aid for talented undergraduate dental students who are interested in research and teaching careers deserve serious consideration from us all. At the same time, ways must be found to increase the scope and intensity and effectiveness of activity at the more advanced levels of dental research.

For the general public, these extended programs of research will have greatest meaning when preventive discoveries are given practical application in day-to-day life. And in view of the seriousness of the overall dental health problem, the Nation's failure to utilize fully the preventive techniques already at its disposal is nothing short of tragic.

Every leading health organization in the country, among them the American Dental Association, the American Medical Association, and the American Association of Dental Schools, has endorsed fluoridation. The Commission on the Survey of Dentistry therefore speaks for informed opinion when it states it is "totally unimpressed by the arguments advanced, usually by health and other faddists, that fluoridation is dangerous, immoral, unconstitutional, and unscriptural." Yet today, more than 10 years after the introduction of a simple procedure for the controlled fluoridation of public water supplies, something less than a fourth of the American people have access to the benefits that method provides. The public denies itself those benefits, and now the fluoridation of water supplies is not even pacing population growth. Evidently, the health and other faddists have lately been more successful in presenting their case to the public than the profluoridationists, though the latter have scientific fact on their side. Perhaps the difference is in the intensity of effort.

Let me quote some other statements from the Commission's report and, I warn you, quote them out of sequence:

"Although 37 percent—of some 750 dentists participating in an opinion survey—take part in fluoridation campaigns in their communities, only about 2 percent have been active as individuals in initiating these campaigns.

"Wide scale educational efforts must be undertaken to acquaint the American people with the importance of dental health and with means of attaining it.

"Education, in the dental health sense, has many facets ranging from campaigns on behalf of public health measures to hygiene instruction in primary school."

And, finally, there is the recommendation of the commission that "all public agencies, with the assistance of voluntary associations and professional societies, make greater efforts to promote water fluoridation and community topical fluoride programs."

As the commission recognizes, the possibility of making greater efforts will depend to a large degree upon the possibility of securing substantial grants for expansion of the State and local dental health programs needed to win widespread public support for fluoridation and other preventive measures. But important as they are, grants are not a substitute for incisive and coordinated action. They serve only as the foundation upon which better programs can be built.

I remarked earlier that the commission continually stresses how much depends upon our ability to educate and be educated, and upon our ability to use what we know with greater force. The fluoridation issue is a case in point. If they are to strengthen and intensify activities in support of fluoridation, public health agencies at the National, State, and local level must make sure that they employ their special resources and knowledge and practical experience to the very fullest extent. And their efforts, in turn, must be reinforced by the professional knowledge and prestige and influence of the private practitioner, working individually in his community and through his dental society. This kind of cooperation should produce an educational force persuasive and authoritative enough to offset the statements, however dramatic, of the small but vocal opposition.

Valuable though preventive measures like fluoridation are, I am sure the commission is right when it states that the achievement of dental health solely through the prevention of disease is far in the future, a fact which throws into relief the importance of what the commission calls "prevention of progression through treatment." And since people differ both in their ability to pay for care and even in their physical ability to seek it, the receipt of treatment cannot be left to chance. The commission makes a series of recommendations for reducing distance between dentist and patient which impress me as both imaginative and workable.

One of these, the incremental care program for school-age children, seems to me to be of particular value and importance. Beginning the first year with 6-year-olds and adding a new crop of them each year, the program would eventually cover all children through high school, and do so at a minimum of cost, for the care would begin in most cases before serious treatment problems have had a chance to develop. Since cost to the family would be based on the ability to pay, every child, regardless of financial status, would have a chance for a lifetime of good dental health. And that, eventually, should mean an impressive reduction in the accumulation of the Nation's unmet treatment needs. Therefore, though a program of this scope would undoubtedly require Federal and State aid in the form both of financial support and of participation by official health agencies, it would also represent a national asset.

Another group whose special needs for treatment deserve more thoughtful attention is the chronically ill and aged. The Public Health Service, for a number of years, has been conducting a series of studies designed to measure existing needs among these disadvantaged people. In cooperation with State and local dental societies and health departments, the Service has been experimenting also in the development of techniques and in the training of personnel to adapt traditional types of treatment to the special needs of people who are too infirm to visit the dentist in his office.

Some idea of the extent of the problem of caring for the homebound and institutionalized came out of a study recently completed in Kansas City. Four thousand nursing home patients, with an average age of 75, were examined; 88 percent were in need of care. If this measure of need holds true for all the population aged 75, then there are today some 4 million older people who require a service they are not likely to get unless a concerted effort is made to provide it. In less than 20 years, the figure will be 8 million. If we are to meet the special dental care needs of our growing population of older people, undergraduate training in dental geriatrics may well be a necessary addition to the modern dental school curriculum.

In efforts to narrow the gap between need and receipt of services, the greatest attention is perhaps being centered currently on the growth of various types of group prepaid dental care plans. Such plans may eventually have as great an impact upon dental care as hospital and medical coverages have had upon medical care. The recommendations of the Commission that the dental profession cooperate with industry, labor, and Government in experimentation with various approaches to group programs are therefore eminently sensible. Their suggestion that dental societies form service corporations to facilitate the development of group programs bears out the opinion of public health officers that this particular approach offers dentistry the best opportunity of assuring orderly growth and quality of care within the framework of group plans.

Even though many people disapprove in principle of group dental programs, cooperation in their design is still advisable. At least you must be prepared to face the changes they entail and to deal with them constructively. For it is much better to control circumstances than to be controlled by them.

Controlling circumstances becomes increasingly difficult as society becomes more complex. It requires infinitely more knowledge and patience. Today the members of all professions find themselves involved in activities which a few years ago did not even exist. And as activities increase, so do the demands upon professional skills and qualities of leadership.

Because this is true, laymen and professional men must meet together to discuss problems of mutual concern. And it becomes all the more necessary for us to accept the fact that we cannot limit our vision to the merely convenient or tailor the future by a pattern fitted only to the past. That is why it is so essential to realize that we must train more professional people, and that we must train them better. Perhaps we must even train a new breed of men—men of broader vision and greater scientific deapth than we have ever before known. Certainly in a field as essential as dentistry, we must, at the very least forgo the luxury of a narrow vocationalism in our educational processes.

To do what must be done will require the best that is in all of us—the willingness to try and the courage to fail. For much of what we must learn and teach can only be discovered by trial and error. If that is a painful process, it is also our greatest hope. As the great Oxford teacher E. R. Dodds once put it, "If the truth is beyond our grasp, the errors of tomorrow are still to be preferred to the errors of yesterday; for error in the sciences is only another name for the progressive approximation to truth."

Hoffa Leads Union in Fight To Amend Rule of Ratemaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on April 13, 1961, I called the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to a national drive against the railroads which James R. Hoffa is mounting.

The following article from the April 17, 1961, issue of Transport Topics, the national newspapers of the motor-freight carriers tells how Mr. Hoffa intends to carry out his program:

HOFFA LEADS UNION IN FIGHT TO AMEND RULE OF RATEMAKING

Teamster President James R. Hoffa last week touched off a massive campaign to urge Congress to enact S. 1197, a measure introduced by Senator ROBERT BARTLETT, of Alaska, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act.

The Bartlett bill is cosponsored by Senators A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Oklahoma; NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire; VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, and RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas. It would amend controversial section 15a (3) of the Interstate Commerce Act, which the trucking charges was an invitation to destructive rate-cutting now practiced by the railroads.

In a telephone network, Mr. Hoffa addressed 212 locals in 170 cities on the subject, urging the membership to write letters of protest to Congress. At the same time Senator MONRONEY appeared in a filmed interview, which was shown at all of the meetings.

The Teamster leader accused the Commission of misinterpreting "intentionally or otherwise" a law designed to make competition between trucks and the rails more realistic.

PROVISION CAUSING TROUBLE

The section of law, passed by Congress in 1958, which is causing all the legislative fireworks, says: "Rate of a carrier shall not be held up to a particular level to protect the traffic of any other mode of transportation."

The most severe effects of the 1958 law have been felt by the trucking industry in hauling new automobiles from assembly plants to distributors and dealers and by other specialized carriers.

Trucks formerly hauled more than 90 percent of such freight. This year, Ford Motor Co. alone expects to transport about a third of its new cars by railroad.

This substantial shift in auto hauling resulted from rates established by the railroads and approved by the ICC which were as much as 50 percent lower than motor carriers were charging.

"This misrepresentation," Mr. Hoffa charged, "will destroy the auto hauling companies, and the jobs of over 15,000 Teamster members unless the railroads and the ICC are stopped."

All five of the cosponsoring Senators of S. 1197 are members of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction over the ICC. A companion bill has been introduced in the House (H.R. 5937) by Representative MORGAN MOULDER, of Missouri.

WIVES ASKED TO HELP

The second stage of the nationwide campaign will be establishing women's auxiliaries among the Teamster wives. A brochure explaining how to establish an auxiliary, and

how it can function in the campaign will be distributed.

Simultaneous with establishment of the auxiliaries, a series of congressional breakfasts will be held in Washington. Teamster members will come to the Capitol, and invite their Congressmen and Senators to breakfasts sponsored by the international union. At the breakfasts the congressional delegations will hear the Teamster members' case for the Bartlett bill.

Also part of the second stage, a massive letter-writing campaign has been undertaken by the entire 1.7 million Teamster members, urging support of the Bartlett bill. It is estimated that over 75,000 letters have been written to Congress and the ICC since January.

Senator Keating Delivers Important Address on Governmental Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the junior Senator from New York, Mr. KEATING, recently delivered an interesting speech on the need for certain governmental reforms before the annual banquet of the Olean Chamber of Commerce. He outlined a concrete program for increasing congressional efficiency in the appropriation process and generally urged fresh initiatives to gear our Government to modern problems.

In view of his long crusade for efficiency in Government and his deep study of this field, Senator KEATING's remarks deserve wide circulation and study. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of his address before the Olean Chamber of Commerce be printed at this point in the RECORD.

REMARKS OF SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE ANNUAL BANQUET OF OLEAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, OLEAN, N.Y., APRIL 22, 1961

Mr. Chairman, members of the chamber of commerce, honored guests, it is a pleasure to be with you here tonight. I must say that during the recent basketball season I saw the Olean dateline quite often in the newspapers. It would appear that Tom Stith and his teammates were of great help to the chamber of commerce in putting Olean in the Nation's eye, and I'd like to state that as a western New Yorker, I was proud of the fine national record established by the St. Bonaventure team.

You are here today as citizens interested in government. There is nothing so valuable to a free society as people such as yourselves. A free government is people. When it ceases to be that—when it becomes bureaucrats and legislators, experts, and researchers operating in a self-made empire, then, it is in trouble.

As a Member of the Congress, I have always taken a deep interest in good government. Good government is not automatic. It requires constant vigilance.

It is founded on the greatness of the past and at the same time is willing to accept the dynamic challenges of the future. Good government, therefore, by definition, is both past and future. Let me elaborate for a moment on this point. As for the past, all of us recognize that the greatness of our Nation today depends very largely upon the preservation of individual initiative and incentives, which are so much a part of our free, competitive enterprise system.

While seeking to govern effectively, we recognize that the concentration of too many activities and of too much power in Washington—or anywhere else—tends to drain so huge a lump of every man's income away in taxes that his energies and initiative are depleted and eventually diminished altogether. We must remember that the coin of Government has two sides—spending and taxing.

But Government cannot be static and inflexible. We must be willing to expand the role of Government in those specific fields in which it is found to be necessary. We must strengthen existing Government programs where there is a clear need to do so.

This is the framework which I try to keep in mind. The Nation as a whole must make the great decisions as to what the Nation should do—what should be the size and scope of the activities of our Federal, State, and local Governments—how authority and responsibility should be related and equated.

To make these decisions, the public must be informed and articulate. There is much yet to be done in bringing the Government closer to the people. In this day and age of mass media, and the urban sprawl, we must renew and reinvigorate our efforts to make Government more understandable so that all Americans can appraise its actions and develop opinions on the major questions of our day.

The chamber of commerce is one of the organizations which is doing an important job in this field.

In this connection, let me touch upon a few questions that illustrate the point I have in mind. In doing so, I want to outline a program to gear our Government to 20th century problems and to promote efficiency in its operation.

First, there is the matter of the item veto. For many years, I have sponsored legislation to permit the President of the United States to veto items in appropriation bills without having to veto the entire bill.

In a nutshell, if we would provide the President with the power to veto items in an appropriation bill, that is the most effective single step we could take to eliminate waste and pork barreling and enable the Government of the United States to operate more economically and efficiently.

Many States have successfully provided their chief executives with this needed and constructive power of the purse. It is clear from their experience that the Federal Government and the taxpayers of America would benefit materially from the institution of the item veto.

This is a matter that should not be the exclusive concern of legislators.

It affects all of us—and every American should think of the item veto not as a vague phrase but as a step towards the better kind of government he wants. And if he has convictions, he shouldn't jingle them in his pocket, but put them on the line. So the next time you write a letter to a Congressman, may I suggest that instead of talking in negative generalities about wasteful spending in Government, you urge him affirmatively to support this constructive reform.

Secondly, there is the proposal, now in the form of a bill, of which I am a cosponsor, whereby a Joint Committee on the Budget would be established.

This committee would examine the budget as a whole, and not piecemeal. It would handle this important fiscal responsibility in an efficient, modern way, not with the horse-and-buggy methods of the past. This bill has wide support. It deserves the backing of responsible, savings-minded, efficiency-minded citizens.

In this same vital fiscal area, there is an urgent need for a broad and searching consideration of tax reforms. Here, too, is a problem that is the business of all Americans, not just the lawmakers.

One suggestion worthy of study in this field is the establishment of a Hoover-type commission to examine analytically the entire tax structure, and submit recommendations for changes geared to the times and designed to eliminate inequities. It is all right for people to have a passion for antiques—but our tax laws shouldn't be early American.

* * * * *

Many businessmen, like yourselves, will say that taxes are a bloodletting where a transfusion is needed. To pursue this subject a bit, as you are aware, more interest is being focused on taxation today than since—well, let me say, since the Boston Tea Party.

Recommendations run the gamut from sanity to extremism. Some groups are now calling for tax reforms that would abolish income tax completely, and return all Government business-type operations to the States.

Now, I agree with the school of thought that favors revision and modernization of our tax policies. I also recognize that there are certain Federal functions that can and should be turned over to local governments. But it is neither realistic nor practical to suggest the abolition of the Federal income tax.

Just as one example, how could we possibly achieve a posture of national defense and security in a world where power is not only the first requisite of safety but the indispensable requisite of survival? The argument for the fragmentation of national power—power based on Federal taxes—falls apart when we contemplate the alternative—a defense system geared to the days of the bow and arrow, not to the age of the hydrogen bomb.

Now, my third point is that we must cease to venerate the status quo. When we build automobiles we don't go on the principle that no improvements are possible on last year's model.

In Government, too often the ways of the past have been sanctified and perpetuated. Not only is last year's model still good, but even the last century's model in some cases. My own feeling is that we must constantly keep the door of our mind open to new concepts, new approaches, new directives. Not because change in itself is desirable, but because changes for the better are desirable—changes that will give us more efficiency-per-dollar, more achievement-per-effort.

I should like to cite an example. The suggestion has been advanced that a special session of the Congress be authorized for the sole purpose of studies, hearings and legislative action in the vital field of appropriations.

Such a session might take place in November and December of each year, prior, that is, to the opening of the regular session. Now such a proposal deserves serious consideration.

The business of appropriating sums in excess of $80 billion requires time, study, consultation, and deep reflection. At present this whole operation is done on a piecemeal basis, subject to the interruptions, the distractions, the emergencies that go hand in hand with a regular session of the Congress.

It is my conviction that more effective, more businesslike, and, not the least important, more money-saving general appropriations legislation would result from this special session proposal I have briefly outlined to you.

There is a fourth and final point I should like to make in this program of modernizing and vitalizing the operation of our Government. This point is embodied in another bill which I am sponsoring in the Senate. This measure is based on the premise that the more people know about the way Government operates, the better a Government operation we will have.

It calls for the establishment of a "know your Government" service whose sole function will be to break down the wall of secrecy that lies between the people and their Government. The idea is to make Government the living thing it ought to be, not the big anonymous, incomprehensible force that directs our lives from a central control system.

Too many of our citizens know only what they're obliged to do for the Government. They don't know that the Government is a two-way, not a one-way street—that it was created to serve the people, not to be their master. My contention is that we must do on the national scale what is so well done on the local scale—in cities like your own.

Your active, informed, alert citizenry is the greatest human resource that Olean possesses. You have a history here of thinking for yourselves, acting by yourselves—and economic adversity hasn't made you sit down and wait, but stand up and fight. For Washington is not the ultimate solution to every problem. It may assist, it may cooperate, but the prime mover must be the drive, the energy, the spirit of citizens like your own who don't just stare at difficulties but roll up their sleeves and go out and work to overcome those difficulties.

I want to make it clear that the four-point program I have discussed with you today is not just a matter of good housekeeping in government. It is, above all, a matter of strengthening the muscles of democracy—of better preparing us to withstand the tremendous challenge that free societies like our own are facing throughout the world today as communism mounts its silent and deadly offensive.

Too many Americans think that a fight doesn't begin until the bell rings—until a shot is fired—until the sirens go off.

The cold, hard fact is that a fight is going on right now—across the world, a struggle that we're in whether we like it or not—a titanic struggle that is not conventional war, where there is no blood, no thunder, but where our freedom can be put to death as surely as a bullet can kill or a bomb can destroy. That is why we Americans can no longer afford the luxury of apathy. That is why the way America is run is the personal business of all Americans, not the prerogative of an official few.

We face a foe that has a single purpose, the destruction of all freedom.

Against that diabolical resolve we must throw the full strength of our energies, the full dedication of our spirit. And in this connection, let me leave one final thought with you—a thought every one of us should burn into his heart and mind. History has recorded for us the many ways in which human freedom has died—gloriously, cravenly, forlornly, but the saddest, most ignominious death of all is when freedom dies in its sleep.

Bracero Program Defended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an article by Richard Strout, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, which appeared in the April 21, 1961, edition of that newspaper:

BRACERO PROGRAM DEFENDED

(By Richard Strout)

WASHINGTON.—There are fewer so-called wetbacks along the Mexican border of the United States today than there used to be. Many feel it is due to the bracero program.

The colorful wetbacks were the illicit immigrants from Mexico who came across the Rio Grande to work on U.S. farms.

Some controversy surrounds the program whose extension is being debated now in a House subcommittee on agriculture where Representative CHARLES M. TEAGUE, Republican, of California, is ranking Republican.

The bracero program, Mr. TEAGUE argues, has helped reduce wetbacks from around 1 million each year to about 30,000.

The braceros, Mr. TEAGUE, are properly transported, house, fed, and insured. Mexican and United States Government officials travel, throughout the areas of our country using braceros, to make certain the treaty provisions are followed to the letter. When they return to Mexico, in most cases at least, they are emissaries of goodwill for the United States."

"Why should we bring in workers from Mexico when we have 4 or 5 million unemployed persons in this country?" Mr. TEAGUE says the answer is that "not enough domestic Americans workers are willing to do hard farm labor."

In a statement he continues: "Several persons, with headquarters here in Washington, appeared before our subcommittee and stated that the bracero program should be abandoned. All of these people were well intentioned, and some of them were clergymen. They did demonstrate, however, an abysmal ignorance of the real situation.

"It is sometimes stated that the bracero program works only for the benefit of the large farmers. This simply is not true. There are two good reasons why it is not:

"1. Large farmers can afford to mechanize, and most small operators cannot.

"2. If our total domestic farm labor supply were not supplemented by the braceros, a shortage of available workers would surely develop.

Then, the large farmers could outbid the small ones for the labor, because the former could afford to take a financial loss for a year or two. On the other hand, the small operators would go bankrupt and would be forced out of business entirely. The larger farmers would be in a position to gamble that the subsequent drop in production would tend to force up farm prices (and consequently food prices) so that they could again make a living."

Where Has "Faith" in Our Foreign Giveaway Program Brought Us in the World?

SPEECH

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 6518 making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, we have passed in this Congress a bill that practically hands a half billion dollars to the State Department in the form of a blank check. We have told the State Department, in effect, "Here is a blank check. Spend it as you see fit."

Now, a half billion dollars may not mean much to some of the gentlemen in this assembly. It certainly does mean much to the taxpayers of this Nation, and especially to the taxpayers in my home State of Indiana.

We on the Appropriations Committee have tried diligently to learn of a definite program that exists for spending this money. We have sought to learn where about $106 million of soft money in the bill is going to be spent. We have tried to learn this to no avail.

We have been told by the State Department that we must back the bill "on faith." Time and again we have been told we "must have faith" that everything will come out all right and that the money will be spent wisely and properly.

I ask you, what kind of justification is that? It is about as sensible as giving $2 billion to the Corps of Engineers "on faith," hoping they will carry out the right flood control projects.

These mystery funds have been neither explained nor justified, yet we are asked to tell our constituents to "grin and bear it"—to "have faith."

What has faith gained us in the past? We have poured billions and billions of dollars down this foreign aid hole and what have we gained by it? Prestige? Friendship? Reciprocated faith in what the United States is trying to do? I think you will agree that the end result of all this aid has been enmity by those getting it, an ever-decreasing circle of friends and allies and a mounting national debt for ourselves.

I, for one, am against voting for these pigs in pokes. When we spend money from now on, I want to know where it is going, why it is being sent and what it is going to do when it gets there.

Our past experience at trying to win friends through dollars has been sad, indeed. I think we should stop playing the rich uncle, embark on a positive campaign of pro-Americanism and display to the world the image of a nation that believes in itself. We should display our intention to continue that direction regardless of minor setbacks. It is time we worried about American strength and prestige first and allow other countries a free and clear choice as to whether they want to join us or not.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], indicated in debate on this bill that the 87th Congress was committed by the 86th Congress to this program. I should like to point out that the gentleman is incorrect. Every Member of the 87th Congress was elected in 1960. The commitments of the 86th Congress in no way bind the 87th Congress and the gentleman from Virginia knows it.

Similarly, each individual Member of this august body was sent here because his constituents hold him in high es-

teem. They expect him to seek answers, to probe for information and to get the facts on everything pertinent to the Nation's business.

If we are now individually and collectively to abdicate this position of responsibility, if we are to proceed on a hazy policy of "faith" in an unknown program, then we have violated our trust. Every one of us should resign and go back home and run for office again. It would be interesting to see how successful those of us who run on a platform of blind faith might be.

Memory of Molly Secure in Hearts of Peorians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the following article from the April 23, 1961, issue of the Peoria Journal-Star. I am sure that the memory of Molly of radio's "Fibber McGee and Molly" will not only remain in the hearts and minds of Peorians, but with millions of their fans throughout the Nation:

Death has split the Peoria couple who became radio's king and queen, but Fibber McGee and Molly will live forever in the entertainment world's hall of fame.

For nearly 20 years Jim and Marian (Driscoll) Jordan enjoyed the heights of radio popularity, meantime amassing a fortune, with good clean comedy their only secret of success.

Show business and the millions of persons who were fans of Fibber and Molly mourned the passing April 7, in California, of Marian Jordan—born on Peoria's south side April 15, 1898—and extended sympathy to her husband, born November 16, 1896 in a farmhouse off Farmington Road.

Jim, the son of a farmer, and Marian, daughter of a coal miner, had been married 42 years. They met as teenagers while singing in the choir of St. John's Church, and have often said it was "love at first sight." They were married here August 31, 1918.

Even as youngsters Jim and Marian had their hearts set on show business as a career, and never lost sight of that goal. However, it was a long, hard struggle—frequently beset with seemingly insurmountable obstacles—before they reached it.

Marian was the youngest member of a family of nine boys and four girls born to Daniel and Anna (Carroll) Driscoll; Jim was one of a family of five boys and three girls born to James W. and Mary (Tighe) Jordan. Marian is survived by two brothers and a sister, living here. Jim has two brothers and two sisters living, but no close relatives here anymore.

Until they went into virtual retirement a few years ago, Jim and Marian had attracted weekly radio audiences up to the 40-million mark with their "Fibber McGee and Molly" show—a series that started in April of 1935. The comedy show had a distinctly American smalltown tang and was one the whole family could, and did, enjoy.

The local background on Jim and Marian, coming largely from her two brothers and her sister—Daniel Driscoll of 2818 W. Hayes Street, Carroll P. Driscoll, of 2923 West Augustana Avenue, and Mrs. Ellen Lord, 1024 North Flora Avenue—shows the close ties Fibber and Molly had with Peoria.

Jim attended St. Mark's grade school and Spalding Institute. In his spare time he studied voice. This study continued 4 years, during which time he was engaged in various jobs including that of wholesale drug clerk, mail carrier, washing machine salesman, and insurance agent. All the time he was going with Marian.

During these early years Jim sang in a local quartet and teamed up frequently with Marian as a harmony duo.

In September 1917 Jim decided to strike out and try to make the big time, going to Chicago and getting a job as tenor in vaudeville in an act known as "A Night With the Poets."

Marian, who had studied at the parochial schools and the Academy of Our Lady, appeared in many amateur theatricals and concerts. She had studied voice, violin, and piano, and later taught piano.

After a comparatively short time in Chicago Jim got lonesome for Marian and returned to Peoria. Five days after they were married, Jim, who had been turned down when he tried to enlist, was called by the Army. After training at a Georgia camp he was sent overseas to serve with the 122d Engineers.

Although he became seriously ill at St. Nazaire, Jordan refused to leave France and turned his entertaining talents to the morale division of the oversea army. He organized a troupe and toured the frontlines.

Once back in Peoria he got a job in a machine shop, but the lure of the entertainment world was too great for either Jim or Marian and they embarked on a vaudeville tour. A bit later they organized a concert tour, being part of an entertainment troupe. These tours lasted 4 years and took the Peoria couple to hundreds of tank towns, opera houses, and churches throughout the Middle West. They got tired of all this, called it quits.

The real break for Jim and Marian, although they didn't realize it at the time, came when they made a visit to Byron, one of Jim's brothers at Rogers Park in Chicago, and someone turned on the radio.

Jim listened, then said: "Marian and I can do better than that." It was when his brother jokingly bet him $10 that he couldn't that Jim accepted the challenge that started them on their way to fame and fortune.

In 1925 they had a satisfactory audition over WIBO, Chicago, and were hired for a song program. After the initial performance they were engaged for one of the first sponsored radio programs in the Middle West—receiving $10 a week as "The O'Henry Twins" sponsored by a candy bar firm.

It was their meeting with Don Quinn, erstwhile cartoonist and gag specialist, that led them up the golden path of radio. He recognized their talents and their potentiality as an outstanding team and continued as their writer all through the years that followed.

His first sketch for them, "Smack Out," concerned a folksy grocery store proprietor who was always smack out of everything except tall tales. This developed into a popular series and the Jordans appeared in this and in other sketches over NBC, as well as on children's programs.

Well on their way, the Jordans reached the top with the creation of Fibber McGee and Molly—which was given its original network airing 26 years ago this month. The series continued from that time until around 5 years ago, except during part of 1938 and 1939 when Marian's health caused its interruption for two seasons.

The show was a moderate success as a daytime feature, but when changed to one of the choicest night spots on the air—9:30 p.m. Tuesdays—it's popularity soared. The Jordans' fortunes rose and they built a home in Chicago—a far cry from one in which they had lived here in the 900 block First Avenue when they were first married.

When Marian became ill in 1938 the Jordans moved to California. There, they continued the show and also made three motion pictures over the next several years. After the Jordans went into semi-retirement, making only infrequent appearances on the marathon radio show, Monitor, a TV version of their Fibber McGee and Molly show with another cast proved a flop.

Costarring with Jim and Marian on their radio show over the years weer such favorites as Hal Peary, "Gildersleeve"; Cliff Arquette as "The Old Timer"; Bill Thompson as "Wallace Wimple"; Gale Gordon as "Mayor Latrivia," and Arthur Q. Bryan as "Doc Gamble."

Fibber, of course, was always the braggadocio, loving guy who told the gargantuan whoppers and cracked the corny jokes that evoked Molly's "'Taint funny McGee." And Molly did Grandma, the dolorous Mrs. Wearybottom, the exasperating Teeny, a neighbor's child, and other characters.

The locale of the show was the mythical 79 Wistful Vista, where a bong-bong of the door chimes would announce the arrival of the various personalities on the show. Fibber's junk-laden closet was the cause of much mirth as all its contents would be heard to spill on the floor whenever he yanked open the door.

Johnson's Wax sponsored the show, which paid the Jordans around $6,000 a week. They made considerably more in the years when they appeared in movies.

Her brother, Carroll, who with Mrs. Driscoll returned a few days ago from California where they attended Marian's funeral, said Jim wants to do some traveling and then wants to go back to work. He didn't say, however, just what he has in mind. He and Marian resided in an estate at Encino. He still owns property in Peoria.

Carroll tells some interesting things about Fibber and Molly, including the fact that "Fred Nitney," about whom Jim often quipped in the radio show, was a real person. Jim told Carroll that Nitney was an entertainer in the troupe he toured with many years ago.

At the end of that tour, Carroll revealed, Jim and Marian—unhappy at the prospect of returning to Peoria and probably losing all opportunity to break into the bigtime—even considered going to China.

Jordan had a sister and brother-in-law who were theatrical impressarios in that country and they wrote urging Jim and Marian to revive their concert company and bring it over.

The Jordans were just on the verge of taking this advice when they got a second letter telling them not to bring "the kids; you'll be traveling in a land where it will be difficult to secure fresh milk." The Jordans looked at their two then youngsters, Jim, Jr., and Kathryn (now Mrs. Victor Newcomer), and the Chinese tour was off.

Carroll revealed, also, that at one time his brother had visions of becoming a "Swiss bellringer." He said, incidentally, he and his wife still have Marian's violin in their home and probably would send it to Jim at some later date.

Danny, the other brother of Marian, likes to remember doing the Irish jig with her when we were kids, and Mrs. Lord also has many fond memories of her sister.

The Jordans visited Peoria several times, the last time 5 years ago.

One of their best friends in their younger days here was Paul Mehlenbeck, 62, of 220 North Western Avenue. He and Jordan were members of the old quartet which appeared at numerous functions in the pre-World War I days.

"Jim was our tenor, and a darned good one," Mehlenbeck recalls. Mehlenbeck, him-

self, gained a widespread reputation throughout the Midwest after the quartet broke up as the leader of his own orchestra for 19 years.

Mehlenbeck said his family and the Jordan family were very close and "I would class Jim and Marian as my very best friends; they were the kind of people one would certainly be proud to call his friends." The Mehlenbecks visited Jim and Marian at their beautiful Encino home a couple of years ago. Mehlenbeck said:

"Jim and Marian showed us a wonderful time and we were thrilled to see their estate. But they never changed; they were the same down-to-earth people that they were back in Peoria before they gained fame and fortune."

Customhouse 22 Miles From Harbor Is A Waste of Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, construction of a customs headquaters for the twin ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach in the Los Angeles Civic Center 22 miles away is an unnecessary waste of taxpayers' money. The GSA proposes to construct the custom house as part of a new 8-story Federal office building costing in excess of $30 million. Two floors, or approximately 150,000 square feet are to be devoted to customs facilities. Customs' cost of the new building has been estimated variously by Federal sources as from $4 million to $6 million. More than 100,000 square feet of this customs space are to be devoted to appraiser's store. The appraiser's store is essentially warehousing where merchandise samples are brought, examined and stored until they are picked by the importer.

This customs appraiser's warehousing in a multistory civic center building will thus cost the Federal Government more than $30 a square foot to construct.

By contrast, good private warehousing, including air-conditioned offices can be and has been built in the harbor area for as little as $5 a square foot. Location of the custom house in the harbor would save the taxpayer construction costs of at least $2 million. This is not the only price the Government pays for its 22-mile bottleneck.

Examiners packages have to be transported from the piers to the appraiser's store in central Los Angeles. This cartage costs the Government between $40,000 and $50,000 a year. Each day, eight appraisers are sent out from Los Angeles to inspect merchandise too delicate or too bulky to truck to the appraiser's store for examination. Travel time, as stated by former Acting Collector of Customs D. B. Strubinger, is 1 hour each way. Thus the eight appraisers, just in traveling to and from the harbor, lose a total of 16 hours, or 2 man-days each day.

Every transportation delay or problem that costs the Government money in attempting to administer customs at the harbor from a headquarters 22 miles inland, also costs the man in the importing or exporting business money. Importers complain that customs clearances that are a matter of hours in other ports frequently become a matter of days in Los Angeles and Long Beach harbors. Shipments frequently cannot be forwarded until the examiner's packages are returned from the appraiser's store. Similarly, if a cargo is taken off a ship after the appraiser's truck has made its visit to that pier, the merchandise must sit on the pier until the truck comes again the next day. Importers complain that damage to merchandise seems to occur most frequently to those packages which are transported to Los Angeles for examination. They do not blame this on the customs, but on 22-mile transportation and repackaging problems. Sometimes, customs forms—called entries—get misplaced by the messenger who once a day shuttles papers back and forth between Los Angeles and the port. That results in extra delay until the mistake is corrected and the messenger makes his next run.

The Influence of Communism on Government Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, here is the last in a series of articles by Robert B. Dresser concerning communism.

It appeared in Economic Council Paper, volume XVI, No. 4, April 1, 1961:

COMMUNISM AND THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE—THE INFLUENCE OF COMMUNISM ON GOVERNMENT POLICY

(By Robert B. Dresser)

Numerous investigations of communism and subversive activities have been made by committees of Congress and of the individual States during the past 40 or more years. A summary index of these investigations during the period from 1918 to 1956 has been printed by order of the U.S. Senate, dated July 23, 1956. The large number of such investigations is shown by the fact that the summary index contains 339 pages.

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN DIES, MARCH 1948

In March 1948 Congressman Martin Dies, Democrat, of Texas, a courageous and much respected Member of Congress, made a most startling and revealing speech before the Southern Gas Association, at Galveston, Tex., on Communist activities in the United States. Congressman Dies was the first chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, originally known as the "Dies committee."

I quote from his speech as follows:

"Democracy and Christian civilization are more gravely menaced throughout the world today than ever before in history. At long last, many of our people realize that fact. Unfortunately, however, they realize it imperfectly and incompletely, and there are still millions of people in the United States who have no conception of the methods, tactics, and purposes of communism. All of us, however, must have some understanding of what has happened in the world about us.

* * * * *

"Only a few years ago, Russia was looked upon as a third-rate power. Today, all of us must concede that Russia is the most powerful country on earth. Now, how did that happen? I propose to answer that question.

* * * * *

"It all began in 1938. I was a member of the Immigration Committee and also a member of the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives. I became intensely interested in Communist infiltration of labor unions, and in Government service. I decided the time was appropriate to investigate and expose Communists' activities in the United States. So I introduced a resolution and the Committee on Rules approved it and the House of Representatives, on May 26, 1938, established the committee.

"Immediately after the committee was established, I encountered strenuous opposition. When I went to the Committee on Accounts to secure an appropriation to finance the work of the committee, I found that the Democratic members were hostile to every suggestion that I made. They finally, upon instructions from the White House, reduced the requested budget from $100,000 to $25,000. I began the work with the paltry sum of $25,000.

"I telephoned the Attorney General of the United States and said, 'Mr. Attorney General, I want to secure the services of some competent and reliable investigators to assist me in this work.' He sent me two men. I received a telephone call, however, an anonymous call shortly before their arrival, telling me both men were members of the Communist Party. I never knew who gave me that valuable information, but I acted upon it.

"When they arrived, I began to question them. I put them through the third degree, in the presence of the entire committee, and finally they broke down and admitted that they were members of the Communist Party who worked for the Department of Justice.

* * * * *

"I announced through the press that I intended next morning to open hearings and give the American people the truth.

"I received a telephone call from President Roosevelt who asked me to come to the White House at 10 o'clock the next morning. I went to the White House. Senator Sheppard was there. Evidently the President thought Senator Sheppard might influence me. The President said to me, 'You know, Martin, I have been watching you for a long time. You have a promising future. You are an able speaker and a young man and I want vigorous, able, young men in the New Deal, and you can go a long way working with me.' He continued, 'You have got to be loyal to me. I can't work with men that I can't depend upon. You can't go through with this investigation.' And I said, 'Why can't I go through with it, Mr. President?' Of course, I was somewhat weakened, to tell the truth. It sounded awfully good to me, what he was telling me, and being human, I am not going to represent myself as any hero because I wasn't. I was just plain scared.

* * * * *

"Well, one thing led to another, and finally the President became somewhat impatient and angry with me, and he turned to Senator Sheppard and said, 'Senator, what are we going to do with Martin?' Senator Sheppard was a very genial, pleasant man and a good friend of mine. He said, 'I don't know. I knew his dad, and when one of these Dies makes up his mind to do something, he usually does it. I am afraid you are going to have trouble in persuading him not to do it.'

"Well, the interview lasted about 45 or 50 minutes, and finally, I looked at the watch and said, 'Mr. President, I have to go because the committee meets and I have to be there to open.'

* * * * *

"I recall for instance, that a man by the name of General Sevinsky, a very able young man who had served with Stalin for a long time, and had become disgusted with the brutality of the Communist practice and had fled to the United States. I discovered his whereabouts and went to see him. He told me an amazing story of what Stalin had told him a long time ago, about the plan to infiltrate the Balkan States, to build secret armies in every country, to spend millions of dollars for propaganda purposes. He told me the ultimate goal of Stalin was the conquest of Europe and then the conquest of the Americas.

"I said to him, 'Why don't you come to Washington and testify? The American people ought to have that information.' He said, 'Mr. Congressman, if I were to come to Washington and testify and if they discovered my identity, the OGPU which is now the NKVD, the secret army of the Politico Bureau, would assassinate me in 2 days.'

"I said, 'Surely they are not that powerful in the United States.' I was very skeptical about it. He said, 'Mr. Congressman, I was chief of the western division of the Soviet intelligence and I know that there isn't a country, there isn't an industry, there isn't a town of industrial importance that members of the OGPU are not there listening, getting and using information and transmitting it to the Soviet Union. They have their agents in the Embassies—even the Ambassadors do not know the members of the OGPU.'

"At any rate, I talked to him at some length and finally, upon the promise that I would protect him and conceal his identity, he agreed to testify.

"I called up the Secret Service and I said, 'I am undertaking a rather perilous thing. This man is fearful of his life.' I undertook to get a commitment from the Government that they would help me protect him, but the Government didn't want him to testify. He did testify. His name was not given then to the press. Within 2 weeks after his startling revelations, which predicted almost 100 percent accurately the progress the Kremlin has made within the last 2 years, within 2 weeks after his testimony, he was found shot in his hotel room in Washington, D.C., and not one arm was raised by the Federal Government to discover and apprehend the man or men responsible for his death.

"Another former agent of the Soviet Union, in New York, was persuaded to testify. Shortly after his testimony, he was found dead. They said it was a heart attack. I demanded another examination and discovered that he had been shot with a fine steel bullet through the eye which had entered his brain and brought about his death.

"Still another man who testified before our committee in Chicago was mysteriously run down by a hit-and-run driver.

"I say these things because my purpose is to show you upon this occasion what happened in the United States and which resulted in the sacrifice of the fruits of victory won by our boys on the battlefields. I am at a loss to understand why men in public affairs are not now clamoring for publication of the secret agreements made with Joseph Stalin by our Government. I have been amazed that people have received with such indifference and unconcern the startling revelation that all of the men who fought and died, died in vain because they were betrayed. And I shall show you here and now how they were betrayed.

* * * * *

"Yes, we continued, continued giving the American people the truth. Finally, we discovered that some 2,500 Communists, agents and stooges and servants and minions of a foreign dictator, were on the Government payroll, occupying in many instances key positions in the State Department, in the Justice Department, and in the Interior Department. So, I wrote to President Roosevelt and told him I wanted to see him about it, and he said, 'All right.'

"I went down to the White House. I said, 'Mr. President, we have got to do something about this. Here is a list of these people. We have raided the organization and we have their membership records. There can't be any doubt about it. If you understand the Communists as I understand them, you will know they are in the Government for one purpose and one purpose alone, and that is to steal the important Government secrets to transmit them to Moscow.'

"The President was furious. I was amazed at his anger. He said to me—he got to calling me Mr. Congressman—he had called me Martin before—he said, 'Mr. Congressman, you must see a bugaboo under every bed.' I said, 'No, I never look under the bed, Mr. President.' 'Well,' he said, 'I have never seen a man that had such ideas about this thing. There is nothing wrong with the Communists, some of the best friends I have got are Communists.' Mind you, that is a truthful account. He made that statement.

"I made that statement before the House soon after President Roosevelt made it and he did not deny it. Everything I tell you, I told to the Congress, and no one to this day has ever denied any statement I ever made.

* * * * *

"Well, the President refused to discharge the Communists and finally I went before the House and induced Congress to withhold appropriations to pay their salaries. The executive department then defied Congress and refused still to fire them. They were kept on the Government pay. Yes, they were on the Government payroll when we were working on the secret of the atomic bomb. And still there are people in America so dumb as to believe Stalin doesn't have the secret of the atomic bomb. How could he have kept from getting it with men in every department of the Government, influential men who wouldn't hesitate a moment to give that information to Stalin. They got it in Canada, didn't they, and Canada wasn't one-twentieth as well organized by Communists as the United States. We were taken in, lock, stock, and barrel, by Communist propaganda.

* * * * *

"I had a member of the Secret Service who worked in the White House give me reports every week on what happened in the White House. I knew that leading Communist agents had access to the White House, were going there and were using their influence to affect our domestic and foreign policy. Now, I know this is difficult for you to believe, but every bit of it is the truth. I am telling you these incidents so that you may have some faint idea of how thoroughly Stalin was able to dupe the United States of America.

* * * * *

"So, my fellow citizens, here was Moscow in full swing in the United States. They were influencing our domestic policy by preaching public ownership. They formed innumerable organizations which were lobbying actively in Washington for this purpose. Of course, they didn't say this was communism. They didn't say these organizations were controlled by Communists. These organizations were making inroads on the economic system of America, acquiring land, acquiring business, narrowing the field of competition, building up the monopoly of public power, which is as dangerous as monopoly in business, if not more dangerous. And Stalin was working on the foreign policy."

REPORT OF JENNER COMMITTEE, JULY 30, 1953

Probably the most comprehensive of the congressional investigations was one undertaken by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate. The report of this committee was dated July 30, 1953. It is a most important and revealing document. The committee was composed of eight Senators—five Republicans and three Democrats—and the chairman was Senator William E. Jenner, Republican, of Indiana. The report was unanimous.

The conclusions of the Committee were stated in the report as follows:

"1. The Soviet international organization has carried on a successful and important penetration of the U.S. Government and this penetration has not been fully exposed.

"2. This penetration has extended from the lower ranks to top-level policy and operating positions in our Government.

"3. The agents of this penetration have operated in accordance with a distinct design fashioned by their Soviet superiors.

"4. Members of this conspiracy helped to get each other into Government, helped each other to rise in Government and protected each other from exposure.

"5. The general pattern of this penetration was first into agencies concerned with economic recovery, then to warmaking agencies, then to agencies concerned with foreign policy and postwar planning, but always moving to the focal point of national concern.

"6. In general, the Communists who infiltrated our Government worked behind the scenes—guiding research and preparing memorandums on which basic American policies were set, writing speeches for Cabinet officers, influencing congressional investigations, drafting laws, manipulating administrative reorganizations—always serving the interest of their Soviet superiors.

"7. Thousands of diplomatic, political, military, scientific, and economic secrets of the United States have been stolen by Soviet agents in our Government and other persons closely connected with the Communists.

"8. Decpite the fact that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security agencies had reported extensive information about this Communist penetration, little was done by the executive branch to interrupt the Soviet operatives in their ascent in Government until congressional committees brought forth to public light the facts of the conspiracy.

"9. Powerful groups and individuals within the executive branch were at work obstructing and weakening the effort to eliminate Soviet agents from positions in Government.

"10. Members of this conspiracy repeatedly swore to oaths denying Communist Party membership when seeking appointments, transfers, and promotions: and these falsifications have, in virtually every case, gone unpunished.

"11. The control that the American Communications Association, a Communist directed union, maintains over communication lines vital to the national defense poses a threat to the security of this country.

"12. Policies and programs laid down by members of the Soviet conspiracy are still in effect within our Government and constitute a continuing hazard to our national security."

Other investigations by congressional committees have resulted in similar conclusions.

STATEMENT OF J. EDGAR HOOVER, MARCH 26, 1947

In further support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, let me quote

from a statement by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, before that committee on March 26, 1947:

"The aims and responsibilities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are the same—the protection of the internal security of this Nation. The methods whereby this goal may be accomplished differ, however.

"I have always felt that the greatest contribution this committee could make is the public disclosure of the forces that menace America—Communist and Fascist. That is why the venom of the American Communist and the now defunct German-American Bund has been directed at this committee as it has also been directed at the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This committee renders a distinct service when it publicly reveals the diabolic machinations of sinister figures engaged in un-American activities."

CONCLUSION

1. Does it appear strange to anyone—

(a) That our Government should permit an organized enemy to plot our destruction in our very midst?

(b) That we should continue to recognize the Government of the country that is directing such action?

(c) That we should continue our membership in an organization, the United Nations, which admits Russia and her satellite nations to membership, thereby providing a most effective means of infiltrating our country with agents engaged in spying and subversive activities?

There was a period from 1917 to 1933 when we refused to recognize the Russian Government. In November 1933, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, acting alone, without any supporting action on the part of Congress or the Senate, entered into an executive agreement with Maxim M. Litvinov, representing Russia, whereby American recognition was extended to Russia, thereby enabling Russia to bring into this country thousands of agents for the purposes of undermining our Government and our system of society.

2. Can there be any doubt about the importance of discovering and exposing to public view the scoundrels who are plotting our destruction?

3. If so, why in heaven's name does anyone wish to abolish the most effective agency we have for this purpose?

The Tangled Web

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee will soon deliberate over the changes in our tax law recommended in the President's tax message. We all know the tax burden is heavy and should be tightened; yet we continue to increase it, already this year by fuel, highway users', and social security tax increases.

Now come these new recommendations which seem only to scramble further an already complicated tax hierarchy of law. This study by the Wall Street Journal is a stimulating one in this connection from which we may all benefit.

THE TANGLED WEB

Ever since the publican appeared on the doorstep to exact the things that were Caesar's, we suppose men have attacked the prevailing tax system as inequitable.

President Kennedy is no exception. His long-range goal, he told Congress the other day, is a more equitable tax structure and a simpler tax law. That is surely a desirable destination, but it's hard to see how the first steps he now proposes lead there.

Take the urgent question of depreciation allowances on plant and machinery. Liberal depreciation gives foreigners a growing edge over American firms which must operate outmoded machinery because of outmoded depreciation rules. But instead of an across-the-board modernization of depreciation, Mr. Kennedy favors a selective and complicated formula that would affect industry most unequally.

Or consider the proposed remedies for tax inequities in the field of foreign investment. Within 2 years, oversea tax havens are to be wiped out. American firms operating foreign subsidiaries are to be stripped of tax deferral privileges and so compelled to repatriate profits that would otherwise be reinvested abroad.

But "tax havens" aren't bad everywhere, in the Kennedy view. In order to enhance the relative attraction of investment, Mr. Kennedy proposes continued tax deferral for firms operating in the developing economies—that is, the backward countries.

Is this a step toward tax equity? To penalize investment in Europe and reward it in India? In any case, is it realistic? Regardless of the special tax favor, capital isn't likely to rush into lands which offer little real incentive to foreign investment or which are openly hostile to it. And the whole approach of punishing private foreign investment is a dubious solution to the imbalance of U.S. international payments. Foreign investment, after all, is a means of oversea income to this country.

Tax reform of this sort deals with effects and leaves causes unconsidered. Capital seeking oversea havens and investment opportunity is, to a great extent, capital driven from these shores by domestic tax inequities and obstacles to profitable enterprise.

To be sure, the President is concerned with domestic tax inequity—as he sees it. In his opinion, the $50 tax credit on dividend income and the 4-percent credit above that sum are wholly inequitable. Because such credits are highly favorable to taxpayers in the upper income (above $10,000) group, he urges their elimination and imposition of a 20-percent withholding tax on all income from interest and dividends.

Dismissed in this soak-the-rich reasoning is the inequity of taxing dividends both as corporate and personal income. Cooperatives, ironically enough, are to have their income taxable either to themselves or to their patrons—not both.

Finally, the President's zeal for tax equity moves him to moral indignation over "expense account living." It is a matter of national concern, he declares, "affecting not only our public revenues, our sense of fairness, and our respect for the tax system, but our moral and business practices as well." Granted. Expense accounts are sometimes flagrantly abused. Having condemned and deplored, however, one should ask the pertinent question: Why?

Here again, misuse of expense accounts is an effect and not a cause. It is an attempt to thwart the arbitrary restrictions and oppressive levies of the Government. The fundamental immorality of the steeply progressive tax rates is reflected in the immoral means by which men try to evade them. And so long as men do not respect the tax "system," so long will they try to beat it.

Contradictory and inconsistent, confused and arbitrary, the tax laws are an open invitation to man's ingenuity. And nowhere is this made more plain than in the new inequities Mr. Kennedy would create in the name of stamping out inequity.

Perhaps the tax laws must be a tangled web of deception and inequity when called upon to yield upwards of some $80 billion in Federal revenue annually. The enormity of the Federal outlay is the clue to urgently needed reform. Only when extravagant Federal spending is sharply reduced will it be possible to reduce rates, and so achieve "a more equitable tax structure and a simpler tax law."

Aid to Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared on Sunday, April 23, 1961, in the Kansas City Kansan—one of the major metropolitan newspapers in midcontinent America—commenting upon the inter-American appropriation bill, 1961, which this House passed yesterday by an overwhelming margin. Included in the editorial is comment by President Deane W. Malott, of Cornell University, a Kansan and a personal friend of mine. The editorial and the comment speak for themselves, and as my vote yesterday indicates, I am in agreement. The article follows:

AID TO LATIN AMERICA

Although coldly received by Congress, the half-billion-dollar aid to Latin America bill was approved by the House Appropriations Committee. The Cuban situation no doubt has whipped up support for the big money bill, as proposed by President Kennedy. Cuba is not included; will get no money from this source. An additional $100 million is recommended for the aid of Chile, which was seriously hurt by earthquakes last year.

The appropriations probably will be made available speedily so that the United States will not be accused of faltering. Our commitments being what they are, there appears to be no course less than granting funds to our neighbors to the south, hopeful that our ministrations aren't too late.

A former Kansan, Deane W. Malott, now president of Cornell University, in an address in California more than a month ago made a strong plea for immediate aid, notwithstanding the great diversity of the 21 countries involved. Nowhere are our problems greater, our stakes so huge, he says.

"In this vast area that is patently within our zone of influence, that is allied with us in every physical way, we have frittered away a grand alliance and, with it, a glittering opportunity. It would have been tragic enough to have thrown this into the discard by intent; worse still, we have come close to letting it go by neglect, simply because we never understood Latin Americans nor they us. This has been an active force at work against us."

Continuing, Dr. Malott declares:

"This problem of militant communism already entrenched in the Western Hemis-

phere, probing, luring, vindictive and insidious, is more serious for the destiny of the United States than any other problem now before us. Unless America takes steps, and costly steps, through the expenditure of many a million of American dollars to improve the social, political and economic health and to help to correct the economic imbalance between the Northern and Southern Hemispheres, you can mark my words, all hope of economic and political solidarity will be gone forever and the Monroe Doctrine and all it has stood for for 150 years will be nothing but the dreams of a past history and a lost opportunity.

"Every knowledgeable person in the realm of Latin American affairs agrees that the only way to stave off the insidious infiltration of Communism is to help improve the all-around standards of these countries, and to help at once. This will be costly; it may be in part wasteful. To many of us further Federal expenditures are most unpalatable, but alternatives do not exist."

The United States-Soviet Space Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an editorial from the magazine Business Week, issue of April 22, 1961, entitled "Can We Match the Soviets in Space?" The editorial takes a realistic look at the recent Soviet achievement in putting a man in space and concludes, very logically, that we are in a space race and that as a nation which in the past has thrived on competition we should take up the challenge.

The editorial is as follows:

CAN WE MATCH THE SOVIETS IN SPACE?

No one can accuse Washington of reacting hysterically to last week's news that Russia had put a man in space and returned him safely to earth. It took Moscow's historic announcement in stride—almost as if it considered defeat inevitable in our efforts to match the Russians in space spectaculars.

In a sense, this is no more than a realistic appraisal of the facts. For all the soundness of our space exploration program, there is little chance of outpacing the Russians for at least the next 3 to 4 years.

The reasons we are behind the Russians are clear enough. We started our space program later. And we still don't have rocket boosters sufficiently powerful to lob heavy payloads into outer space.

How we got into this situation is a matter of history dating back to decisions made shortly after World War II. At that time, we developed small, lightweight nuclear warheads that could be delivered on target by less powerful rockets. Russia followed a different course, largely out of expediency. Lagging in nuclear developments, it set out to design powerful rockets to launch missiles equipped with heavy, fairly crude warheads.

When Russia embarked on a space program, it took its military missiles off the shelf and used them to boost heavy satellites and man-in-space capsules into outer space. We entered the competition belatedly—after the jolt of sputnik. And when we did push forward with a space program in 1958, under the civilian-controlled National Aeronautics and Space Administration, we had to draw on our inventory of less powerful missiles.

Even so, we have scored significantly in space achievements. We can boast a clear lead over the Russians in gathering scientific data from communications, weather, and other types of satellites.

But we can't stage the impressive, prestige-building feats as the Russian can. And these have enormous impact on the minds of all people.

It's high time that this country took another look at its space program to see just where and how it can be speeded up. Big, new outlays of money won't make up for the original delays in starting and formulating our space program. But—in the opinion of some Government officials—small increases in the funds assigned to development of immensely powerful rockets and solid (as opposed to liquid) fuels would go a long way.

Beyond that, the administration should give the space program a sense of top-priority urgency rather than repeat, like a tired phonograph record, that our program is sound. While this country recognizes the scientific and commercial gains to be made in space, it grasps the psychological and political gains only after a sputnik or man-in-space success—and then soon forgets.

We are, like it or not, in competition with the Russians. Other peoples around the world see it that way. It is surely short-sighted for a country that has thrived in an atmosphere of competition to pretend that the space race does not exist.

"A" for Accomplishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the brighter accomplishments that we as a nation have had in our relations with the rest of the world, and one unfortunately whose merit and value is usually relegated to the back pages of our newspapers because it does not represent hot news, has been the educational exchange programs developed under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts.

Although the precise impact of these programs is difficult to gage in terms of better understanding, we can be sure that we as a nation will reap the fruits of this broad educational experience for years to come. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial, "'A' for Accomplishment," which appeared in the April 10 issue of the State Journal, Lansing, Mich., a newspaper which, in serving a community that includes one of the country's major universities, clearly understands and appreciates the purpose and importance of such programs.

The editorial follows:

"A" FOR ACCOMPLISHMENT

Back in the late 1940's the original Fulbright education exchange program was widely hailed as a promising step in improving international understanding.

Later this program was bound into the broader Smith-Mundt Act aimed at strengthening international cooperative relations. In this framework, this country's educational exchange has gone forward for more than a dozen years.

Now the original author, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, proposes to expand these activities and draw them together with other, scattered exchange programs in the cultural field. He also wants to wipe out certain legal irritants that now and then have tended to hamper the effort.

Despite handicaps, educational exchange, backbone of the program, seems to have produced solid results.

Altogether, under the Smith-Mundt and Fulbright Acts, some 60,000 U.S. and foreign students, teachers, professors, specialists, and leaders (such as foreign parliamentarians) have benefited from studies and research here and abroad.

Those who have thought of the program as almost exclusively a student affair may be surprised to learn that grants have gone to 10,700 foreign leaders and specialists, while 1,700 U.S. specialists have gone abroad. Benefits also have been extended to nearly 5,000 foreign teachers and educators, and some 3,000 U.S. teachers.

Overall, two foreigners come here for study for every one American who goes abroad.

The Fulbright part of the program (excluding leaders and specialists) has been substantially financed through use of foreign currency accruing to us from sales of surplus war property and farm products.

Dollar amounts involved have steadily mounted, however, and the annual appropriation by Congress today is in the range of $25 million.

Senator FULBRIGHT puts no new price tag on his plan to unify and enlarge the whole exchange effort. He stresses an intent to make the programs work more effectively, attract higher caliber students and others, and thus add vitally needed enrichment to the cultural and educational life of both this Nation and its foreign friends.

Few Americans are likely to question these purposes or doubt the clear evidence of accomplishment up to now.

Expansion of Our Nation's System of Community Junior Colleges Is Essential in Our Educational Framework

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as one vitally concerned with the expansion of our Nation's system of community junior colleges and as the sponsor of H.R. 16 to provide Federal assistance to the States in carrying out such a program, I was very pleased to read the following letter to the editor by a student at such an institution. It appeared in a recent issue of the East Oregonian, edited by my friend, J. W. Forrester, Jr., of Pendleton, Oreg., and it sets forth clearly some of the reasons for regarding community colleges as an aspect of our educational framework which deserves special encouragement and assistance:

DEAR SIR: At the present time I am attending Columbia Basin Junior College at Pasco, Wash. This, of course, does not qualify me as an expert on the subject of community colleges, but I believe it does give

me a basis on which to make a few comments concerning your editorial of March 31 dealing with the need for such institutions in Oregon.

First I would like to say I agree with your views 100 percent. Community colleges should be encouraged, and they very definitely can fill a unique and necessary place in education beyond the high school level.

Community colleges generally serve a threefold purpose: they provide lower division, college courses, courses for occupational competence, and general education for individual improvement.

As you have pointed out these institutions can do something for those students who do not want to attend 4-year colleges, and also for students who need to get their feet wet before deciding to continue on a 4-year curriculum. In addition to helping the individual this also provides a service to the 4-year institutions. As you know at several such institutions, in this State, upper classmen are required to live off campus due to the great influx of freshmen, and in addition must often limit acceptance of applications. The community college would alleviate this situation by providing facilities for freshman and sophomore work. An example is the State of Washington where there are approximately 10,000 students enrolled in community colleges. In California one such college has an enrollment of 40,000.

It is commendable that some school districts in this State are operating vocational-tech schools. The results of such education are vital to our economy. As we know some persons are not interested, for various reasons, in 4 years of adavnced academic study, but because of neglect due to lack of foresight we have failed to develop the vocational ability of these people.

The above bas been concerned mainly with the young people of the State, but let's not forget that through community colleges opportunities for individual improvement and cultural development are provided to the general public. This in itself brings a deeper awareness of the world we live in.

I am sure that in the future community colleges will become not just important, but essential. If Oregon does not begin now it may find itself in the position where it must deny to many the opportunities for advanced training.

I graduated from Umatilla High School in 1958 and am a resident of Oregon.

Sincerely,

JAMES D. MCMILLIN,
ASB President, Columbia Basin College.
College.

Communism: Menace to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a forthright statement by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, on a subject matter in which every American should be vitally interested. This special feature appeared in Our Sunday Visitor, the National Catholic Action Weekly, published on April 30, 1961, at Huntington, Ind.:

COMMUNISM: MENACE TO FREEDOM

Seldom does a day pass in our generation when news media are able to report current events which do not relate the web of deceit and terror spun by Communist oppression somewhere in the world. It is a known fact that the ultimate goal of communism is domination of the world. The blight of communism has already engulfed one-fourth of the land surface of the world, and one-third of the peoples of the earth presently live under its yoke of slavery. Members of the Communist conspiracy are relentlessly seeking to undermine the governments of those countries which yet remain free.

In order properly to combat communism, we must know what it is. It is a materialistic concept of thought and action which demands the total subjugation of every individual to the will of the state. It is an atheistic theory of government fostering the ultimate abolition of religion.

The code of communism embodies an "end justifies the means" explanation to all actions—there is no consideration given to the ethical conduct or moral values as we know them. And finally, it demands the complete domination of the world, openly advocating, if necessary, the overthrow of non-Communist nations through the use of force and violehce.

Tragically, many Americans do not realize the seriousness of the Communist menace. The immediate threat within the boundaries of our Nation is the Communist Party, U.S.A., an integral part of the international Communist conspiracy. Its members are schooled in the use of the weapons of deceit and duplicity to enable them to fully exploit any situation which might arise. Anything which promotes communism and weakens its opponents is moral under the Communist code. There is no limitation.

We are all aware of the Communist influence exerted in the May 1960 riots in San Francisco, Calif., when a group of ideological innocents—most of them students—became the weapons used by an arm of the brutal Communist dictatorship in an action designed to disrupt the activities of a congressional committee. This was only one example of how a few Communist agitators, using mob psychology, were able to turn peaceful demonstrations into an ugly instrument furthering their cause. Their success in this one instance should be a clear warning to the citizens of our Nation that their paramount goal is the subversion of democracy.

To control such tactics, we must fully understand the true nature of the conspiracy and possess the ability to separate truth from propaganda. Exposure of the tactics of communisnm is a major weapon in destroying its ideological appeal. We must remember that the Communist Party line will coincide again and again with the view of many non-Communists on many specific issues. We must be eternally wary, therefore, not to place an indiscriminate label of "Communist" on those innocent individuals whose opinions on a particular question may parallel the announced official Communist position. This is one of their prime tactics since the creation of disunity arms them with a dangerous weapon.

Our answer to the problem confronting us is not limited simply to enlightening ourselves to the true nature and tactics of communism. We can actively participate in the fight by other means as well. Initially, we must know our Nation—its history, traditions, and heritage. The early settlers surmounted unbelievable odds in carving out this great American Republic which we know today. Much can be learned from the story of their raw courage and determination.

Thereafter, we should keep abreast of the events occurring throughout the world. Nothing is more discouraging to the subversive element than an enlightened citizen who actively participates in his government. Exercise your right to vote by electing representatives of integrity, and actively participate in civic programs promoting social improvement in your community.

Undoubtedly the most inspiring sight to the serpent of subversion is the dark cloud of public apathy which has engulfed so many of our citizens. Through indifference, they are unable to tell right from wrong and, what is worse, their lethargy weakens the moral armor which is so essential in repelling the false truths of communism. It is our responsibility to combat this disease wherever we see it. Indifference can be fatal when the survival of our Nation is at stake.

Lastly, we must attack bigotry and prejudice wherever they appear. We cannot allow them to exist since justice for all is the bulwark of freedom. Our cherished beliefs in the dignity and freedom of man are beacons of hope to the oppressed throughout the world. Let us rise to the challenge and protect our heritage of freedom.

General Electric

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the second in a series by Mr. T. K. Quinn. The first appeared in the RECORD on March 23. Because I feel that Mr. Quinn's articles are important in understanding the recent affair that resulted in the conviction of some of our top business people on price-fixing charges I commend to the attention of our colleagues Mr. Quinn's discussion, which appeared in the March 20 issue of the New Republic:

GENERAL ELECTRIC

(By T. K. Quinn)

(A former General Electric vice president who resigned "because of just such practices as those disclosed in the Philadelphia price collusion case" describes who runs the company.)

There is to be an election to determine whether the present chief officials of the General Electric Co. are to keep their jobs, despite the judgment in the Philadelphia price collusion case. Theoretically, the stockholders will make the decision. Will they, in fact? Not at all. It just doesn't work out that way. Stock ownership in General Electric, as in other giant corporations, is fragmentized and widely scattered. Most of the stockholders, in number, may not vote at all. The big blocks of General Electric stock that always make the annual meetings appear so farcical are held in huge private, insurance or pension trust funds, and to a lesser extent, in mutual funds. Who will vote this deciding stock interest on judgment day? Why, the trustees of these funds, of course. Who are they? Well, about 10 New York banks are the trustees for about three-fourths of it. They will make the decision.

If you want a diagramatic sketch of just how the machinery will work, here is a probable one: Mr. Sidney Weinberg, who sponsored Mr. R. J. Cordiner for his official position with General Electric, must first make up his mind on the relative chances. Sidney won't be too deeply concerned over the ethical questions involved. He's a smart, personally likeable, go-getting, dollar-directed, little man. President of the Wall Street banking firm of Goldman Sachs, he is also a director of General Electric, General

Foods Corp., Continental Can Co., Cluett Peabody & Co., General Cigar Co., B. F. Goodrich Co., Ford Motor Co., McKesson & Robbins, Inc., National Dairy Products Co., etc.

Mr. Weinberg will probably go to work on his banking friends in an effort to convince them that Mr. Cordiner was right when he said, "Nobody has been damaged," just before he announced elaborate plans to prevent future abuses, in a way that implied he knew nothing of the crimes for which several GE executives were jailed and fined. Some of the more responsible and public-spirited banking trustees will protest that the moral standing of the whole business community, and therefore the country, is at stake. They will agree with Judge Ganey that "General Electric and the others made a mockery of our free enterprise protestations," and provided opponents with another argument for more governmental controls and public representation in these quasi-public institutions.

The answer will be halfhearted, "Yes, but Chairman Cordiner discharged a number of the convicted GE executives, and he's trying, belatedly, to straighten things out." Chairman Cordiner did discharge several who were not close to him, and he accepted under fire, the resignation of the president, a Cordiner protege. But Vice President Edward Ginn was not dismissed. He was the big man in the affair, at $125,000 a year, who was in line for the presidency and close to Cordiner. After his jail sentence Mr. Ginn will resume his old position. He's too close to the throne to be cast off. Only the designation of a new chief officer in place of Cordiner would wipe the slate clean and eliminate Mr. Ginn, unless he will accept a payoff, which isn't likely. These things will not escape intelligent people, and General Electric will continue under its present cloud.

At this point the discussion will go to another level. Mr. Weinberg will probably say, "We're all in this together and must hang together or we'll hang separately"—an argument that often wins. He may not fail to remind the bankers of other confidential deals. There is always strong pressure to sit tight.

On the one side it will be contended that the dismissal of Mr. Cordiner would be an admission of guilt, which although believed by Judge Ganey to be true, and supported by the long record of General Electric antitrust violations through the years, was not technically proved in Philadelphia. On the other side, the argument will be advanced that people see through technicalities, that public opinion has been aroused and there is too much at stake to try to defend Cordiner. And what of the example which has been set and its effect on the hundreds of thousands of young men who aspire to be business executives?

In the end the deciding issue is not likely to be responsibility or morality. It will, in all probability, be decided like the collusive prices—a judgment based upon what the traffic will bear. Just how much will public opinion accept? A handful of trustees who altogether own less than 1 percent of the outstanding General Electric stock will decide. They are the ones who are really on trial.

Peace Corps—What It Takes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, James M. Johnston, religious editor of the Milwaukee Sentinel, has a very perceptive article on the Peace Corps in his recent regular column, "Chapter and Verse." In the thought that Members may wish to send this splendid article to young people who write concerning the Peace Corps, I include it herewith:

PEACE CORPS—WHAT IT TAKES

Their imaginations stirred by the prospect of oversea travel and working in some distant spot on the globe, church youths of high school age are showing avid interest in the Peace Corps, which hopes to begin recruiting among the 1961 college graduating classes, though Congress hasn't yet provided the funds.

One Milwaukeean exceptionally well advised about the corps is Robert Tehan Jr., home secretary to Representative REUSS, who is one of the authors of the plan. Tehan enlightened some youths and their elders this week in a U.N. seminar at Wesley Methodist Church.

For one thing, he made clear that service in the corps is for men and women, not boys and girls. Sure, they must be young (though 30 isn't too old) but they must be mature, as well.

Added Tehan:

"They must be thoroughly American and stand for all that American stands for. Imagine how terrible it would be to send a segregationist to Africa." From what Tehan said, however, it would seem the Peace Corpsmen would be expected to show their Americanism by actions, in helpful, friendly instruction, rather than by their words.

Teaching will be their primary responsibility. They will teach literacy, agriculture, health, sanitation, etc., for those seem to be the areas of greatest demand.

THEY'RE WILLING TO LEARN

Incidentally, missionaries report most inhabitants of these so called backward areas show a surprising mental capacity. Most are curious and willing to learn, and even the most illiterate tribesmen, missionaries say, can't be tripped up in arithmetic. They may be victims of a cultural lag, but certainly not stupidity.

Tehan said the cream of embryo doctors, medical technicians and teachers in the 1961 college classes will be screened for the first projects, which will consist of literacy and public health. Large scale engineering projects like dams, roads and powerplants will necessarily come later.

The first candidates will receive cram courses in the language, customs, economics and geography of the areas in which they'll serve, probably something like the training given young missionaries.

YOU CAN BE FIRED

Suppose the screening fails to show gaps of immaturity in the corpsman's character. Suppose he turns out to be a tippler, emotionally unstable, incorrigible, or unfit in other ways. Out he'll go, before he damages the entire project, his coworkers and the name of the United States. For that reason, the corpsmen will not be tied to a long contract.

"It's best if the corpsman is single," said Tehan. "The Government does not intend to provide transportation for a spouse, unless he or she, too, is a corpsman."

What about pay? That will be based not upon what the corpsman with his college degrees is worth, but on a minimum decent standard of living. Because he must be a helpful teacher and friend to the people he is serving, the United States cannot afford to let an economic gulf stand between teacher and pupil. Upon separation from the service, however, the corpsman will receive an allowance.

No Peace Corps will be sent to any country that doesn't want it. That may be difficult to determine, for the Government can frankly expect many an anti-American campaign against a project if it seems effective and steals thunder from the Communist promises. That, said Tehan, is a risk that we must take.

The early stages of the Peace Corps will be financed by mutual security funds, inasmuch as it hasn't yet passed Congress. Senators and Representatives are likely to take a long, long look at the program before they stamp their approval.

It would seem from this talk that much of the success of the corps depends upon the quality of its first class that goes out. The service is doomed unless it gets the best among young men and women. Somehow the interviewers must measure maturity, the "emotional quotient" along with the intelligence quotient.

So, son, if you're looking at the Peace Corps to satisfy your desire for travel and adventure, you'd be happier in other fields. The corps will require more than imagination and a flair for excitement.

But if you're really grown up, if your goal is service rather than adventure, if you can learn to like and help people of a vastly different background from your own, and get more of a thrill out of their progress than your own bank account or comfort—then, perhaps, the Peace Corps is for you.

A Test of Steadiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very thoughtful article and one that is worthy of the serious thinking of the Members of Congress. The article appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, issue of April 25, 1961:

A TEST OF STEADINESS

We are confident that even a few days' time will place last week's Cuban events in better focus. President Kennedy has outlined a firm but steady course and we trust his unusual consultations with three top Republicans have confirmed him in it. For many excited and baffled people are talking of desperate measures.

The American people have had a triple shock. They were disappointed by the failure of the Cuban exile landings. But they were even more jolted by reports that their own Government, through the Central Intelligence Agency, was involved in a miserably managed fiasco. They also are dismayed to find some of their friends unable to distinguish between this operation and aggression.

Even in this mood we do not believe they will listen to urgent voices saying, "Since we have the penalty, why not take the prize? Since we are blamed for aggression, why not send in the marines?"

As the dust from the Las Villas beaches and hysterical headlines settles, answers to these questions will appear. The President has rightly reminded Americans that the use of their Armed Forces in an attack on Cuba would violate both their traditions and their treaty commitments.

Ever since Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931 a good part of world opinion has been trying to define and combat aggression. In the United Nations and elsewhere the nearest approach to agreement holds that invasion or attack by the armed forces of one nation against another is aggression. This was the

basis of the U.N. and the U.S. position on Korea, Hungary, and Suez. It has helped marshal moral sanctions against naked force.

For the United States to abandon this position now would be a disservice to itself and to the cause of peace.

In the U.N. debate it became clear that many people do recognize a difference between aggression and aid given to rebel exiles—regrettable as that may appear even to many Americans. In Latin America there is—despite outcries about intervention—an awareness that the marines have not landed.

If they had, the picture would be very different. Probably Senor Castro could not long withstand the full power of the United States—provided it was ruthlessly used. But at what cost? America would be remembered as the invader, not the nation which gave Cuba its independence. And the whole of Latin America would be embittered—ripe for a whole flock of Soviet-supported Castros. And what could the United States answer in the U.N.—except to try to dodge as the Soviet still does over Hungary?

The struggle in Cuba has only begun. Senor Castro is already following the Batista course, using terror and oppression which will turn the people against him. The exiles will at least infiltrate and sabotage. Economic problems harass his regime. Should he attempt to use force against the United States or any other nations, then greater force can be used against him.

Mr. Kennedy has indicated force could be a last resort. It is true that Communist infiltration and controls blur the usual tests of aggression. But there are better answers than American aggression. If Washington hopes to deal with communism anywhere by ideological and economic rather than military means, it should be able to do so in its own neighborhood.

Actually the main concern should be with Latin America. If the United States helps to promote the reforms which will forestall Castroism there, the dictator in Cuba should wither on the vine.

The Effects of Imports on the U.S. Economy With Special Reference to the 23d Congressional District of Illinois

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, perhaps more than ever before, grave concern is being expressed throughout the land over the serious impact of imports on many American industries. In the decade from 1950 to 1960 merchandise imports have increased by more than 65 percent. While this increase during the decade has not been as large as the increase in exports or in gross national product, it has to a considerable extent been concentrated among certain products, with serious consequences to producers of the same or similar products here at home. I should like to refer specifically to four industries that are of particular importance to the people in my congressional district and that have been seriously affected by imports from abroad: leather footwear, petroleum, shirts, and machinery. I should like to deal with each of them in turn.

LEATHER FOOTWEAR

More than 2,500 people in my district are employed directly in the manufacture of leather footwear. This is an industry which has felt the full brunt of import competition. Imports of leather footwear increased from 22,278,000 pair a year in 1959 to 26,990,000 pair in 1960, an increase of 20 percent in a single year. The imports of nonrubber footwear have grown from slightly more than 1 percent of domestic porduction in 1954 to about 4.4 percent in 1960. The number of pairs of women's, misses', children's, and infants' leather shoes imported in 1959 was over 12 times as large as in 1954 and about 2½ times as large as in 1957, while for men's and boys' shoes the comparable figures were 8 times and 2 times. Detailed statistics for 1960 are not yet available in the Library of Congress. It should be noted however that U.S. production of shoes declined by 5.5 percent from 1959 to 1960, and that our exports dropped by 9 percent during the same period.

In December 1959 the Department of Commerce reported that it saw no indication of any halt in the increase of shoe imports; in fact, it stated:

> There is good reason to believe that shoe imports during 1960 will be 10 percent higher than in 1959.

About double this increase actually occurred. Standards and Poors Industry Surveys estimates that imports could reach 37 million pairs in 1961.

PETROLEUM

Petroleum imports, too, have made serious inroads on our local oil industry. My district has a good share of Illinois' 92 establishments engaged in the processing of petroleum and coal products.

Today the United States has an excess producing capacity of 3 million barrels daily, equal to about 40 percent of actual production. On the other hand, imports of petroleum and petroleum products increased from $829 million in 1954 to a peak of $1,636 million in 1958; in 1959 they totaled $1,529 million. In the years 1954–58 domestic production of crude petroleum rose only 4 percent.

Our oil industry has been in poor economic health since 1957. Between 1946 and 1957 demand increased by about 5 percent per year; in 1958 there was no increase. Since that time demand has risen about 3 percent per annum. Over the next decade demand will probably rise by only about 3 to 3½ percent per year, which means adjustment to a slower increase by our oil industry and an oversupply—with consequent lowered prices—until this adjustment is completed. It is estimated that oil demand during 1961 will increase only from 2 to 2.5 percent. Surpluses have also resulted from extensive drilling programs, from attempting to achieve self-sufficiency because of unsettled world conditions and because refiners tend to produce more oil than is necessary in order that they might reduce unit costs of production.

How can an industry which is operating below capacity but still with surplus production compete with a flood of imports? Naturally costs of production are higher when excess capacity is unused. Large surpluses abroad indicate that excessive imports might cause a break in U.S. crude oil prices. Estimates for 1961 production show little alleviation for this situation. It is true that the Government has an oil import control program, but there have been several increases in the quotas since they were set. On March 10, 1961, oil import quotas were increased to 461,427 barrels a day for the year beginning April 1, an increase of about 10 percent over the then current rate.

In my opinion, Alvin C. Hope, president of the Independent Petroleum Association, best pictured the situation when he pointed out that the price of crude oil had dropped to near the 1953 level while the price of finished steel has gone up to 37 percent since 1953; wages have increased 30 percent; oil field machinery has risen 26 percent and oil well casings costs have jumped 41 percent. Small wonder that oil finding activity has shown a marked decline.

Naturally this affects Illinois' oil industry. Our petroleum and coal products industry employs 16,625 persons. While it is true that we export petroleum products, fuels, lubricating oils, and so forth, we must import crude oils for the production of our exports. Our residual fuel oil must compete with that "dumped" on the America market at low prices. So long as high taxes, high wages and high costs of materials exist, our domestic industry is faced with an almost insuperable problem in competing with imports much of which are virtually dumped in our markets. Ever since the Suez crisis there has been a glut of crude oil which has naturally been accompanied with rapidly increasing supplies of residual fuel oil which has resulted in low prices and has not only affected our domestic oil industry unfavorably but has also had an injurious effect on our domestic coal industry.

SHIRT MANUFACTURES

Approximately 5,775 persons in Illinois apparel and related products industry worked for firms engaged in the manufacture of men's and boys' furnishings in 1956. Imports into the United States of men's and boys' shirts and nightwear totaled $6.9 million in 1956. In 1960 imports of men's and boys' shirts totaled $14.4 million. In 1959 the executive board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America reported that imports of shirts had increased eightfold since 1954 most of the increase coming from the Far East. They continued to increase in 1960, although the rate of increase declined. This may sound like a small amount, but from March to September 1959 imports of cotton shirts from Hong Kong alone increased sixfold. With Japan we have set a quota on imports of cotton shirts at a level above 1 million dozen a year. The segment of Hong Kong producers agreeable to a quota have demanded a figure higher than that of Japan. Present estimates indicate that the ratio of imports from Japan and Hong Kong equals 12 percent of U.S. production. Fears have been expressed that Japanese and Hong

Kong quotas will be ineffective because other low-cost areas such as Formosa, Portugal, and Spain will immediately increase their exports to us. In 1958, 1.5 million dozen shirts were imported; the total for 1959 jumped to 2.41 million dozen.

Apparently we need a worldwide quota or some equalization of cost legislation to permit our shirt producers to compete with these low-cost foreign producers. The Clothing Workers' report I have cited above warned that many thousands of jobs in the textile industry are in jeopardy and I believe it.

MACHINERY

Traditionally, the United States is a heavy exporter of machinery. However, in recent years imports have been growing. In the single year between 1958 and 1959 they rose from $472 million to $656 million or by 39 percent. In the same period exports remained almost stable. One source has estimated that 35 to 40 percent of U.S. machine tool purchases come from abroad. Much of the increase is the result of more modern, lower cost foreign industries rebuilt since World War II, many of them with the financial and technical aid of the United States. One source estimates the cost of foreign machine tools at about 60 percent of American-made tools. Not only do their products come in as imports and compete with domestic industries but they also compete with our exporters in foreign markets. Temporarily, in 1960, our export business increased substantially because we were able to make much quicker delivery than our competitors. Small wonder, because we have been operating at only 60 percent of capacity with a small backlog of orders.

According to a study by the Department of Commerce, Illinois' share of U.S. exports of nonelectrical machinery is one-seventh of the national total. About 11 percent of the Nation's electrical machinery output is located in Illinois. Her machinery industry thus is affected by increased imports, such as 1959 witnessed in industrial, office and printing machinery and in electrical apparatus imports. Furthermore, our machinery industry is experiencing more and more difficulty in competing in world markets.

One pertinent example is the recent award of a contract to Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha, Ltd., of Japan for a number of towing locomotives to be used in the Panama Canal Zone. It is true that the Japanese bid was well under the lowest American bid, that of the Plymouth, Ohio, Locomotive Works. Perhaps this is good business, but I quarrel with the idea that the Japanese were awarded the contract through fair and free competition. Our laws impose burdensome production costs upon business which, together with our high wages, makes the term "free and fair competition" a mockery.

Dun's Review has recently completed a survey of the effects of imports on our economy. Both the members of their president's panel—representing 175 of the Nation's leading companies—and a random selection of 300 small manufacturers expect more serious competition from foreign imports in the next 5 years.

Most of the panel members and the smaller companies polled believe that lower labor costs, less overhead, foreign government export subsidies, and low ocean freight rates account for the difference in costs. Many trace it primarily to lower wage costs although there is diversity of opinion here. I am sorry to say that close to 40 percent of the presidents of large corporations on the panel reported that they plan to launch more foreign operations: licensing arrangements, new plants and expanded facilities abroad, joint operations with oversea manufacturers, and purchase of foreign concerns. I do not know how many of these are located in Illinois nor how many—if any—are in my district, but I do know that this means the export of jobs from our borders and import competition. The smaller businesses must rely on increased efficiency, new products, automation, and greater production. The increase in imports of finished manufactures, which in 1950 constituted about 18 percent of total consumption imports, accounted for about 34 percent of import transactions in 1959. Together with semimanufactures they accounted for over half of U.S. imports by value. This is a grave portent for my congressional district and for the State of Illinois.

For all these reasons, I feel that concrete action should be taken immediately to alleviate the conditions in the boot and shoe industry, petroleum industry, the shirt industry, and the machinery industry.

Mass Transit Is the Lifeline of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the subject of mass transportation is of vital concern to our large cities and growing communities. A most interesting discussion of this problem is contained in an article written by E. H. Wolson, a consultant to management in mass passenger transportation and head of Brown Survey Corp., of Philadelphia, which has rendered service to mass passenger carriers, I am informed, for more than 70 years. The author's article, which is entitled "Mass Transit Is the Lifeline of Business," will be worthwhile reading, I believe, for all Members of Congress.

MASS TRANSIT IS THE LIFELINE OF BUSINESS

(By E. H. Wolson)

Recent developments in Congress resulting from hearings on Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey's urban transportation bill bring into national focus the need of long range projected planning for help for all public passenger carriers. In most areas of local commuter service there have been many evidences that private money to modernize and expand any system is unavailable. American business has been built on the basis of private enterprise, operated with reasonable return to those making the capital investment. Investors in transportation companies' stocks, in too many instances, have received little or no dividends. With this record before the public, it is generally almost impossible to secure private capital except at very high interest rates. Taking into consideration the high subsidies for railroads and other forms of transportation for a relatively few passengers the local privately owned carriers are being more than short changed with the very limited tax relief, granted in some areas but not as a national pattern.

Transit is a service available to all the public. The general public is not fully aware of the importance of transit, taking for granted that it is an expected service, the lack of which is brought sharply into focus by a sudden work stoppage or a public announcement by management of the abandonment of service. Yet the same consideration that is given to utilities such as the gas, electric, and telephone companies, with standby charges for services whether used or not, has never been available to transit. Since none of these forms of revenue have been provided for even though the services rendered contribute greatly to land development, increased income and tax values, certainly special consideration should be given and is more than merited. There is a reluctance by passenger carriers to file for increased fare rates because the public instinctively militantly opposes the granting of these increased rates. In order to supply the expanded service that is constantly being demanded, a service charge for the industry would eliminate many of these problems and sources of public opposition and disapproval.

Mass transit is the business lifeline carrying the bulk of the employed population to their places of occupation, schoolchildren to their schools, and the shopper to the shopping center. The living pattern in the last decade has changed drastically with shorter working hours. TV, with its impact, has changed the evening hours travel pattern. The offpeak and weekend transit use has dropped sharply. Local transit and commuter lines are burdened with heavy peak-hour loads and uneconomical operation of off-peak-hour runs. Most transit companies have peak-to-base ratios of from 3:1 to 5:1. This required heavy costs for equipment for peak use of 2 to 3 hours on working days. To create a more even traffic flow that would utilize equipment and manpower more equitably it would seem that the travel pattern can be changed further with the cooperation and interest of industry and civic governing bodies. One suggestion would be to change the opening hour of business offices to provide for spreading the peak hours of travel, such as having opening hours of business offices at 9:45 a.m. with a proportionate earlier closing, schools to open at 9:30 a.m., and retail establishments to open at 10 a.m. This would create a more even transit flow pattern contributing much needed relief in spreading heavy peaks to an even loading flow. Similar changes in closing hours should also be considered. As with many proposed changes, there will be areas of complaint. The pilot experiment in the intensely concentrated insurance area in New York City on early office opening now in operation is reported to be a satisfactory experience, with employees welcoming the earlier closing hour. In the well remembered gas shortage era during World War II, staggered working hours were proven workable and practical in industry and retail establishments. Schools can be brought into this program. Mercantile establishments would, without a doubt, welcome the change giving them the opportunity to open and close later to accommodate office workers

who would then be free to shop before the stores close.

The Williams bill has many recommendations for financing transit's rehabilitation and growth. This is an urgent program that should be implemented without long delays. Numerous engineering studies, made in every area of the country, are available. These are based on sound engineering plans that could be the basis for making funds available to operators at low interest rates.

The building of highways and freeways are important parts of the national program but can never serve alone the hearts of the metropolitan area by bringing in more cars to add to the center city traffic flow strangulation. Reserve lanes for mass transportation, with planned parking lots would also help give the service flexibility by making it more attractive. The speed of movement of the public carrier in reserved lanes would attract riders and will eliminate the need of much of the private vehicle flow into the center.

Every type of conveyance: Private automobile, bus, high speed transit and commuter railroad has its place in its sphere in the movement of people. The mass carrier has lost most of its appeal because of the lack of speed and in many instances the use of old equipment. The actual back bone of the public transportation system is the service that is rendered by the local carriers, whether operating under private ownership or an authority, that serve the centers of population.

Local carriers have been saddled with the ills of the past, namely: carrying students at highly reduced rates during peak hours with no subsidy from school boards to compensate for the differential in fares. School transportation is a sorely needed public service that cannot be denied, but the cost should be included in the overall school tax from which the carrier should be compensated for the service.

Transit management, in all its phases, have blueprinted modern plans for the expansion of lines and speed of service, realizing fully that they are public utilities. None of these plans can be successfully executed without public aid. This does not mean conversion to public ownership. On the whole private operation, as such, compared to public operation has proven to be more efficient and dollar conscious utilizing its equipment and manpower to the highest potential.

Transit aid is vital in every area. It is important that the operators, whether public or private, tell their story fully through the press and every other public medium, with particular emphasis on simplification of the message so that it can be clearly understood by the public and lawmaking bodies. There is no time like the present to again make mass passenger transit the lifeline of business.

Columbus Couldn't Get a Visa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an article written by Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington, which appeared in the New York Times magazine on April 16. Senator MAGNUSON'S article, entitled "Columbus Couldn't Get a Visa," is an incisive and perceptive analysis of the problems encountered by foreign visitors to the United States and of the need for legislative remedy.

Senator MAGNUSON has made a major contribution toward the encouragement of a greatly increased flow of foreign visitors to the United States by piloting legislation for the establishment of a National Travel Service both last year and this year. No one can speak with greater authority on the question of foreign tourist travel to the United States than the Senator from Washington:

COLUMBUS COULDN'T GET A VISA—AND THEREIN LIES ONE OF THE CHIEF OBSTACLES TO MAKING THE UNITED STATES A WORLD TOURIST CENTER

(By Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee)

Because he was a recent indigent, insane (by contemporary standards) and born in Italy—a country whose immigration quota is heavily oversubscribed—Christopher Columbus could never have qualified for a U.S. tourist visa. Nevertheless, he was the first foreign visitor to these shores.

Since then, foreign visitors have made a remarkably profound contribution to our national advancement. Many of them have become effective ambassadors for us in their lands. Today, with tourist travel becoming an evermore potent economic force, the flow of tourists to this country has taken on new significance. Yet, with a thousand and one reasons for promoting the United States as a host nation, our Government has, until recently, displayed a towering indifference to its guests. Unlike almost every other country, we do nothing to atract the international traveler. There has been little or no official leadership in improving the quality, and minimizing the cost, of tourist facilities here. Our visa laws have had the effect of actually discouraging travel to this country. As a result, most of our foreign visitors today are, in reality, simply bordercrosses, from Canada and Mexico.

Hundreds of thousands of newly prosperous Europeans, as well as our many South American and trans-Pacific friends, have yet to discover America as an attractive and rewarding vacation land. It is a sobernig truth that far more Europeans visit the Soviet Union every year than visit the United States. Of more immediate consequence is the fact that for every visitor from overseas (not counting those from Canada and Mexico), there are three or four American tourists who vacation abroad.

The current movement for a national tourist promotion program actually began when we in Congress awoke to the economic implications of this last statistic. Eighteen months ago the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce undertook a special study of America's declining position in international trade and its effect upon our continuing balance of payments deficits. Realizing that the strength of our export trade is the foundation upon which this country's economic leadership in the free world must be based, our committee concentrated its study on discovering where our sales abroad had faltered and why.

We proceeded down the list, commodity by commodity, and found part of the reason for our payments deficit in 1959 was the fact that the United States was buying more iron and steel, more passenger cars, more textile products from abroad than it sold abroad. Yet our net loss of dollars through the exchange of such products turned out to account for only a small fraction of the dramatically adverse tilt in the payments scale. Then we made the discovery that the greatest single imbalance arose not from an exchange of goods but from an exchange of people.

One needn't be an expert in international trade to know that a dollar spent for the purchase of foreign goods and services represents, in terms of outflow of currency, an import, whether it is spent in the United States or elsewhere. By the same token, an export occurs whenever and wherever a foreigner purchases American goods and services.

In 1960, Americans spent approximately $2.2 billion on travel abroad (not including payments to American carriers), making foreign tourism by far our largest single import. In contrast to this, the combined expenditures of foreigners who visited the United States—including residents of Canada and Mexico—were only one-half as much, placing tourism well down on the list of American exports.

As a result, the current imbalance between our tourist expenditures and tourist receipts is over $1.1 billion—nearly one-third of the entire balance of payments deficit.

Economic self-interest demands positive measures to help close this "travel gap." A prudent sense of international public relations dictates that this should be accomplished by increasing the number of foreigners who visit here—not, obviously, by abridging or inhibiting our own citizens' right to journey abroad.

Contrary to the situation which existed only a few years ago, rising prosperity in many foreign countries has put money in the pockets of would-be travelers, particularly in Western Europe. Travel restrictions imposed on them by their governments have been lifted or greatly relaxed. The potential market for travel to this country, therefore, is growing daily.

It was with such thoughts in mind that several of my Senate colleagues joined with me last year in offering legislation to rescue the foreign visitor from official oblivion by initiating this country's first real travel promotion and facilitation program. Adopted unanimously by the Senate, the bill was not acted upon by the House. A similar measure, Senate bill 610, was again enacted by the upper Chamber in February. At present, it is being considered by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

In his recent message to the Congress on the problem of the outflow of gold, President Kennedy called for immediate steps to plan a program based upon the major provisions of this proposed legislation. The President has also written to me personally in support of the measure which, he agrees, "will open up a long-neglected channel for improving international understanding, as well as help our payments problem."

I am now hopeful that our long endeavors to bring this program into being will soon begin to bear fruit. We must not assume, however, that the job of attracting and accommodating a greater number of foreign visitors can be done overnight, merely by the passage of this needed legislation. Whether the United States becomes an international tourist center depends squarely upon the continuing efforts and awareness of the American Government, the American travel industry, and the American people.

Why do we lag so far behind other nations in the field of foreign travel and what obstacles must be overcome? Contrary to a great deal of supposedly expert, and usually conflicting, opinion, I am convinced that there is no single answer to this question. In my judgment there are at least three major problem areas where positive action is required. It is these three areas toward which we have directed the pending legislation.

First is our total lack of promotional activity abroad. The United States is probably the only organized society on the face of the globe which does not purposefully advertise and promote its scenic, cultural, and recrea-

tional attractions. From Swaziland to Switzerland to Sweden, governments have long considered the attraction of outside visitors an important and legitimate function.

If the governments themselves did not so consider it, it was only because they could rely on a chamber of commerce which did. One need only stroll down Fifth Avenue, Piccadilly or the Via Veneto and observe the colorful and inviting window fronts of tourist bureaus representing countries in every corner of the world. In some capitals a nation's national travel office is often a bigger operation than the same country's local Embassy.

If a U.S. travel office is conspicuous by its absence in London, Rome, or Paris, the loss extends far beyond a question of prestige. Among other activities, these bureaus serve as points of distribution for local travel agents of pamphlets, guidebooks, and other promotional materials published by private and public tourist organizations in the home country.

Walk into any European travel agency and you will in all probability be able to find out the fee on the ski tow at Kitzbuehel, the price of a meal in some obscure Czechoslovak village, and everything you need to know for a trip to Uzbekistan. But chances are that the man behind the counter will not be able to tell you the train fare from New York to Chicago and has probably never even heard of Colorado Springs.

But this is only part of the promotional void.

A few pages away from the one you are now reading you will probably find at least one attractive advertisement beckoning you to some foreign land, inserted by the government-supported tourist office of that country. Nearly $10 million worth of such advertising is placed in American newspapers and magazines every year. Needless to say, the foreign press has yet to see its first U.S.-sponsored full-color spread portraying the gaiety of Mardi Gras in New Orleans, the excitement of an Iowa county fair, or the majestic beauty of Mount Rainier.

If there is any doubt travel advertising and related promotional activities produce results, all we need do is to look again at our own international travel statistics. Since 1953, the volume of foreign travel by own own citizens has exactly doubled. Our population has certainly not doubled in that period; our economy has not grown by anywhere near 100 percent, nor have the levels of disposable personal income. An increase of this order is obviously not the result of any lowering in travel costs.

There is, in short, very little that could explain such a phenomenal burgeoning of American travel abroad except the skillful and vigorous efforts of foreign governments and various international carriers, many of which are owned by these governments.

Aside from stimulating a broader long-term flow of visitors to this country, the program of oversea offices and paid advertising called for in Senate bill 610 would be invaluable in publicizing our two upcoming World's Fairs. The Federal Government has devoted many millions of dollars toward making the New York fair and Seattle's "Century 21" exposition truly international showcases. A failure to back up this investment with suitable promotion abroad would be short-sighted, to say the very least.

The second major factor inhibiting an inflow of tourists to the United States boils down to a question of geography—the thousands of miles that separate us from our principal markets for new tourists, plus the fact that the United States is itself a mighty big country. New jet aircraft have fortunately overcome these disadvantages so far as travel time is concerned. But the problem of travel costs remains as big a hurdle as ever.

If we are ever to coax our foreign friends into seeing San Francisco as well as the east coast, or to lure them to Yelowstone Park as well as to Miami Beach, something will have to be done to keep transportation fares, both to and within the United States, as low as possible.

One suggestion has been made which deserves particularly careful study: the adoption of a flat-rate, limited-period pass by domestic carriers for exclusive use by bona fide foreign tourists. Travel-conscious European nations have long offered this money-saving convenience to American guests in the form of the famous "Eurail pass."

So far as international fares are concerned, significant reductions are bound to come as the volume of two-way traffic increases. Developing a larger flow of foreign visitors will thus serve to benefit the pocketbooks of American travelers as well.

Finally, we come to the much-discussed problem of our visa requirements, the third principal stumbling block in the way of launching a realistic travel program and the best example of why I have called the foreign visitor today's "forgotten man." As a matter of fact, the law presumes he does not even exist.

Section 214(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act states that "Every alien shall be presumed to be an immigrant unless he establishes * * * that he is entitled to nonimmigrant status * * *." If the potential visitor happens to be young and single, or from a country whose U.S. immigration quota is oversubscribed, the task of convincing our officials that he (or she) is a bona fide nonimmigrant may be anything but easy. But even if he succeeds, he must then go on to pass all of the tests of admissibility—legal requirements which were designed with the immigrant, not the visitor, in mind.

How does this work out in practice?

If a Danish citizen, for example, wants to visit his brother in Minnesota, he must first travel to our embassy in Copenhagen, present his passport, submit photographs, show evidence of his visitor status, fill in the necessary forms and then proceed to satisfy our consul that he is not feebleminded, a drug addict, a polygamist, a criminal, a leper, a professional beggar, or a person liable to become a public charge or who has any immoral purpose in coming to the United States.

There are 31 separate categories of excludable aliens and the whole procedure may take anywhere from a day to a month.

Finally, with visa in hand, our Danish friend catches his plane, feeling like a Brooklyn schoolboy who has just wangled a ticket to the world series—until he arrives in New York. Then he discovers that this hard-won piece of paper is nothing more than a permit to apply for entry into the United States.

He must now take on a completely new branch of our bureaucracy, the Immigration and Nationalization Service, and satisfy them, too, of his honesty, morality, and financial resources. If he is lucky, the inspector stamps his passport "Admitted" and the ordeal is over.

But suppose insead that the brother in Minnesota decides on a trip to Denmark. The contrast is almost unbelievable. Never once does he see the inside of an embassy or consulate. The first Danish official he encounters is at the airport in Copenhagen, a pleasant fellow who stamps his passport "Welcome to Denmark" (in English, mind you), hands him an envelope wtih a souvenir medallion and a letter of greeting, and sends him on his way.

It is a demonstrable fact that the average Dane, Swiss, Bolivian, or Thai today finds it much easier to enter Communist Russia than to get within sight of the Statue of Liberty. For all our talk about the Iron Curtain, the unpleasant truth is that when it comes to international pleasure travel our own curtain of red tape can be far harder to penetrate than the Iron.

The Department of State is to be commended for its recent abolition of the so-called "long form" for visitors, thus clearing away some of this red tape. But that is only one step in the right direction. Further administrative improvements to expedite visa issuance can profitably be made, including fuller staffing of our consulates abroad.

It is probably also time to take a long new look at the law itself. I am constantly struck by the brevity of our statute on passport eligibility for Americans, which is only a few lines long, compared with the page after page of legal provisions applicable to friendly tourists. Surely it is just as damaging to the national interest (if not more so) to have American indigents, prostitutes, and so forth, displaying our flag abroad as it is to allow such persons into this country temporarily from abroad.

Yet we have never felt the necessity for placing endless restrictions on American tourists, and rightly so. Why, then, should our foreign visitors present such a different problem? Legislation looking toward a simplification of the law respecting foreign visitors has recently been introduced by two of my colleagues, Senator JACOB JAVITS and Representative JOHN LINDSAY, both of New York. These measures deserve our careful consideration.

Sensible administration of revised visa laws, plus reasonably lower transport costs, plus an adequate program of travel promotion abroad should result in a significantly increased stream of foreign visitors. But will we be prepared to receive them? More important than any other aspect of our national travel program is the care and attention we give to this question.

Unless we can gear our own tourist industry—an industry which in a way includes almost all of us—to an accommodation of the special requirements of new foreign guests, it might be better not to extend the invitation.

This means more and better packaged tours, solicitation and accommodation of specialized groups of travelers, an end to the notorious rudeness of baggage handlers and other service personnel at ports of entry, sight-seeing trips built around the needs and interests of foreign guests, civic and private hospitality clubs to meet and socialize with oversea travelers, more language proficiency on the part of sight-seeing, hotel and other key industry employees, and many, many other things. Above all, it means a general recognition of the importance of assuring that each traveler from abroad returns to his home with a higher opinion of America, her ideals, her institutions and her people.

The less than $5 million travel program which the President and we in the Senate have recommended may never completely close the travel gap. But it still adds up to a mighty inexpensive welcome mat for a Nation which prides itself on being a good neighbor.

A CIA Briefing by the New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 22, 1961, by the highly respected Latin American correspondent for the Times, Mr. Tad Szulc,

writing from Miami. It would seem that the only way Members of this body can get information on the activities of the virtually autonomous Central Intelligence Agency is from the press. Mr. Szulc has done a fine job with his informal and unclassified briefing on the Cuban situation, but it is hardly a substitute for regular reports to the Congress on the activities of the CIA. I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that recent events in Cuba will accelerate action on the proposals to require the intelligence agencies of the Government to report directly to authorized committees or a joint committee of the Congress.

The article follows:

CIA Is Accused by Bitter Rebels—Cubans Assert U.S. Agency Failed To Coordinate Drive and Ignored Warnings

(By Tad Szulc)

Miami, April 21.—Bitter Cuban rebels here were analyzing today the causes of the failure of their attack this week on the regime of Premier Fidel Castro.

With their political leadership battered and divided, and with the underground organizations in Cuba badly mauled, deep resentment is mounting against the United States, and especially the Central Intelligence Agency, over what is widely regarded here as monumental mismanagement.

As has been an open secret in Florida and Central America for months, the Central Intelligence Agency planned, coordinated and directed the operations that ended in the defeat on a beachhead in southern Cuba Wednesday.

Among the immediate questions arising here is what is to be done with more than 4,000 men of the rebel army who were not committed in the first attack and are now scattered about the Caribbean area. They were described as demoralized and disoriented.

Meanwhile, the recruiting centers have closed in Miami and officers and men, proclaiming their bitterness, are beginning to trickle back from the camps. There was a danger simply evaporate.

Cuban sentiment here is that it is up to the United States to handle the situation in Cuba directly.

A second question is whether and how the underground organizations can be rebuilt in the face of mass arrests all over Cuba and of the break in communications between them and the rebel centers in Florida.

From reports and opinions gathered among Cubans involved in this week's events, and from information available beforehand but kept confidential, the picture that emerges is one of military, political, intelligence and security failures.

The principal charge leveled at the Central Intelligence Agency by Cubans from numerous groups is that it precipitated the attack without adequate coordination with the underground and despite urgent warnings in recent weeks against such an attempt.

EXCLUSION IS CHARGED

The agency is also blamed for excluding from the operations several rebel groups—which include a number of experienced guerrilla officers—because of alleged favoritism for other factions for political reasons.

With such a lark of coordination, many rebels claim, the Central Intelligence Agency could not have expected to see the fulfillment of its intelligence estimates that a major internal uprising would follow the first landing. The entire operation was based on the assumption of a popular explosion against Premier Castro as soon as the landing materialized.

But, the rebels charge, the proper climate for such an uprising was not allowed to be established because of the Central Intelligence Agency's haste to produce the attack, using groups it particularly favored. These groups were components of the Democratic Revolutionary Front which belongs to the Cuban Revolutionary Council, the top rebel command, and the principal among them was the Movement of Revolutionary Recovery led by Capt. Manuel Artime, a 29-year-old officer.

According to almost unanimous reports, Captain Artime was the favorite of the Central Intelligence Agency and of the agent directing the field operation.

POLITICAL ISSUE BLAMED

According to these sources, Captain Artime and his group received most of the military equipment and financial assistance, including funds for the families of men in military camps.

The Peoples Revolutionary Movement, an organization that is directed by Manuel Ray, Dr. Castro's one-time Minister of Public Works, and that operated the most effective underground network in Cuba, is reported to have received no financial support and almost no equipment.

The Central Intelligence Agency, it was reported, began to deliver sabotage materiel to the Ray movement only in the last few weeks, when it joined with the Democratic Front to form the Revolutionary Council.

The alleged reason for the disapproval of the movement was its belief that Senor Ray's and his associates' political ideas were too radical.

The Central Intelligence Agency, it was reported, believed the Artime movement to be more conservative.

SPLINTER GROUPS FORMED

For personal and political reasons, a series of splinter groups developed within the movement led by Captain Artime. Late last year, he was beaten up in a Miami street by a group of his former associates.

Numerous officers, including several cofounders of the Movement of Revolutionary Recovery who has been Premier Castro's guerrilla captains in Sierre Maestra, split away. They attempted to form "free-lance" guerrilla organizations, hoping for U.S. aid in transporting them back to Cuba and equipping them with weapons and sabotage materiel.

What follows is a summary of the history of the Cuban rebel operation from the beginning of training in Guatemala, as described by qualified sources:

The rebel troops began to be trained in Guatemala under Central Intelligence Agency supervision about last May. The ranks of the revolutionary army swelled as the months went by, reaching strength in recent weeks as a mobilization order was issued by the Revolutionary Council.

The training took place in seven camps in the vicinity of the Pacific coast of Guatemala. The camps were at La Suiza, Helvetia, Trax, Champerico, Retalhuleau, San José Buenavisea, and Sayaxche.

A shrimp factory was established at Champerico to serve as a cover. Most of the other camps were made to look like ranches.

AIR BASE ESTABLISHED

An air base with a 4,500-foot landing strip was established at Retalbuleu, and the rebel air force was equipped with C-54 and C-46 transports, B-26 bombers and P-51 fighters, the latter obsolescent types.

The Cuban pilots were trained by at least seven U.S. pilots belonging to a F-104 jet fighter group.

When a group of foreign newsmen went to Retalbuleu in January to see for themselves that reports of a Cuban military buildup there were untrue, the pilots were ordered to hide in a shack.

The aircraft were used late last year and early this year to drop supplies for the anti-Castro guerrillas in the Escambray Mountains.

To facilitate operations, Cuban airmen painted Guatemalan and Cuban Air Force insignia on their planes or left them unmarked, depending on the missions.

When two B-26 bombers attacked air bases in Cuba last Saturday and one of the pilots who landed in Miami described himself as a defector from the Cuban Air Force, his picture, published in local newspapers, was promptly identified here as that of a Lieutenant Zuniga, a flyer from the Guatemalan camp. He has vanished.

The account given by qualified sources continued:

The bulk of the troops were trained for a conventional army, using tanks, mortars and bazookas. A U.S. Army colonel commanded the training.

Special guerrilla forces were trained at one or two of the camps, and some of the Cuban officers were sent to the U.S. Army's Jungle Warfare School in Panama.

A Filipino guerrilla specialist was in charge of some of the training. He was assisted by five or six instructors who are believed to be Slavs, perhaps Ukrainians, and who were assisted by interpreters.

However, Cuban officers complained that they were not receiving proper instruction and that the rocky terrain of western Guatemala taught no useful lessons for guerrilla action in the forest-covered mountains of Cuba.

In time, political problems and friction began to develop in the camps. Captain Artime was the center of many of the arguments as nervousness rose.

When the revolutionary council ordered a purge of men who were once supporters of the former dictator, Fulgencio Batista, Central Intelligence Agency agents were reported to be reluctant to give up trained personnel to satisfy political requirements.

Charges were constantly heard in Miami that Batista supporters held high positions in the camps. Ten days before the landings a gun battle was reported to have occurred in one of them.

CASTRO AGENTS INFORMED

That a landing was imminent this month was known to almost all Cubans in this area. This included at least 100 known Castro intelligence agents. Although local law enforcement agencies even had their photographs, Federal authorities made no visible effort to remove them.

As troops from Guatemala and from smaller camps in Louisiana and Florida began to get moved to jumpoff points in the Caribbean in the first week in April, the rebel leaders sounded urgent warnings against an invasion attempt.

They argued forcefully with Central Intelligence Agency agents and other U.S. authorities that any substantial landing should be preceded by a softening-up campaign of sabotage.

They also were insistent that a strategy of small multiple landings be used instead of a single thrust.

Early last week, however, the preparations for a landing went into high gear just as a major sabotage campaign began in Cuba. These last-minutes preparations were kept a secret from the underground organizations not favored by the Central Intelligence Agency.

AGENT HANDLED START

A top underground leader who went to New York last week for conferences with the Revolutionary Council was not informed of the plans. As he prepared to return to Cuba with a load of special explosives for the stepped-up sabotage campaign, a friend telephoned him that an invasion had begun.

In New York, the members of the Revolutionary Council, meeting at the Hotel Lexington, were spirited out through the backdoor by 10 Central Intelligence Agency agents Sunday afternoon and taken to secret spots to await the moment to land on the beachhead.

This report appears to contradict allegations made later that the landing Monday was merely intended as a supply operation.

There are reasons to believe that several of the council's members were not aware at that moment of what precisely was about to occur. Senor Ray was reported to be among those kept in the dark.

The invading force was reported to have jumped off, among other points, from the islands of Great Corn and Little Corn, off the coast of Nicaragua.

The islands belong to Nicaragua, but they have been 99-year leased to the United States since 1916.

As the rebels sailed toward the beachhead, several hundred trained anti-Castro fighters were being held back in Miami for no apparent reason.

They included about 150 men of the People's Revolutionary Movement, and about 400 men of another group.

For reasons that were not made clear, perhaps as many as 100 officers and men from the Guatemalan camps, including airmen, were brought to Miami several weeks ago and told to remain with friends, or at motels, each receiving $50 weekly.

One of the important criticisms of the landing operation was that it was not accompanied by broadcasts into Cuba urging the people to rise, and informing them who was leading the attack. This, it was stressed, left Cubans in a state of uncertainty and confusion, compounded by broadcasts by Radio Swan, a Central Intelligence Agency-operated propaganda station on Swan Island, claiming victories and uprisings that were not actually happening.

"People could not take chances on exposing themselves not knowing what was happening," a rebel leader here said.

Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD a sermon on the Peace Corps which the Reverend Ensworth Reisner preached in the First Methodist Church of Milwaukee. His thesis is that the 10th chapter of Matthew might well be a statement of the basic principles to guide the establishment of the Peace Corps:

PEACE CORPS

("If the house be worthy let your peace come upon it."—Matthew 10: 13.)

Behold a strange and wonderful thing has come about. A nation is about to send forth disciples who shall have power against unclean spirits, and to heal sickness, and to eliminate all manner of disease. These shall go forth and say to all the world, "The Kingdom of peace is at hand." These disciples have freely received the benefits of a great nation. They are to freely give. They are to have no salary, yet each will receive his meat for his work. Where there is worthiness and need in a house their peace is to rest upon it. And where there is no need, they are to depart. They are to be sent forth as sheep in the midst of wolves and must be wise as serpents yet harmless as doves. They should beware of men for they will receive much opposition. But they should not be anxious as to how they should respond or speak, for the responsibility is not theirs, it is the Spirit of God which speaks through them. Behold a nation is preparing to send forth disciples. And it is being called the Peace Corps.

The idea of the Peace Corps is rooted in a great American tradition which considers Americans to be "citizens of the world." This phrase was pronounced by such persons as Thomas Paine and John Paul Jones, the great naval hero of the Revolutionary War. Following the War of Independence, Jones extended his efforts to many other nations, including Russia, because he felt that freedom, independence and peace as pronounced in the American Declaration of Independence should be the heritage of people everywhere. As the mid-19th century approached, the burgeoning vitality of America again sent forth disciples thru many missionary societies and charged them with the responsibility of casting out unclean spirits and of healing the disease of peoples from the Hawaiian Islands to China, the Middle East, and Africa. These missionaries not only carried with them the religious sentiments of their particular churches but even more, preached and taught the Gospel of equal opportunity, of freedom, and of man's concern for man.

At the turn of the 20th century this same spirit of discipleship sent forth men and women not only as representatives of churches, but as disciples of the gospel of peace to proclaim the kingdom of good will among men. There were a thousand forms starting with the student volunteer movement under John R. Mott at the turn of the century, to world neighbors which sought to bring agricultural and village industry activities to depressed peoples. This wave of world conquest for peace and righteousness translated itself into the 14 points of Woodrow Wilson, the Charter of the United Nations, foreign aid, and the efforts of hundreds of private foundations. And now the Peace Corps.

The cynic can look at all these ventures and point to their failures, the sometimes attendant hypocrisy, the waste and presumptuousness of many efforts. But history will testify to the eventual effectiveness of these myriad approaches to discipleship.

Typical of these movements emanating from America are the origins of the Peace Corps idea. The seeds of the Peace Corps were planted by Christian pacifists who in the twenties and thirties contended that the only way to stop the waging of war was to wage peace. I attended a meeting of the Friends Service Committee, that group of Quakers and similarly minded persons, who planned work camps where young people would give their time living on a subsistence level to meet the needs of depressed peoples, especially in the slums of American cities. One of the first successful ventures in work camps was held in Dearborn, Mich., as the result of the efforts of the Reverend Mr. Owen Geer, a soldier in World War I who dedicated his life to pacifism in rejection of the failure of war to bring peace and democracy. Work camps developed all over America and extended to foreign shores. Dedicated young people donated everything from months to years in these projects.

Then came World War II. At the outset the pacifists devoted themselves to those wounded by war. They volunteered to enter war torn areas to care for the victims of evil. Their heroic efforts and sacrifice were so significant that the military authorities were afraid to permit this kind of work to become an alternative to military service. So their efforts were sharply curtailed during most of the war. However, the civilian public service camps and projects could not be completely throttled. These groups became human guinea pigs, worked in mental hospitals until the whole care for mental disease was transformed in America. One of the effects was a profound influence upon the thinking of General Hershey, who was and has remained the head of the Selective Service. General Hershey has been one of the main advocates of the Peace Corps.

Another root of this idea came as the result of the beginning of the World Neighbors organization when Mr. Con Dale, of Waukesha, and I prepared a thorough study which was presented to the International Administrations office in Washington, in which we proposed that the Government finance Peace Corps activity under the direction of voluntary services organizations; such as, World Neighbors and others. Some years ago I discussed this matter with Jim Hagerty, President Eisenhower's press secretary, and it received very favorable response from the President. However, neither World Neighbors nor other voluntary organizations were in a position to give the kind of direction which was needed.

At a meeting of the Milwaukee County Council of Churches Committee on International Relations at Plymouth Congregational Church, I proposed the idea to Congressman HENRY REUSS, who is a fraternity brother and longtime friend. Again I reiterated the idea one day when visiting him in Washington. Apparently the force of the suggestion was revivified in his mind while visiting some of our oversea establishments, and he tells in an article in the Christian Science Monitor of this latter incident. Senator HUMPHREY, through his activity in the old Epworth League of the Methodist Church, which has fostered some workcamps and had advocated young people working for peace in such projects, was also greatly influenced by these ideas. I called upon him in Washington some years ago with the suggestion of a Peace Corps. Undoubtedly there have been many others furthering this idea. Henry Hitt Crane of Detroit sent a letter to the President suggesting such activity to be conducted by our military personnel in oversea bases. Some of the military people have already endeavored, on an individual basis and even a regimental basis, to conduct projects in such places as Korea and elsewhere. Responding to these thoughts, part of the great American tradition, HENRY REUSS proposed a study bill in Congress. President Kennedy took it up in his campaign. And now there has been a response such as rarely before received.

There are two reasons for this response. First, it is part of the great American tradition, and second, it is in partial fulfillment of the directions of Jesus given to His disciples at the outset of His ministry. What Jesus taught was the fulfillment of the deepest instincts of human nature.

With the paraphrasing of a few words, the 10th chapter of Matthew might well be a statement of the basic principles to guide the establishment of the Peace Corps. Matthew first states the principles of His ministry in the Sermon on the Mount. None of these principles advocated the establishment of a church or other ecclesiastical organization. They were the universal statement of basic truths in man's relationship to man which would result in peace and good will among men. They applied to everyone, regardless of his religion, his race or his color. Then Jesus proceeded to demonstrate to His disciples the way in which He would put into effect this program of peace and good will among men. "Jesus went about all the cities and villages teaching in their synagogues and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom and healing every sickness and every disease among the people."

But one man couldn't do it all, so He called His intimate group of 12 disciples and "gave them power against unclean spirits to cast them out and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease." If this isn't the primary function of any Peace Corps, I don't know what is. Unclean spirits obviously include all those things which are against the social betterment of any people. All manner of sickness certainly would include sanitation, public health, as well as private concern for the physical disabilities arising from malnutrition, bacilli, and virii. Disease could certainly include all those condtions immediately affecting the freedom and well-being of human individuals. To attack these things is to attack some of the underlying causes of economic and social disease which creates bitterness and antagonism and leads to war.

Jesus directed the disciples to go to the lost sheep of the House of Israel first and carry out a program of education about the possibilities of peace and good will—or in the words of the Bible, "Preach the Kingdom of Heaven, saying it is at hand." Obviously the Peace Corps cannot eliminate all sickness, social and economic conditions, but they can give the people who are most susceptible, hope that such conditions of peace and good will are at hand. More than anything else the lost sheep of the earth need to have a realistic hope that peace and prosperity and opportunity are at hand, and this preaching or educational program can best be accomplished by the Peace Corps, by working for the betterment of the sick, the outcast, and those possessed of deplorable conditions.

Next Jesus gave the disciples the basic attitude they should assume. They were not to approach it from a "better than thou" point of view. They were rather paying off a debt they owed. "Freely ye have received, freely give." This is the reason why they were to receive no salary—neither the disciples nor the Peace Corpsmen. Neither silver nor gold nor brass will be provided for the purses. However, they will obtain subsistence commensurate with that received by other workmen. As Jesus stated it, "The workman is worthy of his meat"—but you're not to receive any profits. You've already received the profit by the many things that you have received. Americans who go into the Peace Corps have received their education, their training, their advantages in a prosperous and free Nation. They certainly dare not enter the Peace Corps for the sake of exploitation or profit.

The next thing Jesus made clear was that the disciples were to go where there was responsiveness and real need. "Wherever you go," He said, "Inquire who is worthy and abide there if the house be worthy let your peace come upon it, but if it be not worthy let your peace return to you and shake off the dust off your feet." It should be the policy of the Peace Corps to go to those people who are receptive and who are in need, who will receive education, assistance and sanitation, agriculture, household industries, and other self-help projects. There must be a conscious need upon the part of those who are to be assisted, for to force help upon an individual is to destroy the effectiveness of that help, just as it is to give help to those who don't really need it. Those who reject the gestures of good will and peace should be left alone—"shake off the dust of your feet," for if they persist in their refusal as Jesus said, "it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in that day of judgment than for that city."

Next Jesus advised His disciples, "I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves. Be yet therefore wise as serpents and harmless as doves." There is no question but what the Peace Corps will be subjected to all manner of difficulties. It will have no authority except what it can win for itself. The Marines cannot stand back of it, and those who feed upon poverty, disease, will be bitter in their efforts to discredit those who are in the Peace Corps. Among some of the depressed people moneylenders get up to as high as 50 and 75 percent interest on short-term loans, and it may be to the benefit of exploited people to learn the advantages of a credit union.

Such will cause all kinds of scheming on the part of moneylenders. Sanitation projects may interfere with factories that pollute streams. And those who work for peace and good will among men have to expect a snake in the grass and fight him with harmless shrewdness, wise as a serpent but harmless as the dove. It may even mean that those who work for the Peace Corps will have trumped up charges leveled against them. They may be brought before governors and kings and accused of all sorts of things because they are Americans. But they should not be anxious if they follow the Spirit of God in their helpfulness and good will. For their testimony for the peace of the world is not merely their own responsibility but that of God who works through them. As Jesus stated it, "It is not ye that speak but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you."

I have no illusions about the Peace Corps alone bringing in the Kingdom of God any more than has the missionary movement brought heaven on earth. And certainly the Peace Corps has already been subjected to disillusioning doubts cast for political purposes. We can expect the Communists to try to invade it and discredit it. Perhaps more dangerous is the possibility that some of its leaders may try to substitute educational qualifications for the Spirit of God in the training program. It may hagridden with bureaucracy as is the tendency in all Government agencies. It should be expected that some Peace Corpsmen may prove traitors, but then one of the disciples of Jesus was a traitor, also.

These failures, these criticisms, these nibblings of the mice of cynicism are not too important. What is important is that we as a people and as individuals under God fulfill our heritage and carry on the great mission of the Kingdom of God. If we do this in our generation we will hand on the torch of peace and good will among men under the Spirit of God as a heritage for all the world.

Polio Vaccines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, with the approach of the polio season, it is of special interest to all Americans that this once deadly disease is almost conquered. Emphasis is now being placed on a variety of vaccines to do the job with greater ease and convenience. Progress in a field such as this is often of necessity slow to insure maximum safety. The following article, I feel, gives excellent expression and clarification to the progress in the battle against polio.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, "What's Delaying the New Polio Vaccine?" from the April 1961 issue of Redbook magazine:

WHAT'S DELAYING THE NEW POLIO VACCINE?

(By Ruth and Edward Brecher)

In Cincinnati last spring 180,000 children swallowed a few drops apiece of the new Sabin "oral" polio vaccine. Throughout the rest of the year only one case of paralytic polio was reported in the city. That one case occurred in an unvaccinated man who had recently returned to Cincinnati from New York City and was probably infected before his return. In Hungary too, according to Dr. Albert S. Sabin, of the University of Cincinnati College of Medicine, who developed the Sabin vaccine, not a single case of paralytic polio was reported throughout that country during the July-August-September 1960 polio season following a nationwide oral-vaccine campaign.

Similar dramatic results have been reported with two other new oral polio vaccines—one developed by Dr. Hilary Koprowski, of the Wistar Institute in Philadelphia, and the other by Dr. Herald Cox, of Lederle Laboratories. Yet none of these vaccines is available now for general use in the United States—nor will they be available in time to prevent paralysis during the coming polio season. Why the delay? Equally important, what should young adults do right now, while waiting for an oral vaccine, to protect themselves and their children from paralytic polio this year? When Redbook sent us to find out we encountered several ugly accusations. The Russian newspaper Izvestia, for example, alleges that American vaccine manufacturers are delaying the new oral vaccines because they are making so much money on the Salk polio vaccine. Dr. Koprowski charges that his vaccine is being discriminated against. Dr. Sabin insists that polio could have been wiped out in the United States altogether this year if the U.S. Government, the National Foundation (March of Dimes) and vaccine manufacturers had pushed ahead at top speed with his vaccine last winter. In contrast to such accusations, here are the blunt facts as we have rounded them up from both official and well-informed unofficial sources. Here too is a sober, scientific evaluation of how the new oral polio vaccines are likely to affect you and your family. The familiar Salk vaccine is composed of polio viruses which have been killed by formaldehyde. It is one of the safest and most effective vaccines ever produced against any disease. It erects a barrier of antibodies in your bloodstream so that even though polio viruses subsequently enter your intestinal tract and multiply there, they cannot get past the antibody barrier to reach your nervous system and cause paralysis.

The new oral vaccines contain living viruses which have been weakened or tamed. These tamed viruses infect your intestinal tract after you swallow them and multiply there, creating an immunity not only to paralytic polio but also to further intestinal infections caused by polio viruses. If enough people achieve this intestinal type of immunity, it is expected, polio viruses will no longer be passed back and forth from person to person within a vaccinated community. The disease may thus be eradicated altogether.

Who is responsible for holding back the new live vaccines?

First, strike off the National Foundation from the list of suspected culprits. It has been continuously supporting Dr. Sabin's oral vaccine research since 1953 with more than $1 million in March of Dimes grants; and it has been financing research on the Sabin vaccine in other laboratories as well. This support is continuing.

Next, don't blame the vaccine manufacturers. At least four companies are planning to manufacture the Sabin vaccine, and because of the competitive advantage of being first on the market, all of them have an

incentive to move quickly. Two of the four are currently manufacturing the Salk vaccine, and may therefore have some slight incentive to go slow. But the other two companies have no Salk vaccine to sell. The company likely to be first with the Sabin vaccine (Lederle Laboratories) reports that it has already spent $11 million on oral vaccine research and an additional $2 million for a new oral vaccine plant and equipment. Since this investment will not begin to pay off until the Sabin vaccine is actually marketed, Lederle obviously will lose rather than profit by delay.

This leaves the U.S. Government at the head of the suspect list.

The Government agency responsible for deciding whether or not to license any new vaccine is the Division of Biologics Standards (DBS) of the National Institutes of Health, a unit of the U.S. Public Health Service. If a vaccine proves unsafe after licensing, the DBS gets the blame—and rightly so. It is your sentinel, posted by law to safeguard you and your children from unsafe vaccines and from overinflated vaccine claims.

The DBS has learned the hard way how important it is to be extra cautious. Back in 1955 it licensed the Salk vaccine in a hurry, at the urging of the National Foundation and others; polio was then on the rampage and no other preventive was available. The results were in general excellent, with many thousands of men, women and children saved from crippling or death. But a price was paid for haste; several bad batches of vaccine managed to slip thruogh an unnoticed loophole in the DBS regulations governing safety. As a result, 61 children who received vaccine from those batches came down with paralytic polio; others caught polio from them; several died.

The DBS regulations were immediately tightened up, and the Salk vaccine has been completely safe ever since. But DBS officials resolved to avoid a similar situation with oral polio vaccine if it was humanly possible.

Live-virus vaccines by their very nature require special safety precautions. If the Salk killed-virus vaccine were to be accidentally contaminated by some other viruses during manufacture, the formaldehyde which kills the tough polio viruses would no doubt kill the other viruses as well. A live-virus vaccine has no such built-in safeguard. Contaminating viruses may travel with the tame polio viruses into your body and produce disease. Such an incident actually occurred during World War II; serum hepatitis viruses got into a yellow fever vaccine and thousands of cases of serious, sometimes fatal, hepatitis followed among American soldiers and others all over the world.

Against this background of possible hazards, and knowing that an effective polio vaccine (the Salk vaccine) was already available throughout the United States, DBS officials and scientific advisers decided to proceed with what Dr. Roderick Murray, head of DBS, describes as "all deliberate speed." This policy turned out to be warranted. During field trials of the Cox and Sabin oral polio vaccines in 1960, something happened which emphasized again the need for caution—and which, in fact, resulted in putting the Cox vaccine out of the running.

In Dade County (Miami), Fla., 412,000 men, women, and children swallowed the Cox oral vaccine last spring. The vaccine proved effective, on the whole, but three young men a young woman, and a 2-year-old child came down with paralytic polio within 9 to 14 days after swallowing it; this is the length of time it takes polio viruses to produce illness. In West Berlin also a number of cases of paralysis were reported among 300,000 residents who took the Cox vaccine.

There is no proof that these cases were caused by the Cox vaccine. Some of them—or conceivably all of them—may have been due to polio viruses already present. But enough doubt was raised to eliminate the Cox vaccine as a candidate for immediate licensing.

No such doubts have been raised about the Sabin vaccine. Large-scale field trials have now been run in Cincinnati, Ohio, and Rochester, N.Y., and smaller trials in New York City, New Haven, Cleveland, Nashville, Houston, and New Orleans. The results have been excellent. The Polio Surveillance Unit of the U.S. Public Health Service reports not a single case of paralytic polio traceable to the vaccine. In other countries too the Sabin vaccine has been used on a large scale with success; Dr. Sabin estimates that by the end of 1960, 77 million people had taken his vaccine in the U.S.S.R. and an additional 23 million elsewhere.

Convinced by this vast and rapidly accumulating body of evidence, the DBS has now announced regulations under which companies planning to manufacture the Sabin vaccine will be licensed. These licensing requirements are very strict. Each batch of vaccine, for example, must be tested separately in living rabbits, guinea pigs, adult mice, baby mice, and human kidney cells grown in test tubes. Samples of each batch must also be injected directly into the muscles, spinal cords, and brains of a number of monkeys. No manufacturer will be permitted to sell his first batch until he has proved by tests on five successive batches that he is able to turn out a safe vaccine consistently.

Since meeting all these requirements will take time, the Sabin vaccine probably will not become available for general use until late 1961 or early 1962. As a result, we can be confident that when the first oral vaccine is finally licensed, it will be as safe as scientific precautions can possibly make it.

Dr. Sabin is not happy with the time schedule. He believes that the safety of his vaccine was proved more than a year ago and that it should have been licensed for general use last winter.

Dr. Koprowski is not happy either. He believes that his vaccine is as safe and effective as Dr. Sabin's and should be eligible for licensing along with it. He challenges the evidence which caused the DBS to conclude that the Sabin vaccine is safer than his.

Perhaps the DBS did err in one or both of these respects. If so, it erred in the direction of greater safety for the millions of people who will take the new vaccine.

How much good will the Sabin vaccine accomplish for you and your family when it does become available? Here are the answers given Redbook by public health officials who have no personal stake in either the Salk or the oral vaccines:

CERTAINTY OF PROTECTION

When Dr. Salk manufactured his own vaccine in his own laboratory, it successfully immunized an overwhelming majority of the people who received it. Later, when placed in large-scale commercial production, it was somewhat less effective. Dr. Sabin's vaccine is at present almost 100 percent effective in his own hands, and the experience to date suggests that it will prove to be highly effective protection when it is being commercially produced and distributed.

DURABILITY OF PROTECTION

A few years ago, widespread publicity claims were made that an oral vaccine would provide lifelong protection without a booster, instead of the merely temporary protection which the Salk vaccine was supposed to provide. As a matter of fact, the protection provided by the Salk vaccine—to the surprise of almost everybody except Dr. Jonas Salk himself—is providing remarkably durable. Children vaccinated during the 1954 National Foundation field trials, for example, still show a very low polio rate after 6 years. But no one can foretell whether this protection will continue through the years or will begin to taper off. Nor is there any way of telling now for how many years the Sabin vaccine's protection will last.

SPREAD OF PROTECTION

It used to be claimed that the "tamed" viruses in the oral vaccines would spread rapidly from vaccinated individuals to others. Thus by vaccinating part of a community you might immunize the rest willy-nilly. This claim has proved to be exaggerated. The tamed viruses often spread from a child to his brothers and sisters; they may even spread to his parents, friends, and neighbors. But you can't rely on this spread, and there is no practical way of knowing whether or not one child or adult has "caught" immunity from another. Even limited spread, however, is a point in favor of the Sabin vaccine.

ONE-DOSE PROTECTION

It used to be said that you would be able to swallow just one dose of an oral vaccine and forget all about polio forever. This claim is still occasionally made. But the Sabin vaccine is generally given in three separate doses spaced 4 to 6 weeks apart, and a fourth dose may prove advisable. One-dose protection is a possibility but not yet a reality.

Will an oral vaccine replace the Salk vaccine, or merely take its place as an alternative polio preventive? It is too early to tell. Some experts point out that the Salk vaccine can be combined with diptheria, tetanus and whooping cough vaccines in a single series of shots; when this is done, recent research indicates, both the Salk vaccine and the diptheria vaccine produce a higher level of immunity than either does when given alone. It is quite possible, accordingly, that many physicians will continue to use the polio-diptheria-tetanus-whooping cough combination shots for infants and young children even after the Sabin vaccine is on the market.

Despite the availability and high effectiveness of Salk vaccine, millions of people have failed to get their shots—because of the discomfort or the bother or simply because they do not fully appreciate the importance of protecting themselves and their children. For this reason severe polio epidemics continue to occur among the unvaccinated, as they did during 1960 in Providence, in Baltimore and in perhaps a dozen other American communities.

Public health officials hope that even before the Sabin oral vaccine is available, many of the unvaccinated will respond to the antipolio campaign and get their Salk injections. But because oral vaccine is so painless to take and easy to administer to large groups of people, they expect it to reach many millions who have not had their Salk shots. The Sabin vaccine provides protection more promptly than the Salk vaccine—fast enough so that it can be given to an entire community whenever one case occurs. By preventing intestinal polio infections, it will slow the spread of the polio virus from person to person and may thus stamp out polio altogether—as smallpox has been stamped out—within a reasonable period of time.

Meanwhile, polio will be with us again this summer and fall. The best way for you and your family to get protection this year is by completing your series of four Salk shots now.

What about next year? The two vaccines are completely compatible. After completing your Salk shots this year you can take the Sabin vaccine by mouth next year. The Salk shots will protect you from paralytic polio; the Sabin oral vaccine may raise the level of that protection and will, in addition, prevent you from being a polio "carrier" capable of infecting others.

The Youthful President Kennedy and the Youthfulness of the Biblical Joseph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Israel H. Leventhal, who is the spiritual leader of the Brooklyn Jewish Center, one of the largest and most outstanding congregations in the United States, recently delivered a sermon which I now have the honor of inserting in the CONGRESSIOAL RECORD. The observations which Rabbi Leventhal makes concerning President Kennedy are most astute. I take great pride in the fact that the rabbi and many of the members of the congregation of the Brooklyn Jewish Center reside in the 10th Congressional District of New York which I have the honor to represent.

The sermon follows:

THE YOUTHFUL PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND THE YOUTHFULNESS OF THE BIBLICAL JOSEPH

(Excerpt of sermon preached by Rabbi Israel H. Levinthal on Sabbath Beshalach, January 28, 1961, on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Bar Mitzvah of the Rabbi)

It is now long after the presidential election, and most of us saw on the television or read about the impressive inauguration of our new President. Whether we are Republicans or Democrats, all of us, in the true American spirit, accept the verdict of the electorate and join in the fervent prayer that Heaven's blessing may accompany President Kennedy in all his paths of duty, and that he may succeed in strengthening the role of genuine democracy in our land and in bringing the world nearer to the goals of universal peace and human brotherhood.

It is the accepted rule for clergymen not to take an active part in political campaigns unless a great moral issue is at stake. Throughout my ministry I have adhered to this rule. Now, however, that the election is over, it is not out of place for a clergyman to comment on certain phases of the election campaign. In fact, immediately after the election, political commentators and editors, representing both parties, tried to analyze the election results and to offer reasons for the victory of the one candidate for and the defeat of the other. It is in this spirit that I permit myself to offer my comments on the subject in this Sabbath's sermon.

One of the things that struck me as strange in the recent campaign was the emphasis which the Republican leaders had placed upon Senator Kennedy's youth. I recall reading in the press that at the first meeting of the Republican Strategy Committee, immediately after the presidential nominations, it was unanimously decided to issue a directive to all Republican speakers that they should never refer to the Democratic nominee as Senator Kennedy but always as the young or youthful Senator Kennedy—implying of course that being young meant immaturity, inexperience, naivete.

That a man of 43 should be regarded as a youth was something that I could not comprehend. In our Jewish tradition, a lad of 13 is regarded as already mature for the performance of our religious duties. At 18, according to the rabbis, he is ready to marry and to assume the responsibilities of family life. At 30, a man is deemed to reach the height of physical vigor; and at 40, to attain the full strength of mind and understanding. In fact, in an interesting passage in our ancient rabbinic literature, there is a discussion on this very theme: Unto what age can a man be called a naar (a youth)? Rabbi Akiba said: Up to the age of 30; Rabbi Meir said: Up to 25; and Rabbi Samuel said: They are both wrong, only up to 20 years of age. To the Jewish mind it would be absolutely incomprehensible to speak of a man of 43 as young or as a youth.

Now what is wrong or bad in being young? It seems to me, as one who has already reached the age of the hoary head, that youth is one of man's greatest blessings and that youth offers a man great, creative opportunities. Lord Beaconsfield, from the richness of his experience, cried out: "We must be young to do great things." And William Hazlitt, the celebrated British critic, gave as his judgment that "Almost everything great has been achieved by youth." Allowing for exaggeration in these statements, we certainly cannot agree that being young is synonymous with immaturity, or that in itself, it makes one unfit for leadership. Furthermore, there is a difference of only 3 or 4 years between the ages of Kennedy and Nixon; and if at 43 one is young, and at 46 or 47 one is fully grown, the question arises: What year is the dividing line when one passes from youth to ripened age?

It is interesting to note that in this Sabbath's Scriptural reading there is a reference to the great Biblical character, Joseph. Four weeks ago we concluded the story of his dramatic life. We have been reading since then the story of the bondage of the Israelites in Egypt, and today the reading deals with the account of the exodus from Egypt and the passing of the Israelites through the Red Sea. But in the midst of today's portion we are again reminded of Joseph: "And Moses took the bones of Joseph with him."

Let us turn for a moment to the early phase of Joseph's life. You recall the story: how he was imprisoned in Egypt, how—while a prisoner—he interpreted correctly the dreams of Pharaoh's butler and baker. And now Pharaoh dreams a dream which no one can interpret for him. The butler reminds himself of his own dream while imprisoned and how Joseph's interpretation was fulfilled. He forgot the promise that he had made to Joseph that he would remember him and speak well of him to the Egyptian authorities; but now the opportunity was his to serve his master and to win his favor. And so he approaches Pharaoh and tells him of his own experience: "And there was with us naar ivri—a Hebrew youth who interpreted for us our dreams."

The rabbis were surprised that the butler referred to Joseph as a naar—a youth. The Bible itself tells us that he was 30 years old when he stook before Pharaoh—and how can one speak of a man of 30 as a naar? But the rabbis have a ready answer: the butler referred to him in a derogatory sense—K'shoteh—a foolish, immature, inexperienced lad—v'en raui ligdulah, unfit for position of greatness or leadership.

Pharaoh, however, at the first meeting with Joseph, immediately recognized his greatness, and appointed him to the high position of vice ruler of the realm. And the masses of Egypt also recognized his qualities of leadership, and they called him avrech—a strange word, which the rabbis translated as av b'chochmah v'rach b'shanim—"patriarch in wisdom and youthful in years." It was this combination which Joseph possessed—maturity in wisdom and youthfulness—not so much in years, but as one commentator notes, B'tiveo, and his nature, in spirit—that captivated the minds of the ruler and the masses of Egypt.

I have the feeling that what helped President Kennedy more than anything else was that millions of our citizens recognized in him this remarkable combination of av b'chochmah—rich maturity in wisdom and rach b'shanim, a youthfulness in his very nature and spirit. One may be old in years and yet be blessed with such youthfulness in spirit. Moses, the Bible tells us, was 80 years old when he undertook the difficult task of delivering his people from their Egyptian bondage. In our own day, we see Ben Gurion, at 74, yet blessed with the spirit of youth in directing the affairs of state in Israel.

As a matter of fact, the Bible often uses the term "naar" not in the sense of youth but in that of youthfulness, and thus refers to a number of the ancient heroes as naar, though they were advanced in years. "And Joshua, his servant, naar"—and the rabbis tell us that he was then 42 years of age. David speaks of "my son Solomon naar"—and again the rabbis tell us he was 43 years old. Speaking of the spies whom Joshua sent to investigate the city of Jericho, the rabbis tell us that they were Caleb and Pinchas, and that Caleb was then 78 years old. Yet the Bible speaks of them as naarim—youths, and the rabbis continue in their comment: "The Bible calls them youths, shehayu zerizim k'naarim, because they were as energetic, as enthusiastic, as zealous as young men." The Prophet Hosea, speaking of God's love for Israel, tells us: "ki naar Yisrael, v'ohavehu," usually translated, "When Israel was a youth, I loved him." I think the meaning of the verse is: "Because Israel is youthful, I loved him."

Though Israel is among the oldest of the world's peoples, it is today again revealing its spirit of youthfulness—its power of creativity in every field of human endeavor.

And this is what America, as well as the world at large, needs and craves for: the spirit which youth typifies—vigor, enthusiasm, adventure, and daring to translate into action the ripe wisdom and experience which a leader may possess. Such is the quality of leadership which the American people have recognized in President Kennedy, and which has won their hearts.

* * * * *

And now we can better understand the deeper meaning of our text in this Sabbath's scriptural lesson: "And Moses took the bones of Joseph with him." The rabbis were puzzled by this verse: mai immo, they ask, "Why did Moses have to carry the bones of Joseph with him?" Could he not have assigned other Jews to perform that task? Many are the interpretations which the sages offer. I think the answer is simple. Moses was quite old at the time—past 80 years of age. But he held on to the body of Joseph as a constant inspiration and challenge that he had to endeavor to retain the spirit of youthfulness which Joseph had typified. For he realized that once that spirit of youthfulness departed from him his power of leadership would also depart.

* * * * *

If I may be permitted, I should like to add a personal word. This Sabbath has a special significance for me: it is my Bar Mitzvah Sabbath. Many years have passed since that eventful day in my life—60 to be exact. I realize that I have long passed the stage of naar, of a youth. I have already passed the stages of ziknah and sevah—by which the rabbis designate one's 60th and 70th years. But, like Moses, I, too, symbolically speaking, want to cling to the bones of Joseph and to retain his spirit of naarut—of youthfulness—and to be zariz k'naar—to retain the zeal, the vigor, the enthusiasm of youth, so that for years to come you may be able to say: ki naar yisrael—for Israel is still young in spirit—and therefore I may continue to have your regard and your esteem.

* * * * *

And thus we offer a fervent prayer this Sabbath to our Heavenly Father, first, in

behalf of our new President—that he may ever be blessed with the gifts of av b'chochmah—maturity in wisdom—and of rach b'shanim—the spirit of youthfulness in years. And for myself and for all the older men and women in our congregation, I pray that we may be enabled to be zerazim k'naarim—active, vigorous, energetic like the young, so that we may continue to serve better our faith, our people, our beloved America, and all mankind.

The Touchdown Club of Washington, D.C., and the Olympics for the Deaf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to attend a luncheon at the Statler Hotel sponsored by the Touchdown Club of Washington and I was extremely pleased to learn of its efforts and its interest in supporting various worthy causes and local charitable institutions. What started out some years ago as a luncheon group interested primarily in sports—hence, the origin of its name "Touchdown" as a symbol of football—has emerged into a large and respectable organization of many business and professional people who still retain a deep interest in sports.

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON was the main speaker at the luncheon and, as usual, delivered an excellent address. John R. O'Brien, vice president of Hoffman Electronics Corp., was the general chairman at the luncheon, which was in the nature of a welcome to the new Washington Senators baseball team. Many Members of Congress plus a substantial number of the Touchdown Club's membership were present to greet the baseball team and to extend best wishes for a most successful season.

The president of the club is Andrew Davis, himself a well-known football player in his college days. Other officers of the club are George Neumann, vice president, and V. T. Curtis, secretary. The club's board of governors consists of the following: Clifford Battles, A. J. Bergman, E. R. Carr, James Castiglia, Walter Conway, John Cooney, Hugh Flynn, Thomas Hurney, James Johnson, Henry Krause, Al Lujack, Scott Morris, John R. O'Brien, Otis Printz, John Stapelton, and Charles Wilson.

In talking with some of its leaders, I was pleasantly surprised to learn of the Touchdown Club's activities in promoting sports in the interests of good will and cooperation. One club official, General Manager Al Fiorentino, told me: "The heart of our club lies in helping youngsters find themselves in team sports, which demand so much loyalty and so much sacrifice for a common goal." With a purpose of this kind, we can truly say that it is "a club with a heart."

Perhaps one of the most laudable endeavors undertaken by the Touchdown Club is its effort to help raise the necessary funds to send a group of athletes from Gallaudet College in Washington to compete in the 9th International Games for the Deaf—known as the Olympics for the Deaf—which are scheduled to be held this summer at Helsinki, Finland. These games are held every 4 years, the last time being in 1957 in Milan, Italy, where the United States was represented by 40 deaf athletes who scored 182 points in track and field, swimming, and tennis, and won the world championship in basketball.

At this year's Olympic Games for the Deaf at Helsinki, August 6 to 10, some 1,000 deaf athletes from 34 countries are expected to compete in track and field events, basketball, swimming, tennis, wrestling, gymnastics, soccer, cycling, and others. Women will participate in track and field, swimming, tennis, and other sports. The President of Finland will officially open the Games at the Olympic Stadium in Helsinki, which seats 80,000 people.

A substantial number of the athletes on the U.S. team will be made up of students from Gallaudet College in Washington, which is the only college in the world for the deaf. It is a private liberal arts college, established in 1864 by act of Congress. In order to cover the expenses of the Gallaudet squad at the Helsinki games, a sum of $50,000 is needed.

The Touchdown Club of Washington has undertaken the task of sponsoring agency in the effort to raise these funds. Judging by its record of achievement of the past in supporting worthy causes, there is no doubt in my mind that its effort will again prove successful. I want to take this opportunity of paying a well-deserved tribute to the officers and members of the Touchdown Club for assuming this responsibility. It is a noble deed which should be widely recognized.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert into the RECORD two brief articles from a pamphlet of the American Athletic Association of the Deaf in which are described the forthcoming games for the deaf at Helsinki and the results of the 1957 games at Milan.

The two articles read as follows:

NINTH WORLD GAMES FOR DEAF, HELSINKI, FINLAND, AUGUST 6 TO 10, 1961

The selection of Helsinki, Finland, as the scene for the 1961 International Games for the Deaf is both symbolic and unique. It is symbolic because it exemplifies the growth of the International Games for the Deaf as an all-encompassing international movement. It must be called unique since the "Deaf Olympic" games will take place in the White City of the North for the first time in the history of the games.

The Finns were to have been host to the sixth international games for the deaf at Helsinki in 1949. Unfortunately Russian planes blotted out all of the splendid Finnish physical setup, such as a stadium, arenas, etc., which had been built and readied for the 1942 Olympiad. Furthermore, the tedious process of restoring Finnish economy to its prewar level made it impossible for that country to sponsor such a gathering. Recognizing Finland's inability to play host, the CISS awarded the honor to the Danish clubs of the deaf, and they acted as host to the sixth international games for the deaf at Copenhagen in 1949.

Now Finland is ready and is inviting all the deaf in the world to the Ninth World Games for the Deaf, August 6 to 10, 1961.

The President of Finland will open the Ninth World Games for the Deaf on August 6 at the Olympic Stadium which will be the scene of all track and field events for both men and women plus the soccer finals. This stadium seating 80,000 was the scene of the memorable 15th Olympiad for the hearing in 1952.

Just a few hundred yards away is Olympic Park where both spectators and participants, seated in three sports arenas and the ultramodern swimming stadium, will watch the soccer preliminaries, swimming, water polo, tennis, and basketball events. The other events such as highway cycling, 25 kilometer marathon race, and shooting will be held in the environments of Helsinki and necessary conveyance will carry both spectators and participants to the sites of these events.

For the housing of some 1,000 deaf athletes, Olympic Village, located in Otaniemi and about nine kilometers west of Helsinki includes nine buildings, which during winter are inhabited by technical students. Athletes from each country will have an opportunity to mix freely with others, but each nation will have its own section of houses. Fine training and practice facilities are closely available for most of the games events, so there's no reason—except for amusement and sightseeing—for any athlete to leave home. And there is a good restaurant in the village, where 500 persons can have their meals at the same time. A Finnish sauna on the nearby seashore will undoubtedly prove an experience. It is interesting to note that this village housed the participants of the 1952 Olympic Games.

Tackling the tremendous task of staging the Ninth International Games for the Deaf is a national undertaking. The Finnish Government is contributing the cost of financing the games. The organizing committee, composed of several deaf leaders of Finland and hearing sports leaders, is directing the planning and preparation for the 1961 World Games for the Deaf.

Events for the Helsinki meet are track and field, swimming, basketball, wrestling, soccer, tennis, cycling, shooting, gymnastics, and ping pong.

RESULTS OF 1957 CISS GAMES AT MILAN, ITALY—U.S. ATHLETES WIN FIRST PLACE IN MEN'S TRACK AND FIELD MEET

(Yanks dazzle world cagers to grab international title; Americans receive 17 gold medals, 9 silver and 11 bronze awards; Germans top greatest games ever as records tumble.)

The 1957 Milan games already deserve on one count a special niche in International Games for the Deaf history.

The largest U.S. team ever to participate played a dominant role in making it history to be remembered.

And Russians participated in this meet for the first time since the first International Games for the Deaf were held in Paris in 1924.

As in the hearing Olympics, the CISS does not recognize the point system of all sports which decides one nation victor over another. Individual, rather than team performance, they hold, should be paramount. Consequently team standings quoted here are unofficial.

Twenty-five nations competed in the games, with a total of 625 athletes, while 11 other countries sent delegates as observers.

Everything was performed according to the hearing Olympics. There was a parade of nations in full dress and John Smith of Idaho, double winner of the 1953 games at Brussels, led the U.S. contingent by carrying the American colors.

The men's track and field meet developed into a dual meet between the United States and Russia. The United States took five firsts against seven for Russia, but we took first place with 147 points. Russia was runner-up with 121 points. The United States took five seconds and eight thirds, while Russia collected three seconds and three thirds.

This was for the male contestants only. With the women the Russians amassed 115 points, Germany secured 66 and Poland 42. All the United States got was one point from its sole feminine competitor. In this country the women (deaf women at least) do not go in for such sports.

Of 13 world's records and 3 games marks set by male performers during 6 days of fierce competition—sometimes under adverse conditions—Americans broke 3 global marks and tied one standard for this international classic. The Russians rewrote four world's records and shattered one games mark.

It was not surprising that the United States won the basketball championship for that is a favorite American sport. Playing outdoors and on a marble court, a new experience for them, the boys from Little Rock, 1957's AAAD champions and American standard-bearers, defeated Finland, 57–30, France, 51-12, Italy, 89-39, and Belgium, the 1953 champ, in the finals, 81–25.

Participating in only 4 sports, the United States did well with only 40 athletes. They won first place in men's track and field, first place in basketball, fifth place in swimming, and third place in mixed doubles tennis. In all, they won 17 gold medals, 9 silver and 11 bronze awards. Twenty-six of the 40 athletes got medals, and 31 scored points for Uncle Sam.

In the overall picture, taking into account all sports such as the rifle shooting, soccer, gymnastics, ping pong, cycling, etc., Germany led in the number of medals won, 24 gold, 9 silver and 16 bronze, a total of 49. Host Italy was next as it garnered a total of 38—5 gold, 14 silver and 19 bronze. The United States was third with 37 medals, while Russia was fourth with 31—13 gold, 11 silver and 7 bronze.

Airlines' "Overbooking"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1961, I introduced a bill, H.R. 1208, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

The bill is designed to eliminate the practice of overbooking of passenger space reservations. I first introduced this measure in the 85th Congress.

Unfortunately the situation has not changed. This highly questionable practice is still going on. Since the airlines will not stop it themselves there must be remedial legislation.

The bill would provide protection for passengers by permitting them to bring a court action against the airline if they present themselves to board a plane for which they have confirmed reservations and the space is not available. Damages collectible would be an amount to cover actual losses, plus twice the amount of the fare paid or $100, whichever is greater, plus a reasonable attorney's fee and court costs.

If the passenger does not bring suit within 2 years the United States could bring the action against the airlines.

Those airlines which allow such shoddy practices have made this legislation necessary. As for the others they will probably benefit from it by an increase in business as a result of this additional guarantee to the passenger.

It is my hope that the Congress will act favorably on this measure in the near future.

Crisis in the Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article written by Selig Greenberg in the April 1961 issue of the Progressive entitled "Crisis in the Hospitals":

CRISIS IN THE HOSPITALS

(By Selig Greenberg)

(This is the first of two articles on hospital costs by Selig Greenberg, writer on medical problems for the Providence, R.I., Journal and Evening Bulletin. Mr. Greenberg has twice been honored by the Lasker Foundation for his distinguished writing on medicine. He won the Associated Press Managing Editors Association Award for his series of articles on the problems of the aged.—THE EDITORS.)

The Nation's hospitals—the outposts of our phenomenal medical progress—are now confronted with a profound crisis, at the very time they are advancing toward ever greater miracles of healing and lifesaving. Soaring hospital costs and hospitalization insurance rates have brought a rising tide of public concern, expressed in demands for greater efficiency in hospital operation, and for reforms in the prevailing patterns of health insurance. Across the country labor unions, business firms, citizens' groups, and public officials are calling for controls on skyrocketing costs, curbs on services which are either wholly unnecessary or could be furnished less expensively, and a more rational and coherent system that will get the most out of the medical care dollar. Increasingly, warnings are heard from responsible sources that the squeeze of spiraling costs may price voluntary insurance out of the market and force full Government control of our whole complex of health services.

There is probably no more explosive issue in the entire controversial field of medical economics than that of hospital costs. For it is here, more than in any other area of medical care, that the problems of the technological revolution in medicine are rapidly coming to a head.

Hospital services now not only account for the largest single portion of the Nation's health care bill, but they are at the heart of our system of medical practice. As medicine grows more intricate and its tools more elaborate, the trend inevitably is toward increasing concentration of medical services within the hospital. And it is the very triumphs of medicine which are catapulting costs. Nowhere is this more evident than in the hospitals, which have become a large-scale and complex business requiring the coordination of a great array of professional skills and huge capital investment in expensive facilities and equipment.

Basically, the crisis of hospital function and financing stems from the fact that we are both the beneficiaries and the victims of the remarkable progress of medicine which has brought us better health and longer life but also has enormously complicated the rendering of medical services and raised their costs. The revolution in medicine is far from over, and hospitals have yet to fulfill their growing potential. Further scientific advances will unavoidably mean still costlier diagnostic and treatment procedures, more elaborate and expensive equipment, and an even greater need for technical personnel. A continued rise in hospital costs thus appears inescapable. So it is all the more vital to eliminate the waste, duplication, and lack of integrated planning now common in the hospital field. If there are ways of operating hospitals more efficiently and economically—as many authorities believe there are—the public certainly has the right to insist on getting full value at the lowest possible price consistent with high quality.

Good hospital care clearly cannot be produced cheaply. But if costs are to be kept within acceptable bounds and quality improved, we will need a much higher degree of self-discipline by the medical profession and a far greater readiness on the part of hospitals to yield some of the privileges of their cherished autonomy than have so far been evident. It is no exaggeration to say that the future of the organization of medical care and practice in the United States depends on the extent to which the doctors and the hospitals can be prevailed upon to recognize that their business is the public's business.

The statistics of rising hospital costs and utilization are instructive and sobering.

For a number of years, hospital room charges have been advancing at a much faster rate than any other item in the U.S. Department of Labor's Consumer Price Index. The overall index, which is pegged at 100 for the 1947–49 period, had risen to 124.6 by the end of 1959. At that time the index for all medical care services put together stood at 150.8. But for hospital room rates it was 208.9.

In 1946, the average cost per patient day in voluntary hospitals was $9.39. By 1959, it had jumped to $30.19, an increase of more than 220 percent. Nor is the end of the spiral anywhere in sight. Experts are generally agreed that hospital costs will continue to rise at the rate of 5 to 10 percent a year. A spokesman for the American Hospital Association has predicted that the average cost per patient day may reach $50 by 1968.

Of equal importance in contributing to the steady climb of the Nation's hospital bill is the striking increase in the rate of hospitalization. Thirty years ago, 37 out of every 1,000 Americans were admitted to general hospitals in the course of a year. Since then the ratio of hospital admissions has zoomed to 124. A variety of factors has figured in this upward trend. For one thing, hospitals can do much more for the sick than they could 2 or 3 decades ago. Widespread insurance coverage has removed much of the economic deterrent to hospital care for those in the middle and low-income groups. In the Nation's population there has been a steady increase in the numbers and in the proportion of older people, who have a higher incidence of chronic diseases requiring more frequent hospitalization. Many conditions of modern city living make for significantly higher hospital use than in rural areas. The large proportion of working wives means that often there is no one at home to take care of a sick husband or child. The high price of household or nurs-

ing help to care for the sick at home and the limited size of city apartments also force up the hospitalization rate.

The net effect of higher costs of hospital care and its much greater frequency has been a tripling of expenditures for hospital services in the United States in the past 15 years. Out of a total private medical care outlay of $18.3 billion in 1959, payments to hospitals were $5.5 billion, the biggest single share, and $500 million more than the amount paid to physicians. The latest available breakdown shows that 30 cents out of every medical care dollar now goes to hospitals, 27 cents to doctors, 26 cents for drugs and appliances, 11 cents to dentists, and the remaining 6 cents for other professional services.

There are many sound reasons for the continued rise in hospital operating costs. A U.S. Public Heatlh Service official has summed them up with the cogent observation that "when we talk about the cost of medical care today as compared to the past, we're talking about the price of an electric washer-dryer compared to a washtub."

There is no ready solution for the costliness of new and more effective medical procedures, more elaborate surgery, and more potent drugs. Such dramatic advances as open-heart surgery, artificial kidneys, heart pacemaker units, cobalt radiation treatment, and radioisotopes to pinpoint internal abnormalities are restoring patients to health sooner and more completely, and, frequently, are saving lives which otherwise would be lost. But some of these miraculous procedures are enormously expensive, requiring dozens of physicians and technicians for a single patient.

As productivity has gone up, industry has been able to shorten its workweek. But hospitals cannot shorten their week. They must remain open 168 hours a week, 52 weeks a year. To keep pace with the standard 40-hour week in the community, hospitals have been forced to hire many new employees to fill each around-the-clock job. They also have been obliged to bring their lagging wage scales closer to those of private industry. While raising its wage level, industry has often managed to cut its labor costs through automation. But hospitals cannot substitute machines for people. On the contrary, as available lifesaving services proliferate and newly developed equipment is constantly added, more rather than fewer people are required to operate them. In 1946 voluntary hospitals in the United States had, on the average, 156 employees for every 100 patients. By now the ratio of employees for each 100 patients has risen to 225. Whereas in the automobile industry wages currently account for only about one-third of production costs, payroll expenditures have shot up to 70 percent of hospital budgets.

New medical sophistication has made hospital care an accepted component of the average American's standard of living. The public learns quickly these days of new medical discoveries through the press, radio, and television. The more people learn about medical progress, the more they are likely to go to the hospital, where the latest advances can be most effectively applied. The rising standard of living also has brought a demand for more attractive hospital facilities. Hospitals are expected to match the comforts of motels by way of air conditioning, piped-in radio, perhaps television, and certainly window draperies. The new standards also call for a telephone at the bedside and some choice of menu. While the effect of these niceties on the patient's recovery is debatable, their effect on the hospital's unit costs is obvious.

Another element in the picture has been the sharp increase in new hospital construction throughout the country. This expansion has been, in general, a laudable development. Antiquated buildings have in many places been replaced, and additional bed space has been provided to keep pace with the forward march of medical science. But we have lagged in developing more economical facilities such as hospital outpatient clinics and adequate nursing and convalescent homes for chronic patients. Concentration upon the expansion of costly hospital bed capacity designed primarily for the acutely ill is wasteful. Competent opinion is that the more hospital beds are available, the greater is the tendency toward admissions for relatively trivial ailments and for longer-than-necessary stays, particularly when such abuse is encouraged by the benefit structure of hospitalization insurance.

The fact that patients now go home much sooner than they used to—the average length of hospital stay has been cut in the past 30 years from 15.3 to 7.8 days—is in itself far from an unmixed blessing.

The shorter stay means that more intensive treatment is concentrated within a shorter period of time, so that daily costs are higher. An additional cost factor in more rapid patient turnover is that chances are greater there will be vacant beds which have to be staffed but produce no income. One of the paradoxes of the hospital cost problem is that it is the result of both overuse and insufficient use of facilities. On the one hand, hospital beds are sometimes used needlessly for patients who could just as well be taken care of elsewhere at much lower cost. On the other hand, hospital facilities are not utilized as efficiently as they should be, with the result that about one bed out of four is usually empty, and in some institutions the average occupancy rate is even lower. Low occupancy means a correspondingly heavier proportion of overhead in daily per patient costs.

Much wider use of hospital services and their greater costliness have been reflected, inevitably, in steadily climbing hospitalization insurance rates. As Blue Cross and other plans throughout the country have repeatedly been forced to seek premium hikes, growing attention has been focused on the urgent need for eliminating hospital inefficiencies and needless use of expensive facilities. An important point to bear in mind is that hospital costs are no longer solely the concern of patients and their families. With the phenomenal spread of health insurance, which now covers more than two out of every three Americans, the hospital bill is being underwritten by the healthy as well as the sick. This means that the public is more and more looking upon hospital costs not only in terms of charges for services rendered but also in terms of the monthly cost of insurance.

Rate hearings before State insurance commissioners have increasingly provided a platform for the critics of hospital efficiency and of the effect which the present health insurance system has upon it.

Such hearings in New York, Pennsylvania, and a number of other States have produced charges that the prevailing insurance approach lays too much emphasis on hospitalization, ignoring possibilities for more economical treatment of many conditions in the doctor's office or in outpatient clinics; that Blue Cross—and Blue Shield, its companion surgical-medical insurance program—have built-in incentives for getting between hospital sheets merely to take advantage of insurance benefits; that hospitals could do considerably more than they have been doing to keep down their operating costs; that because of the general lack of overall community planning and integration in the hospital field there is duplication and overlapping of personnel, equipment, and services; that much of the present organization of hospital services, revolving around the doctor as a private entrepreneur, has become inefficient in the context of the growing complexity of medicine and must be drastically revamped to take advantage of opportunities for greater productivity and lower costs; and that the public is not adequately represented in the management of the voluntary hospitals and the insurance plans.

The adverse effect of health insurance, which now provides the greatest share of hospital income, in relaxing many of the pressure for economy in hospital operations is emphasized in the report of the Commission on Financing of Hospital Care. The commission, sponsored by the American Hospital Association and made up of a distinguished group of authorities, concluded after a lengthy study that the emergence of insurance as a major factor in medical economics has "to some degree reduced, if not removed, incentives that would otherwise operate to encourage maintenance of hospital operating costs at the lowest level practicable."

The commission's report points out that prior to the extensive use of insurance, when people were required to pay the full bill directly to the hospital, there were "natural economic restraints" on costs, and lower-cost institutions providing services of equally good quality enjoyed a competitive advantage in attracting more patients. But with the introduction through insurance of "a new element in the relationship between cost and use of services," the report says, Blue Cross, as "the intermediary between the purchaser of hospital care and the hospital, must inevitably assume some functions previously the direct responsibility of patient or hospital."

One of those holding that "genuine economies can be made by hospitals without lessening quality of service," and that Blue Cross should insist on such economies instead of merely acting as a collection agency for the hospitals, is Francis R. Smith, Pennsylvania's dynamic State insurance commissioner.

Smith, who feels that his authority to pass on Blue Cross premium rates goes much further than the checking of actuarial tables, and extends to the things which pyramid costs, has for several years been preaching the doctrine that neither the hospitals nor Blue Cross have done all they can and should to control such abuses as unnecessary admissions and excessively protracted stays, and to put into effect other efficiency measures. And the commissioner has used his legal powers to enforce his views. In a series of trail-blazing decisions, he has ordered Blue Cross, and the hospitals in Philadelphia, and other cities, to adopt certain economy measures before any further insurance rate boosts would be granted. Among the economy possibilities, he has advocated are wider use of opportunities for outpatient diagnosis and treatment, tighter controls on the scheduling of admissions and discharges, and on length of stay, better scheduling of medical procedures to avoid needless delays, more effective use of technicians and nurses, sharing of specialized equipment among hospitals, and greater standardization of supplies along with joint purchasing.

Considerable progress has been achieved in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other Pennsylvania communities under Smith's prodding during the past 2 years. Blue Cross plans have developed medical review teams to ferret out abuse of insurance contracts. They have expanded their coverage of diagnostic services and home nursing visits, in order to cut down hospitalization. Hospitals have organized medical utilization committees to check on needless admissions and excessive stays. They also are moving to achieve greater management efficiencies and to coordinate expansion through joint planning.

While hospitals are a big enterprise, but not a business in the ordinary sense of that term, Smith said in a recent speech, "This does not mean that hospitals cannot be businesslike. More needs to be done in applying commonsense business practices and methods to hospitals—wherever they will apply."

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N.J*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N.C*
Alford, Dale, *Ark*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn* 4501 Conn. Ave.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Andrews, George W., *Ala* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N.Y*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N.J* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Barry, Robert R., *N.Y* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N.H*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont* 9 Dearborn Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Becker, Frank J., *N.Y*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Beermann, Ralph F., *Nebr*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo E., Jr., *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala* The Washington
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*
Bromwell, James E., *Iowa*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Brooks, Overton, *La* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* Alban Towers
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Bruce, Donald C., *Ind*
Buckley, Charles A., *N.Y*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio* 5540 Colfax Ave., Alexandria, Va.
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derounian, Steven B., *N.Y*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio* 800 4th St. SW.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* 2816 N. Jefferson Arlington, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N.Y*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* 319 Third St., SE.
Durno, Edwin R., *Oreg*
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa* 3725 Macomb St.
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Finnegan, Edward R., *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* 1133 House Office Building
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* The Congressional
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N.J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garland, Peter A., *Maine*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa* The Congressional
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Glenn, Milton W., *N.J* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* 3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George, *Ala* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Harding, Ralph R., *Idaho*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*
Harsha, William H., Jr., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* 1323 Barger Dr. Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N.Y*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S.C*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Holtzman, Lester, *N.Y*
Horan, Walt, *Wash*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa* 2120 16th St.
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johansen, August E., *Mich*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.* Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* 5906 Harwick Rd.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N.Y*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex* 4848 Upton St.
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N.C*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn*
Kyl, John, *Iowa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*

Appendix

Statement of Senator Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, on the 26th Annual Convention of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am delighted to report that the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, one of our Nation's outstanding veterans' organizations, will be holding its national convention this year in Atlantic City, N.J. I can assure each of its members who are planning to attend a warm and sincere welcome from our Garden State.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement outlining the plans for this, their 26th annual convention at Atlantic City, N.J. Various sessions of the convention have been marked to be held in various parts of the city, culminating Saturday evening in a gala convention banquet and ball at the Ambassador Hotel, Atlantic City, N.J.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE OF NEW JERSEY, ON THE 26TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The 26th annual convention of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America will have many serious aspects, varied and interesting recreational events have been arranged for the members of the organization, their wives and families. On Tuesday preceding the convention there will be a visit to the Atlantic City races with a fashion show for the auxiliary members and friends. On Tuesday evening there will be a Catholic War Veterans night at the Atlantic City Steel Pier. On the evening of the following day there will be an informal social night which will be held at the Ambassador Hotel, Atlantic City, N.J., for all Catholic War Veteran members and families.

Throughout the week there will be other interesting activities and ceremonies including a Catholic War Veterans night at Convention Hall, Atlantic City, N.J., at the 22d showing of the Ice Capades on Thursday evening. On Saturday morning a parade will take place on the boardwalk from the convention headquarters to the convention hall where a Pontifical High Mass will be celebrated by His Excellency Celestine J. Damiano, Archbishop of Camden, N.J. The closing event of the weeklong gathering will be the convention ball and banquet on Saturday evening with special Catholic War Veterans candelight ceremonies and rituals.

The convention will see reports of progress made by this national veterans' group in the fields of Americanism, Catholic action, leadership, membership, veterans' affairs, and youth welfare.

At various times throughout the convention, prominent Americans are scheduled to address joint sessions of the Catholic War Veterans and its auxiliaries. These men, all outstanding in their particular field, will bring to the Catholic War Veterans and through them to all veterans and Americans messages on "National Security," "Veterans' Affairs," "International Relations," and other vital subjects.

The Catholic War Veterans of the United States came into existence in the year 1935 when it was founded by a former Army chaplain, the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Higgins, LL. D., of Astoria, Long Island, N.Y. Recognizing a need for a militant veterans organization composed of Catholic men and women who served their country in time of war, Monsignor Higgins founded an organization that has grown throughout the years and now has posts in more than 40 States and in the words of its own constitution:

"To promote zeal and devotion for God, for country, and for home:

"(a) For God: to promote through aggressive organized Catholic action a greater love, honor, and service to God; an understanding and application of the teachings of Christ in our everyday life; recognizing the wisdom of the church in all matters of faith and morals.

"(b) For country: through a more vivid understanding of the Constitution of the United States of America and through active participation in the promotion of its ideals of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, develop a more zealous citizenship; to encourage morality in government, labor, management, economic, social, fraternal, and all other phases of American life; to combat aggressively the forces which tend to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions.

"(c) For home: To promote the realization that the family is the basic unit of society; to aid in the development of an enlightened patriotic American youth; to assist all veterans and widows and dependents of deceased veterans.

"(d) These objectives are encouraged without regard to race, creed, or color."

Throughout its existence the Catholic War Veterans has been part of the fierce war of ideologies seeking to capture the minds of men. This organization has spotted and fought totalitarian and brutalitarian philosophies of both the right and left, and stood firm on the solid stand of freedom of the individual and personal independence of its citizens, under the law.

The Catholic War Veterans creed from the now-famous speech, "Catholicism and Americanism," of the late Archbishop John Ireland, of St. Paul, Minn., states:

"My religious faith is that of the Catholic Church—catholicism, integral and unalloyed—catholicism, unswerving and soul-swaying, the catholicism taught by the supreme chieftain of the Catholic Church, the Pope, the Bishop of Rome.

"My civil and political faith is that of the Republic of the United States of America—Americanism, purest and brightest, yielding in strength and loyalty to the Americanism of none other American, surpassed in spirit of obedience and sacrafice by that of none other citizens, none other soldier, sworn to uphold in peace and in war America's Star-Spangled Banner."

The Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America have received many commendations from agencies in Government, in business, in welfare and hospital work, in rehabilitation, in child guidance, in patriotic, fraternal, veteran, and religious spheres. It has the approbation of the present Pope, John XXIII, and all Popes from the date of the founding of the organization. It is recognized by the Veterans' Administration in the handling of cases before it.

It has been commended by every U.S. President in office since its inception and received accolades of a great many American statesmen.

Programs have included summer camps for youngsters, informative material exposing fascism, nazism, and the cancerous core of Communist propaganda, broadcasts and information bulletins on veteran benefits, support of youth groups, establishment of scholarships, fight for veterans' rights, and the spiritual comfort of our comrades, proper burial for veterans and care for their widows and dependents, exposure of intolerance, bigotry, and disloyalty, promotion of activities which tend to strengthen the moral fiber of the Nation and its people, and build a "greater spirit of faith and patriotism."

The current program of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America is strictly positive. The Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America are not anti-anything; they are protagonists of right, truth, and justice. Their whole philosophy is based on the recognition of man's dignity and rendering "to God the things that are God's." They insist on the recognition of the moral basis, underlying all political, economic, and social themes.

Their emphasis lies in action. "It is better to light one candle than to curse the darkness." They feel that no program, no matter how magnificent, can be effective unless it is acted upon.

The less than three decades of Catholic War Veterans' existence have proved fruitful for our freedom. And the future of America is safe, when public-spirited, patriotic citizens who have fought for their Nation in war, continue to serve in peace.

The Catholic War Veterans is organized to serve the individual and the Nation. Size is not the measure of its service, its reputation, its loyalty, its faith or its spirit of fellowship.

As they celebrate that 26th anniversary milestone of their history, Catholic War Veterans take pride in their past—are confident of their future.

Watchdog of the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an edi-

torial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press for April 25 entitled "Watchdog of the Great Lakes." This editorial points up the significance of H.R. 6626 introduced by Representative ROBERT GRIFFIN, of Michigan. I sincerely hope that this House shares with all of us from Michigan a deep concern for preserving the purity of the waters of the Great Lakes which serve in so many ways millions of people in the bordering States.

The editorial follows:

WATCHDOG OF THE GREAT LAKES

Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, of Traverse City, appears to be making a name for himself in Congress as "Watchdog of the Great Lakes." He is now pushing a measure to bring these waters under the Oil Pollution Act of 1924 to prevent the dumping of oil wastes. This act now applies only to tidewaters.

This action follows his earlier interest in enforcement of regulations against refuse dumping by Great Lakes ships. The U.S. Public Health Service is warning all ship captains entering the St. Lawrence Seaway concerning these rules.

In these activities Representative GRIFFIN is seeking to control pollution of the lakes as much as possible to safeguard sources of drinking water, beaches and the waterway itself. In this he should have the support of all Great Lakes States, particularly his own, since Michigan has the longest shoreline of any of the States except Alaska and it is surrounded on three sides by these waters.

Pollution was a problem long before the seaway was opened. Now it is a greater problem than ever and in future years, as shipping gains with every season, it will be a vital matter to maintain the purity of the lakes as far as possible to preserve both recreational and economic advantages.

In earlier generations there was a tendency to consider Michigan's forests as inexhaustible. This complacency later led to a rude awakening. The same attitude concerning the preservation of Great Lakes waters could bring a similar reaction—too late.

Representing the heart of this great region, Representative GRIFFIN is admirably suited to be its conservation champion. He already has proven his determination to carry through—as in his labor reform battle of a year ago.

Investigation of Communist Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a recent editorial from the Pilot, the archdiocesan newspaper in Boston, ably discusses the need for balance in the investigation of Communist activities.

The editorial points to the proper role of anti-Communist activity and comments upon the damage done to the cause of anticommunism by the excesses of zealots and amateurs in the field.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE UNBALANCED VIEW

The longer one lives the more it becomes plain that balance is the rarest and perhaps the most precious of the intellectual virtues. It is what our fathers used to call wisdom, the ability to see the whole picture, the comprehensive view. Just as a little learning is a dangerous thing, so also a high enthusiasm can upset the balance of the total reality and the end product is excess.

Our reflections on this subject are prompted by the rash of publicity which has been flooding the press and news media generally on Mr. Robert Welch and his Birch clubs. In a world as complex as ours, simplification can be a vice and sincerity is no excuse for exaggeration. Nothing discredits a good cause quicker than supporting it by misrepresentation. When we feed the cause of genuine anticommunism with overstatement, we err just as badly as those who nourish communism itself by understatement. The evidence available seems to indicate quite plainly that this movement, with all kinds of good intentions allowed, is unbalanced, excited, and definitely out of focus.

The lessons which can be profitably drawn from such an endeavor—a good thing gone wrong—are many and should not be lost on thoughtful observers. In protecting ourselves against communism, we should be careful that we do not fall into evils almost as bad. It is possible to escape the dogs only to perish in the swamp. Moreover we must remember that we cannot rewrite history; it is fatuous to speak of returning to the simplicity of earlier times or to suggest carrying out the responsibilities of present day government with the machinery of the 18th century. We live in a real world with real problems which we must meet realistically; there is no place for hysteria, exaggeration, accusation, or misrepresentation in an authentic anti-Communist effort.

Unfortunately, people of good will and even prestige who wish to give their support to a genuine anti-Communist movement in the United States have very little to turn to, and it is not to be wondered at if some of them are caught up by the promises of organizations like the Birch clubs. Clearly, we need a highly estimable group of American intellectuals who could be relied upon to speak and act with a balanced view on communism and at the same time supply materials for study groups of adults and young people on this subject. Such an effort could intelligently channel the human resources of our country in the kind of anticommunism which is most effective. It would expose Communist patterns of operation and educate in Communist techniques, but at the same time, and most important of all, it would seek to remove those social ills on which communism thrives.

The excesses of Mr. Welch will have served us well, even if obliquely, if they remind us of our responsibilities in combating communism intelligently and by the use of those means which do not betray the very principles we have set out to defend. Anticommunism should not be discredited by the misplaced enthusiasm of certain anti-Communists; it should be reformed into that institutional expression which embodies our own ideals and demonstrates their clear superiority over the claims of totalitarianism. Until we have done this, and it is not easy to do, we will continue to be exposed to the efforts of amateurs whose good intentions cannot redeem their repeated errors.

Miss Ellen Titus Is the Winner of the Schenectady Area Spelling Bee, Conducted by the Schenectady Union Star, and Comes to Washington Next Month for the National Spelling Bee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have always been very much interested in spelling contests, not only because I remember taking part in them as a boy, but also because of the importance these days of spelling in providing a solid foundation for an effective education. On top of that, as all of us in this House are well aware, it is especially wonderful to win any contest that carries with it a trip to Washington.

For all these reasons I was most pleased the other day to learn of the success of one of my constituents, 13-year-old Ellen Titus, a student at Van Antwerp School in the town of Niskayuna in Schenectady County, in winning the Schenectady area spelling bee last week, conducted by one of the great family newspapers in my home city, the Schenectady Union Star. As a result of her victory, capped by spelling successfully the word "rescissible," Miss Titus comes to Washington next month to compete in the national spelling bee. I look forward to greeting her here and I wish her the very best of luck in this important championship contest.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include an article from the Schenectady Union Star of April 24, describing in detail the exciting sequence of Miss Titus' victory:

"RESCISSIBLE" IS THE WORD THAT WON FOR ELLEN TITUS

(By Ann S. Hamlen)

"Rescissible" is an uncommon word and an uncommonly tricky one to spell. Because she tackled it successfully, 13-year-old Ellen Titus, of Van Antwerp Junior High School, won the area championship in the 1961 Union-Star-sponsored Schenectady area spelling bee Saturday.

Her winning word means "capable of being rescinded."

Close to 900 spectators watched and applauded the 37 young experts who competed as finalists in a public spelldown at Union College Memorial Chapel. In addition to families, friends, classmates and teachers, the big, airy hall was well filled with persons who had no connection with the bee except a lively interest in an impressive display of skills and sportsmanship.

"INTERESTED OBSERVER"

One of the first to arrive, more than an hour early, was a man who said he was "just an interested observer."

Ellen, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Albert C. Titus, 2060 Grand Boulevard, won her laurels at the end of a 3-hour contest which was climaxed by a tense 45-minute duel with Patricia Reynolds of Draper Junior High School, 14-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Reynolds, 791 Curry Road, Rotterdam. Both girls are eighth graders.

Both also are superior spellers. For minute after dramatic minute they fielded such challenges as "meningitis" (spelled correctly by Patricia) and "interlocutor" (mastered by Ellen). When the tournament ended, thunderous applause greeted winner and runner-up alike for a truly spectacular demonstration of achievement.

Steve Fitz of WSNY was announcer-pronouncer for the bee, which was broadcast as it took place over WSNY. Judges were Dr. William M. Murphy, Union College English professor, chairman; Miss Margaret Walsh, head of the Mont Pleasant High School English department; Miss Marguerite Bostwick, Mohonasen High School English department head; and Joseph Porter, English teacher at Schalmont High School.

Words for the spelldown were taken from "Words of the Champions" booklets distributed by the Union-Star to participating schools for study purposes, and from Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, second edition.

THIRTY-SEVEN FINALISTS

Each of the 37 finalists appearing on the chapel stage Saturday was a school champion speller. They were chosen from among approximately 6,200 seventh and eighth grade pupils in nearly 270 classes. Eight boys and twenty-nine girls made it to the finals.

Winning through to the 11th of 12 rounds was 13-year-old Anna Hood, a seventh grader at Duanesburg Central School, who placed third. Judith Smith, a 13-year-old eighth grader at Fort Plain Central School, placed fourth, and 12-year-old Gail Shaffer, a Gilboa-Conesville Central School seventh grader, earned fifth place.

Paper Mate inscribed two-tone pens were presented each school champion at the close of Saturday's bee. As runner-up, Patricia also earned a $25 U.S. saving bond, while to Ellen went a complete, current set of the Encyclopedia Britannica, the Britannica's World Language Dictionary, a Zenith all-transistor portable radio, and her choice of a Paper Mate inscribed Mark IV pen or desk set.

Ellen now will represent Schenectady and its neighboring communities as a finalist in the 34th Annual National Spelling Bee, sponsored by Scripps-Howard newspapers. She will leave Schenectady May 31 to join 72 youthful spelling champions for several days of a specially planned program that will include sightseeing and other events, in addition to the national bee finals.

Roy Swanigan, West Virginia Legislator, Overcomes Handicap To Enjoy Fruitful Life—Operates U.S. Senate Subway Car

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, with the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped meeting today and tomorrow in Washington, D.C., it is an appropriate occasion to call attention to one of the Senate subway car operators who has overcome a handicap and is taking an active part in public affairs.

I refer to Roy Swanigan of Fayetteville, W. Va., who is a member of the house of delegates of the West Virginia Legislature.

Today's editions of the Washington Evening Star contains an interesting column by George Kennedy, who writes as "The Rambler," and depicts the story of Mr. Swanigan in a most stimulating manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the newspaper column to which I have made reference.

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

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 27, 1961]

THE RAMBLER IS TAKEN FOR A RIDE

(By George Kennedy)

Roy Swanigan, a young-looking man with brown hair, good complexion and a soft voice—not of the Deep South but with the slightly higher note of the hill country—operates one of the cars on the new subway to the New Senate Office Building.

He is a member of the West Virginia Legislature.

"We had a 60-day meeting in January and February," he said yesterday. "We went all out. We increased taxes and expenditures by about $30 million. West Virgina must advance. We also ratified the amendment giving the citizens of the District the vote."

He began work on March 30 after the biennial session. There will be a short session, 30 days, in January 1962. He has already arranged to attend it on annual leave.

He has not yet decided whether he will stand again in the 1962 primary election.

He is from Fayetteville, southeast of Charleston the capital of the State. Fayetteville is near the New River which flows into the Kanawha. The capital is in the valley of the Kanawha which flows into the Ohio. Fayette County is Democratic. The four Democrats leading the primary are sure to be elected to the legislature.

He was one of the 18 candidates in last year's primary—the same one which was so decisive in the selection of the Democratic candidate for President. He was first among the 18. It was his initiation in politics.

He had applied for this job 2 years ago—before he ran for the State legislature. But there was no place for him then.

Senators JENNINGS RANDOLPH and ROBERT BYRD were very helpful and especially Representative CLEVELAND BAILEY, of Clarksburg.

Mr. Swanigan is very well qualified for the job. For years he was an electrician for the New River Coal Co. He operated a motor in the mines pulling a string of cars loaded with coal blasted from the face. Like all jobs in the mine, an electrician is a member of the United Mine Workers.

There was an accident in 1955. Roy Swanigan fell below the cars and his legs were mangled just below the knees.

He did not lose consciousness and he was able to give himself some first aid by improvising tourniquets.

Four months later he was back on the job with artificial legs.

When asked about it yesterday, he jumped out of the car and walked briskly up and down the platform.

He said, "The physical rehabilitation people say I'm one of the best walkers in their experience.

"I don't know about that but I do know this. I am the only double amputee in the United States who is a licensed airplane pilot."

He produced a card to prove it. That wasn't necessary. Something about Roy Swanigan is insistent that anything he says is so.

"I've been with the New River Coal Co. for about 20 years. They are pulling in their operations. As an electrician I had charge of the motors and the powerplant in one part of the mine.

"They told me my job would be over April 1 of this year. An electrician with seniority would be able to take care of the operation."

Roy Swanigan, who is 41, now lives in Falls Church at 1438 Patrick Henry Drive with his wife and two children, an 18-year-old son and a 15-year-old daughter.

This conversation was gleaned going back and forth between the Capitol and the New Senate Office Building.

At the latter end, a distinguished-looking, gray-haired man boarded.

"Hello, Senator," said Roy Swanigan.

The Senator cordially acknowledged the greeting. When he alighted at the Capitol end, Roy Swanigan got out a little book of pictures of the Senators.

"That's CARROLL of Colorado," he said. "I know about 55 of them now. I've only been here 6 weeks. I will know them all pretty soon."

Americans Very Concerned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I enclose an editorial from the Washington Daily News, Washington, N.C., which I think is most timely. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the editor of this paper, Ashley Futtrell, for the clear and understandable manner in which he has pointed out the situation in Cuba and the obligation the Congress and the Government of the United States owe the people in an effort to prohibit the establishment of a communistic government on our eastern coast:

AMERICANS VERY CONCERNED

Americans in all walks of life have become vitally concerned with what is taking place in Cuba. This is not a sudden concern, but it has been one which has grown upon the people.

When Fidel Castro first came to power, Americans generally were content to sit back and pay scant attention to what was taking place at our back door step. Bit by bit, as Castro turned his island into a communistic fort, concern of rank and file Americans seemed to grow.

This concern has grown until today we wonder if the Kennedy administration is not somewhat behind the general feeling in the United States as to definite steps.

Ask the man on the street what he thinks we should do about Cuba, and he will express disgust and disdain at the situation. He will say immediately that we have put up long enough with Castro's actions, and that the time is past due for more concerted American action. President Kennedy minced no words last Thursday when he spoke before the editors of America. He told Russia America would tolerate no interference, and that for security reasons we could not allow Cuba to be a Communist satellite. That sounds most reasonable and Americans generally will stand behind the President in this crucial hour.

Americans do not want war. Somehow the feeling has existed for a long time that "we hope Castro will be overthrown by his own people." But how long must we keep hoping while Castro builds an ever stronger military camp there? With the help of

Russia, he can equip, train, and maintain quite a sizable force. And in all probability he is working toward that end right now—day and night.

For Russia to accuse America of fomenting the recent small invasion is to be expected. Russia says nothing about what she has given Cuba in the way of arms, guns, planes, tanks, and technical assistance. But she points the ugly finger at us and tells us "you are to blame," while at the same time trying to scare us off from any other help. We do not know how much help America has given to the Invasion. But it stands to reason that we have not given very much. After all any private in the U.S. Army knows full well that one division of American marines or soldiers, well trained, well equipped and with proper air support, could go into Cuba today and defeat Castro's army. And it could be accomplished quickly.

If we are in the business of offering wholesale help, then why has such a quick invasion failed? Surely it would not have failed if America had taken even a small part in the planning and execution of the invasion.

Within a matter of hours, America could take over Cuba now if she wished to do so. When charges are made, and when the defeat of the invading army is made to sound like an American defeat, it does give rise to serious thinking in this land of the free and home of the brave.

Americans today are vitally concerned, and they have a right to be.

U.S. Taxes Cost Hawaii $230 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HIRAM L. FONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I read with great interest that Hawaii leads 10 other States in the Union in contributions to the Federal Treasury.

In a bylined story in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, veteran newsman Frank Hewlett has written a succinct article noting Hawaii's rank in the Internal Revenue Service Report of 1960.

Mr. Hewlett, who now heads the Star-Bulletin's Washington bureau, is a former United Press correspondent and was the last war correspondent to escape from Corregidor at the outbreak of World War II.

I ask unanimous consent that this news report published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of April 21, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

U.S. TAXES COST US $230 MILLION

(By Frank Hewlett)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—Hawaii taxpayers shelled out $230 million to Uncle Sam last year for another record. It was $41 million more than in 1959.

A report issued today by the Internal Revenue Service shows Hawaii contributed more to the Federal Treasury in the calendar year 1960 than 10 of the States.

Furthermore, two Southern States which only a few years ago were far ahead of Hawaii are rapidly being overtaken by the 50th State.

Total internal revenue collections for Arkansas were $230 million and Mississippi $240 million compared with Hawaii's $230,589,000.

States with smaller Federal tax collections than Hawaii were Alaska, Nevada, Montana, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine.

A breakdown of the tax collections by the Honolulu Internal Revenue Service office showed: Corporation income and profit taxes, $41,530,000; individual income and employees taxes, $176,102,000; gift, excise and other miscellaneous levies, $12,956,000.

Our Immigration Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD, the text of a letter sent by Mr. Edward F. L. Bruen, chairman of the committee on American citizenship of the New York County Lawyers Association, to the chairman of the subcommittee on immigration of that committee. Mr. Bruen's letter reads as follows:

NEW YORK COUNTY
LAWYERS ASSOCIATION,
COMMITTEE ON
AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP,
March 28, 1961.

SAMUEL PAIGE, Esq.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Immigration, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. PAIGE: As you know from time to time I send comments to the chairmen of the subcommittees which I think should be in the hands of the entire committee.

I am sure you understand that I do not wish to in any way limit the scope or direction of your work. The following is submitted merely as thought provoking background material for the questions which are likely to come before our members.

Our present immigration and nationality law is the act of a sovereign power which could, of course, keep out all persons who are not citizens of the United States and deport any already within the country merely on the ground that they are aliens. This power was derived by the Federal Government from the people of the individual States. During its early history our National Government like the colonial governments had encouraged immigration largely because of the sparcity of the population on a great continent.

With the need for immigration no longer a practical requisite for survival or rapid development, there still remains a belief that neither our country nor people of other lands seeking U.S. citizenship would be the gainer by barring further immigration. This belief is generally shared by the patriot and all men of good will. We are, however, with the rest of the world experiencing in the United States a population explosion which reliable authorities have estimated will bring our population past 200 million by 1970 and 230,800,000 by 1980. Without any increase from foreign lands, for these new citizens to be born here, we will have to greatly expand opportunities for gainful employment.

There are some few people who have apparently so far detached themselves from the realities of distressed or depressed areas, critical shortage of proper housing, hospital, medical, educational and training facilities as to urge that the United States should adopt a policy designed to drain off the excess population of certain other countries. History shows that migratory movements are not the correct answer to overpopulation. The solution lies within the control of the over-populated countries. For the United States such a task would prove useless. The sovereign ship of state can refuse to take on more passengers for the sake of the comfort of those already aboard. It may keep loading until the safety point is reached; it may ignore the safety limit or it may take on those calculated to scuttle it. Neither of these last courses would be permitted by one loading a lifeboat regardless of whether he was hoping for rescue himself or planning to go down with the mother ship. What is best for the United States may be best for the world also.

The patriot's faith that his country will be the gainer by never closing the barrier would not be matched by his intelligence if immigration should be open to all. Some standards must be met. Guesswork and emotionalism are not proper bases on which to rest a sound immigration policy. The present law, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 163; 8 U.S.C. 1101) like most laws is not perfect. It is, however, an understandable standard for the open door. With this standard in effect well over 2 million, quota and nonquota, immigrants have been admitted to the United States during the last 8 years.

This law which like a tax law can never be popular in all quarters is based on the national origin quota system. The quotas are based upon the proportion of our people having a particular foreign national origin. If we look at the ethnological composition which has made our country the greatest on earth and enables us today to offer a better life to those of other lands, we can better understand the basic theory of this system. Our people have demonstrated that they can live together in comparative peace and harmony notwithstanding the fact that they originated in various proportions from different foreign countries. Similar proportions of quota immigration will not only tend to maintain our ethnological composition, but will promote a continuance of the peace and domestic harmony. While it is possible that our people could continue to live together in peace and harmony under different proportions of foreign national origins, no one can guarantee it, and only a few seem willing to risk it outside of the special interest and minority pressure groups who seem to be thinking largely in terms of the desire of the people they favor to immigrate, rather than the unbalance in people, economy, politics and other conditions it threatens.

There are advantages in having each quota computed under the identical formula. This mathematically fixes all quotas at one-sixth of 1 percent of each of our foreign national origin groups. No country knowing in advance what its quota, and that of all other countries will be from year to year, can offer just criticism. The fact that some foreign countries do not fill their quotas does no seem a valid argument for unbalancing the proportions further by admissions from countries whose quotas are oversubscribed. During the last 30 years Congress has consistently declined to accept this idea of jackpot, which would be a source of misunderstanding as a quasi-guarantee that the United States would receive immigrants to the total number of all the quotas. The basic reason for the failure of the "jackpot" bills in previous Congresses was that the scheme is based upon a misconception of the purposes of the quotas. Neither the quotas nor the total

thereof constitutes a number of immigrants the United States either needs or must have each year. They constitute the maximum number of quota immigrants we are presently prepared to receive from each country, whether we need them or not. On the other hand, there is no limit on the number of nonquota immigrants who may enter the United States annually, which is generally in excess of the volume of quota immigrants.

A strong theoretical case may be made for recomputing the quotas upon the basis of the various foreign national origins of the American people as shown by the census of 1960, instead of the 1920 census. The change would perhaps not be advisable in that there is serious question as to whether an increase in permissible volume of quota immigration is desirable. If the jackpot principle should also be applied, the increase could result in 1 million annually instead of the 2 million during the last 8 years. The only true nondiscrimination would be to give each country a quota numerically equal to or identical with that of every other, a system which no one advocates.

Like previous laws it characterizes citizens as native born and naturalized. The latter can lose his citizenship by reason of prolonged residence abroad while the former cannot. This has led to the hardly fair charge of second-class citizenship. A native-born citizen becomes such under our Constitution, which the people of the several States adopted at our national origin, by reason of birth whether he desires it or not. He therefore makes no promise regarding residence as a condition precedent to the acquisition of citizenship. An alien becomes a naturalized citizen on the understanding that he intends to reside permanently in the United States. A more valid charge of second-class citizenship can perhaps be made in that it permits the naturalized person not to agree to bear arms. Naturalized citizens should assume all the obligations of citizenship. Conscientious objectors should be granted exemption from combat military service without regard to naturalized or native-born status.

Another aspect of the act is that criticism with the interest of aliens in mind urges statutory appeal on visa applications. American consular officers abroad issue visas to those seeking entrance which administrative review of their decisions by the Secretary of State. The United States is the only country presently granting aliens access to its courts on a question of their right to enter the national territory upon arrival at a port of entry. It would seem only right that U.S. citizens who seek to enter foreign countries should be assured of receiving reciprocal rights by foreign countries by treaty if we are to give such statutory appeal to them.

Yours faithfully,

EDWARD F. L. BRUEN,
Chairman.

Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, many fine articles have been written about Kansas, as we celebrate our centennial year; but none has been more descriptive of the true picture of our State than an article written by John Bird, one of the editors of the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. Bird is a native Kansan; and he grew up in the midwestern part of our State. His family is one of the old, established families of Kansas; and, with this background, he was able to write a most excellent article. In it he describes the great growth and development of our State, the wealth of its natural resources, its people, their cultural background and mannerisms, and the great part the State has assumed among all the States of the Nation.

Kansas was the first State in the Union to establish a program of rural medical care. This program was established in 1949, during my administration as Governor of Kansas; and its value has been demonstrated by the fact that every community in the State now has a doctor, and most of them have hospitals and clinics.

This program set the pattern for other States in our Nation. Much credit for the program goes to Dr. Franklin Murphy, who at that time was head of the Kansas Medical Center.

Kansas people have always been progressive in ideas and spirit. It is truly a great State.

Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that the article is estimated by the printer to make two and two-thirds pages at the cost of $216, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

KANSAS, MY KANSAS

(By John Bird)

For some reason, my old home State of Kansas long has reminded me of a weather-toughened old dame, prim and frugal in her daily life, but on occasion likely to kick up her skirts in a raffish cancan. This may be at considerable variance with the standard personification of the 34th State as a calm, clear-eyed pioneer mother, but so be it. The old girl is doing some fancy prancing right now, commemorating her 100th birthyear with extensive hurrah and pagentry involving bush-bearded pioneers, gun-slinging cowboys and sheriffs, whooping Indians, painted dance-hall girls and, of course, that flaming old anti-slavery fanatic, John Brown.

When I heard of these festivities, it seemed fitting that I should revisit my native State and wish her many happy returns. True, after growing up on her high plains, I had spent most of my adult years elsewhere. Kansas was still on her bony knees in dust and depression back in the thirties when, along with many other of her surplus offspring, I had fled to gentler climes—and a steady job. But being born a Jayhawker is an incurable disease. Even after long exile the symptoms recur in the form of niggling memories of the vast sweep of Kansas landscape, the magnificant color of her skies, the hoarse, insistent voice of her winds and, perhaps most of all, the inconsistency of her behavior.

This last trait has caused Kansas to be much misunderstood and even maligned by obtuse outsiders. But to the likes of me, it made her far more alluring than if she were completely predictable and respectable. For the Kansas I fondly remembered was as capricious as her volatile weather. Her attitudes seemed to reflect the varied human strains which shaped her into a State—stringy New England abolitionists, hell-for-leather cattlemen, stolid wheat bringers from the steppes of Russia, ascetic religious sects and even a few free-thinkers seeking room for their free thoughts. With equal facility and affection Kansas mothered blue-nosed reformers and gaudy sinners, farsighted educators and bumptious ignoramuses, courageous statesmen and barnlot politicians, writers of great wit and nasty backhouse scribblers, pioneers in medical science and monstrous quacks. Many had this in common: They were individualists; they stood out against the flat horizon.

And perhaps most endearing, my old Kansas has a wonderful sense of humor—a wry one, to be sure, for her life was not easy. Long ago her settlers learned that the great rectangle of earth that is Kansas—about 200 miles wide and 400 long, 82,276 square miles, larger than Ohio and Indiana together—could not be easily subdued, but must be taken essentially as she was, with her droughts, tornadoes and blizzards as well as with her bountiful years and incomparable autumns when the harvest-flavored air was a joyful tonic. Often there was no choice in Kansas but to cry or to laugh—and to the State's everlasting credit she produced more wisecracks than sob stories. I fondly remember the news dispatch of the midthirties from Great Bend, reporting the worst dust storm of years and commenting, "Lady Godiva could ride through the streets without even her horse seeing her."

Thus fortified with memories, I flew to Kansas, rented a car and covered a mere 1,200 miles of the State's 125,000 miles of roads—the main ones are as good as any in the Nation, wide, straight and fast, speed limit 70 miles per hour, except on the Kansas turnpike where it is 80 miles per hour and no dawdling. I headed west, first through the rolling Flint Hills in the eastern third of the State. Local residents are quick to point out that this 4 million acre meadow is one of the last large blocks of true prairie left in the United States. "Lots of tourists still think they are in Missouri when they see these grassy hills and wooded valleys," a friend at Lawrence complained. The rest of the State is not pool-table flat, despite the impression it gives, but a gently swelling plain rising to heights of more than 4,000 feet near the Colorado border.

Some things were blessedly the same. In central Kansas I dropped in on my 97-year-old mother-in-law at her old limestone farm home, standing like a fortress on the prairie. She came here as a bride 76 years ago and here raised 10 children—I got the 10th. She was taking a delicious-smelling roast out of the oven and didn't look a day over—well 80. She was particularly anxious to know whether young Mr. Kennedy would be able to stand up to that awful Mr. Khrushchev. I said time would tell. Farther west, out in Ellis County, I visited my mother, in her early eighties, at her Big Creek farm, which she has run in exactly her own way for many years. She looked fine and recently had been out in the barn lot, helping a small grandson break a colt. "Don't you make anything out of that," she warned. "We hand-raised that colt, and he is as gentle as a kitten."

But almost everything else I saw or heard gave testimony of a fast-moving transition. At her century mark the once-embattled Kansas has become a well-heeled, full-figured dowager, rather smugly proud of her financial solvency, political cleanliness, and widespread but rather bland culture. As one longtime reporter in Topeka, the fast-growing State capital, put it, "There's just not much excitement any more. We're a prosperous and pleasantly stagnant State. Even the college kids are reactionary these days. Our politics are so honest it's pitiful."

Kansas now has a comfortable, gadget-ridden way of life which, in the opinion of some close observers, has "leveled upward."

There are some pleasant surprises for the visitor such as the jewel-like art museum in the little town of Lindsborg, population 2,300. It was erected in the memory of Birger Sandzen, a bold painter, wood carver, and lithographer of Plains and Rocky Mountain scenes; a fine collection of his work is lovingly displayed here, along with that of other, mostly modern Kansas artists.

But at the same time there is a feeling that, from a creative standpoint, the State has become too standardized. Oscar S. Stauffer, Topeka, dean of Kansas publishers, told me. "We're turning out good newspapermen, but they aren't as electric as they once were." Kansas writers, poets, artists, and sculptors are busy and much respected—but they aren't very well rewarded. A surer road to financial prominence is a chain of elevators to store surplus wheat or a flock of productive oil leases.

Kansas is especially desirous that outsiders should appreciate her material progress. As I traveled and looked and talked with a variety of citizens, a definite party line emerged. It was an answer at last to the vitriolic editorial "What's the Matter With Kansas?" published in the Emporia Gazette, which started William Allen White on the road to fame. He wrote it in 1896 when colorful Populist rebels such as "Sockless" Jerry Simpson and Mary Elizabeth Lease were bellowing calamity and urging hungry farmers to raise less corn and more hell. That 1961 reply is: "There's nothing the matter with Kansas."

Much of the evidence on the landscape, in the towns and in the ledgers appears to support the boosters' views. The State's record of well-heeled stability, especially since World War II, is indeed impressive. Total personal income for the State's population, now 2,178,611, has been running around $4,500 million and is well diversified. "We have become an industrial State," John H. Sticher, executive director of the Kansas Industrial Development Commission, told me proudly. "Over the past 10 years the cumulative total of payrolls has exceeded the total of farm net income by almost a billion dollars."

Kansas is still highly farm-minded, even though, as sharp-tongued John P. (Jack) Harris, editor of the Hutchinson News, says, "The yearning for industry has become almost an hysteria." The large, square-cut farms and ranches which cover the State are marvels of productive power, backed with science and hard-won skill. The old Dust Bowl? That area long has been green and the harvests abundant. The gritty ghost of the black blizzards was exorcised for good, Kansans believe, when a dry spell just as serious as that of the midthirties gripped the State for 5 years, 1952–56. Production sagged, of course, but there was no disaster, no exodus of dispossessed. Today's farmers use soil-conservation methods, they have drought-resistant crops such as the amazingly productive new hybrid grain sorghums, and greatly expanded irrigation facilities—all of which soften the impact of drought.

Kansas productivity and affluence are as obvious as her billboards. For much of my journey I was within sight of one oilfield or another, where the knob-headed walking beams of the pumps nodded up and down to one another like amiable storks. Each nod puts money in Kansas pockets; she is fifth among States in oil output, pumping up around $350 million worth of the stuff a year. In the wide, broad-bottomed Kaw Valley—running from Kansas City, Kans., to Manhattan—is a new wave of settlers, housed in attractive modern plants—such notable immigrants as Du Pont's Cellophane, General Motors (Buick-Olds-Pontiac), Hallmark Cards, and Goodyear Rubber Co. Out on the high plains the land spreads out like a god's checkerboard; here are great squares of Kelly-green winter wheat which make her the Nation's No. 1 producer of bread grain. On the skyline—like medieval castles—rise huge new grain elevators, built to guard a peculiar treasure; they store a total of 741 million bushels of wheat, much of it surplus, more than the output of two of the State's bumper crops.

At Manhattan my alma mater, once called Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, now has been officially renamed Kansas State University, and I needed a guide to take me around the glittering, proliferated campus. When I was a student there in raccoon-coat-and-flapper days, the enrollment was around 2,500, and the native limestone buildings were spired and arched, ivy-covered and shadowy. Today there are 7,500 students; new laboratories, dormitories, classroom buildings, and auditoriums have swarmed up to the hills where we once hid out for interesting experiments with thumbed beer. The new architecture is flatly modern—horizontal lines, bright abstract decorations, great expanses of glass. My first impression of these slick surroundings—designed for the utmost in comfort, correct lighting, and mood of color—was not a generous one. Frankly, I thought, This is too damned good for college kids.

But then I realized that I was an antique. Today's academic facilities may be plush, but the students make better use of their opportunities than did my generation. "The quality of students has improved strikingly in recent years," President James McCain told me. "About 82 percent of them ranked in the upper half of their high-school graduating class. These youngsters who come off the farms and out of the small towns know that many of them can't go back. They are serious. They want to be well prepared to compete anywhere in the world."

The emphasis on education in Kansas is traditional. The pioneers from New England were literate folk who believed that knowledge sets men free. There are 42 State-accredited colleges and universities in Kansas, and as a rule the schools are distinctly "of the people"—they do far more than teach. They react to the State's needs with a multitude of programs and services.

One of the most striking results of this service concept is the "medical renaissance," which has given Kansas a fine rural-medical system—so effective that Dr. W. Clarke Wescoe, chancellor of the University of Kansas, at Lawrence, told me seriously, "I would rather be taken acutely ill in a small Kansas town than in the middle of New York City."

This wasn't always so. Right after World War II, Kansas medicine was "worse off than in the old horse-and-buggy days," I was told. Many communities had no physicians and were unable to attract them. The suggested solution came in 1948 from brilliant Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, then the young dean of the medical school and later to be chancellor of the university. The plan itself was direct enough: (1) The medical school should train more doctors, nurses and technicians; (2) the communities should themselves develop the medical facilities, clinics and hospitals which would attract young doctors; and (3) the medical school, State medical society and State board of health should provide refresher courses and postgraduating training to keep the rural doctors up to date.

The Murphy plan was adopted and financed by the Kansas Legislature in 1949. By 1957, claim Kansas medical authorities, every community in the State had a doctor and most had hospitals or clinics.

To get a sample of this community medical service I stopped at Quinter, a crossroads town of 800 out on the high plains. And here I found a beautifully designed, community-built, 30-bed hospital, staffed by three well-trained young physicians. The doctors, Carl C. Gunter, Herman W. Hiesterman, and Richard L. Penfold, proudly showed me around, pointing out large and sunny rooms with such refinements as piped-in oxygen over every bed, a well-equipped operating room, a modern delivery room, and a nursery with special equipment to keep premature babies under controlled temperature and humidity. Construction will start this spring on a new wing, a 38-bed nursing home for the aged and chronically ill. "Then we'll have the whole works," one of the doctors said.

These doctors chose to practice in Quinter because of their experience in an unusual preceptor program, under which every K.U. medical student must spend 6 weeks as an aid to a practicing physician in a small town. "I served a preceptorship here in 1950," Dr. Gunter told me. "Dr. Hiesterman and I had decided in medical school that we would practice together, and I persuaded him to come here. Dr. Penfold preceptored here in 1955 and liked it enough to come back."

"We're organized so that one of us can be away for advanced study at any time," Dr. Hiesterman added. He took a year, during 1957 and 1958, for a residency in surgery in Lincoln, Nebr., and Dr. Gunter took a year of study in surgery at a Portland, Oreg., hospital.

The three doctors are much in favor, also, of the circuit courses offered by traveling teams of doctors from the K.U. Medical Center. These are monthly sessions presented at strategic localities throughout the State. "The last one covered the recent advances in diagnosis and treatment of cancer," Dr. Gunter said. "It's a sort of a continual updating process."

The young doctors are enthusiastic about smalltown life. No time lost between home and work, no traffic jams, plenty of good hunting and fishing and no problem to go after it, they pointed out. But such proximity has its hazards. Late one night Dr. Gunter, who lives just half a block from the hospital, was called in an emergency. He jumped out of bed and took a shortcut through a neighbor's back yard—where he connected abruptly with a new clothesline the neighbor had installed. "I was in worse shape than the patient when I finally staggered into the hospital," he says.

Perhaps Kansas' greatest virtue, in the eyes of conservative Jayhawkers, is her habit of living comfortably within balanced budgets. "Fiscal sanity," former Gov. George Docking called it. Whitely Austin, young editor of the Salina Journal, couldn't resist nipping editorially that many voters "might believe that it has something to do with the outhouse."

Docking, a hard-shelled banker, was one of those political mavericks which Kansas occasionally produces, a Democratic Governor in a traditional Republican stronghold. He was first elected in 1955 and was much admired for his wizardry with balance sheets. He also qualified as an individualist of the old stripe—a headstrong man with an explosive temper and a knack for searing comment. "George would get up to speak before a large, influential group and couldn't resist verbally jabbing them in the eyes with a burnt stick," one of his friends told me. He told teachers that they were underworked and overpaid and newspaper editors that they were more interested in selling advertising than printing the news. He took a bitter dislike to Chancellor Murphy, one of the most popular men in the State, and when Murphy resigned from K.U. last year to accept the chancellorship of the University of California at Los Angeles, Docking was accused of hounding the educator out of the State. The voters turned against Docking when he ran for a third term last fall—but were happy about the fiscal sanity, which left a surplus of $28 million in State funds.

John Anderson, Jr., the Republican who succeeded Docking as Governor, is a milder mannered type who isn't likely to set the prairies aflame in any great crusade. He came whistling up the stairway at the State capitol to meet me for a Saturday appointment and chanted a few choruses of "Nothing's the Matter With Kansas." He is a handsome, smooth-featured man, looking even younger than his 43 years, and formerly was State attorney general. He emphasized that there are no political bosses in Kansas. "The people run the politics," he said. "There has been no really effective machine for at least 8 years, not since the Republicans got into a big fight between two factions. That's when Alf Landon, who had been the Republican leader, became sort of like an old bull kicked out of the herd by the younger ones. But in any case, Kansas is no place for strong political machines—if one is built up, the people are quick to reject it."

The big issue in Kansas, he told me, was industrial development. "We're losing population from the farms and gaining it in the towns. We need to get more industries and jobs to ease this transition. We have great inducements. We can offer a central location, fine transportation, an excellent water supply, a great supply of oil and natural gas for fuel and a good industrial climate. The people who come off our farms know how to work, and they're willing to work."

His plans for Kansas? Nothing startling. No major reforms. "As any other State, Kansas has to keep its government in tune with the changes in society itself."

Kansas does have some worries—the readjustment she faces isn't easy. But her leaders seem most concerned about the image—their term, not mine—which the State projects to the rest of the country. It may be significant, for example, that some doctors now speak of the "Dodge City syndrome"—meaning the foot and leg wounds suffered by youngsters who shoot themselves while practicing quick draws with a loaded six-gun. Western atmosphere may be good for tourist trade, but Kansas officials want it known that they wear late-model business suits as well as cowboy boots and 10-gallon hats.

"Seriously, one of our main drawbacks is the peculiar idea of Kansas that is held in the East," said Dr. James Surface, Kansas-born, Harvard-trained young dean of the Kansas University School of Business. "People back there, sometimes people in influential positions, are inclined to think of this State as rather primitive, still exclusively devoted to ranching and farming." We were talking in his ultramodern office in brandnew Summerfield Hall, which has more glass than an aquarium. He had been stressing the opportunity offered research-based industries by the scientific brainpower and extensive laboratory facilities available at Kansas institutions.

This problem of a poor first impression is no new one. From the earliest days, casual visitors have given my native land a bad press. The first white-skinned tourist to look down his nose at her was Francisco Vasquez de Coronado, governor of New Galicia, Mex., who came here searching for the allegedly golden Quivira. What he found so disgruntled him that he strangled his Indian guide and complained in his report. "These provinces * * * are a very small affair * * * not any gold, nor any metal at all." I'm glad that the greedy conquistador was thrown out of office when he returned to Mexico.

The Great Plains suffered more badmouthing after the Louisiana Purchase, when the Federal Government sent Capt. Zebulon M. Pike to inspect some of its new real estate. In 1806 he crossed what is now Kansas and noted: "These vast plains * * * may become in time as celebrated as the sandy deserts of Africa." Daniel Webster didn't help, either, when he spoke eloquently, but with typical Ivy League myopia, against western-development plans in 1824: "What do we want with this vast and worthless area, of this region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts and shifting sands and whirlwinds, of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? I will never vote 1 cent to place the Pacific coast 1 inch nearer Boston."

That gives you an idea. The bloody struggle of Kansas to become a free State added to her reputation as a hard and nettlesome wench. She became a sort of mid-19th century Korea when a wavering Congress in 1854 backed away from the Missouri Compromise and left it up to the Territory of Kansas to settle the question of slavery for herself. Pro-slavery forces from Missouri swarmed into Kansas to terrorize free-soil settlers and to stuff ballot boxes. The abolitionists of New England organized the Emigrant Aid Society to send 20,000 free-State settlers a year to the territory. The area lapsed into anarchy and might well have fallen to the southern forces had not the fiery John Brown and other abolitionist zealots, such as James Montgomery and his Jayhawker guerrillas, forsaken the political niceties and turned to murderous retaliation. It wasn't until 1859 that a free constitution was ratified, and on January 29, 1861, President James Buchanan signed the bill admitting Kansas to the Union. By then the new State had enough New England settlers to mark it for generations with a stern Puritan conscience and, some say, more than a touch of Puritan hypocrisy.

Today certain Kansas scholars are more amused than perturbed by the warped impression their State casts on the TV screen, where some of her frontier marshals, sheriffs and badmen go through gallant, highly improbable maneuvers. Nyle H. Miller, the genial secretary of the Kansas State Historical Society, has been flooded with requests for information about them—even such fictional ones as Matt Dillon. He says, "These frontier lawmen certainly were a colorful lot, but they shouldn't be fitted with halos."

He points out, for example, that the much-televised Wyatt Earp actually was a lowly policeman in Wichita—and his most publicized fight there was with a fellow officer, for which he was fired and given a polite hint that he had better leave town or be jailed as a vagrant. In Dodge City Earp served as assistant or deputy marshal and during an out-of-office interim paid a small fine for clouting Frankie Bell, a dancehall girl, in the chops. Of James Butler (Wild Bill) Hickok, famous for his gunslinging in Abilene and Hays, Miller says, "his nickname should suggest that he was quicker on the trigger than he was in the head. At least once, in Abilene, he shot one of his own policemen."

The 1880 census of Dodge City lists the cane-carrying Bat Masterson as sharing a dwelling with Annie Ladue, 19, "concubine," while Bat's brother, Jim, then city marshal, was playing house with "Minnie Roberts, 16." Miller suggests, "Maybe that was the way they kept their eyes on juvenile delinquents." He also believes the TV producers are missing a good bet in Marshal Henry Brown, who pacified riproaring Caldwell, causing grateful citizens to present him with a gold-mounted Winchester rifle. A few days later a gang attempted to rob the bank at Medicine Lodge. One of the bandits was shot down—and turned out to be none other than good old Marshal Brown.

A key question in Kansas these days can be seen along the backroads where farmhouse after farmhouse stands abandoned, looking out dusty-eyed on a countryside that is largely empty of people. The farms have been mechanized, have consolidated into larger and fewer units. Kansas has been losing farms at the rate of 2,000 a year since the midthirties, now has about 115,000. The rural schools, community churches, and small villages—unfavored in the new scheme of things—have withered away. C. Peairs Wilson, dean of the school of agriculture at Kansas State, told me that farmers in the farm-management associations, sponsored by the university to encourage businesslike methods, now operate about 1,000 acres apiece.

How much bigger can farms get? "That depends on how much bigger machines can get," he said. "Also, on the limits of financing." Wilson pointed out that a 1,000-acre farm may easily require an investment of $200,000 for land alone. A young man with little capital hasn't much chance of starting for himself. "In fact, we may see the development of family farm corporations," he said, "both as a means of financing efficient-sized farm units and for transmitting the business intact from one generation to another." This had a peculiarly ironic ring for me, because back in the late twenties my father, the late John S. Bird of Hays, built up a system of large-scale, highly mechanized farms, operated under a corporate management, as a means of low-cost production of wheat. The farm politicians became alarmed by this efficient development, claiming it would "gobble up the land," and passed a law against farm corporations. Now there is talk of repealing that law.

On top of this technological revolution, Kansas agriculture has been plagued, in spades, with surplus crops, low prices and rising costs. Her gross farm income, divided about evenly between crops and livestock, has been running around $1,100 million a year—but the net farm income has been rising and falling like a roller coaster, with a downward trend. Where it ran in the $450 million to $500 million range in the early fifties, it was down to $411 million in 1960.

If Kansas farm leaders have any surefire answers to the farm problem, they didn't tell me. Consistently increasing crop yields have offset Government acreage-control programs. "We have learned how to produce," said Roy Freeland, secretary of the State board of agriculture. "Now the question is, Can we learn how to market it?"

The wheatgrowers of the State are trying to learn just that. In cooperation with growers in other wheat States they have set up a farmer-financed Great Plains Wheat Inc., headed by Clifford Hope, retired U.S. Congressman and longtime member of the House Agricultural Committee, and have set out on a worldwide market-development program. "Our aim is clear cut," said Hope. "It is to dispose of every possible bushel of wheat at home and abroad and to develop new uses and outlets." The growers have set up offices in many parts of the world, have sent teams of experts abroad to seek out new markets, have helped close soft-currency sales of surplus wheat to needy countries, have improved wheat grading and originated new wheat products and have undertaken nutrition programs to persuade Asiatic peoples, such as the Japanese, to develop a taste for wheat as well as rice. They can't measure results yet, but believe they are contributing to increased exports.

Nor is the industrial theme song without some sour notes. "Our eggs are still in too few baskets," Dean Surface puts it. "We have developed a huge aircraft industry, for example, but it's almost as up-and-down as our agriculture." And down in Wichita, a traffic-heavy city of 254,000, I saw what he meant. Here, thanks to several early birdmen such as Clyde Cessna and Walter Beech, Wichita-made aircraft are flown all over the world. For the past decade, well over half of the general type—private and executive—of airplanes produced in the United States

have rolled off the assembly lines of the Cessna and Beechcraft plants. "This business has doubled in the last 5 years, and we expect to beat this record in the next 5," said Dwane L. Wallace, the long, lean aeronautical engineer and onetime racing pilot who heads Cessna.

But the great Boeing Wichita plant, devoted to military aircraft, is feeling the effects of the shift away from manned bombing planes. Its work here on the eight-jet B–52H will be completed in mid-1962. Boeing's payroll, once at a peak of around 40,000, now is down to 20,000. Although Wichita has succeeded in attracting some new industry, such as a hotel-furniture manufacturer, the town is feeling a pinch as surplus aircraft workers look elsewhere for jobs.

In many ways Kansas is looking inward at her colorful past during this centennial year, but the younger generation of Jayhawkers have many close-at-hand evidences that they are part of an uneasy world. The message is writ in the immensity of the Kansas skies by the white contrails of the nuclear-bomb-carrying B–52's which take off from airbases in Kansas. It is seen in a new kind of "silo" being dug by the dozens in her flat, black soil, not to store feed for livestock, but as undeground nests for intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Nowhere is the irreversible march of the times more clearly symbolized than in the neat, reformed old cowtown of Abilene, where in 1910 young Dwight David Eisenhower, living on the wrong side of two sets of railroad tracks, wrote his Senator seeking an appointment to either Annapolis or West Point. Today that section of Abilene is much visited by people from all over the world. Not far from the old Eisenhower family home is a reconstruction of Old Abilene, a small but realistic reminder of days when herds of longhorns, up from Texas on the Chisholm Trail, met the railhead here, and the six-gun was the law. Next door to the white frame house where a future general and President grew up stands the monumental Eisenhower Museum, crammed with the personal mementoes of a Kansas boy who went a-soldiering.

"Fortunately, the Eisenhowers never threw anything away," said J. Earl Endacott, former Abilene schoolteacher and now executive director of the Eisenhower Foundation, which operates the museum. "Right now we're sorting out the deluge of material from the White House."

Across the street is being completed a huge new library to house the Eisenhower presidential papers and documents. But more poignantly expressive than these multimillion-dollar marble structures is the worn and frugal home, innocent of modern push-button conveniences, speaking simply but powerfully of the human values which produced one of the world leaders of our times.

As I got ready to say goodby to my old State, I realized more than ever that my newspaper friend in Topeka was right—the old rugged flavor had faded. In today's Kansas there would be no place for a Carrie Nation, who when jailed in Wichita for throwing rocks at a saloon picture of Cleopatra, buck-naked at the bath, declared, "You put me in here a cub, but I will go out a roaring lion, and I will make all hell howl"—and did. The puritanical influence has mellowed; prohibition, which Kansas pioneered in 1881, was repealed some years ago, and liquor stores are plentiful.

Even the Kansas newspapers, once noted for their crusading, independence, and earthiness, have toned down. True, I found the Emporia Gazette encouraging its readers to argue, sometimes in verse, about the odors wafted into new suburbs by large cattle-feeding yards. Other editors around the State were chuckling over "the cow-plop war." From my own tender years as a printer's devil on the Hays Daily News I recalled exciting occasions when irate subscribers, differing with the editor's mordant views, came storming into the office and threatened to whip him. He was, necessarily, a nimble man. But now—"The old fighting-newspaper tradition is largely dead," said Jack Harris. "Most editors are too interested in the business side these days, too conservative, too afraid to offend."

Another editor returned the compliment by saying, "You know, just about the time we think Jack is ready for some nice award, he goes off the reservation and kicks everybody in the teeth."

The real truth, it seems to me, is that Kansas really isn't in a fighting mood these days, having very little to fight about. And that lifts an old, old burden from my conscience. This thought came to me when I was leaving my old home town and drove past the public school where, in the fifth or sixth grade, we small fry were required to memorize a poem, "The Call of Kansas," which ran, in part:

Sweeter to me than the salt sea spray,
The fragance of summer rains;
Nearer my heart than these mighty hills
Are the windswept Kansas plains.

I had always felt a bit guilty—as had that poet—about leaving Kansas, as though deserting a battlefront in favor of some balmy shore. But now I know that the State is getting along very well indeed without me.

Quakers Buck Kinzua Dam, Stir Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial that appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on April 25, 1961, regarding the Kinzua Dam project on the Allegheny River, which expresses my sentiments.

It is my fervent hope that this administration will take a hard look at this project:

QUAKERS BUCK KINZUA DAM, STIR CONSCIENCE

The Quakers, old and steadfast champions of the causes of the American Indians, have launched a last-ditch appeal to the Federal Government for an independent review of the Kinzua Dam project on the Allegheny River.

Entry of the Society of Friends—popularly known since Colonial times as the Quakers—into the effort to preserve for the Seneca Nation the tribal lands along the Allegheny may be specially effective. For in 1794, four Quakers from the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends responded to an invitation from both the Senecas and the U.S. Government to participate in negotiating the Pickering Treaty, signed by President George Washington, under which the lands were set aside "forever" for the Senecas.

The Society of Friends thus has an historical association with the white man's obligation to the Indians which would be broken unilaterally if the Kinzua Dam is built without the Senecas' consent. It may be that President Kennedy will intervene to suspend the Kinzua project pending a review if the intervention by the Quakers stirs popular appreciation of the "sacred" nature of the pact entered into in 1794.

Over the weekend, the Indian Committee of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends designated Walter Taylor, national representative for the American Indian program of the American Friends Service Committee, to coordinate a new program designed to persuade the President and other Federal authorities to halt the Kinzua project. It was pointed out that Basil Williams, president of the Seneca Nation, has written to President Kennedy stating "we will abandon our opposition to the Kinzua Dam if and when it is shown by competent, objective evidence that a feasible alternative does not exist."

President Kennedy is confronted with many problems more grave than that of the Indians living along the Allegheny. But we submit that no U.S. obligation is more solemn or more demanding of his thoughtful attention as Chief Executive than the treaty of 1794 by which the Senecas assured a struggling new government of their support when they were being wooed by a foreign power to harass the United States.

These times and the intervention of the Society of Friends surely are auspicious in the Indians' behalf. Foreign powers again strive to destroy us. And entry of the Society of Friends into the Kinzua controversy should call to mind with a stab of conscience for every other honorable American a celebrated picture: Benjamin West's painting of William Penn, the Quaker, treating with the Indians for the peaceful settlement of the Colony of Pennsylvania. Unilateral abrogation of the 1794 treaty will mock all such recollection of our American heritage.

Beating Us With Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, many of us are extremely interested in the legislation introduced by our colleague, Representative ROBERT GRIFFIN, concerning the operation of our Federal tax laws pertaining to certain municipal bonds.

The editor of the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press comments on Mr. GRIFFIN's bill in an editorial of April 18 entitled "Beating Us With Federal Taxes." The bill is H.R. 6368, and under leave to extend my remarks I include the editorial:

[From the Grand Rapids Press, Apr. 18, 1961]

BEATING US WITH FEDERAL TAXES

Michigan and those other States that have been losing industries to the South can't do much about preventing communities in that part of the country from using local tax concessions to lure new industries. But they can do something about preventing Mississippi, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and other States from making it possible for new industries to beat the Federal income tax, and thus using this as an inducement for industries to relocate within their boundaries.

What Michigan and the other victims of this practice can do is support the bill introduced in Congress by Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, of Traverse City. GRIFFIN'S bill is intended to prevent any industry from

deducting from its taxable income the rent it pays on an industrial plant financed by municipal bonds. The income from such bonds is not taxable under Federal law.

GRIFFIN, however, has rightly insisted that permitting communities to use their tax-free bonding powers to build factories for new industries is contrary to the intent of the law. "Such practices," he declares, "amount to cities selling out their income-tax-exemption privileges (on the bonds) to private corporations." It is not the cities that are escaping Federal taxation in such cases but private industries. These industries are competing with other industries that must pay the full income tax.

Actually what is happening is that those communities that do make it possible for industries to claim an income tax deduction for rent paid in such instances are forcing industries in other States to carry an undue proportion of the income tax load. Industries that do not have to pay the full income tax are able to sell at lower prices than their competitors in, for instance, Michigan. Our competing industries, therefore, are being squeezed by having to pay higher taxes and meet lower prices.

This is the second year that GRIFFIN has tried to close this tax loophole. Last year his proposal got through the House but was dropped when House and Senate conferees met to iron out differences in House and Senate bills. This year Michigan's Senators should see to it that a similar provision is made a part of the Senate bill; and they should be prepared to fight for its adoption.

Research on Health Effects of Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Public Health Service made an announcement a few days ago that under air pollution legislation of the Federal Government now on the books a major research project has been undertaken in southern California, in which the University of Southern California and the Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District will jointly do research on the effects of air pollution from automobile exhausts on laboratory animals.

The Public Health Service announcement goes on to say that this study represents the largest research effort of its kind yet undertaken in the field of air pollution.

Mr. President, I commend the Public Health Service for undertaking this highly important research project under legislation we in the Congress fashioned. Meanwhile, I suggest the need for strengthening the hand of the Federal Government in the effort to cope with the problem of air pollution, because as time goes by, as has been thoroughly demonstrated in discussion after discussion in the U.S. Senate and across the country, the problem becomes more menacing and grows larger.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Public Health Service announcement be printed in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

A major research project is now underway which should add valuable information to what is known about the health effects of air pollution, the Public Health Service announced today.

The study is a joint project with the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District, and the University of Southern California to observe the effects on laboratory animals—mice, guinea pigs, and rabbits—of breathing the same air breathed by people in Los Angeles County. The contaminants of primary interest are those specifically associated with automobile exhaust—hydrocarbons, oxidant, carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen, and certain particulates.

While the test animals breathe the air at special sites located at varying distances from the heavily traveled throughways, a control group of similar animals will be living in purified air from which contaminants have been removed.

The study represents the largest research effort of its kind yet undertaken in the field of air pollution.

Commenting on the agreement today Dr. L. Otis Emik, Division of Air Pollution, Public Health Service, stated: "In this field of study we have long needed careful observations of the effects on laboratory animals of precisely the same exhaust contaminated air which people breathe. These observations may give us the opportunity to observe in animals, during short periods of time, effects which in human beings might take decades to occur."

Under the terms of the research contract, S. Smith Griswold, director, Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District, will direct the establishment of 4 stations at which pollutants will be monitored and animals studied. The initial contract, at a cost of $152,000 will cover the establishment, operation, and maintenance of these stations until June 15, 1961.

The University of Southern California will furnish and operate facilities for housing the exposed and control animal colonies, on the grounds of the University Medical School and at sites provided by the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District. The work at the University of Southern California will be under the general direction of Dr. Leslie A. Chambers, director of the Allen Hancock Foundation. Members of the faculty of the Medical School who will participate include: Dr. Paul Kotin, assistant professor of pathology; Dr. Oscar J. Balchum, assistant professor of medicine; Dr. John Mehl, chairman of the department of biochemistry.

Transportation in Interstate Commerce of Alcoholic Beverage Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised and encouraged by the Carolina Christian Union, Jesse Seaver, president, to enter for the RECORD their stand in support of H.R. 2221.

This bill has been introduced by the Honorable Eugene Siler, of Kentucky. The purpose of the bill is "to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes."

I have personally received a list of 284 genuine signatures, all of which endorse the Siler bill. Most of the signers are of my constituency in the First Congressional District of North Carolina.

I take this opportunity to make known the stand of the Carolina Christian Union officially for the RECORD.

GSA Plans To Place a Customhouse in Sargasso Sea of Traffic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, more than two-thirds of the total land area of central Los Angeles is either roadway or parking lots. This is necessary—indeed, it is not enough—because of the dependence of Los Angeles on auto transportation. But many people believe the saturation point has just about been reached. Charles Luckman, the eminent architect, has suggested in a study that central Los Angeles may eventually strangle in its own traffic, with cars locked bumper to bumper and unable to move. Right now, during rush hours, this is not so far from reality.

Yet, the GSA has proposed to build a new customhouse and Federal office building, which would be the largest office building in Los Angeles, without making a provision for one single off-street parking space for private automobiles of employees or persons doing business in the building. The Southern California Architects Association has protested the building because of this lack of provision for parking. As a matter of fact, the new Federal building would not only add to parking congestion without contributing new facilities, it would actually subtract from parking facilities now in existence. The new Federal building is scheduled to occupy two blocks just off the Santa Ana Freeway. The entire area of one of those city blocks is now a parking lot. The importance of parking to central Los Angeles was underscored by S. S. Taylor, general manager of the Los Angeles Traffic Department, who recently declared:

> Unless an integrated transportation system operates inside the loop of freeways that will surround downtown Los Angeles in 1962, the freeways will destroy the city they were meant to serve. The traffic capacity of the freeways is dependent upon the accessibility and capacity of streets and parking spaces in the terminal areas. A freeway system without parking is like a railroad without a station. It is clogging at the entrances and exits that threaten these great arteries.

Yet the GSA proposes to build a customhouse in the Los Angeles Civic Center that has not merely inadequate, but no provision for offstreet parking. Fur-

ther, the customs service proposes to operate trucks in and out of this building with the further congestion they will cause on access roadways and on the freeways themselves.

There is a sensible solution. Build the Federal office building if it is really necessary, but separate customs headquarters from the building. Put the customs facilities in the harbor where they belong anyway. Use the space saved for parking.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Watertown, N.Y., Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on April 22, the Watertown Daily Times celebrated its 100th anniversary. The Times, which is the largest daily newspaper published in northern New York, has a national reputation as one of the outstanding newspapers in the country. That reputation is richly deserved. Its vigorous international and progressive viewpoint, enlightened approach to journalism, and long record of public service and leadership have made the Watertown Times indispensable to our New York State life. Its editorials have often been brilliant and statesmanlike documents of our times. I am happy to say also that the Times has an outstanding representative in Washington in Alan S. Emory, who has been its correspondent since 1951.

In bringing to the attention of the Senate the 100th birthday of the Watertown Times, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Times' anniversary edition, as well as letters from President Kennedy, Vice President Johnson, and Governor Rockefeller.

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

ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF THE TIMES

When the first daily newspaper, the Daily Reformer, was printed in Watertown on April 22, 1861, it editorially commended that, "We have reluctantly embarked in the enterprise of publishing a morning daily." That first editorial likened the paper to a merchant who must serve the customers what they desire. It further reasoned that, "Now in this time of national peril the people want the news hourly and will have it, if procurable, two or three times a day." Perhaps this was a somewhat hesitant launching of a new enterprise. Certainly that first day was not inaugurated in anything like the manner that new business is launched today. In fact, even the celebration of this newspaper's 100th birthday probably would not be understood by those who celebrated the first day of publication so quietly and perhaps without much enthusiasm.

The Reformer was almost 10 years old as a weekly before it became a daily. It continued for almost 10 years, known as the Reformer, before it became the Times, its name for the past 90 years. The reluctance to make a complete break with the past is demonstrated by the fact that even when the Reformer and Times continued as a daily, the Weekly Reformer was still printed for many years as an adjunct.

The news which the public was described as wanting hourly was that of the Civil War. Looking backward, one cannot help but give a certain amount of emphasis to that word "procurable," for the business of procuring the news in that day was principally that of a close reading of the mail and a reprinting of what other newspapers far away were printing as their news stories. The only original information and writing was in the editorial column, and even on occasion the editor found that he either lacked the time or the inspiration to write every day. That, however, was not a weakness of the first daily newspaper in Watertown. It was characteristic of all papers of the time. Just as perhaps today's characteristics are that there be the fullest kind of comment and the broadest kind of news coverage.

In that first editorial there was clearly a pledge "to respond faithfully to the high toned demands of an intelligent public for news and wholesome reading." That is the key to the 100-year longevity of this newspaper. For regardless of the editors, of which there have been quite a few, each tried to meet the demands of an intelligent public for news and wholesome reading.

This kind of ideal, together with the individual editor's interpretation, made this newspaper succeed. Its greatest success probably occurred between 1900 and 1930. For that was the period in which it competed with another daily, the Watertown Standard, a struggle that lasted through those prosperous decades. Most significantly the competition ended not in the depression of the thirties but in those months just before the Nation's economy began to falter. This was a newspaper battle that had gone on with bitterness and vindictiveness to the point that one adversary made his decision to sell out. This is not to recount the battles of that day, but there are at least three inheritances in 1961 from that period.

The first inheritance is city manager government for the city of Watertown, an issue that the Times fought for against the opposing newspaper. There is a municipal street lighting plant for Watertown, similarly the materialization of an issue that was fought and won by the Times. Finally, the third inheritance is the Times itself, and some of the material assets that this newspaper has added to this community.

Make no mistake about it, if that battle had not been won in August of 1929 by the Watertown Times, this newspaper probably would not be in existence today. It had no substantial resources as a result of the national prosperity that encompassed the country up to 1930. It possessed, however, a fierce desire for political and economic improvements for Watertown and northern New York. It did not possess economic connections. So had the depression begun with two newspapers in Watertown locked in harsh combat, the winner might well have been the Standard that did have access to financial resources. It had lost money, but the losses were made up for many years in an effort to beat the Times; editorially to contest the liberal political attitudes, whether in municipal affairs or State affairs.

Every so often there have been examples in history of idealism triumphing over economic realities. The moment sometimes is a fleeting one which must be prepared for and capitalized upon quickly and irrevocably. That moment did occur in the case of this newspaper's history when suddenly the financial backer of the Standard decided that further losses in a struggle against the Times were wasteful and unrealistic.

So this newspaper, 2 months before the official signal of world depression, became the sole daily newspaper in Watertown. But the responsbilities upon the Times in this new role were even greater in the eyes of its editor than the desirability of a restrictive consolidation. The Times immediately opened up its news columns. The editor concluded that the Times should meet all the newspaper needs of this community. Readers had to have the satisfaction that the Times was striving to be a better paper than the two that it succeeded.

Thus throughout the 1930's, in spite of the depression, the Times became a bigger and more complete paper with wider and wider circulation. It grew in the 1930's and that growth continued in the 1940's and the 1950's.

Part of the expansion was in radio, both here and in Massena; then came television, the Times owning the three stations. The culmination of 100 years is this new building with the printing press which just has been opened. That printing press is the first brand new printing press ever owned by this newspaper. And there is more to come in the construction of a second new building which will lead to the abandonment of the 100-year-old property on Arcade Street.

Today all these things have been possible through the vigor of this newspaper and the transfer of some of this vigor to its other enterprises. Yet the common ingredient throughout the growth and expansion of 100 years has been news which has been written and edited in an effort toward faithful response to the intelligent public.

This proper handling of news has resulted in the success of today. Future success will only depend upon the continuance of a faithful news response to the demands of an intelligent public.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, March 11, 1961.

Mr. JOHN B. JOHNSON,
Editor and Publisher, Watertown Daily Times, Watertown, N.Y.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I understand that on April 22 the Watertown Daily Times will celebrate its centennial. I certainly want to add my greetings and to express my congratulations.

The Watertown Daily Times has long been recognized as an outstanding journal throughout our Nation. I know it must give you a great sense of satisfaction to look back upon so many years of achievement and service to the community and to the country.

Sincerely yours,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

STATE OF NEW YORK, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, April 17, 1961.

MR. JOHN B. JOHNSON,
Editor and Publisher, Watertown Daily Times, Watertown, N.Y.

DEAR JOHN: The 100th anniversary of the Watertown Daily Times, one of the outstanding newspapers of New York State is decidedly an event for enthusiastic celebration. One would like to have known Beman Brockway, who was already an editor of distinction and a State legislator when he went to Watertown in 1860 to join Lotus Ingalls and L. N. Stowell in the publication of the New York Weekly Reformer.

It took a lot of nerve to turn the Reformer into a daily paper at that time in the country's affairs, especially as Watertown, though starting to grow, had a population of but 6,000. One cannot resist a feeling of nostalgia over the fact that it was started with a capital of $700, $500 of which was borrowed.

The same qualities, with the 20th century complexion, were present when Harold B. Johnson of Gouverneur joined the staff of the Watertown Daily Times in 1904 after journalistic experience in Oregon and Montana.

When he joined the staff, the circulation was little more than 5,000. By the end of his regime it had risen to more than 40,000.

Today, under your able leadership as editor and publisher, the Times is forging steadily ahead to meet the increasing challenges and complexities of the sixties.

I am happy to join with your associates and colleagues in Watertown in saluting you and your able staff, and I hope and am confident that the Watertown Daily Times will score even greater successes in the second century of its history.

Sincerely,

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 4, 1961.

Mr. JOHN B. JOHNSON,
Editor and Publisher,
Watertown Daily Times,
Watertown, N.Y.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I am delighted to learn that the Watertown Daily Times will celebrate its centennial on April 22.

The Watertown Daily Times has set an enviable record of community service throughout the years. It has taken a vigorous role in the clarification of both local and international issues, and it has earned a wide reputation not only in northern New York but throughout the country.

I want to extend to you and to all the members of the staff my warmest greetings on this occasion.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

A Bill Worth Passing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial appearing in the April 24, 1961 issue of the South Bend Tribune, of South Bend, Ind., entitled "A Bill Worth Passing":

A BILL WORTH PASSING

State and county wefare departments are watching with interest and understandably hoping that Congress will not turn a cold shoulder on a bill introduced by Representative WINFIELD K. DENTON, Democrat, of Evansville, Ind.

DENTON is proposing a Federal "runaway pappy" law that would authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to track down deserting fathers who cross State lines to escape support payments to their families.

Despite reciprocity agreements between States, welfare departments face no end of difficulties in forcing the "runaway pappies" to meet their family responsibilities. In the first place it is often difficult to find them. The FBI could lend valuable aid in this respect because its investigations are not hampered by State lines.

DENTON'S bill proposes that any individual who, to avoid compliance with a support order, shall travel or move in interstate or foreign commerce from the State in which the proceedings have been instituted * * * shall be punished by a fine of not more than $2,500 or by imprisonment by not more than 3 years or both.

Wilmer Tolle, director of the St. Joseph County Department of Public Welfare, says the very existence of such a law would have great psychological value.

Noting that under the Dyer Act the FBI locates the thieves of stolen cars, Fred H. Steininger, Lake County welfare director, asks this pertinent question:

"Why should the FBI not be asked to locate deserting parents?" Answering his own question, he says, "Surely the crime of deserting a family and doing it with impunity by crossing a State line is much more serious than stealing an automobile and crossing a State line."

There is logic in that observation.

A law such as DENTON proposes has much to recommend it. It would be a sturdy club in the hands of welfare departments in their efforts to compel deserting fathers to meet their responsibilities to their families. Even if it were only moderately successful in achieving the ends for which it is intended it would be a boon to taxpayers who shoulder the burden the runaway fathers shed. Congress should be disposed to give the Denton bill careful consideration.

Prof. Arthur Burns Analyzes the Administration "Gap" Theory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Burns, professor of economics at Columbia University and the president of the National Bureau of Economic Research, recently addressed the 10th Annual Conference of Business Economists at the University of Chicago. In his speech, Professor Burns comments on the "gap" or stagnation theory of economic analysis that has been put forward by the Kennedy administration's Council of Economic Advisers as an explanation of recent economic developments and guidelines for future economic policies. Because of the importance of this subject, I would like to insert this speech of Professor Burns at this point in the RECORD:

THE NEW STAGNATION THEORY AND OUR CURRENT ECONOMIC POLICIES

In discussing so large a topic as our current economic policies, one must make a choice. I have decided to concentrate less on the policies themselves than on their theoretical foundations. Policies are always based on some theory. What I shall chiefly try to do, therefore, is to examine the economic theory that underlies the major economic policies of the new administration.

This task has been made relatively easy by the policy statement submitted by the council of economic advisers to the joint economic committee on March 6.

The council's theory can perhaps be conveyed best by reading a few excerpts. According to the council, the American economy today is beset not only with a recession, but with persistent slack in production and employment, a slowdown in our rate of growth. Further, according to the council, economic recovery in 1961 is far more than a cyclical problem. It is also a problem of chronic slack in the economy—the growing gap between what we can produce and what we do produce. Especially since 1955, the gap has shown a distressing upward trend.

The essential point of this theory is that, quite apart from the recession, there is increasing slack in our economy; there is a growing disparity between actual and potential output; in short, America faces a problem of secular stagnation.

The Council informs us that "the problem of unused potential becomes continually more urgent." The gap between actual and potential output has not only been growing, but has become very large. The gap is said to have been $32 billion for 1960 as a whole. Using annual rates, the gap is estimated at $40 billion for the fourth quarter of 1960 and at $50 billion for the first quarter of 1961.

But what, it may be asked, is the large and growing gap due to? The basic reason, we are told, is that there has been a retardation of investment. The rate of increase in the stock of capital per worker has been declining. The average age of our stock of equipment has been rising. And there has not only been a retardation of investment in business plant and equipment, but public investment has also been inadequate—that is, investment in education, health, research, and development of natural resources.

It follows from the Council's analysis that if our actual output is to approximate our potential output, invesment in business plant and equipment will need to be substantially increased, and so also will public investment, especially investment in human beings.

Furthermore, if we proceed to increase both private and public investment sufficiently, our economic potential itself will rise more rapidly. According to the Council, the rate of advance that our economy now achieves when it operates at full employment is 3.5 percent per year. This rate will be higher if investment is carried out on a larger scale.

The theory that I have just sketched bears some resemblance to the Keynes-Hansen theory of secular stagnation, which dominated economic thought during the 1930's and 1940's.

Just as Hansen saw secular stagnation as he looked back in time, so the council now sees the recent past. And just as Hansen saw secular stagnation as our fate in the future, unless appropriate remedial measures were taken in time, so the council now sees the future.

Hansen, however, believed that private investment was bound to remain inadequate in view of the disappearance of the frontier, a declining rate of population growth, and a shift from capital-using to capital-saving innovations. Hence, he argued that it will be necessary to rely heavily on rising governmental expenditures if we are to escape a chronic condition of mass unemployment.

The council is far less pessimistic about the prospects for private enterprise and investment. Not only does the council argue that larger governmental spending can and will stimulate private investment, but the council also proposes that some of our tax laws be revised in the interest of creating greater incentives for private investment. In other words, the council seems to view the private economy as a dozing giant who, while not capable of realizing his potential through his own efforts, will come fully to life again and stay alive if the Government does its part by spending more and by revising some of the tax laws.

Clearly, the council's stagnation theory is gentler and less pessimistic than Hansen's. Indeed, it must be regarded as a gay and optimistic theory in the light of still older stagnation theories such as Friedrich Engels' or Thorstein Veblen's.

When Engels speculated about the future, he saw only the continuance of depression and the eventual breakdown of capitalism. And when Veblen turned to the future, he likewise saw chronic depression from which, to be sure, our people would be occasionally relieved but only through accidental developments.

The Council's diagnosis of the state of our economy, despite its stagnationist accent, has none of the morbid pessimism of earlier stagnation theories. A theory of secular stagnation such as the Council's therefore need not cause anxiety. Viewed coldly, it merely provides a warning. And the warning may be salutary if there is an empirical basis for the new theory. How substantial, then, is the evidence in its support? Let us turn to this question.

One piece of evidence cited by the Council is the progressive decline of business-cycle expansions in the postwar period. The expansion of 1949–53 lasted 45 months. The expansion of 1954–57 lasted 35 months. The expansion of 1958–60 lasted 25 months. In other words, successive upswings have been progressively shorter, and this is a symptom of noncyclical or secular slack.

In judging this evidence, it is necessary to recall that the expansion from 1949 to 1953 was dominated by the Korean war. This expansion might well have been shorter if the war had not lasted so long.

Historically, wartime expansions have always been exceptionally long. Indeed, the expansions of 1861–65, 1914–18, 1938–45, and 1949–53 are the longest business-cycle expansions that we have had.

Since the expansion of 1949–53 is clearly an abnormal case, it is best to put it aside. We are then left with the fact that the most recent business-cycle expansion was shorter than its immediate predecessor. There is nothing remarkable about this fact. Of itself it surely provides little reason to expect or to fear secular stagnation.

The Council cites, however, another piece of evidence; namely, unemployment was approximately 3 percent at the peak of business in 1953, but about 4 percent at the business-cycle peak in 1957, and about 5 percent at the business-cycle peak in 1960. This evidence seems to suggest that successive upswings are becoming weaker.

However, as I've just noted, the peak in 1953 was a wartime peak of activity. We then had an overtime economy. It seems more sensible to regard the 3-percent unemployment rate of 1953 as an exceptional case than to take it as a yardstick of economic performance.

This is as clear when we look back of 1953 as when we look forward, for the unemployment rate was about 4 percent at the business-cycle peak of 1948 just as it was 4 percent at the peak of 1957. Not only that, but the Council itself regards a 4 percent unemployment rate as signifying a condition of practically full employment.

It is true that the unemployment rate was appreciably higher in 1960 than in 1957. This comparison is entirely valid. But one instance of higher unemployment of itself gives fragile support to the generalization that successive upswings are becoming weaker or to the theory that the gap between actual and potential output has a distressing upward trend.

The Council presents still a third piece of evidence. This takes the form of a direct measurement of the gap between actual and potential output.

Quarterly figures of the gross national product, adjusted for changes in the price level, are taken as a measure of actual output. Potential output is then measured by a curve which starts at the level of the actual output in mid-1955. This curve moves forward in time at an annual rate of increase of 3½ percent, and it moves similarly back of 1955.

Why, it may be asked, does the curve depicting potential output start in the middle of 1955? The reason is that unemployment was then approximately 4 percent of the labor force, and the Council regards a 4 percent unemployment rate as a "reasonable target for full utilization of resources."

And why is this curve of potential output allowed to rise at an annual rate of 3½ percent? Because, we are told, this rate "represents the rate of advance of gross national product (corrected for price changes) that our economy now achieves when it operates at reasonably full employment."

Once the curves of actual and potential output are drawn, the gap between them is obtained by subtraction. It is this gap which is said to show a distressing upward trend, especially since 1955.

The first and perhaps the most important question raised by this arithmetical exercise is why the curve of potential output is passed through the middle of 1955.

True, the unemployment rate was about 4 percent in mid-1955 and actual output may therefore be taken as equal to potential output at that time. But the unemployment rate was about 4 percent also in the second quarter of 1947, in the second quarter of 1957, and in other scattered quarters of the postwar period. Any one of these quarters or dates could have served just as well as mid-1955 for the starting point of the 3½-percent curve of potential output.

The results, however, would have been very different. As the Council draws the 3½-percent curve, the gap between actual and potential output in 1960 comes out $32 billion. But if the curve had been started in the second quarter of 1957, when we also had a full-employment output by the Council's criterion, the gap would have been only $20 billion.

And if the curve had been started in the second quarter of 1947, when we likewise had a full-employment output, the gap would have vanished. In fact, we would then have to say that actual output in 1960 exceeded potential output by over $2 billion.

It is plain from these calculations that if we merely vary the starting point of the 3½-percent curve, and do so without departing from the Council's logic, we can easily draw a more encouraging picture of the recent past than the Council has drawn.

I have thus far followed the Council in assuming that our potential output has been growing at a 3½-percent annual rate. I do not question the plausibility of this figure, but neither would I question the plausibility of a somewhat lower or a somewhat higher figure. We must reckon with the uncomfortable fact that small differences in the growth rate are capable of making a very large difference in projections of national output.

The Council has not descibed the precise derivation of its 3½-percent growth rate. It seems clear, however, from what the Council does say that it did not use a method that is particularly appropriate on its own economic logic.

If it be assumed that a full-employment output exists when the unemployment rate is 4 percent, then every figure of the gross national product at times when unemployment is at this level must express a full-employment output. A curve linking such figures will then automatically show the rate at which real output advances when our economy operates at reasonably full employment.

Unhappily, however, numerous pairs of such figures can be found in the postwar period, and some pairs yield a growth rate of less than 3½ percent while others yield a higher rate.

Let me comment on one of the more decent calculations of this type. As previously noted, we had a 4 percent unemployment rate in the second quarter of 1947 and again exactly 10 years later. Between these two dates, our output grew at an average annual rate of 3.9 percent, which is higher than the growth rate of potential output estimated by the Council.

Let us now see what happens when this 3.9 percent curve is carried forward to 1960. At first blush, it might appear that the gap between actual and potential output would exceed the $32 billion figure computed by the Council. In fact, however, the gap turns out to be only $26 billion.

This illustrative calculation shows, once more, that it makes a good deal of difference whether the curve of potential output is started at one date or another. By starting the curve of potential output in the second quarter of 1957 instead of mid-1955, it is possible to convey, first, that the upward trend of the gap is smaller than the Council found, second, that the gap has lasted a shorter period, third, that all this is true despite the assumption of an appreciably higher growth rate of potential output than the Council estimated.

This concludes what I have to say about the Council's evidence in behalf of its theory. I hope that I have not left the impression that the new theory of secular stagnation is utterly without foundation. That would not be true. This theory is tied to some actual experience. But when the evidence is examined, it turns out to rest fundamentally on one fact, namely, that the business-cycle expansion of 1958–60 was exceptionally short and incomplete. When the expansion ended, our economy was still some distance from full employment.

I do not question the importance of this fact. Nor do I question its disturbing character. But I do question what inference can properly be drawn from this solitary fact.

I would urge two things. First, a theory which has such a slender foundation in experience must be viewed somewhat skeptically. Second, there is a better explanation of what happened between 1958 and 1960 than is offered by the neostagnation theory which of late has become quite fashionable.

Let us note, to begin with, that economic recovery proceeded very briskly until the spring of 1959. Between the first quarter of 1958 and the first quarter of 1959 the Nation's physical output rose by 8 percent. Between mid-1958 and April 1959 the rate of unemployment also fell sharply—from about 7½ to almost 5 percent.

But soon thereafter a sharp retardation of economic growth set in. The expansion of business activity terminated in May, having run its course in only 2 years and stopping at a time when the economy was still some distance from a full employment level.

Many factors undoubtedly contributed to the unsatisfactory character of the business-cycle expansion from 1958 to 1960, but I believe that three developments were decisive.

First of all, we had a violent shift in Federal finances. Between the first quarter of 1959 and the third quarter of 1959 the Federal cash deficit, allowing for seasonal factors, fell from an annual rate of $17 billion to $2 billion. By the second quarter of 1960, we were already operating with a surplus at an annual rate of $7 billion. Thus, in a period of little more than a year, we had a turnaround in Federal finances of about $24 billion.

This was undoubtedly one of the very sharpest shifts of Federal finance in our Nation's history.

Second, the fiscal restraint on general economic expansion was accompanied—indeed preceded—by a tightening of credit conditions.

By mid-1959 commercial banks were already in debt at the Federal Reserve to the

tune of $1 billion. The money supply stopped growing. Demand deposits diminished by nearly $4 billion between July 1959 and May 1960. Interest rates rose sharply, both on short-term and long-term loans. Indeed, long-term rates advanced faster than during a comparable stage of any business cycle during the past hundred years.

Still a third factor contributed significantly to the incompleteness of the expansion of 1958–60; namely, the protracted steel strike in the second half of 1959.

Anticipations of the strike first led to a sharp buildup of inventories and a boom psychology in the spring and early summer of 1959.

Once the strike came and continued to drag on, it caused both concern and confusion in the business community and led to some hesitation in placing orders for investment goods. The strike also led to some confusion in governmental circles and prevented early recognition, which otherwise might well have occurred, of the magnitude of the restraints that were being imposed by our Government on economic expansion.

And when the strike finally ended, many business concerns—having in the meantime had an extraordinary stimulus and opportunity to reexamine their inventory policies—proceeded to practice new economies in managing their inventories.

In all these ways the steel strike contributed to an early end of the expansion which commenced in the spring of 1958.

If this sketch of the background of the recession is anywhere near the mark, we must attribute the incompleteness of the expansion of 1958–60 partly to the steel strike but even more to our governmental policies of restraint.

To be sure, these policies were designed to prevent further inflation and to restore confidence, both at home and abroad, in the management of our national finances. I have no doubt that these policies were sound and even essential. But, as happened in the event, they were pushed with excessive vigor and they were not checked in time.

On my reading of recent history, the neostagnationist theory which is now being widely used to explain the incompleteness of the expansion of 1958–60 is, therefore, quite unconvincing. To be sure, our economy faltered, so to speak, prematurely. But the early onset of recession was due to special factors, to factors of a kind that need not be repeated, rather than to some permanent or growing weakness of our economy.

I have dwelt on two very different interpretations of economic developments in recent years. These interpretations necessarily have different policy implications.

On the basis of the Council's interpretation, and to use its own language, "we face a stubborn problem of chronic slack, and the road to full recovery is a long one."

On the basis of my interpretation, there is no chronic slack of our economy. The problem of recovery that we face is not very different from that which we faced in 1949 or in 1954 or in 1958. Full employment is not a remote possibility. On the contrary, it may well be reached some 15 or 18 months from now.

In view of its interpretation of recent history, the Council logically concludes that "the expansionary effects of Government programs will be welcome even if they occur well after the recession has been reversed."

I believe, on the other hand, that the mildness of the recent recession supports the thesis that the underlying forces of economic expansion are strong and that they have of late been only temporarily suppressed. I believe that signs of economic recovery are already here and are rapidly multiplying. In view of this fact and in view also of the substantial increases of Federal spending that were initiated in the closing months of the Eisenhower administration and the further increases that have been set in motion by President Kennedy, I think that we would be courting inflation and a gold crisis if we now arranged new governmental spending programs so that they would mature when the economy is already advancing without them.

If we accept the Council's view that "we face a stubborn problem of chronic slack," the distinction between governmental spending to spur recovery and governmental spending to spur long-term growth becomes unimportant, and the same might be said of the distinction between governmental spending to promote social welfare and spending to promote economoc growth.

On the other hand, if my diagnosis of the state of our economy is correct, these distinctions are vital. Thus, I would hold that improved medical care of the aged, however desirable it may be in the interests of human welfare, will do little or nothing to improve economic efficiency or to accelerate long-term growth, and that it is entirely misleading to favor better medical care of the aged, as is now being done, on the ground that it will also promote long-term growth.

Again, I would grant quickly that a liberalized social security program, such as President Kennedy advanced in his economic message to the Congress, would help to speed economic recovery. But I must go on and point out that the same can be said of any type of governmental deficit spending. Since the liberalization of the social security program is designed to be a permanent reform, rather than to serve merely as an antirecession aid, I think that it is a mistake to advance such a program in the guise of a recovery measure. The Congress should pass this legislation only after full deliberation indicates that it is likely to promote the national welfare in the long run, and not merely in the months immediately ahead.

Once again, on the basis of the Council's analysis of the state of our economy, the problem of accelerating economic growth requires that we undertake greater public and private investment expenditures. I would readily grant this general proposition. However, the problem of accelerating long-term economic growth is excessively simplified when we suppose that it will be resolved merely by greater investment outlays.

Once aggregate spending is sufficient to maintain full employment, the rate of economic growth must depend principally on the rate at which economic efficiency increases.

Efficiency and productivity are undoubtedly promoted by some types of investment, but they can also often be promoted without any additional outlays or even with reduced outlays. We need think only of the restrictive practices that abound in construction work, in railroading, in agriculture, and in many of our manufacturing concerns.

I think that if we seriously want to accelerate economic growth, we will need to remove many of these impediments to efficiency, whether they arise from careless business management, or from the coercive power of trade unions, or from governmental legislation itself.

I have tried in the course of my remarks to indicate how a difference in interpretation of recent economic developments will lead to some differences with regard to economic policy. But I want to guard against any exaggeration of these differences.

Let me say at once that I see considerable merit in many of the proposals that the President has advanced for dealing with the recession.

I applaud his vigorous efforts to speed tax refunds, to enlarge the distribution of surplus foodstuffs to the needy, to speed early payment of dividends on veterans life insurance, to accelerate governmental lending under existing programs, to speed procurement which has already been scheduled, and to accelerate construction work which is already underway.

I admire the President's appeal for prompt enactment of a temporary program for extending the duration of unemployment insurance benefits. The Congress has already acted favorably on this request and I hope that the Congress will go further and enact, as the President has recommended, a permanent unemployment insurance law for coping with recessions.

I also feel encouraged by the new administration's recognition of the need to revise some of our tax laws in the interest of stimulating private enterprise and investment. I look forward hopefully to legislation along these lines.

But while I find the greater part of the President's recovery program entirely congenial, I am unable—as I have already stated—to regard liberalized social security programs, even though spending on them can get underway promptly, as sound measures for dealing with a recession.

I also doubt the wisdom of proposing a substantial increase of the minimum wage at a time of recession. I do not regard a lifting of the minimum wage as a useful antirecession device, particularly at a time like the present when we are having a serious balance-of-payments problem.

Nor am I able to accept without some reservations the view that greater Federal investment in education, health, housing, research, and resource development is desirable in the interest of accelerating the Nation's long-term economic growth. I think that some of these types of expenditure may be justified on grounds of social welfare and that others may be justified on grounds of economic efficiency, but I fail to see how all of them can accelerate the Nation's long-term economic growth merely because we now call them investment.

Nor am I able to accept the view that new and larger governmental spending programs on education, health, housing, research, and resource development should be welcomed even if they materialize well after the recession has been reversed. This particular view rests precisely on the stagnationist theorizing that I have taken some pains to scrutinize this afternoon.

I have been forced by the nature of the topic on which you have invited me to speak to make some critical remarks on the economic thinking and policies of the new administration. But I also have found much to commend.

I deem it only proper to conclude by saying that the administration has avoided extreme economic views, that it has in no way shown hostility to business enterprise, and that the economic moves actually taken by the administration have been more prudent than some of its economic rhetoric has at times suggested.

A One-Man Corps in Peace and War—Most Reverend Quentin Olwell, C.P.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, much is being said, and we hope much will soon be done, to reconstitute our national im-

age and regenerate the spirit of sacrifice which moves us to greatness.

Among the model lives we would do well to emulate in this regard are those of the American missionaries of all faiths who have left their homeland and seek to serve the spiritual and temporal wants to others in every corner of the earth. They work with the sick and savage. They teach, labor, spend themselves freely in the service of God. We should never overlook the great contribution they also make as Americans for as they carry out their corporal works of mercy they also portray this country in the role of the good Samaritan. It might be said that 1 hour in 1 day of their lives is more lasting and effective in winning friends for our country than is a million dollars in foreign aid. For when they win a soul to God they release a captive from darkness, away from the threat of communism.

A true example of such endeavor is the life of Most Reverend Quentin Olwell, C.P. I have had the privilege of knowing Bishop Olwell and his family for many years. They are lifelong residents of Brooklyn, and I have been pleased to have them as neighbors in the 12th Congressional District, which I represent.

The life and works of Bishop Olwell in China in World War II, the privations and imprisonment he suffered at the hands of the Communists, his labors in the Philippines are all singular instances of courage, denial of self, leadership, and determination.

It is fitting that the church he serves has raised him to her hierarchy. The service he has performed for his country is beyond any temporal reward.

It is with pride and a sense of homage that I commend to my colleagues three articles which recently appeared in the Brooklyn Tablet describing the works of this servant of God and country—"A One-Man Corps in Peace and War."

The articles follow:

BROOKLYN-BORN PASSIONIST WILL BE CONSECRATED

MARBEL, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.—Very Rev. Quentin Olwell, C.P., Brooklyn-born superior of the Passionist Fathers in the Philippines, will be consecrated here Tuesday, April 25, as the first vicar apostolic of the prelature nullius of Marbel and titular bishop of Tabraca, Africa.

The 4,000-square-mile prelature, which contains 300,000 people, two-thirds of them Catholic, is located on the Island of Mindanao, half way around the world and but 5 degrees above the equator. It was carved from the prelature nullius of Cotabato in January, at the same time that Father Quentin's elevation was announced by Pope John XXIII.

Archbishop Salvatore Siino, papal nuncio to the Philippines, will be the consecrating prelate. Coconsecrators will be Bishop Cuthbert M. O'Gara, C.P. exiled Bishop of Yuanling, China, and Bishop Gerard Mongeau, O.M.I., prelate nullius of Cotabato.

ARCHBISHOP MOLLOY'S CROZIER

Among Bishop Quentin's symbols of office will be a crozier formerly used by Archbishop Molloy and a pectoral cross which is the gift of the priests and people of the Passionists' Immaculate Conception parish, Jamaica, where the new prelate served in 1951.

Archbishop Molloy's crozier is a gift of the Brooklyn Diocese offered through the kindness of Very Rev. Msgr. James W. Asip, associate diocesan director of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith.

The motto on his coat of arms "Gloria Dei et Salus Animarum" (Glory to God and the Salvation of Souls) recalls Archbishop Molloy's motto "Salus Animarum Suprema Lex" (The Salvation of Souls is the Supreme Law").

Expected to be present at the consecration and Pontifical Mass are the new bishop's sister-in-law, Mrs. Evans G. (May) Olwell of 374 East 25th Street in Our Lady of Refuge Parish, Brooklyn; Very Rev. Cornelius Hazlett, C. P., provincial, and Rev. Linus Lombard, C.P., from the U.S. provincial headquarters in Union City, N.J., and Rev. Fidelis Connolly, C.P., an Air Force chaplain stationed in Japan.

Bishop Quentin's brother, who died August 2, 1957, was an outstanding Catholic layman who had served as head of Ozanam Conference, Society of St. Vincent de Paul, Columbus Council, Knight of Columbus Parkville Post, C.W.V., and Our Lady of Refuge parish Holy Name Society.

The bishop is an uncle of Evans G. Olwell, Jr., who lives with his wife and six children in Sea Cliff, L. I.; Mrs. John F. (Mary) Conroy of Marblehead, Mass., who also has six children; Mrs. Charles (Patricia) Montrie, Bethesda, Md., four children; Mrs. Benjamin (Antoinette) Conroy, Uvalde, Tex., three children; and Quentin Olwell of Brooklyn.

MOST REV. QUENTIN OLWELL: BROOKLYN'S PASSIONIST BISHOP FOR PHILIPPINES

(By Don Zirkel)

Father Quentin Olwell is credited with bringing about many significant improvements during his 28 years as a missionary in China, but he admits to failure in one minor detail he would like to have changed.

When his departure in 1951 was featured by the view of several unfriendly guns pointed at him, he could have said, "This is where I came in," because his arrival in 1923 had featured just as many unfriendly guns—and they weren't just pointing, they were shooting.

ST. CECILIA'S SCHOOL

Born Bertram Olwell November 4, 1898, the son of James and Ellen Evans Olwell, he grew up on Marcy Avenue and describes himself as a "charter member" of St. Cecilia's School, Greenpoint, because he was a member of its first graduation class.

He then moved to Staten Island, where he attended Port Richmond High School. He joined the Passionists at St. Joseph's Prep Seminary, Pittsburgh, was professed September 15, 1916, and ordained February 4, 1923, at St. Vincent's Abbey, Latrobe, Pa.

Father Quentin's first assignment was to China, where he labored until expelled by the Chinese Reds in May 1951.

During World War II, Father Quentin was of invaluable assistance to the American forces, having been credited with saving this country more than $5 million through his negotiations with the Chinese Government. He also devised a method of converting high octane gas for planes so that it could be used for army trucks and cars.

During the war he narrowly escaped death on many occasions when the Japanese bombed his mission. Once he was struck by shrapnel and suffered a concussion.

He speaks enthusiastically about the conduct of the American troops in China, declaring that their greatest contribution to friendship with the Chinese was their practice of the principle that the Chinese were their equals and not an inferior people. An estimated 40 percent of the 50,000 American troops in China were Catholics and their spiritual care was entrusted largely to missionaries.

In September 1949, a cable was received from Father Olwell, then superior of the Passionists in China, that the Yuanling Diocese had been occupied by the Communists.

Less than 2 years later—at that time vicar general of the diocese—he was sentenced to expulsion from Red China for counter-revolutionary and reactionary activities.

Specifically, he was accused of having asked the faithful to pray for the repose of the souls of two Catholics who had been executed by the regime as "bandits."

Before the expulsion of the Passionists, the Yuanling Diocese under the direction of Bishop Cuthbert O'Gara, C.P., included 12 central missions, catechuminates, grammar, high and trade schools, hospitals, dispensaries, orphanages and homes for the aged. It stretched across 16,000 square miles of rugged hills from which 5 million natives eked out a hard existence.

Erected as a prefecture apostolic March 13, 1925, it was confided to the American Passionists with headquarters at St. Michael's Monastery, Union City, N.J., where Bishop O'Gara is currently living in exile.

Father Quentin's career in China was such a success that he helped save a soul before he even reached his mission station. But let him tell it in his own words, as quoted from his first letter home, September 16, 1923:

"We arrived safely in Shanghai after a fire on board the boat, and after spending 26 hours in the worst typhoon that hit these waters from many a day. Three ships went down in it. We received the SOS from them but had all we could do to manage our own vessel.

"We took a fairly good size steamer up the Yang Tzye Kiang River, which got us in Hankow about the first of September. Then the fun began.

"From Hankow we were to go to Changteh, and from thence to our central mission Shenchowfu. Well we got on a Chinese launch to make the trip to Changteh.

"No doubt you have read about the bandits in China. They are in reality soldiers from another province. In their own cities and villages they are soldiers but in other places they are bandits, going about looting the people and taking whatever they can get their hands on, and if necessary killing to do so.

IN AN AMBUSH

"We got about a day's distance from our destinations when I realized what it felt like to be in the trenches and have the enemy shooting at you. We had sailed into an ambush of the bandits and they were using us as a target. We immediately stopped, turned the boat and made all haste back to Hankow. Thank God none of us were hit.

"The chief engineer of the boat was shot clean through. The bullet came through the door of his bunk, entered his left side and came out the right, and stopped in the wall. Father Dominic has the bullet.

"We set about using our first aid knowledge but to no avail; the poor man died in about 6 hours. We were rewarded, however, for the man was instructed and baptized before he died. Thus our loss of about $80 fare and the few hardships we had to put up with were nobly repaid, for what greater than to save an immortal soul?

"I seem to have the requirements needed for a missioner, that is the natural ones, God knows I fall down miserably on the others. The missionaries that I have met over here are real saints. No doubt you have read of how they suffer death most courageously. To meet them has been an inspiration to me. Don't begin to think that I shall suffer such things. God calls the giants for these tasks; I am only a pygmy."

SERVED IN JAMAICA

After arriving in and leaving China under gunpoint, Father Quentin served at Immaculate Conception Monastery, Jamaica, and as

pastor of St. Gabriel's Monastery Church, Boston.

But the call of the missions was too strong and in January 1958 he went back to his first love: not to the China mainland still closed by the Communist forces of occupation but to the mission recently entrusted to the American Passionists in the Philippines.

Father Quentin was superior of the group of nine Passionists (including Father Paschal Smith of Hollis) who took over the southern part of the Prelature Nullius of Cotabato on the island of Mindanao, with headquarters at Marbel.

Within 3 years the 200,000 Catholics there were being served so well by the Passionists, now numbering 21, that the Holy See established the Prelature Nullius of Marbel.

And to be first Prelate Nullius of Marbel, Pope John XXIII has called a giant—a man who the Holy Father, his Passionist confreres, his friends in Brooklyn, and his subjects in the Philippines firmly believe has all the requirements, natural and spiritual, to be a great mission bishop.

PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE: GROWTH OF CHURCH IN MARBEL

Half way across the world on the Philippine Island of Mindanao lies the Prelature Nullius of Marbel, which Bishop Quentin Olwell, C.P., will serve as vicar general after his consecration there April 25.

The prelature covers 4,000 square miles of the southern part of the province of Cotabato, and has a population of 300,000 people. The tip or toe of Marbel prelature is but 5 degrees above the equator on the Celebes Sea.

It is a land of high mountains and wide valleys with spreading farms and mahogany-rich forests. The region lies outside the path of the terrific typhoons that annually cause such destruction in other parts of the Philippine Archipelago. The climate is favorable.

Malayan settlers entered Cotabato Province centuries ago. In the latter part of the 15th century, the Sariph Kabungsuan of Arabia arrived with religious teachers and proselyted the Malayan immigrants into the worship of Allah. They thenceforth were known as Moors or Mores.

WAS MOSLEM STRONGHOLD

Less than 100 years ago, the Province of Cotabato was an independent sultanate, a Moslem stronghold. According to the 1952 Philippine Guidebook, there were no Catholics in Cotabato before World War I, and before 1939 there were scarcely a thousand Christians there.

After World War II, as a result of a government-sponsored program called the National Land Settlement Administration, tens of thousands of Filipinos were encouraged to uproot themselves from land-poor Huk-ridden provinces of the Republic and become homesteaders in the rich Koronadal Valley of southern Cotabato. The newcomers were mostly Catholic, and soon outnumbered the Mohammedans.

Missionary reinforcements were urgently needed, and the Holy See called upon the Possionist Fathers to take missions in southern Cotabato.

When the first band of Passionist missionairies, under the superiorship of Father Olwell, arrived in southern Cotabato at the beginning of lent in 1958, they entered among a people whose colonizing accomplishments rival those of the Pilgrim Fathers of American history.

Twenty years before, this region was a forest wilderness. Today, the success of these pioneers is a thing of admiration in the far-flung series of settlements that stretch inland to Marbel, the principal city. Here more than 250 population centers have literally, like Jack's beanstalk, sprung from the earth. There are 10 cities, 150 villages called "barrios," and 115 hamlets called "sitios." Over 200,000 of the 300,000 industrious natives who live in these new townsites and peaceful farms are Catholics.

MANY DIALECTS

One of the tasks that confront the missionary is the multiplicity of dialects. The immigrants coming from different parts of the Philippines are inclined to settle in groups according to the dialect. There are a variety of dialects even in the same parish. However, the English language is a great help, and since many of the young folk are learning English in the schools, the missionary can preach in English and be understood by a large number of people.

The Prelature Nullius of Marbel, which has been carved from the Prelature of Cotabato, is fortunate in possessing educational institutions on the college and high school level, called Notre Dame Schools, open to Catholic and Mohammedan alike. In fact, in some of them the Mohammedans outnumber the Catholics.

These schools were established by the intrepid and farseeing Prelate of Cotabata Bishop Mongeau and the Oblate Missionaries of Mary Immaculate. There are 2 small colleges, 10 high schools and elementary schools and some 4,000 students. They are staffed by the American Marist Brothers, the Filipina Sisters of two congregations, the Dominican Religious of St. Catherine of Siena and the Augustine Recollect Missionaries.

There are 10 parishes and many outmissions in the Prelature Nullius of Marbel, where 21 Passionist missionaries labor. The faithful in some 60 of the barrios have built on their own initiative simple chapels of nipa thatch. The missionaries visit these mass centers as often as possible, to instruct the people, administer the sacraments, validate marriages and baptize the children. There is also, aided by the Oblate Sisters of Notre Dame, a secular institute specializing in catechetical work in the villages.

The Oblate Fathers publish a Catholic weekly newspaper in Cotabato called the Mindanao Cross with a circulation of nearly 10,000. They also have a radio station which daily broadcasts the news and religious instruction, etc.

In preparation for the consecration of Bishop Olwell, much work has been done to the parish church which will now become the cathedral. The edifice had been built for practicality and not for beauty and the front had been described as giving the appearance of a gigantic American barn. Two bays have been added and a beautiful facade is under construction.

The future holds great promise for the welfare of the church in southern Cotabato. Under the leadership and inspiration of the new Prelate of Marbel, Bishop Quentin Olwell, C.P., and his zealous Passionist missionaries and untiring missionary sisters and brothers, there is every reason to hope for great things in this new Passionist mission halfway across the world.

A Clear Look at Politics and Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John M. Lupton, a State senator from Fairfield County, Conn., recently addressed the weekly Republican luncheon meeting in Hartford on the subject of "Politics and Politicians." I think his remarks are so pertinent and well put that I would like them reproduced in the RECORD:

A CLEAR LOOK AT POLITICS AND POLITICIANS

Mr. Chairman, our special guests today, my fellow Republicans, instead of a report on some of the legislation moving through the general assembly at this time, I would like to offer a change of pace as my contribution to these weekly luncheon talks. Instead of talking up a Republican achievement, or complaining about a Democratic failure, I would like to talk about some places where in the people's minds both political parties have shortcomings.

Most of us who have spent some years in politics talk among ourselves about how little the public appreciates us. We deplore the low esteem in which politics and politicians are held by most Americans. We know how honest and dedicated we are, but what's the matter with the people, why can't they see it?

It is easy to feel hurt and impatient and left out when we hear community leaders, who are not politicians, call for some aspect of public administration to be lifted above politics. I don't like the growing chorus singing the praises of nonpartisan government (whatever that is). But I think most of all I am worried by the way my fellow citizens too often walk off and leave their self-government. It doesn't interest them, they think it's a low-quality calling. The bare bottom truth of the matter is, they couldn't care less about politics and politicians.

Some of us who are in Government talked about this problem among ourselves. We found it easy to blame the public. It is easy to say that any man who doesn't participate in self-government is "spitting at a mirror," who only insults himself and his country.

It is easy to say these things, and we have said them. But is that the whole story? Have the American people been letting themselves and their country down by their refusal to support politics and politicians personally, or is it possible that politics and politicians of both parties have been letting the people down?

It is quite clear that there are places in which both parties are not answering the country's needs, large areas in which both Republicans and Democrats confuse bad politics with destiny. That's what I want to talk about today.

I believe, we in the two major parties are forgetting our duty to lead. Too often we seek our political opportunities in contests to find appetites to feed. This is not leadership. It is exploration. Like geologists with geiger counters we move among the people with our antenna way out seeking bonanzas of public interest. This is contrived democracy and cannot succeed because it is the product of groups and interests which do not see or care to see the total picture. This brings me again to the necessity for political leaders to lead. They alone are in position to take a clear look at what they are doing.

Subtly, possibly without our even realizing it, this failure of political leaders to lead, is the major reason why politics and politicians enjoy a low rating among the people. Divided among themselves, scarcely aware or interested in each other's problems, the people in various pressure groups are getting just about what they want out of legislators. The ease with which they are able to do this has not increased their respect for the people who take care of them.

I believe that there is a great responsibility of politics and the political parties

to answer simply, the needs of human dignity in every human being.

I know this is a spiritual area from which politics and political parties shy away—but this is my very point: as leaders of a Government whose very foundation is spiritual, can we afford to neglect the spirit of man?

If we do, can we be sure that what President Kennedy calls "our nonmilitary defenses" will not be damaged? I don't think we can be sure. Yet, for 25 years in America this is exactly what we have been doing and the affliction is growing.

This is a primary mistake in the area of public education, and public education is issue No. 1 in Connecticut State government.

Many of us here, most of us, in fact, because I have discussed this with most of you, have told me you were raised in what we fondly call "a flag-waving America." This was the era of rolled up sleeves, when America never won a debate and never lost a war, hot or cold. These were the days when schools taught civics, when our history books were an exciting parade of patriots, when the Fourth of July was a bigger day than the 15th of April. These were the days when we got the message of what America stands for, loud and clear—that it was the land of the individual, not the state. We were taught the "self-evident truths"—we considered them, we explored them, we were taught them. We believed them. They became a part of our character. The days I speak of were before God was objected to, when the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was a renewal of faith in the country founded on His full approval of us because we believed and swore to defend His "blessings of liberty." This was before God and patriotism went out of fashion in our public schools.

Let's trace the political history of what I am talking about. First we took the reading of the Bible out of the public schools, so as not to offend. The salute to the flag and the pledge of allegiance have a remarkable history too. They were removed from many schools because a woman in Ohio won a court case which said she didn't have to have her children acknowledge any earthly authority. How could we let a thing like this happen?

What good is it if we give a nuclear physicist a fine education in his science and then find that he spends all of his spare time raising roses, playing chess or pursuing the hobby of cabinetmaking with no time whatsoever for public duty? What kind of a job is public education doing if businessmen can chase dollars from dawn until dusk and spend the rest of their time chasing golf balls or playing cards? These situations are typical which means the people are goofing off their political responsibility. Thus, hasn't our public school system failed in its primary purpose, that of education for citizenship? This is where the lack of moral leadership by our political parties has let the people down. After all, it is we who put the official stamp on the administration of the public schools. We establish the climate in which public education operates.

A second place where we in politics are failing to lead is in our handling of the people's money. There is a thing called across-the-board grants. Across-the-board appropriations where only specific funds for certain areas or individuals are needed is not only a waste of the people's money, it is demoralizing political pandering as opposed to political leadership. Isn't the belief of both parties, that across-the-board grants are the the only the people will go for—a damning admission of their lack of faith in human dignity? How do we know the people won't respond to leadership in this respect? Have we tried it lately? I think the people will respond nobly.

Possibly this two-party position which is timid about granting funds on the basis of need and strong on across-the-board spending is already suspected by the people. This is part of the public relations problem of politics.

This across-the-board thing, as we all know, operates in many areas of Government. The prime case these days is in Federal aid to education. If a few States need public money, apparently we are going to have to vote money for all States in order for the few to get it. If Mississippi needs the money but New York and Connecticut do not, then Mississippi should get the money and New York and Connecticut should not. Yet Connecticut and New York as well as Mississippi should be able to vote for the aid for Mississippi. Any other interpretation is not only wasteful, but immoral.

My third and final example of where we fail to lead is in our attitudes toward public assistance. For example, let's take a clear look at the sick and the aged in our hospitals and convalescent homes. Welfare as most of you know is our second highest cost in Connecticut. Last year it was about 25 percent of the general fund. The number of State-supported cases in nursing homes has risen at a fantastic rate over the past few years. In 1950, welfare patients comprised 25 percent of the total patients in chronic and convalescent hospitals in the State. By 1960, 57 percent of such patients were receiving State aid. Meanwhile, costs have tripled from $2.9 million in 1950 to $8.7 million last year.

By law, it seems we permit more and more grown children who have the ability to pay to shirk their personal responsibilities to provide for their parents and to pass this duty on to the State.

This is a dangerous trend, the direct opposite of basic American traditions of facing up to personal responsibility.

We in politics have a duty to apply a realistic yardstick of ability to pay in all public assistance situations. The present tendency to be overly generous hurts particularly the great number of our citizens who, although in modest circumstances, are nevertheless determined to pay their own bills and take care of their own.

The prime reason that our political leaders should lead is not just to restore the prestige of politics and politicians. That will be a desirable byproduct.

Nor should we undertake leadership only because it will free the people from the imprisonment of socializing taxation. It will do this too, because highly responsible individuals will cost our country far less per person. The urgent reason why our political leaders should lead is to direct our citizens forward once more to self-evident truths—to make them forget the worship of the consequences rather than the causes of our freedom.

I have not been describing a health political condition. What I have given is a partial description of what is actually happening. We are confronted with a conflict of misused political power as opposed to the way of life that was instilled in men wiser than we, and framed in the documents we live, and sometimes suffer by. These are the self-evident truths.

Bucktail Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the centennial anniversary of the embarkation on an historic venture of a group of patriotic Pennsylvanians known as the Bucktail Regiment. The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has recently passed a resolution calling attention to the valiant efforts of these patriots; and I am proud to announce that our distinguished colleague, the Honorable LEON H. GAVIN, joins me in calling the resolution to the attention of the House:

Whereas on April 17, 1861, Thomas L. Kane, of Smethport, McKean County, Pa., issued a call by authority of Governor Curtin for volunteer rifles and marksmen "prepared to take up arms immediately, to support the Constitution of the United States and defend the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania"; and

Whereas James Landregan, while lounging in front of the Smethport headquarters, spied a deer hide hanging outside a butcher shop across the street. Noticing that the tail was somewhat larger than the average, he cut it off and stuck it in his hat, little dreaming that he was about to give an entire regiment its distinctive insignia. Thomas Kane thought that there could not be a more appropriate name for an outfit from the mountains of northern Pennsylvania since deer abounded upon every hillside. Kane decided immediately that it would be the "Bucktails"; and

Whereas volunteers from McKean, Elk, and Cameron Counties responded and converged upon the town of Driftwood, Cameron County, Pa., from where, on April 27, 1861, the Cameron County Rifles under the command of John A. Eldred, afterwards Company C Bucktails, mustered on June 1, 1861, mustered out June 11, 1864; the Elk County Rifles under the command of Capt. Thomas B. Winslow, afterwards Company G Bucktails, mustered in May 29, 1861, mustered out June 11, 1864; and the McKean County Rifles under the command of Capt. William T. Blanchard, afterwards Company I Bucktails, mustered in May 30, 1861, mustered out June 11, 1864; all under the leadership of Thomas L. Kane, afterwards commanding officer of the regiment and later a major general, embarked upon four rafts for Harrisburg, where they were mustered into the service of the State and formed the nucleus about which the Bucktail Regiment of the 13th Pennsylvania Reserve Corps, the 42d Pennsylvania Volunteers was organized, which, during the term of service, was almost continuously attached to the Army of the Potomac.

During their services, they participated and were engaged in the following campaigns and battles: Danesville, Mechanicsville, Haines Mills, New Market Cross Roads, Malvern Hill, Harrisonburg, Cross Keys, Catlett's Station, Groveton, Second Bull Run, South Mountain, Antietum, Fredericksburg, Gettysburg, Wilderness, Spottsylvania Court House, North Anna, and Bethesda Church; and

Whereas on April 27, 1908, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania caused to be erected at Driftwood an appropriate monument to the valor nad glory of this patriotic regiment; and

Whereas the Historical Societies of McKean, Elk, and Cameron Counties are meeting at Driftwood on April 27, 1961, to mark the centennial of the departure of this colorful outfit for enlistment in the service of their country; and

Whereas on May 30, 1961, the present veterans' organizations of McKean, Elk, and Cameron counties, together with descendants of this famous regiment, will gather at the Bucktail Monument at Driftwood to commemorate the centennial of the departure of these volunteer rifles and marksmen for the War Between the States: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, pays tribute to these valiant men who constituted the volunteer rifles and marksmen who became known as the Bucktails; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend the Historical Societies of McKean, Elk, and Cameron Counties and the veterans' organizations of said counties, for commemorating this centennial event, and for carrying on the spirit, the courage, the faith, and the patriotism of such worthy and hardy men; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Historical Societies of McKean, Elk, and Cameron Counties.

EDWIN W. THOMPKINS.
ALBERT W. JOHNSON.
WILLIAM F. RENWICK.

Federal Subsidies to Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News of April 18, 1961:

DO TEACHERS NEED FEDERAL SUBSIDIES?

A noted observer of the education scene, Russell Kirk, asked the above question in a recent article appearing in the National Review magazine. It is Mr. Kirk's contention that "in no other country are teachers better rewarded, relatively or absolutely" than in America. And then he offers some sobering figures for consideration.

Since 1930, the real income of teachers (in terms of purchasing power) has increased 106 percent," Mr. Kirk says. And he adds that during this same period the workload of the teacher has diminished through a reduction in the size of classes.

Advocating Federal aid to education to pay in part teachers' salaries, proponents contend that unless teachers' salaries are greatly increased the profession will be unable to recruit enough competent young people for public schools.

Between 1929 and 1956, in terms of 1956 dollars, the overall average of teachers in public schools had their salaries increased by $1,988.

Apparently, according to Mr. Kirk, this hasn't been too discouraging to those seeking a career in education. He says about 32 percent of all college graduates complete preparation for a teaching certificate—that is to say, about a third of all college graduates plan to become teachers. As further contradictory evidence of proponents' position, Mr. Kirk notes that in the last decade the number of certified teachers in the public school system has increased 57 percent. This can be compared with only a 12 percent increase for the same period of the overall American labor force.

Only national defense exceeds public education in expenditures taken from tax sources. Education accounts for some 15 percent of all Government tax revenues—public welfare gets 3.2 percent; law enforcement, 1.3 percent.

Throughout the history of our public education—including all the advances, new schools, greatly increased number of teachers, etc.—local communities and individual States have borne these costs. And of these costs, teachers' salaries have had the major share.

Skillful propagandists and zealous supporters of Federal aid to education have had much to say in support of their position. It is wholesome to see the other side of the coin as reviewed by a competent observer.

Resolution of Bar Association of State of Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the Bar Association of the State of Kansas held its annual meeting in Wichita, Kans., on April 22, 1961. The executive council of the Bar Association of the State of Kansas and the general assembly passed unanimously the following resolution:

To the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy; the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States; the Honorable Byron White, Assistant Attorney General of the United States; the Honorable Bernard G. Segal, Chairman of the Committee on Federal Judiciary, American Bar Association; the Honorable Andrew F. Schoeppel, U.S. Senator from Kansas; the Honorable Frank Carlson, U.S. Senator from Kansas; the Honorable William Avery, the Honorable Robert F. Ellsworth, the Honorable Walter L. McVey, the Honorable Garner E. Shriver, the Honorable J. Floyd Breeding, the Honorable Robert Dole, U.S. Representatives from Kansas:

Whereas by virtue of the retirement of the Honorable Sam G. Bratton, chief judge of the 10th judicial circuit, there is now a vacancy to be filled in said 10th judicial circuit; and

Whereas if, as, and when the judgeship bill is enacted into law, there will be an additional judgeship created in the 10th judicial circuit; and

Whereas the State of Kansas has had no representation upon the 10th judicial circuit since the retirement of the Honorable Walter A. Huxman in 1957; and

Whereas it has been the practice within the 10th judicial circuit to rotate the appointment of judges so that if possible all States within the 10th judicial circuit are represented upon the court; and

Whereas there are now representatives upon the court from the States of Oklahoma, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and further, until the recent resignation of the chief judge, New Mexico has been represented, Kansas thus being the only State in the circuit not represented upon the bench; and

Whereas according to the previously recognized practice it is now Kansas turn for the appointment upon the bench of the 10th judicial circuit; and

Whereas the following figures show the population of the six States in the 10th judicial circuit for 1960, to wit:

Oklahoma	2,328,284
Kansas	2,178,611
Colorado	1,753,947
New Mexico	951,023
Utah	890,627
Wyoming	330,066

thus indicating from a population standpoint Kansas should be represented upon said court; and

Whereas the following tables indicate the work done in civil cases both in the district courts of the six States within the 10th judicial circuit and the appeals commenced in the 10th judicial circuit from the six States within the circuit, namely:

Source of appeals and original proceedings commenced in the U.S. courts of appeals, 10th circuit, during each of the fiscal years 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960

	Fiscal year—				
	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
10th circuit, total appeals	241	218	249	229	234
Colorado	46	28	35	36	35
Kansas	43	41	50	38	60
New Mexico	25	23	21	22	23
Oklahoma:					
Northern	23	13	24	13	13
Eastern	17	25	13	18	13
Western	40	32	24	47	39
Utah	22	14	31	17	18
Wyoming	11	12	9	11	6
The Tax Court of the United States	6	18	31	2	4
National Labor Relations Board	4	4	5	8	12
All other boards and commissions	4	4	4	8	9
Original proceedings	----	4	2	9	2

Total civil cases commenced and terminated in the U.S. district courts, 10th circuit, during the fiscal years 1958, 1959, and 1960

	Number of judges	Fiscal year 1958		Fiscal year 1959		Fiscal year 1960	
		Commenced	Terminated	Commenced	Terminated	Commenced	Terminated
10th circuit, total		3,008	2,833	2,581	2,664	2,819	2,587
Colorado	2	416	345	360	339	382	394
Kansas	2	940	880	954	948	969	899
New Mexico	2	409	320	273	341	311	280
Oklahoma:							
Northern	5	309	308	203	187	250	186
Eastern		196	216	154	167	170	143
Western		512	479	391	442	414	376
Utah	2	142	193	155	146	182	190
Wyoming	1	84	92	91	94	139	119

In summary, the figures show that Kansas has approximately twice as many cases in the circuit as Colorado, approximately 3 times as many as the State of New Mexico, approximately 3 times as many as the State of Utah, 10 times as many as the State of Wyoming, and approximately an equal number with the State of Oklahoma, all with no judicial representation upon the 10th judicial circuit now, nor in the last 4 years; and

Whereas the Bar Association of the State of Kansas feels that Kansas should be represented by a judge upon the 10th judicial circuit: Now, therefore

The executive council of the Bar Association of the State of Kansas in executive session and the Bar Association of the State of Kansas in its general session at its annual meeting at Wichita, Kans., this 22d day of April 1961, resolve:

(1) That the State of Kansas has not been represented upon the 10th judicial circuit for a period of more than 4 years;

(2) That all other States in said circuit are and have been represented during such period;

(3) That Kansas is entitled by virtue of the statistics set forth herein to representation upon the 10th judicial circuit;

(4) That by virtue of past practices in rotation of appointments within the 10th judicial circuit, Kansas is entitled to the next appointment to fill any vacancy upon the bench of said circuit;

(5) That the bench and bar of the State of Kansas respectfully and insistently request that the present vacancy upon the bench be filled by an appointment from the State of Kansas; that in the event it is not so filled, then that the next appointment to the bench either by virtue of the new court bill creating an additional judgeship or by a vacancy upon the court be filled from the State of Kansas; that it is the opinion of the bench and bar that Kansas is entitled to the first appointment made.

Passed unanimously by the executive council of the Bar Association of the State of Kansas in its annual executive meeting on April 19, 1961, and by the general assembly of the Bar Association of the State of Kansas in its annual meeting on April 22, 1961, at Wichita, Kans.

ALEXANDER M. FROMME,
President, Bar Association of the State of Kansas.

JOHN W. SHUART,
Executive Secretary.

Astoria's 150th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a celebration was held on March 25 in Astoria, Oreg., to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the founding of this important port city at the mouth of the Columbia River. The event, which I trust will mark Astoria's emergence into a new era of growth and prosperity, attracted many visitors, including Lord Astor, whose forebear founded the city in 1811 as an outpost of his great trading empire.

Establishment of Fort Astoria by John Jacob Astor 150 years ago marked the first permanent penetration of our western frontier under the American flag. A recent article in American Forests magazine by Don Carlos Miller, entitled "Astor Land," recalls the early origins of Astoria and details some of its many present-day attractions. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

ASTOR LAND
(By Don Carlos Miller)

Anyone hearing mention of Waldorf-Astoria immediately thinks of New York City and one of its most famous hotels. Few people associate the name with a remote section of Oregon wilderness. But it was in the Beaver State that a man from Waldorf, Germany, garnered the bulk of a huge fortune, of which he invested some $30 million in Manhattan Island real estate.

Yes, it was largely through his industry that Oregon became known as the Beaver State. While Abraham Lincoln was a small boy he was building a fur-trading empire throughout the West; he built Fort Astoria near the mouth of the Columbia River in 1811—that is, a party of his men did.

Thus, the name of John Jacob Astor is of prime importance in Oregon as well as in New York. Astoria still stands on the south bank of the mighty river, grown and modern but still filled with memories of its historic past. The Astor Column atop Coxcomb Hill in Astoria stands as a visible tribute to one of the great founders of America. Erected in 1926 to a height of 125 feet, the column contains a spiral staircase leading to an observation platform at its top from which tremendous views of the Columbia, the Pacific, and the forestland of the northwest can be viewed, a sight well worth the climb.

At the same time a 7-foot spiral frieze decorate the outer portions of the column. This frieze, the work of Italian sculptor A. Pusteria, depicts many of the historic events that led to the eventual settlement of the area.

However, John Jacob Astor was not the first important personage to exert his influence upon this great and trackless land. The famous Lewis and Clark expedition wintered here in 1805–06. Sent out by President Thomas Jefferson to explore the Oregon country, they sighted the Pacific on November 11, 1805. They constructed a pole fort 4 miles west of Astoria, a replica of which is now used as a museum and is open to the public. They called it Fort Clatsop because of their friendly relations with the Clatsop Indians. Here they waited out the winter in the hope of meeting a trading ship on the Columbia and obtaining fresh supplies. This they never accomplished, leaving a few days too soon.

During their stay they made salt from sea water at a cairn located in the present resort town Seaside, producing from three to four quarts of salt a day. Also, they killed 131 elk and 21 deer, as well as taking a large amount of blubber from a giant whale that was tossed up onto the shore by the stormy seas.

Even Lewis and Clark had their predecessors, there being Bruno Heceta in 1775, and Robert Gray in 1792 who sailed his ship, the *Columbia*, up the legendary river of the West that ran through the land the French trappers called Ouragon, meaning hurricane, probably because of the fierce storms in the Cascades. Then there were the Spanish galleons that haunted the coast for 250 years.

Here the knowledgeable fades into mystical tales of hidden treasure supposedly buried somewhere on Neahkahnie Mountain; these mingle with stories of the abode of Ekahni, the supreme god of the Kill-a-mox people, which was on the same mountain. Many fortune hunters have dug here and reported finding strange items such as beeswax candles and Spanish coins. One of the latter, dated 1679, was exhibited for many years in the Nehalem Valley Bank. But if there ever was a treasure on Neahkahnie it is still there as far as anyone knows.

While this mountain rises only 1,710 feet it juts sharply upward from the sea and is higher than any other land for miles around, affording the hiker who is willing to climb the thousand feet above U.S. 101, which skirts its base well above the sea, a view of a vast and tumultuous domain of ocean, forest, and mountains.

Astoria is some 40 miles north of Neahkahnie and between the two lies a fabulous region of great ocean headlands, of wide sandy beaches that can scarcely be surpassed in any clime, of rivers and forests and quaint sea towns. Winters are not cold because of the warm Japanese Current that washes the shore, but rain is so common no one pays any attention to it. To see someone swimming in the rain is not strange at all. Summers are temperate with sunshine a fair share of the time.

Of the resorts, Seaside is by far the best known and offers about any accommodation possible, as well as the usual coastal carnival atmosphere. This is almost out of place along the 400-mile Oregon coast; it is a Seaside exclusive.

Fishing and clamming are common sports and the great salmon runs up the Columbia and lesser rivers in September bring thousands of visitors from all over the world. Commercial fishing is one of the chief industries of Astoria, as well as many of the other towns along this coast, and party boats may be hired at most ports.

While much of the best timber of the region has been cut, lumbering is still of great importance. Sawmills are numerous and many of these welcome visitors.

This area once contained the most dense forest of all Oregon, the State that still is the leading producer of lumber and has one-fourth of the available timber of the United States. Here new growth forests cover the mountains prettily, awaiting the day when they reach cutting size.

Near Cannon Beach a great forest burn with huge, gaunt trees stands as terrible evidence of what fire can do; this, while not scenic, is certainly thought provoking and should be included in any tour of this west Oregon region.

Many ships puting into the mouth of the Columbia have misjudged in fog and storm and run aground. Some of these stand starkly in the sands and may be visited when the tides are right. One of these, the Peter Iredale out of England, is a trademark of Fort Stevens State Park 7 miles west of Astoria.

Indeed it is a strange and interesting land, this region that John Jacob Astor, the Lewis and Clark expedition, and the countless nameless adventurers made known in the cities and hamlets of the East; it is hardly less fabulous than they led their fellow Americans to believe. And, while it is much changed from that day, it is one of the great adventure areas of America and will remain just that for many generations.

Authorization for Sale of Agricultural Commodities

SPEECH
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4728) to amend title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently favored the principle of disposal of commodities to the needy both here and broad. Until now this program has been used primarily for that purpose and, incidentally, to help build better international good will.

Under the present proposal, however, there is justification for only little more than one-half of the $2 billion requested. The balance of the amount is purely on an if-and-when basis.

It would look as if the new administration is attempting to convert this commodities disposal program into a giant, global, boondoggling operation.

Keep Raritan Arsenal Open

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the decision by the administration to close down the Raritan Arsenal in New Jersey, thereby throwing out of work about 3,000 persons, is a matter which is of great concern not only to the community so severely affected but to the public at large.

The Raritan Arsenal came into being in 1917 and during all these years has served the Nation well. It is situated on the banks of the Raritan River where vessels can dock and carry supplies to different parts of the world and in times of war this Army post has played a very prominent part. In view of the fact that 9 percent of the total work force in this area is now unemployed, it is certainly a strange policy for the administration which is so concerned about unemployment and the relief of depressed areas to accentuate, at the same time, an area of depression and increase the distress.

The Daily Home News, of New Brunswick, N.J., which plays a prominent part in the life of this community has discussed this matter in various editorials which are factual and persuasive. I am pleased to have permission to insert three of them in connection with my remarks, as follows:

[From the Daily Home News, New Brunswick, N.J., Apr. 1, 1961]

KEEP RARITAN ARSENAL OPEN

We are glad to see a strong and swift mobilization of forces locally to resist the Defense Department's decision to close down Raritan Arsenal and to try to force a reconsideration of this decision.

The impact of the closing of Raritan Arsenal, even though the closing were spread over the full 3-year period indicated, would be a great economic blow to central New Jersey.

We deplore a decision which would throw a civilian staff of more than 2,500 persons out of their jobs here. We deplore a decision which would take a $15 million payroll out of this area. We deplore a decision which would cut off over $3,500,000 of Government materials purchases annually in the area.

Raritan Arsenal has served the Nation well, in war and in peace, since 1917. It has admirable rail and highway connections. It has a big reservoir of skilled workers. It is almost invaluable as a wartime military supply adjunct of the busy port of New York, funneling materials and equipment down the Raritan River and up the Arthur Kill to transocean shipping points.

It seems strange to the laymen that a Government installation which has served so well and on such a vast scale—there were 10,000 people working at Raritan Arsenal in World War II—should suddenly lose its military value and become "surplus." This seems particularly strange at a time when the cold war seems warming up and the international situation is at one of its most critical stages.

There are jobs to be protected in this matter. And there may well be the matter of national security affected too.

We are glad to see such strong support mobilized so quickly to keep the gates open at Raritan Arsenal and to keep this key defense operation functioning.

We are confident that if more key governmental, political and civil workers get into the campaign, Raritan Arsenal, with all that it represents to the area, can be kept here.

[From the Daily Home News, New Brunswick, N.J., Apr. 13, 1961]

DEVELOP SURPLUS LAND OF ARSENAL

As the move to persuade the Government to keep Raritan Arsenal open gains impetus, it would be wise for the area to take out an insurance policy against the possible closing of the arsenal, by persuading the Government to dispose of the valuable industrial land across Woodbridge Avenue from the arsenal.

If the Government has any merit in its contention that the arsenal itself is surplus today, certainly it must admit that this buffer acreage across Woodbridge Avenue is double surplus. This acreage is not used for arsenal purposes. It isn't even fenced in.

Edison Township has been trying without success to get this land sold and put on the tax rolls. The Government has been adamant. Now that the Government says the whole arsenal shebang is surplus, it must admit that this idle acreage is expendable.

By placing this land on the market immediately, the Government will show its good faith. And it will provide Edison Township with needed ratables, while at the same time cushioning the shock of any eventual closedown at the arsenal.

The idle acreage could be converted to industrial uses swiftly, and the jobs thereon might well be available to workers displaced by any eventual closing down of the arsenal.

We believe 100 percent that every effort should be made to keep Raritan Arsenal operating. At the same time it is the course of wisdom to be prepared for the worst. We can prepare in part—with Government cooperation—by pushing industrial development on the land opposite the arsenal.

[From the Daily Home News, New Brunswick, N.J., Apr. 21, 1961]

GOVERNMENT HASN'T PROVED ITS CASE

Despite the Pentagon official's statement that the order closing Raritan Arsenal is irrevocable, we think it's too early to accept that verdict as final.

The outburst of public indignation at the announced closing continues to gain impetus. The campaign of the arsenal workers is eloquent.

But beyond the emotional demonstrations, the facts which are being brought out tend more and more to suggest that the arsenal is a mighty useful enterprise. Certainly the vast printing and publications phases of the arsenal's work can be carried on here, with experienced personnel and modern equipment, as economically as elsewhere. And the move would be costly.

Certainly the arsenal's outstanding warehousing and shipping record belies any suggestion that the operation here is uneconomical.

We can see the missile argument. Maybe the arsenal is not big enough to store missiles safely; and we are not at all sure that the people of the area would like that kind of operation. But we cannot see any new development which suddenly makes heretofore efficient operation here inefficient, or heretofore economical operations here suddenly wasteful.

No one disputes the Government's right to close the Raritan Arsenal for logical reasons. But the Government must make its case plain. So far, it seems to us, the case of those who would keep the arsenal open seems the more convincing. The Government hasn't made its case yet.

A Bill To Establish a Federal Commission on Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill on establishing a Federal Commission on Taxation, for the purpose of making a thorough study of our whole Federal tax structure with the view of effecting necessary reforms.

I would like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD my statement of reasons for introducing this measure:

THE HONORABLE DON L. SHORT, CONGRESSMAN FROM NORTH DAKOTA, URGES STATES BE GIVEN BACK THEIR TAXING PRIVILEGES—INTRODUCES BILL TO SET UP COMMISSION ON FEDERAL TAXATION TO STUDY NECESSARY TAX REFORMS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—In introducing legislation today which would provide for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Taxation, Congressman SHORT commented: "While I don't hold with setting up commissions for everything under the sun, here is a case where there is a definite need for one. Many of the Members of Congress find themselves in a situation where it is impossible to give adequate time and study to important tax reforms which are long overdue." SHORT stated it was his contention that "the creation of a Commission to go into all aspects of tax reforms and adjustments which would have a stimulating effect on our economy seems to me a most sensible approach, and would prove an assist to the hard-working Ways and Means Committee members, who have before it many important measures which are time consuming in themselves."

Congressman SHORT reiterated his belief that the Federal Government has assumed many of the prerogatives in the taxation field which would ordinarily fall to the States. "If our benevolent Uncle Sam will only give back to the people what is rightfully theirs, we can save a lot of this money that is lost in the shuffle back and forth between the States and the Federal Government. Our paternal Federal Government has in effect been patting the States on the heads as one would a child and saying, "Now if you will just leave everything to me, life will be much easier. Whoever thinks that is just kidding themselves."

"One of the first reforms that could be instituted is to eliminate the Federal excise taxes," SHORT suggested. "Here there is a field that the Federal Government has invaded. These wartime emergency taxes should and can be removed. It would stimulate our economy at a time when it is needed. Later, if the States find they need to avail themselves of this prerogative in order to furnish the services and privileges the public demands, then they have this area available for their use, and do not lose half of the dollars in transit." Congressman SHORT further asserted, "With the taxing reins back in the hands of the States, we can stay in the driver's seat insofar as aid to education, medical care to the aged, etc., are concerned. Control can stay where it should be—at home. It's part and parcel of local responsibilities."

Congressman SHORT went on to point out that "President Kennedy has indicated his belief that there is a need for tax revision, which, after all, is a legislative responsibility, in his tax message which has just come before the Congress. If he is sincere in this expressed belief, let him join in this move to set up this Commission, which should be bipartisan in nature, and urge a thorough, analytical study which can come up with recommendations for reforms; reforms which will permit our American businesses to flourish and grow—reforms which will stimulate and encourage the growth of our economy which seems to be in need of confidence right now—reforms which will allow us to hew to the line established by our Founding Fathers in a Constitution which has weathered the test of time and experience, a system based on the principle of freedom of opportunity which has made our country what it is today—the place on this earth where the individual, regardless of race or color or social or economic position, has the greatest opportunity to exercise his ability and ingenuity, and energy for the benefit of himself and his family, his fellow citizens and his country.

Address by Hon. Gordon Scherer, of Ohio, at the Seventh Annual National Military-Industrial and Educational Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address by the Honorable GODRON SCHERER, of Ohio, delivered on April 12, 1961, at the Seventh Annual National Military-Industrial and Educational Conference, Sherman Hotel, Chicago, Ill.:

I feel certain that all of you were impressed by the film which you have just seen, "The Spy Next Door." It has given you, as well as the millions of Americans who have viewed it on television, a better understanding of the enemy we face: his flexible and deadly purpose, his cunning efficiency, the diabolical thoroughness of his spy apparatus, and his utter inhumanity and cruelty. The film has something important to tell all of us about how dangerous an enemy we face and how much we must do if we are to remain free.

"The Spy Next Door" ties in with the theme of this conference because it demonstrates how vital it is for all Americans to know their enemy better, to have a true grasp of the nature of the conspiracy behind the activities the film portrays—a conspiracy which has created the largest and possibly the most efficient espionage network the world has ever known; which maintains the largest standing army on the globe and, at the same time, the largest corps of political propagandists and agitators known to history—along with a fifth column in every free nation.

As you know, an attempt was made to censor this film. A nationwide protest forced its showing and defeated the effort to suppress the truth it conveys. I am sure that all of you, as believers in academic freedom and freedom of information generally, are glad that the suppression effort was defeated.

Because it was defeated the film, today, is still serving the American people. The Armstrong Cork Co. has made it available not only to this gathering but to many others—and will continue to do so as long as it is not used for commercial purposes. The State Department, the Atomic Energy Commission and the National War College have already used it to assist in the education and training of certain of their personnel.

One thing about the film which is not known, except to a few persons, is that this film is based to a considerable extent on information developed by the Committee on Un-American Activities. Six months before the film was shown, Jerry Ross, who wrote the script knew little about Soviet espionage. As part of his preparation for writing it, he visited the committee, and also the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, talked with its counsel, and was given various committee hearings and reports on the subject. As he has told the committee, "an appreciable amount" of his background material came from these publications. Those of you who have read all committee releases of the last few years undoubtedly saw in the film many familiar items, situations and techniques.

There is material for many more documentaries such as "The Spy Next Door" in the hearings and reports of the Committee—material on Communist directives and techniques for infiltrating our basic industries, our schools, churches, and professions—on Communist wrecking-of-freedom strategy and tactics in all walks of life.

The overwhelming majority of you, I am sure, do not believe that an agency which gives such information to the people, and is charged by the Congress with doing so, should be destroyed and vital data on Soviet espionage and many other aspects of communism thereby suppressed, any more than you believe "The Spy Next Door" should have been suppressed.

Yet, I must regretfully say that certain elements of a group in our society which is represented at this gathering has played, and is still playing, an unduly large role in the effort to suppress such information by bringing about the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Earlier this year large ads were published in the Washington Post and the New York Times, ads which made false charges against the committee and urged its abolition. Of the 327 persons who signed this ad, more than one-third, well over 100, were educators.

Last month the American Civil Liberties Union issued a statement signed by 250 professors from 79 colleges and universities, urging that the committee be abolished. Recently, a similar statement came out of Cornell University, signed by 52 professors. In January, 87 Brown University professors signed another statement to the same effect.

The committee's hearings in San Francisco last May were protested by several hundred professors from colleges in the vicinity of that city, even though the purpose of the hearings was to develop information on the leadership, activities, the strategy and tactics, of the important Northern California District of the Communist Party.

I may be old fashioned, but I believe that educators have a duty and an obligation to maintain, defend and strengthen any society, culture and government that gives them the freedom and the opportunity to search for truth, to teach, and entrusts to their care the education of its youth. Certainly, they have no right to use their position and their freedom to mislead youth and to assist in the destruction of that society, culture and government at the hands of a criminal international conspiracy which is a dedicated enemy of political, academic and intellectual freedom. For them to do so knowingly is intolerable. That some do it unwittingly is deplorable.

Just what are these professors up to? What are they trying to bring about?

I will tell you what will have been accomplished, with their help, if the committee is abolished.

They have charged over and over again that the committee has no useful purpose, that it has not fulfilled its primary function of recommending legislation in the area of its jurisdiction, that it has not even tried to live up to this obligation, but has merely sought to expose as un-American innocent persons whose ideas it does not like.

What is the truth?

Independent studies made by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress reveal that the committee has an impressive legislative record. They reveal that in the years 1941 to 1960 it made 96 separate and distinct legislative recommendations to the Congress, and that 35 of these recommendations have been adopted and are now a part of the body of law of this land which is designed to protect you and the Nation, along with the professors, from the subversive forces of communism.

These studies also reveal that 52 bills and 1 House resolution embodying recommendations made by the committee were pending at the close of the last Congress, the 86th, and that 8 of these bills had been passed by the House although the Senate did not act on them.

Again, these studies reveal that the executive branch of our Government has adopted 13 recommendations of the committee which covered policy matters rather than legislation.

As early as this is in the new Congress, the committee already has before it legislation on more than 30 separate matters.

Many people fail to understand that much legislation in the field of internal security which comes out of other committees is actually based on the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Many such bills are recommended by various other committees in every session of the Congress.

The Voorhies Act, or Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1940, has proved to be one of the most effective laws in protecting our country against Communist subversion. That law came out of the Judiciary Committee, yet it was based completely on the investigations and hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

During the last few years the Communists have received a tremendous psuedo-legal assist in their propaganda and agitation campaign to undermine all efforts to uncover and curb their activities. This has been made possible by the fact that, over and over again, the Supreme Court has granted certiorari in contempt cases, even though no substantial new principle of law was at issue in any one of them. Each time a decision has been handed down in these cases, Justices Black and Douglas have delivered

minority, dissenting opinions which are in no way valid or binding. But they have been seized upon by the Communist Party and its fronts and also by some non-Communist newspapers and individuals, and have been repeated and publicized over and over again to create the false and dangerous belief in the minds of many persons that any investigation of communism is unconstitutional, a violation of the Bill of Rights.

To remedy this situation, the chairman of the committee, Mr. WALTER, recently introduced a bill which would require that five members of the Supreme Court must agree before the Court can grant certiorari in such cases. This bill, of course, has been referred to the Judiciary Committee, but it is based on the work and experience of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Let us go back now to the question asked a moment ago. What will they accomplish?

They will have achieved the destruction of the legislative agency that has done more than any other in the history of this country to protect our national security. This is a basic fact and truth that no amount of high-flown words uttered by them can conceal.

There is another thing they will have accomplished. Congressional committees have a vital informing function, associated with but not identical to, their legislative function. This is their duty to shed light, to bring out as much information as possible, on matters of vital national concern.

Without question, communism is such a matter or we would not be gathered here as we are today. I will not attempt to cover in detail the committee's record in this field, but over the years it has published many thousands of pages of hearings, reports, and scholarly works on this subject. I can say without fear of contradiction that there is no agency of Government that has given the Congress, the executive branch, and the people as much authoritative information on communism as has the Committee on Un-American Activities.

A few minutes ago, I mentioned the film "The Spy Next Door" and its writer, Mr. Jerry Ross. One of the committee publications he was given when he visited our offices was a report entitled "Patterns of Communist Espionage," published by the committee in January 1959 and ignored by some newspapers and treated snidely by others. But the State Department, the British and West German Governments, and the Military Assistance Institute, which trains our military attachés for service abroad, have all secured this report in quantity to use it in the training of their foreign service personnel. This is just one example of the service performed by the committee in carrying out its informing functions.

When the committee's enemies are not spreading falsehoods about its legislative record, they talk about its "methods." This is a timeworn tale, but still good for a ride in liberal journals and organizations.

What is the truth about the committee's methods?

Over 15 years ago, in 1945, the committee requested the Brookings Institution in Washington to prepare for it suggested standards for determining un-American activities, in conformity with the Constitution and the committee's enabling resolution. That study was prepared and the recommendations in it have been followed by the committee since that time.

The Committee on Un-American Activities was the first committee in the House to have published rules of procedure. In addition, it abided by those rules for a number of years before they were put in print.

In the 84th Congress, when the House Rules Committee was considering the authorization of one-man subcommittees, the counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities appeared before that Committee and argued against this step so strongly, and effectively, that the idea was dropped.

Educators are supposed to search for truth. Have they done so in matters pertaining to the committee? Could they have done so and, at the same time, spread so many falsehoods about its legislative record and "methods"? I think the answer to the question is apparent.

Although polls reveal that the committee is overwhelmingly supported by the people in the grassroots of America, a considerable portion of the public is nevertheless misinformed about the committee on these issues. If this were not so, the type of criticism of the committee so frequently made in the press and on public platforms could not, and would not, be made half as often as it is. It is my belief that educators have a responsibility to get the truth across to the public in this area, instead of promoting the false and irresponsible criticisms that so many of them have.

When the American Bar Association urged, not long ago, that the techniques and objectives of communism be taught in our schools, it pointed out that such a program will be "beset with many obstacles."

Some of you may wonder why this should be so. Certainly, you say, we must know our enemy. The greater the number of people who truly understand communism, the greater the chance that freedom will be preserved and communism destroyed—just as, the more we teach about cancer and heart trouble and the more research we do on diseases, the greater the chance there will be of eliminating them.

I think I can safely say that the Committee on Un-American Activities gets more mail from people in all walks of life and in all parts of the country than any other committee on the Hill. For this reason, I have a pretty good idea of what many Americans are thinking on this and other subjects and can vouch for the soundness of the American Bar Association's observation.

Among those who really know communism and could be qualified as experts or authorities on the subject, there is a fear that many teachers just don't know enough about communism to give a realistic course on it and that much work must first be done teaching the teachers. They believe that there has been a failure here on the part of our educators, who are not now ready to do a job they should be able to do.

Some parents are afraid of the idea because they do not understand that what its advocates urge is, as Allen Dulles has said, the "realistic teaching of the history and policies of communism," with emphasis on the realistic. We certainly do not have in mind what could be called a pro-course on communism. We do not advocate the teaching of the noble-sounding claims of Communist propagandists, but rather the truth about Communist practices, its designs for world conquest, its strategy, tactics, crimes, complete immorality, hatred of freedom and other harsh realities about this tremendous power complex which threatens the world.

Among those who understand the type of course contemplated, a good number are wary of those who will do the teaching. They fear what will happen to their sons and daughters if they take a course in communism under certain professors. As the American Bar Association said: "There will be those who fear that a well-meaning program may itself become infiltrated or perverted."

This is not merely because of the statistics I gave earlier about the hundreds of professors who have urged that the Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished, though it is partly for that reason. Rather, it is primarily because it is unfortunately true that a check of the letterheads of the major Communist fronts of today and recent years reveals all too often that educators comprise one of the largest groups—and sometimes the largest group—supporting these organizations. The same is true of the numerous party-line and Soviet-serving statements released during the past two decades. Consistently, educators have been among the largest groups giving support to such documents.

In the spring and summer of 1959, the Committee on Un-American Activities planned hearings in California. Approximately 100 persons were subpenaed to testify in these hearings. Every one was a teacher or employee of an educational system. Eventually, the hearings were called off at the request of the California Teachers' Association, and the information developed by the committee was turned over to the local boards of education for action, also at the request of the teachers' association.

I do not have a complete record of what has happened since then, but I do know that some of the teachers concerned have resigned their positions rather than face an inquiry by their schoolboards; that others have been dismissed after a fair inquiry.

Last summer, at its annual convention, the American Federation of Teachers adopted a resolution urging the committee's abolition and making unfounded charges against it.

Mr. WALTER, the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, immediately sent a telegram to the federation stating that facts in the hands of the committee contradicted the charges it had made. He invited, and challenged, the federation to present, under oath, evidence of the charges it had made against the committee.

Eight months have gone by since that telegram was sent. To date, no reply has been received. When challenged to substantiate its charges, the teacher group backed down, hoping, apparently, that the committee and everyone else would forget the matter. But the committee has not forgotten it, and I don't believe the American public has either.

What do you suppose the average American parent thinks of facts such as these? Do you wonder that, though they see the logic of teaching the truth about communism and even the need for it, they are wary of the implementation of such a program?

Isn't it natural that they see, and fear, the damage that can be done with the wrong teachers giving such a course?

Those of you in the teaching field may think I am being unduly critical of your profession. I am afraid, however, that many educators have too often been guilty of a rather cavalier attitude toward the people of this country and fuzzy about communism and the welfare of the Nation itself. If this were not so, could there be such strong and widespread feeling in our high school and college faculties against the committee?—which actually means against revealing the truth about homegrown treason, for that is what communism is. The contrast between the "teacher attitude" toward the committee and the attitude of the overwhelming majority of the American people, is one example of how completely out of tune with the public too many educators have been on some vital issues. I am convinced, too, that the fault is not the public's, but rather that of the educators.

Perhaps, for a change, some of our educators should give a little more thought to looking at the mote in their own eye. If they did so, I believe they would see quite a change in the public's attitude toward them.

In closing, I would like to say this: It has not been pleasant for me to say many of the things I have said today about a group that plays so vital a role in our national life and the survival of freedom. But,

though I wish the things I have spoken of did not exist, the fact is that they are all too real and I felt that I should speak of them.

Moreover, I choose this occasion to do so, because I thought it best that they be mentioned before those who are representative of the most responsible and informed element in the educational field, you teachers, professors, and administrators who are here today.

Like most Americans, I have complete faith in the great majority of educators in this country. Like other professions, however, yours is plagued by a vocal, irresponsible minority, which creates a very real public relations problem for all educators.

I think there is only one way you can solve this problem, by being equally vocal and by encouraging many more of your colleagues to be the same way. You must make it clear to the people of this country that this minority is not truly representative of the educational profession—by drowning out its voice with a much larger one.

I realize that, to most of you, teaching is your major interest. You are not anxious to become public agitators, to publicize your names on letterheads, in newspaper ads, and so on. But when Communists, fellow travelers and your irresponsible minority use these legitimate weapons to help to destroy freedom, why should you hesitate to use them to preserve freedom, to defend your country and its institutions?

Of late, the term "the silent generation" has frequently been applied to our youth. I am afraid that for too long, our educators, or at least the best and most responsible element among them, have been silent on too many vital issues, leaving the field of public policy, communism and security wide open to those within your ranks who are actually your enemies and the enemies of your profession.

Again, I urge you to speak up and to get as many of your colleagues as possible to do the same.

Other speakers at this conference have undoubtedly told you that it is very late in the game. They are certainly right. Nevertheless, it is most encouraging that this meeting is taking place, that so many educators who realize their responsibilities are attending it, and steps are being taken to give to the students of America the knowledge they need to preserve the freedoms their forefathers have handed down to them.

I would like to congratulate the sponsors of this conference and all those attending it. A few minutes ago, we saw one kind of "Spy Next Door." We must not forget that in many countries of the world where the people did not wake up until it was too late, there is for every single citizen a "Spy Next Door"— a spy to report his activities and words to "big brother," the totalitarian destroyer of academic freedom and all the freedoms we hold dear. This is a thought we must keep uppermost in our minds and make a guide to our actions—so that communism, the agency which creates such spies, will never dominate the American scene.

Judges and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the American public will be appreciative of a nonpolitical approach when the administration makes its appointments of judges to fill the 70 new places on the Federal bench.

Surely this is an area where ability is the basic requirement and I commend the editorial that appeared in the New York Times on April 27 to the attention of my colleagues:

JUDGES AND POLITICS

The appointment of judges to fill the new places on the Federal bench is going to prove a test of the administration's capacity to put ability above politics—where that priority is most necessary. Attorney General Kennedy will take a large share of the praise, or blame, for the quality of the judges chosen.

Congress has set a poor example so far in putting politics in its rightful place. The Democratic majority in the last Congress would not approve any of the urgently needed additions to the Federal bench while a Republican was President. Then came the unseemly haste with which the Democratic-controlled Senate rushed through a bill to create 73 new judgeships after Mr. Kennedy took office. Since then the House has passed a measure to add 70 new places.

We doubt that as many as 70 new judges are actually needed. The Judicial Conference, top administration body of the Federal courts, had urged 59 before the Senate voted for 73, though the conference later upped the recommended figure to 69.

The appointments to fill these posts will be the object of far more public, and partisan, scrutiny than usual. Outstanding merit should be the chief if not the only requirement. And we assume that that test will not rule out all Republicans from the President's—and his brother's—lists.

Human Relations Goes to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. HART] for the March issue of the Committee Reporter, a publication of the American Jewish Committee. This article, entitled "Human Relations Goes to Washington," will be especially pertinent in the months ahead, as we work toward the development of a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Senator HART points out that there is need to plan for constructive programs of community relations designed to improve intergroup relations in our urban centers. As we attempt to improve the physical environment in our cities, which will contribute to greater family stability, to better health, to more effective education, then we also have the opportunity to improve the respect which all groups must all have for one another in order to build true communities.

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

HUMAN RELATIONS GOES TO WASHINGTON

(By Senator PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan)

Along with usual political promises, presidential campaigns have a way of generating an occasional new commitment to a new idea. This last campaign was no exception. The concept of a Department of Urban Affairs was just such an idea and there is good reason to believe it will soon come into being.

The almost fantastic accumulation of problems facing our cities is not, however, simply a matter of physical decay and technological change. These are enormous problems to be sure: housing, highways, schools, water, transportation, and the like. But continuing population growth, on the one hand, and population movement, on the other, have added a social dimension of equal significance.

Consider, for example, that we have become a nation predominantly of "big" cities; about 108 million or 60 percent of our citizens living in 168 standard metropolitan areas. This is a city-dwelling population larger than the national total in 1920. Not only has our farm population been dwindling from about 32 million to around 20 million during the period, but perhaps the most striking feature of this population shift has been the movement of more than two and a half million Negroes from the Old South to the urban orth and West in the decade between 1940 and 1950. This shift has continued into the sixties. Coupled with it is movement in the East of nearly a million Puerto Ricans from the island to the mainland, and in the West the movement of an estimated 2½ million more Spanish-speaking people from Mexico into the States.

Movements of these dimensions had their counterpart earlier in this century, of course, with the immigration waves from central and southern Europe. It was these masses, agrarian in background, limited in education, with their distinctive cultural language and religious differences, who had become the first victims of the urban slum. It was, in fact, by their strong backs, and with their caloused hands that our cities were built. The heightened intergroup tension before and after World War I, the spread of the Ku Klux Klan into the cities culminating in the mass parade of costumed marchers in broad daylight down Pennsylvania Avenue in the Nation's Capital, the intensity of religious hatred in the Al Smith campaign had characterized the problems of urban adjustment being experienced by the immigrant. In similar fashion, new problems arising out of race were to emerge in the cities as World War II got underway.

Problems growing out of religious differences have perhaps disappeared less than they have changed. The metamorphosis from street fights, rock throwing and vandalism, which characterized the economic fears and competitions between groups, to political factionalism and contests for power in the big-city political machines now has moved on to the suburban ramparts of the country club and the industrial or financial board of directors. Thus the problem of attaining full political participation, equal economic status and true social acceptance remains a continuing challenge to this day's city dweller of the second half of the 20th century, of whatever background, old and new alike.

While the facts demonstrated that there is no inherent relationship between poverty and group background, between illiteracy or dependency or crime and such identity, in making this point we have often failed to appreciate that group identity is a concomitant of such problems. We always make the point that racial or religious discriminations often have created a vicious circle forcing continued limitation on the minority group member who, because of lack of education or

status, is forced to remain dependent. But we have failed to emphasize and add that no attack on poverty or crime or slum housing or urban renewal can hope to be very effective without taking into account the factors of racial, religious, and ethnic group interests which are tied into them.

Fortunately, from experience during the past two decades, we know that both skills and knowledge can be developed to deal precisely with those aspects of urban life which have historically been the most explosive—the problems, tensions, and misunderstandings growing out of group differences. In these 20 years some 70 cities have created official committees or commissions on intergroup or human relations. Some 25 States have established such agencies and have organized informally under the Governors' committee on civil rights. Collectively, these units of government now appropriate approximately $5 million for advisory and regulatory services to assist these communities in dealing with these problems. If growth is a measure of success, then this idea is working. It has even found roots in the South with more and more communities setting up interracial study committees in the face of increasing pressure from the new student sit-in movement.

With the creation of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs, happily now at hand, perhaps at long last it will be possible to establish within it a Federal Intergroup Relations Service. Such a unit could function as a national service bureau for local, State, and regional intergroup relations agencies and could work with smaller communities not having their own intergroup relations committees. Perhaps this is what then-Senator Lyndon B. Johnson was reaching for as a concept when he proposed his Federal Community Relations Service. Such a Federal Intergroup Relations Service is consistent with the objectives contained in the Douglas bill for technical assistance in meeting the school desegregation crisis. It simply extends this idea into other issues and other areas. Such a unit could serve as an information clearing house for both public and voluntary intergroup relations agencies; it could provide badly needed consultative services. It could engage in fact gathering and stimulate research as well as providing help in establishing training programs for professional and volunteers in the field, including the sponsorship of pilot projects.

Federal concern with intergroup relations problems is not entirely a new concept. Appropriately, there are intergroup relations officers in the Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA), the agency most likely to become the nucleus for the new Urban Affairs Department. There are similar specialists in the Office of Education, the Post Office, the Defense Department, the Department of Labor. What is now needed, additionally, is a service that is directed toward the community.

Because of its strategic location within a Department of Urban Affairs, a national intergroup relations service would be able to cut across various functional areas all of which are manifest in urban problems. Such a service provides a challenging opportunity to bring to bear all the knowledge we have painfully obtained, all the experience and skills we have gained as part of our total attack on the problems of our cities. To fail to see this, to look upon the urban problem as physical and industrial and financial without some realization of this additional and critical aspect, the cities social existence would be short sighted indeed. If ever there was an illustration of what is meant by a "New Frontier" here is one and the opportunity for action is at hand.

NOTE.—Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat of Michigan, was elected to the U. S. Senate in 1959 following 4 years as Lieutenant Governor of Michigan. He is a member of the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency as well as the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure.

Germany's Contributions to Western Unity and Consolidation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the free world continues to rejoice over the tremendous political and economic postwar recovery of Western Germany under the inspiring leadership of Konrad Adenauer. The new Germany has come to be looked upon as one of the strongest bastions of freedom existing outside of the Western Hemisphere. In some respects of foreign policy, in fact, the support of West Germany of anti-Communist programs and policies has been much more closely similar to that of the United States than that of our valued friends in the British Isles.

For the further information of the Congress and the country, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent report on West German progress as provided by the Press and Information Office of the Federal Government.

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

GERMANY'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNITY AND CONSOLIDATION OF THE WEST

(Activeness and efficiency of the Federal Republic in the frame of NATO, bulletin No. 12 of the Press and Information Office of the Federal Government)

At the beginning of 1961 Franz Josef Strauss, Federal Minister of Defense, held a speech before the Economic Club in New York, in which he declared amongst other things: Our main problem after the war was the mastering of a threatening ghost: the immense rate of unemployment; for there was a state, in which the economic circulation had been interrupted by the Iron Curtain, its vast agrarian surplus territories having been separated and ceded to Poland, a state whose remaining ground had been divided into four occupation areas, hermetically separated from each other. Moreover, all this happened in the same Germany, whose apparatus of production as well as transportation facilities were almost entirely destroyed, while a throng of expellees and refugees overflowed into the western zones of the country. We sat on a tiger, so to speak. For even the bayonets of the occupational forces would have been unable to keep in check the desperate and instigated masses. And moreover, how should we procure lodging and subsistence in this already destroyed country, the population of which had increased by 25 percent within a very short period?

Considering your own strong economy as well as the fact that your country, the United States, is not divided, just imagine what it would mean to you, if you would have to shelter, within a few years, 55 million refugees, deprived of their property, if you would have to incorporate the same in the economic situation and to procure them with homes. The above figure shows clearly the extent of the problem, of course with regard to America's state of affairs, however, please, do not forget the fact that the aforementioned throng of refugees reached such a degree that it would correspond to an immigration rate of 700,000 persons per year to the United States.

And even more drastic picture is obtained, if one starts from the principle that the U.S. economic unity of today would be partitioned as follows: twice the ninth part of the territory to be evacuated of its present population and surrendered to the U.S.S.R., i.e., the States of Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, Nevada, Idaho, Montana, and Utah. Two further ninth parts of American ground to become a satellite state under Communist control and government, i.e., the States of New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. Finally the remaing 5 ninth parts, separated from the ceded areas by an Iron Curtain, would be forced to shelter 40 million people, destitute of goods and homes, as well as to incorporate these in the economic life.

REPULSE OF COMMUNISM BY NONMILITARY MEANS

Owing to the courageous policy of the Adenauer government as well as to the diligence of the German population we finally succeeded in overcoming this problem in the Federal Republic. With it the first great repulse of bolshevism was gained in a fight with nonmilitary means, for, as is well known, wherever misery and chaos are predominant the professional revolutionaries are in clover. In the years between 1949 and 1960 we provided 6.5 million new places in the labor market, and from 1950 to 1960 we built 5.5 million homes and, year by year, we are paying 12.5 percent of our public revenue for welfare work.

We gratefully admit that the assistance of the United States of America as well as the change of policy on the part of the Western occupational forces has helped us to a considerable extent. That is the truth. And it should not be defined as an "economic miracle" but rather as a victory in the struggle against radicalism.

Sierra Leone Gains Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today marks the entrance into full independence of a new West African nation—Sierra Leone. As one who has followed the steady progress of her people into freedom, I should like to extend my heartfelt congratulations to Prime Minister Sir Milton Margai and Sierra Leone's 2 million citizens.

Founded in 1787, the new nation enjoys strong historical ties with both the United States and Great Britain. Its capital—Freetown—was established to provide freed slaves a home of their own, while the beautiful "Mountains of the Lion" were chosen by the Anti-Slavery Society to settle a number of freed slaves from 18th-century England and America.

After World War II, Great Britain created a Protectorate Assembly, gradually increasing the measure of autonomy exercised by the Sierra Leone Government. Since May 1960 the Prime Minister and his cabinet have enjoyed a large degree of internal self-government. Our every good wish goes out to them for the successful discharge of their new responsibilities. Let us hope that the relationships between our two countries will proceed in ever greater friendship and understanding.

Under unanimous consent I include the following article:

SIERRA LEONE: INDEPENDENCE WITHOUT PAIN

(By Roy Lewis [1])

On April 27, 1961, a new West African nation will enter the stage of world affairs; it will replace South Africa as the 12th member of the British Commonwealth, and will probably become the 100th member of the United Nations. Sierra Leone's coming of age deserves special interest in the United States because its foundation in 1787 is interwoven with the skeins of American history. For the beautiful, thundery "Mountains of the Lion" off the flat mangrove-fringed coasts of West Africa were selected by the Anti-Slavery Society to settle a number of freed slaves from 18th-century England and America. Moreover, its mighty harbor, Freetown, was the base from which Her Majesty's frigates and gunboats intercepted the slave ships and eventually put down the trade.

LOCATION ENHANCES IMPORTANCE

Sierra Leone is a relatively small country by the standard of the independent African countries de l'expression anglaise, as the phrase now goes, but it is well up to the average of the states that have emerged from the break-up of the French colonial empire in Africa. It's population is over 2 million, about the same as its ex-French neighbor, Guinea, and rather larger than that of its other neighbor, Liberia, whose history is also closely associated with the slave trade and the first aspirations of African nationalism. Sierra Leone is smaller than either of its neighbors—about the size of the State of South Carolina; but because it is wedged between two States representing opposite ends of the African political spectrum, it is of some considerable political importance. Its harbor is the finest in West Africa, though the British never made it into the base that the French made of Dakar.

The past always lives to some extent in the present, and Sierra Leone's past cannot be forgotten in considering its potentialities. Though the colony dates from 1787, the country as a whole did not become a British possession until the 1890's, when a large area of the hinterland behind the colony area was declared a protectorate, and treaties were made with about 150 small chieftaincies, belonging to perhaps 20 major tribal and linguistic groupings.

This is important for several reasons. The small colony was, though rather poor, deeply anglicized. The creoles, though almost wholly African in blood (they had some admixture of English and West Indian ancestry), were detribalized, relatively prosperous, sophisticated, and educated. They thought of the tribal Africans as bush savages, and in return were called black Englishmen. The protectorate as such was administered separately from the colony until very recently; English common law and freehold prevailed in the colony, codified native customary law mainly in the protectorate, where land was communally owned and, ironically enough, some local domestic slavery persisted until 1928. For Sierra Leone to become a nation, this division has had to be overcome; the creoles, now only about 80,000 in number, had to become one with the natives and the tribes had to lose their separateness from each other (though this latter process is far from complete). In the past 60 years, the economic process has been one of opening up the interior and uncovering its wealth, both agricultural and mineral, for the good of the whole territory.

BOUNDARIES FIRM

Sierra Leone, physically, is a more soundly delineated area than many African states, for it is bounded by the sea and the crescent of mountains which form the headwaters of its own many fine rivers on the western side, and of the Niger which flows eastward. The country is a vast draining-board tilted toward the Atlantic, well-watered, hot, and so located that it can grow a great range of tropical produce in a varied climate at the junction of the true tropical forest belt and the savannah belt. Ethnically, it is not quite so self-contained, though only one major tribe—the Mende—overlaps largely into neighboring Liberia.

The protectorate was developed, outwards, from Freetown (and Bonthe, a now moribund port). It was slow work, because of the backwardness of the people by European standards, lack of communications, and the difficulty, at first, of finding any export crops; when palm produce became the territory's staple, the prohibition of land alienation left its cultivation entirely to the African chiefdoms, and this was not very efficient. Development was also retarded by World War I, and then by the depression; but in the 1930's, cobalt, diamonds, and iron ore were discovered, and the mining of these, together with the development of new tropical crops—swamp rice, cocoa, coffee, ginger, piassava, benniseed, etc.—began rapidly to transform the country, a process which received immense impetus after the war, when diamonds were found not to be confined to the single area, Kono, where they were first discovered, but all down the estuaries of the rivers that drain the country.

This rapid economic growth, though painful in many ways, transformed the country politically. First of all, it put wealth into the hands of the tribes of the hinterland, so that the creoles became, in many ways, the poor relations. Secondly, this wealth began to break up the bonds of tribalism, further undermining the foundations of chieftaincy which British rule was already transforming. Thirdly, in letting news, movement, and ideas flow in the protectorate, it spread the gospel of African nationalism—which at first was taken up by creole intellectuals, who became the first teachers of the tribesmen. A strong protectorate movement, headed by some of the chiefs, began to press for more responsible rule and for freedom—not merely from British control, but more particularly from "creole" privilege in Freetown and the colony area.

After World War II, Britain acknowledged the propriety of all this, and set up a protectorate assembly; the colony, like nearly all British colonies in the West Indies and elsewhere, had had a measure of popular representation from the nineteenth century. In the past decade, Sierra Leone's political history has been the usual British colonial one of a succession of constitutions, each more liberal than the last, paving the way steadily towards fully democratic institutions and independence, under the pressure of a nationalist party. But in Sierra Leone this has been complicated (as in Ghana it was not) by jealousies between the creole-ruled colony and the protectorate.

It is the signal triumph of the present Prime Minister, Sir Milton Margai, that in the building of the nationalist party (the Sierra Leone Peoples' Party), he has successfully brought together the majority of the creoles, the traditional chiefs, and the politically-conscious masses of the protectorate. His work of unification is an astonishing political feat, and it alone entitles "the doctor" (as he is affectionately called—he is, in fact, an Edinburgh-trained medical practitioner) to be described as father of his country. He is a Mende.

A UNITARY STATE

Sierra Leone has developed, under British tutelage, as a unitary country like Ghana, not a federal state on the Nigerian pattern. The creoles have retained, however, a certain advantage in representation, and the chiefs also have a reserved place in the assembly; if this is not an exact one-man one-vote equal-district type of representation on the Westminster model (and therefore much criticized by the young radicals), it in fact is not far off it, and takes account of historical factors that cannot yet be ignored.

In the final phase before independence, which has lasted since May 1960, the Governor has only had minimum reserved powers, and Sir Milton has run the country with a cabinet drawn from both the SLPP and the opposition factions. The existence of one small opposition group, not represented in the prevent government, preserves the essentials of a party system—so far at least. Parallel with this constitutional development has gone the steady "africanization" of the civil service, as fast as the growth of schools and higher education permitted. Sierra Leone's Fourah Bay University—the first institution of higher education in Africa—was founded as a college in 1824 by the Church Missionary Society and raised to full university status in 1960.

Economically, the country has done well, and is now fairly prosperous. Its annual budget is around $30 million; its exports from January to September 1960 were $51,849,076 and its imports, $53,189,480—a rapid increase since 1947. In addition to the minerals mentioned above, rutile has been discovered and is being worked, and bauxite is being investigated, but iron and diamonds remain the twin pillars of the state.

Unquestionably, Sierra Leone needs a great deal of development capital. The extension of its iron extraction industry from Marampa to Tonkolili was unduly delayed (in favor, ironically, of the development of Guinea's hematite ores), and much exploration needs to be done. It is vital that national wealth should expand if the needs of a growing population are to be accommodated, if creative work is to be provided for the young people flowing from the new schools, and if the expansion of education, health, and welfare services is to be sustained.

DIAMONDS BRING CHANGES

The great diamond boom has awakened Sierra Leone, once so sleepy, Victorian and conservative, fully into the modern world. Independence, which has ben achieved rapidly, yet with skill and a minimum of disturbances (there have been some), brings a new challenge.

Though in politicians such as his brother Albert Margai, Minister of Natural Resources, Foreign Minister John Karefa-Smart, Minister of Finance Muhammad Sanusi Mustapha, and a dozen others, Sir Milton has a good team, there is still a severe shortage of administrative talent. British expatriates, if in diminishing numbers, will be needed to serve the state for some time in the departments, and technicians may be needed from abroad in increasing numbers, despite the growing outturn of trained Africans from Fourah Bay and British and American universities.

In any analysis of the outlook for Sierra Leone, two dangers that it may be delicate

[1] Roy Lewis, formerly chief African correspondent of the London Economist, is the author of the definitive book on Sierra Leone, "Sierra Leone: A Modern Portrait" (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1954). Mr. Lewis has recently taken over as head of the Economist's Washington, D.C., office.

to mention ought to be faced. One is internal. The great diamond boom, and the vast smuggling racket that burgeoned from its mishandling in 1953–56, put immense wealth into the hands of the Lebanese and Syrian trading community. This community is not noted for its wisdom or public spirit, and is concerned to keep its gains less by wise entrepreneurship than by judicious influencing of local African leaders. These may not be wholly taken in; but the fact remains that, the British having egregiously failed to make the Lebanese community pay its full share of the tax burden, the Africans must now do so—or risk becoming puppets of an expatriate plutocracy. The Lebanese have performed a valuable role in the Sierra Leone economy—but today they risk becoming an object of jealousy and dislike as a barrier to African traders.

GUINEA WOULD INFLUENCE

The second danger is external, and is complementary to the first: Guinea has certainly every intention of exerting increasing influence on its neighbor, which it regards as very backward in terms of Africanism. Sierra Leone has free institutions—a British-type judiciary, a representative house with an opposition, a free (if inadequate) press, a western tradition more deeply rooted than in most parts of Africa. But is this enough? Young Sierra Leonians, educated abroad and sensitive of Africa's revolution, are restive and critical; since they will soon be in politics, the days of moderation may be numbered. The Soviets are concentrating their efforts in making Guinea a "show place." There will be a very direct rivalry and contrast between Guinea and Sierra Leone in the next few years, between the fruits of the democratic, liberal, British-colonial and Commonwealth method, and the authoritarian (though also African) method of Sekou Toure and his colleagues.

To sustain its sovereignty—including its small army and its new diplomatic establishment—Sierra Leone will need an expanding budget, and more external aid than the £7,500,000 which Britain gave it as a farewell present. What will take the place of the colonial development and welfare funds which now automatically cease? To pay for the heavy cost of economic, and social development—even now, barely 5 percent of the former protectorate people are literate, compared with 80 percent or so in the former colony—swift aid, in loans and technical assistance, are required. In my view, the most vital sectors are education—where the need is greatest for teachers and teacher training—and agriculture. Despite a good deal of agricultural progress, especially in mechanized swamp rice cultivation, the export potential is far from realized, while the many unsolved problems of keeping tropical land fertile cry for urgent investigation. A series of comprehensive studies has been made; what is now needed is men, organization, energy—and money.

SIERRA LEONE

Capital: Freetown (population 100,000).

Area: 27,924 square miles (colony, 256 square miles; protectorate, 26,669 square miles).

Population: 2,260,000 (mid-1958 estimate).

Official language: English (Mende is the principal local language in the south, and Temme in the north).

Imports, 1958: £23,950,000, chiefly manufactured goods, machinery, fuel oils, cement.

Exports, 1958: £19,600,000, chiefly diamonds, iron ore, palm kernels, coffee, cocoa, kola nuts.

Budget, 1959–60: revenue, £11,488,000; expenditures, £12,286,000.

Principal occupation: agriculture.

A Healthy Agriculture Is Necessary for a Healthy National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when Orville Freeman, our new Secretary of Agriculture, testified before the House Agriculture Committee on the new omnibus farm bill, he described the scope of the proposed measure. He also stressed the great need for this legislation in the interest of a healthy agriculture and a healthy national economy. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a portion of his statement in the RECORD.

SCOPE AND URGENCY OF NEW FARM LEGISLATION

In opening the discussion of the Agricultural Act of 1961, I should like to first, describe briefly the scope of the provisions encompassed in the bill as a whole; and second, emphasize the urgency of this legislation.

I. SCOPE

This bill encompasses several different program areas, but they are all essential parts of achieving the goal of the best possible utilization of our agricultural abundance to contribute to the national well-being under conditions that will enable farmers to achieve a fair income.

One part of the bill is directed toward greater consumption of farm products—toward expanding our exports and improving our programs to meet human needs and promote economic development in the emerging nations. This is an essential part of our agricultural program to adjust our agricultural abundance to meet the needs and conditions of our times. We need to expand our exports as well as our efforts to provide an adequate nutritional base for all Americans. And this expanded utilization of farm products must be taken into account in our plans for adjusting production to the quantities and kinds of agricultural products that we can use.

Another part of the bill relates to agricultural credit, and is directed toward enabling all our family farmers to benefit from the improvements contemplated in the farm program, to strengthen the position of family farmers, and to enable them to make their maximum contribution to the Nation's economic growth.

Still another part emphasizes the assurance that farmers' cooperatives will have the legal protection they need to grow and prosper in our modern economy, and by that growth to enable them to make a greater contribution to the economic well being of their members.

The longest portion of the bill, title 1, relates to supply adjustment and price stabilization. It provides the procedures and the machinery whereby farmers can work together, in cooperation with government, to adjust their production to modern needs and conditions; and thereby to achieve for themselves fair incomes, as they make available to consumers adequate supplies at fair prices.

We believe that all these program areas should be treated together as they are combined in this bill, for the failure to act affirmatively in any one of these areas is to cut away one important support of the total program for agriculture.

II. URGENCY

I believe that the early enactment of this legislation is imperative in the interest of farmers, consumers, taxpayers, and the economy as a whole. Its urgency is highlighted by several factors.

This legislation is urgent because the decline in farm income must be reversed

The decline in farm income in recent years need not be spelled out for members of this committee. You are well aware of the facts. But I assure you that it needs to be presented to others. Nothing has impressed me more, during my 3 months in this office, than the extent to which the nonfarm public is unaware of the critically low level of farm income. Emphasis on surplus and subsidy have clouded the true facts.

The annual per capita income of farm people averaged $986 in 1960—only 43 percent of the average of $2,282 received by the nonfarm population. This is a substantial drop from the 1947–49 period, in which the per capita annual income of farm people was about 58 percent of the per capita nonfarm income. Thus, the disparity in income has been increasing, at the expense of the producers of our most essential human needs, at the expense of those whose productive efficiency has made us the best fed people in the world.

Farmers' realized net income from farming in 1960 totaled $11.6 billion, which is a decline of 26 percent from the 1947–49 average. It is true that there are fewer farms today, and therefore the decline in net income per farm is not quite that much. But in 1960 the net income per farm from farming, after adjustment for price level changes, was 20 percent below the 1947–49 average.

	1947–49 average	1960	Percent change
Realized net income from farming (billion)	$15.7	$11.6	−26
Realized net farm income per farm (1960 dollars)	3,224	2,568	−20

These income declines result largely from a 12-percent reduction in average prices received by farmers from the 1947–49 average and a 20-percent rise in prices paid for items used in family living and in farm production. As the result, the parity ratio, which measures the relative price position of farmers, declined from 108 in 1947–49 to 80 in 1960—a drop of 26 percent.

	1947–49 average	1960	Percent change
Prices received by farmers (1910–14=100)	271	238	−12
Prices paid, interest, taxes, and wage rates (1910–14=100)	250	299	20
Parity ratio (1910–14=100)	108	80	−26

Income declines over the past decade have not been the same for all classes of farms. But net incomes in 1960 of representative commercial poultry farms in New Jersey, of representative wheat-fallow farms in the Pacific Northwest, of representative wheat-small grain-livestock farms in the northern plains, and representative cash grain farms in the Corn Belt, all were down to between 20 and 30 percent below the 1947–49 level.

In short, all income data indicates that farm incomes have declined in absolute terms during the 1950's, as other incomes were rising. Thus, in comparison with nonfarm incomes, the comparative position of farm incomes has worsened steadily. These declines have occurred even with the farm programs that have been in force. They are

not going to improve by talking and wishing. They are going to improve only as we take positive action to raise them. Any further delay would have serious consequences, not only to farmers, but to the rest of the economy.

This legislation is urgent in the interest of a healthy national economy

It should be self-evident that a stable, prosperous, and growing agricultural economy is absolutely essential to a stable, prosperous, and growing national economy. But, since this fact is not adequately recognized, I should like to review the contributions that a strong, growing agricultural economy can make to a growing national economy.

There is not an industry or a person in the United States who is not touched in some way by what happens in agriculture. A survey some 5 years ago showed that farmers and their families represented a market for $40 billion of purchases from the economy. Farm families buy the goods and services we all do as consumers. Farmers as business men buy the products of industry in order to produce. When farmers are prosperous—when their incomes grow along with incomes in the rest of the economy—the industries which service them benefit, and the workers employed in these industries benefit. Disadvantaged agriculture means disadvantaged industry and unemployment. For example, farmers spend some $2½ to $3 billion annually for tractors, motor vehicles, and farm machinery. Agriculture is a big market for these items. But agriculture hasn't grown in recent years and we all know that there is distressing unemployment in our key centers of the automobile industry today.

I could recite many facts on how important agriculture and our farm people are to our everyday economic activities: that farmers consume 320 million pounds of rubber, about 9 percent of the total amount of rubber used in the United States; that farmers purchase products involving 6½ million tons of finished steel; that farmers buy 45 million tons of chemical materials; that farmers buy 18 billion gallons of petroleum, more than is used by any other single industry; that farmers use more kilowatt hours of electricity than is used by Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore, and Houston combined.

The point I am making is that when agriculture hurts a lot of other people hurt—whether they live and work in the small rural communities or in the big manufacturing centers far removed from the farm production line. Farmers have a big potential for helping the Nation achieve a faster rate of economic growth and a higher rate of employment. But this will flow only from basic improvement on the farm.

The farm problem is closely related to the problem of unemployment. Workers released from agriculture by technological advances have not been able to find suitable employment in the nonfarm sector and there has been a damming up of labor with the consequent underemployment in agriculture. Next, the low gross returns received by agricultural producers have seriously restricted the market for machinery and equipment, lumber and construction supplies, and operating items such as gasoline, fertilizer, and pesticides. Finally, the low and inadequate net incomes earned by farm families has restricted the market for consumer durables and convenience goods and thus placed a brake upon the full production of these goods and services in the nonfarm sector.

These interindustry relations must be corrected and brought into balance as a means of contributing to overall economic development. We believe that the passage of the Agricultural Act of 1961 will make a significant contribution to the reestablishment of a set of economic relations between the farm and nonfarm sectors of the economy which will contribute to sustained economic growth.

Our New Secretary of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, which appeared in a recent issue of the Catholic Reporter, published in Kansas City, Mo., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

And may I say that this article about one of Minnesota's outstanding sons was written by another Minnesotan of whom we are also proud, Richard T. Greer, assistant librarian of the Senate Library.

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

(By Richard T. Greer)

"And I must say the Secretary of Agriculture is working overtime," said President Kennedy at his second press conference. In office only 9 days, Mr. Kennedy had discovered that Orville Lothrop Freeman, the 16th, the youngest and in some respects the unlikeliest Secretary of Agriculture, is a young man in a hurry.

The new administration is nearly 2 months old and the lights continue to burn brightly in the Independence Avenue office of the Agriculture Secretary long past midnight. For his is a formidable and perhaps the most thankless task of all those of the New Frontier.

The fact that he is not himself a farmer, is indeed city born and raised, and is a lawyer-politican suggests to some critics that he is hardly qualified for this most difficult of cabinet posts. But as a three-term Governor of one of the country's leading agricultural States, Orville Freeman is hardly a babe in the woods when it comes to agriculture and its problems.

He knows that the problems he has inherited from a harassed but proud predecessor are viewed by many old political hands as largely unsolvable. He has few illusions about the "mess" in agriculture. Yet he has grasped the reigns of command over the vast and bureaucratic Department of Agriculture with a zest which not a few Members of Congress have greeted with enthusiasm.

"As Secretary," Freeman has said, "I'm going to be selling agriculture." So far two fundamental judgments appear to underpin this salesmanship: the success of American agriculture, and the blessings of our agricultural abundance.

With regard to the first, he puts it this way: "We work less and less and less to eat better and better and better, and the most dramatic success story of the American economy and its productivity, the genius of organization and production, is agriculture * * * and yet somehow we have drifted off where we consider this is a great problem. It is a great success."

While the Nation eats better for less than any other people in the world, the former Minnesota Governor argues, the overwhelming number of farmers who make it possible barely make ends meet. Indeed, farmers have been subsidizing consumers, rather than the other way around.

The blessings of our abundance? "In agriculture, as in so many other things, we live in an age of abundance. Any nation that does not learn to use its abundance for the good of men will fail." He therefore will urge that more food be sent abroad to the world's needy, that other prosperous countries share this burden, that organizations such as the United Nations FAO participate more fully, and that existing machinery to carry on this task be strengthened and expanded.

One midwestern Senator, obviously pleased with these views, told his colleagues it was great to have, at long last, an Agriculture Secretary who believes in going to bat for the American farmer. And from a southerner: "I am happy to see someone come to Washington who makes it his No. 1 objective to try to help the farmers."

Actually, Ezra Taft Benson disagreed little with these Freeman principles. But it is also a well-known fact that though many American farmers agreed with Benson's approach to agriculture, they nevertheless thought he was on the other side—against the farmer. Freeman knows his farm policy proposals will never get off the ground without substantial support from farmers and their farm organizations. Thus he hopes to convince them early he's on their side.

For example, he contends that the American farmer has been the victim of unfair public criticism, among other reasons, because of governmental bookkeeping practices. Farmers are charged in the agriculture budget with a number of expenditures which by no means benefit them alone.

The costs of the school lunch program and Government purchase and distribution of food for the needy in this country should not be part of agriculture's budget. Nor should the costs of selling our surpluses abroad be borne by the American farmer, he points out, since the currencies received are subsequently turned over to other departments and agencies such as the State Department for the construction of embassies abroad or the Defense Department for the construction of military housing abroad.

Furthermore, loans made to, say, the Rural Electrification Administration are repaid in full with interest. Why lump them in with other expenditures? Other items, says Freeman, such as the annual $50 million subsidy to the American merchant marine and $20 million for the purchase of dairy products for the Defense Establishment are charged to agriculture. All in all, over $3 billion of the $6 billion Department budget are used for benefits that accrue to others than the farmer.

But there are tougher and more immediate problems that cry for solution—dwindling farm income, increasing Federal expenditures and mounting surpluses. "I don't come to Washington with all the answers," he remarked to a reporter upon his arrival in Washington. "For quite a while I want to do a lot of listening and not much talking."

In January he listened to the Tower of Babel views of the leading farm organizations at two conferences. He has been dutifully consulting farm-State members of Congress of both parties.

In many ways, Freeman is the exact opposite of Ezra Taft Benson. Unlike either Benson or his boss President Eisenhower—both of whom disdained politics—he is, like President Kennedy, first of all a politician. And unlike conservative Benson, the new Secretary is an unabashed liberal. The former's conservatism found expression in

his advocacy of a return to free-market policies. The latter's liberalism inclines him to use "governmental machinery wherever needed * * *, unhampered by either the worship of the free market or fear of subsidy."

Freeman's gerat-grandfather, Gus Johnson, came to Minnesota from Sweden in the middle of the 19th century. The frustrations of living with so many other Johnsons—getting the wrong mail or pay envelope—caused him to become a "freeman" in name as well as in fact. During his many statewide campaigns in Minnesota, candidate Freeman found it expedient to remind his Scandinavian audiences of this family ancestry.

The Agriculture Secretary was born in Minneapolis 42 years ago. As a student at the University of Minnesota during Franklin Roosevelt's second term, he shared with his new friend, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, the ferment and unrest of that period. He was president of the all-university council and a letterman on the famous Gopher football squads of those years. He received his bachelor's degree magna cum laude and also a Phi Beta Kappa key. "Even then," Senator HUMPHREY recalls, "Orville was a demon for work. He always had about four jobs, in addition to getting top grades in school."

HUMPHREY and Freeman became convinced that in political action lay the best hope to combat the depression. But the Democratic Party in Minnesota was an impotent third in the struggle for political office. Even the stronger Farmer-Labor Party had fallen on bad days. They decided a marriage of the two was the only road to political victory in the State. Their strategy was proved correct by the election of HUMPHREY to the U.S. Senate and, in time, Freeman's election to the Governor's chair.

Meantime the war came and Freeman was off to the Marines. In 1943 while leading a patrol on a South Pacific island, the left side of his face was shattered by an enemy sniper's bullet. For 8 months he lay in a hospital, his speech seriously impaired. A politician unable to speak passably is little better off than a pianist without an arm. But hard work and a Demosthenese-like determination ultimately paid off. Today he is a first rate public speaker.

After the war Freeman picked up his law degree and became assistant in charge of veterans' affairs to the mayor of Minneapolis—HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. He also served as HUMPHREY's Civil Service Commission chairman.

The now-merged Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party took on a decidedly left-wing complexion in the early postwar years. Progressives, Communists, and others of similar persuasions found in the Humphrey-Freeman team an implacable enemy. After 2 bloody years of political in-fighting, which provided a considerable education in the rough and tumble of political brawling, the undesirables were purged, yet the liberal complexion of the party was preserved.

Did Kennedy offer Freeman the Agriculture Secretary job first? Perhaps not, but if others turned it down because of the trials and frustrations suffered by Mr. Benson, who was Washington's favorite political target, Orville Freeman welcomed the challenge—and besides, he was out of work at the moment, for he had just suffered a sharp defeat in his try for an unprecedented fourth term as Governor of Minnesota.

He had some hesitancy about accepting, he recalls, but after considerable soul-searching and consultation with his wife and two teenage children, he decided he was "anxious to have the opportunity."

Freeman begins with an important advantage that Benson did not have for 6 of his 8 years in Washington. He has a friendly party in control of Congress where new farm policies ultimately must be approved.

Thus far his reception on Capitol Hill has been warm and perhaps even sympathetic. Many old-time members have been secretaries come and go, and they know full well the problems confronting this young man. Realists that they are, they are not lyrically hopeful that things will get better before they get worse. But they know, too, what astute political leadership can do, and they look with quiet expectation upon Orville Freeman.

A recent report prepared for the new administration by a special task force makes gloomy reading for Freeman and his advisers. Total farm output will continue to rise faster than consumption, surpluses will continue to accumulate in Government warehouses, and the yearly cost to the Government will continue to range from $2 to $4 billion, says the report.

Adjusting agricultural production to demand, it contends, will in the long run depend upon other than specific farm policies. It will depend largely upon "the achievement of a vigorous rate of growth for the rest of the economy and availability of nonfarm jobs."

That farmers in greater numbers are seeking nonfarm employment at a time when the national unemployment total rises alarmingly is verified by the recent 5-year farm census. In 1959, for example, 45 percent of all farmers did some off-farm work, and 3 out of 10 worked at off-farm jobs more than 100 days. Thus farm employment problems further aggravate the larger unemployment crises.

At the same time, the revolution in farm technology shows few signs of tapering off. During the past 5 years, according to the census report, "greater changes in farms and agriculture (have occurred) than for any other 5-year period recorded by a nationwide census."

To the task of grappling with these problems, Secretary Freeman brings some impressive assets. For one thing, he has, as even his critics concede, a first-rate mind. (A spokesman for the American Farm Bureau, the country's largest farm organization which is largely unsympathetic to the New Frontier, said Freeman was probably "the best of the men Kennedy could have chosen. He's not a meathead, that's for sure.")

As a former Governor, he also brings a record of genuine achievement in good government. Each of his six budgets was in balance, and though he increased State expenditures on all levels of education, welfare, and rehabilitation, he also raised the revenues to pay the bill.

And he brings to his new job a remarkable administrative ability. No scandal marred his administration. As Governor, he simultaneously raised wages of State employees and cut superfluous fat out of some State functions. Budget-minded Members of Congress are of course delighted to turn such talent loose in the Agriculture Department, which, like an iceberg, has on view in Washington a fraction of its total body.

A policy resolution of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference last year stressed the overriding need to preserve the basic family farm structure of American agriculture if the cultural, religious, and social values of the rural way of life are to survive. Freeman couldn't agree more. In Minnesota, his policies were designed to protect these farms rather than the larger corporate enterprises. However, he believes the family farm competes successfully in the majority of instances with what is called corporate farming.

What general approach to our agricultural problems will the new administration take? Though the President's farm message has not yet been sent to Congress (at this writing), some hint of its directions can be gleaned from the views of Willard W. Cochrane, currently Freeman's top adviser and former professor of agricultural economics at the University of Minnesota.

Cochrane's farm philosophy can be summed up in the term "managed abundance." In his words, it means this: "By supply control I mean the conscious adjustment of supply to demand, commodity by commodity, year after year, to yield prices in the market that have already been determined fair by some responsible agency."

Underlying this approach is the judgment that previous farm programs have failed to sustain reasonable prices and control surplus production. Our current surpluses are in wheat and feed grains. The wheat surplus we now have would satisfy domestic requirements for about 2½ years; other surplus grains equal about a half-year's production.

Freeman points out, however, there is no surplus of protein foods such as meats, oils and fats which must now be purchased on the open market by the Government for school lunch programs, welfare programs, and distribution to destitute families.

A similar situation of oversupply of some products and undersupply of others exists in the world market, he contends. But we dare not dump our grain surpluses on the world market without fear of disrupting the markets of friendly nations such as Canada. Yet many items not in oversupply here would sell readily on world markets, items such as nonfat dried milk.

The managed abundance approach would seek to cut surpluses not readily usable either domestically or in foreign markets and would foster greater production of those products in steady demand at home and abroad.

As a preliminary, the Agriculture Secretary has already set in motion a broad inventory of both domestic and world food and fiber needs. Presumably from this knowledge intelligent engineering of production in this country can be undertaken by the Government.

Can it be done without far more Federal control and direction than we have had in recent years? Will it not require infinitely varied and complex policies and programs? And will the farmer accept it, even with better prices for his products? What about the consumer? Critics argue that he is going to be saddled with higher prices at the food market with this kind of program. And lastly, what about Congress? Will it give such broad powers to the President and his Secretary of Agriculture?

At this point, only one thing seems clear, Orville L. Freeman will be walking an exceedingly thorny path this year and perhaps those to come.

Authorization for Sale of Agricultural Commodities

SPEECH
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4728) to amend title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, apropos the colloquy which just occurred, it came to my attention this week through having a caller on behalf of India regarding

India's desire to have us grant her a portion of our off-shore sugar allotment in the coming long-range sugar program. I told this very fine young man that I had always had none but the friendliest feelings for the great country of India. They are accepting our bounty. It is freely given in the form of the contract our chairman mentioned a few minutes ago concerning wheat. We are in the process of giving wheat to India in substantial quantities over an extended period of time. I had not known of this proposition the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] mentioned, that they turned right around and were buying planes from the Soviets. I would not imagine that we would give India a sugar quota, but it does seem to me that it is high time we in the Congress knew what is going on. I think we have every right in these negotiations to be called in, however, as I have heard it expressed a number of times in the past, it seems we are called in not at the beginning but only at the crash landings.

Israel's 13th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, April 20 marked the 13th anniversary of the birth of the State of Israel. The 13th year is highly significant in the tradition of the Hebrew people. It is on that birthday that a young lad enters on the threshold of maturity with concomitant charges of responsibility.

The growth of Israel toward this kind of symbolic maturity is reflected in the basic facts of Israel's economic life. Whereas in 1948 Israel had a population of 790,000, in 1960 its population was 2,128,000; industrial production hardly existed but in 1960 the figure was $1,070 million. So it is with exports, imports, agricultural production, irrigation, afforestation, water usage, and so forth. More specifically, exports in 1948 amounted to $29,680,000 and in 1960 amounted to $265 million; in 1948 there were only 412,000 acres of cultivated area and in 1960 there were 1,100,000 acres. Today Israel has a fleet of 53 ships which carries 445,000 tons of cargo as compared with the 4 ships she had in 1948, which carried a total of 14,000 tons. The number of Israeli teachers has quadrupled in the same period and its elementary school education has increased almost six times.

We must keep in mind that Israel's infancy was a cruel and troubled time. The barren soil, the absence of industry, the influx of immigrants, the war with the Arabs and the continued hostility of its neighbors were the heaviest of burdens to place in the path of a newborn. But the determination was there and the most important of all resources, men and women, whose daily lives were dedicated to the rearing of this infant without counting the cost of the individual's deprivations and sufferings.

It is little wonder then, that the little country of Israel has been watched with consuming interest by economists, social scientists and educators throughout the world. At its very beginnings there were few who believed that Israel would survive. There are now many who are studying to find the why of its survival.

Israel has become a factor in the rising nations of Africa. By that I mean not the mere establishment of trade relations but the serving of these nations by teaching them the use of methods and tools which have profited Israel herself. This has been done quietly and effectively and in the best tradition of international relations. And this has all been done within the framework of a working democracy. It is understandable then that the world, both hostile and friendly to Israel, marvels at the achievements of this nation only 13 years of age.

May 1 Proclaimed as Industry Day in Pennsylvania by Gov. David L. Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, dated April 18, 1961, which I received from Mr. H. Thomas Hallowell, Jr., president of the Standard Pressed Steel Co. of Jenkintown, Pa., and regional vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers, with which he forwarded a copy of Governor Lawrence's proclamation designating May 1, 1961, as Industry Day in Pennsylvania, as well as additional material associated with that designation.

The indicated material follows:

STANDARD PRESSED STEEL CO.,
Jenkintown, Pa., April 18, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: You will be interested to know that Gov. David L. Lawrence has proclaimed May 1, 1961, as Industry Day in Pennsylvania. A copy of the Governor's proclamation and other materials sent to press and publicity media in the State are enclosed for your further information.

Sole purpose of the observance of Industry Day, planned by the initial sponsoring organizations as an annual custom—is to call the attention of the public to industry's contribution to our American life, its qualities as a good neighbor in the community, and its potential for providing all people an ever-richer, fuller life.

We have had Labor Day on our national calendar since 1882. Unlike Labor Day, however, Industry Day is not planned as a holiday. It was conceived as a working celebration.

The selection of the date, May 1, for this observance and recognition is most appropriate, in my opinion, in that it is a perfect counterstrategem to the Communist observance on this day. The observance will also call to mind that the use of capital in the form of plants and tools, provided by savings, makes jobs which grow where an unfavorable climate does not exist, and in which we all have a part as citizens, management, labor, Government, and communities.

Because of the nearness of the date, Industry Day this year will be, of necessity, on a limited basis. But with the date now officially on the Commonwealth's calendar, plans are being formulated for a full-scale promotion of the May 1, 1962 observance, to include at local levels across the State, company-guided tours and open houses, complete newspaper, radio, and television coverage, display advertisements, displays of locally manufactured products in banks and store windows, and similar promotion, all pointing up the important role of industry in our daily life.

Sincerely yours,

H. THOMAS HALLOWELL, Jr.,
President, Regional Vice President, NAM.

PROCLAMATION—INDUSTRY DAY, MAY 1961

Whereas this Commonwealth's industries provide gainful employment for the largest single group of its citizens, and therefore constitute the State's primary economic resource; and

Whereas in this industrial State, it is industry through the teamwork of investors, management, and employees which provides the driving force to the Commonwealth's economy, and makes possible our high standard of living; and

Whereas the success of this Commonwealth's industrial community is in the widest public interest because it has a direct relationship to the personal welfare of all our citizens; and

Whereas a favorable industrial environment is essential to the expansion of existing industry and to the attraction of new industry to the State; and

Whereas the Commonwealth is constantly striving to improve the environment in which the industrial community operates and to increase the property of our State and raise the standard of living of all our citizens: *Now, therefore,* I, David L. Lawrence, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in cooperation with these efforts, do hereby set aside May 1, 1961, as Industry Day and respectfully request that the Commonwealth's industrial and business community, civic and fraternal organizations, educational institutions, and public and private communications media, share in the observance of these mutually beneficial objectives.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State, at the city of Harrisburg, this 23d day of March, in the year of our Lord, 1961, and of the Commonwealth the 158th.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE, *Governor.*

By the Governor:

———,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

HARRISBURG.—Gov. David L. Lawrence today set Monday, May 1 as Industry Day in Pennsylvania.

In a statement, the Governor said "Pennsylvania has long ranked as one of the world's great industrial areas. We are proud of our industrial heritage and the part our manufacturing plays in the Nation's overall economy.

"The latest McGraw-Hill report shows that Pennsylvania ranks third in the Nation in industrial building contracts for 1960, trailing only Texas and Ohio. Industrial construction totaled more than $176 million this past year.

"This shows, beyond doubt, that industry finds Pennsylvania's tax climate favorable for both location and expansion. Perhaps most important is the fact that this industrial construction includes projects undertaken by a wide variety of industries—ranging from the small, local firm to the best known of the Nation's manufacturing and distribution giants.

"Through the observance of Industry Day I hope that public attention will be drawn to the great economic and social contributions industries have made to the American way of life.

"I am, therefore, designating Monday, May 1, 1961 as Industry Day in Pennsylvania. I urge all industrial and community leaders to cooperate in planning appropriate local participation in this statewide event."

Pennsylvania manufacturing employs nearly 1½ million men and women who receive salary and wages aggregating approximately $7 billion.

Latest available statistics disclose that manufacturing industries of Pennsylvania produce over $26 billion worth of products per year. New capital invested by these industries in the State amount to over $690 million annually.

In addition, nonmanufacturing industry, of all types, contributes additional billions in payrolls and wealth to the State's total economy.

Industry Day in Pennsylvania was inaugurated and is cosponsored by the following organizations: The State department of commerce; Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce; Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association; National Association of Manufacturers; and the Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers' Association.

William R. Davlin, secretary of the department of commerce, is chairman of the Industry Day in Pennsylvania Committee. Others serving on the committee are John H. Seeton, secretary of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association; Bernard S. Payne and James Coffey, regional managers of the National Association of Manufacturers; Arnold L. Edmonds, executive director of the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce; and G. Richard Dew, general manager of the Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers' Association.

INDUSTRY DAY IN PENNSYLVANIA—FACT SHEET

Date: Monday, May 1, 1961.

Sponsors: Department of Commerce, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers' Association.

Chairman: William R. Davlin, secretary of the Department of Commerce of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Purpose: To recognize and call public attention to the importance of industry's contribution to the American way of life and to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in particular; to its qualities as a good neighbor in the community; and to its potential for providing all people with an ever-richer, fuller life.

History: This is the first of Industry Days in Pennsylvania. Because of the proximity of the date, the promotion of the Industry Day Observance this year will be in a limited fashion. However, the sponsors plan to make Industry Day an annual event, with elaborate plans already being prepared for a full-scale observance for next year, May 1, 1962.

Beliefs: The Industry Day Committee in Pennsylvania believes that a favorable business climate is essential to the further expansion of the economy in the State, the creation of new products and additional jobs for our growing population, and the prosperity of our Commonwealth.

Theme: Pennsylvania Industry, through the teamwork of investigators, management, and employees, provides the driving force to the Commonwealth's economy.

Program: Pennsylvania companies and local chambers of commerce, and manufacturers' associations, can assist in planning local activities designed to tell industry's story to the public. State, county, and municipal statistics may be found in basic source books on the Pennsylvania economy. These include the "Industrial Directory of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania" and the "Statistical Abstract," both prepared by the Department of Internal Affairs. They can probably be found in your local library or chamber of commerce.

What chambers can do (with and through cooperation of local members):

Remind newspapers, other media of upcoming Industry Day date, urge coverage, assist in gathering local material, facts, figures, etc.

Urge retailers, department stores, banks, libraries to cooperate in observace of Industry Day by assisting in displays, drop-in ads, etc.

Cooperate by cosponsoring with other civic, service clubs luncheon or dinner honoring local industry for their contributions to the community.

Urge member industrial companies to hold open house and plant tours for public.

Devote an issue of chamber publication to Industry Day.

Recommend that schools promote essay contest among pupils as to "How Industry Contributes to the American Way of Life in Our Community."

Suggest to local clergy that sermon on Sunday prior to Industry Day, Monday, May 1, be devoted to "Industry and Its Place in Our Local Economy."

Suggest to company editors of member companies that editorials or articles be prepared in observance of Industry Day.

Suggest to local radio and TV stations the possibility of interview or panel programs using key opinion leaders and company executives.

Suggest to local civic, service, and women clubs that they devote program meeting the week of May 1 to observance of Industry Day, and be prepared to provide speaker(s) if it is requested.

Publicize Industry Day in company publication through articles, editorials, etc.

Use company bulletin boards to display letter (message) from management to fellow employees over official signature of company president.

Enclose letter, brochure, leaflet, etc., to fellow employees and their families in paycheck envelope.

Use Industry Day announcements over your public address system.

Cooperate with other industry in community or area in offering open-house tour of plants to local schoolchildren and public during Industry Day.

Assist, cooperate, with your local newspapers, radio and TV stations. Alert media that Industry Day will be May 1. Assist them in preparing ads, articles, suggest editorials.

Supply local figures and illustrations, etc.

Arrange an interview or panel discussion on Industry Day with local radio and TV stations for company executives in area.

Offer an Industry Day display to local libraries.

Arrange for Industry Day display with local bank, or department or retail store. Display should point up the importance of industry to that particular community.

Contact local manufacturing group or chamber of commerce for cooperation, suggestions, in initiating programs for your entire area.

Interest schoolchildren in writing essays "How Industry Contributes to the American Way of Life in Our Community."

Sponsor an Industry Day luncheon or dinner under your own company auspices, or combine with other local area companies, and invite key opinion and community leaders.

Nineteen Hundred and Sixty-one Essay Contest, State of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HIRAM L. FONG

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, this morning the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped opened its 2-day conference here. Winners of the 1961 National Essay Contest conducted by the President's Committee were to be awarded prizes at the opening session.

Hawaii's winner is a 16-year-old Kamehameha Boys' School student, Kimo Douglas of Honolulu. In his State-winning essay, Kimo pointed out community and agency programs to rehabilitate the physically handicapped so that they may become useful and purposeful citizens.

I was impressed with this youth's statement that the "rehabilitated individual is transformed from a tax liability to a position of tax support in the community."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kimo Douglas' essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

Over 1,000 handicapped persons in Hawaii were successfully placed on jobs during 1960. Many of these were trained or completely retrained through rehabilitation. Best estimates indicate that there are approximately 60,000 handicapped persons in Hawaii who have need of such services according to the State vocational rehabilitation service. Greater efforts will have to be directed toward aiding the handicapped.

Hawaii is fortunate in having one of the finest rehabilitation centers in the United States. Community attention is being made to centralize rehabilitation services near the rehabilitation center of Hawaii so that more can be done for those who need help.

A visit to the rehabilitation center will prove the effectiveness of the rehabilitation operation from the standpoint of medicine, occupational therapy, and sincerity of the trainers of handicapped workers. Such a visit reveals beyond any question it is ability not disability that counts. Agencies cooperating with the rehabilitation center of Hawaii include the Oahu Health Council's rehabilitation committee; State department of health; medical doctors, especially bone specialists who treat a lot of handicapped workers; social service workers of various hospitals; and the State department of social services.

More public funds should be allotted to meet the challenge of rehabilitation. Every dollar spent in effecting rehabilitation of the disabled returns to the community a hundredfold when we consider that the rehabilitated individual is transformed from a

tax liability to a position of tax support in the community. Therefore, rehabilitation not only works for the benefit of the handicapped but also benefits society.

It is encouraging to know that the State employment service has trained personnel who specialize in placing handicapped workers. This agency works in close cooperation with the workmen's compensation service, the various hospitals, and the vocational rehabilitation service in placing handicapped workers.

A study of the reports covering activity of such handicapped workers indicate they are reliable, efficient and in many instances more suited to certain jobs than the average worker. Their attendance records, desire to learn, and their interest in proving ability counts, should indicate to the employer that it is good business to hire the handicapped. Many employers, both large and small, have found that handicapped workers have the ability to perform certain jobs better than other employees who are not handicapped. These jobs should be cataloged and employers encouraged to fill future vacancies by hiring handicapped people.

Each year the local branch of the President's Committee on the Employment of the Physically Handicapped makes every effort to solicit the cooperation of employers in hiring handicapped workers. It is interesting to note that awards made by this Committee to employers for hiring the handicapped range from the largest to some of the smallest employers in the State.

Rehabilitation in Hawaii is making good progress but is not too well understood by many persons who would become more interested if more adequate counseling was provided.

To the handicapped person, rehabilitation is a means by which a feeling of helplessness can be conquered in remaining capabilities developed to a maximum so that a place in society can be assured. This means of development is known as physical restoration. This, of course, is of importance in rehabilitation, but the measure of success depends on job placement. Such employment must be on the bases of skill and abilities equal to those of nonhandicapped workers. When the handicapped worker has reached the maximum in physical restoration, is satisfactorily placed on a job suitable to his ability, then rehabilitation has been successful. A proof of any rehabilitation program is revealed by successful job placement, this requires the greatest cooperation on the part of government services, employers, and the rehabilitee. Sometimes successful job placement requires alterations to working devices which will permit a handicapped person to operate standard machines and other equipment.

To summarize the vocational rehabilitation of handicapped persons is basically an economic problem. The goal of vocational rehabilitation is employment at wages equal to going rates for regular workers. Although rehabilitation records show and rehabilitation agencies publicize data showing that, properly selected, properly trained, and properly placed, the disabled worker does as well as the able-bodied person, there remains much to be done in this area in order that handicapped workers will be given equal opportunity to become successfully rehabilitated. Great care must be exercised in placing handicapped workers so that future records will continue to prove the value of hiring the handicapped.

Disabled workers successfully placed in industry will always be the best advertisement for hiring the handicapped. Teamwork by rehabilitation officials, doctors, placement specialist, and employers will be required to insure the success of this operation. Hawaiian industry and know-how together with our community support should prove equal to the challenge.

Privileged Treatment for High Income Lawbreakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the New Republic of April 10, 1961. It is shameful that these men, who have cheated the American public out of millions of dollars, should receive special treatment at the hands of the law. They make a mockery of the principle of equality before the law:

WHO YOU ARE

The seven top-salaried executives jailed in the Government's antitrust case against the electrical equipment industry have been released from prison—all of the 30-day sentences having been reduced by Judge Ganey for good behavior. The last to depart, John M. Cook, a vice president of Cutler-Hammer, Inc., of Milwaukee, was also the last to begin his sentence; he had been granted a delay so that he could attend his daughter's engagement party. A newspaper reporter described his exit thus: "Andrew J. White, the prison warden and Mrs. White were waiting when Cook emerged from the cell block into the prison foyer. So was Joseph Swain, Cook's attorney. As Swain tried to help Cook with his bag and the warden stood next to him, it seemed as if a houseguest was departing. 'Thank you for all your courtesies and kindnesses,' Cook said quietly to Warden White. White clapped him gently on the back. 'It's been a pleasure,' he replied."

Mr. Cook is returning to his job with Cutler-Hammer; same salary, same authority.

The president of the Allen-Bradley Co. of Milwaukee got off easier. He was given a suspended sentence by Chief Judge Ganey because his wife was ill. Or Judge Ganey might have been touched by this defendant's candor: "No one attending the gatherings was so stupid he didn't know (the meetings) were in violation of the law. But this is the only way business can be run. It is free enterprise."

On the other side of the tracks it's a different story. Take the case of the international vice president of the textile workers, Boyd E. Payton. In 1960 he was sent to prison for allegedly conspiring to damage the strikebound Harriet & Henderson Cotton Mills. He was convicted largely on the testimony of one witness, who, according to the union, had been employed as an agent provocateur by the North Carolina State Bureau of Investigation. The witness' record showed arrests ranging from intoxication to impersonating a police officer, stealing a police car and assault with a deadly weapon. Furthermore, it was said that he had a grudge against the union for it had refused to take his discharge from the Fieldcrest mills to arbitration.

Payton's trial took place in military-held Henderson, N.C., with a special judge, a special prosecutor and a special jury drawn from a neighboring county. It was concluded in haste and Payton was given 10 years. One difference between Mr. Payton and the president of the Allen Bradley Co. of Milwaukee is that Mr. Loock confessed there had been a plot, that it was carried out, but he chalked it up to "free enterprise" and went free. Payton insisted upon his innocence and the fact that the dynamiting he was accused of plotting had never been carried out. This got him 10 years. There's another difference: Payton can't get his job back for 5 years after he comes out of prison because of the Landrum-Griffin Act.

A Railroad Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Alexander F. Jones, executive editor of the Syracuse Herald-Journal, is a long-time leader in the American press, an "editor's editor." Casey Jones is well-known in Washington because of his long tour as managing editor of the Washington Post and later assistant to the publisher, where he won the respect of governmental officials and the whole Washington community.

Mr. Jones has written a constructive editorial on railroad consolidations and mergers, and I wish to call it to the attention of this body. Entitled "A Railroad Policy," it appeared in the April 11 edition of the Herald-Journal:

A RAILROAD POLICY

(By Alexander F. Jones)

One of these fine days the White House, the Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the general public are going to take a good look at the bleak future facing American railroads and actually do something about one of the most alarming conditions facing our economy.

Many of our railroads with a long history of success are losing money today hand over fist.

Many of them are talking merger in an effort to eliminate duplication, to cut losses, and to bring about greater efficiency.

Here in New York the State is lending money to railroads to buy new equipment so commuter service into the metropolis can be maintained. So far as I am concerned, this is the first step towards nationalization.

Everywhere railroads are cutting passenger service, applying for permission to discontinue branch lines and uneconomic trains, both passenger and freight. As a result of the economy steps, equipment and service have deteriorated.

The inroads trucks have made on railroad freight revenue and automobiles and airlines have made on passenger travel are common knowledge and need no elaboration here.

Neither does the tax picture, which is admittedly prejudicial, for railroads are assessed to the hilt and airlines are subsidized and trucklines need only State licenses.

Railroad securities today do not have the attraction as good investments that they once had.

Altogether, American railroads appear to be dying on the vine, outmoded and passé.

The fact is, however, that American railroads are basically as vital in our economy today as they ever were.

Anyone disputing that statement has only to recall what happens in any community or area when a strike paralyzes rail service.

The commodities necessary to keep our wheels turning, steel, coal, oil, foods, and refrigerated items, still come to most communities by rail.

And in wartime our first line of both defense and offense is the railroad system.

Lack of equipment in the movement of men or material would be fatal. Everything must move like clockwork, or a serious jam occurs at port terminals.

Anyone who tries to minimize the basic part railroads play in our scheme of things would be on mighty thin ice.

Then what is the answer?

One answer is the evolution of natural mergers which would eliminate duplication of service.

A board of the best transportation minds in the country, the best financiers, the best equipment experts, the best port and lake traffic men should immediately initiate an overall study of American railroads not only in relation to each other, but also in regard to truck, air, lake and river competition.

There are real solid answers to all of our transportation and distribution problems if we would approach them from a national standpoint and stop listening to proponents of some branch, either rail, air, truck or water, peddling their respective wares.

It seems utterly ridiculous to me to have to sit here and watch Cyrus Eaton, the Cleveland industrialist, try to gobble the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad for his Chesapeake & Ohio system in the hope that if this merger is approved by the ICC he will be able to so cripple the New York Central system it will go into bankruptcy and be easy meat to swallow also.

Today the New York Central system has 61 connections and 98 common points with the B. & O. It has 45 connections and 67 common points with the C. & O. This tremendous duplication of facilities compares with a mere 17 connections and 23 common points between B. & O. and C. & O.

The New York Central wants a three-way merger with these railroads to eliminate duplication and to save millions of dollars.

Judging from the map it is a natural and understandable desire.

I see no reason why the ICC should be exclusively concerned with the plans of Mr. Eaton to pull off a Wall Street coup and add x number of millions to his treasury.

The question here is whether the merger is in the interest of the people and of a more efficient rail system.

Our interest in Syracuse is that a prosperous New York Central will be able to run more trains in and out of this city and give better service.

Wherever you look on a railroad map, competing lines are talking merger and consolidation.

The Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul and the Chicago & Northwestern are deep in a merger plan.

The Santa Fe and Union Pacific are contesting control of the Western Pacific.

There are several merger plans cooking among railroads centering in St. Louis.

Here in the East, the Pennsylvania line is deep in several studies.

It all emphasizes a need for a national policy that will not depend on Wall Street coups that smell more than a little of the Jay Gould, Jim Fisk days, and have little concern for the public welfare.

Missing the Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to our colleagues for their consideration a thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the Wichita (Kans) Eagle on April 15, 1961. It is my feeling that this editorial provides good food for thought as we prepare to discuss new education proposals:

[From the Wichita Eagle, Apr. 15, 1961]

MISSING THE MARK

The administration is rolling up the heavy artillery in its fight for Federal aid to education; but some of the artillery is not aimed too accurately.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has issued figures showing that some of the strongest congressional opponents of the Kennedy school aid program have eagerly accepted Federal impacted areas aid. These Congressmen, the administration hints, should not trumpet their fears about Federal control of education while happily voting impacted areas aid for their districts.

The administration has a point. But it does not follow that these muzzled Congressmen are honorbound to vote for the Kennedy school aid bill. Wichita provides a case in point. Impacted area aid, given to school districts whose school population is swollen by nearby military or defense installations, provides about $1 million a year to the Wichita school system. The Kennedy program, while providing nationwide school aid, would sharply reduce impacted areas aid. Wichita, which would receive $650,000 under the Kennedy plan, would benefit little, and could even lose $350,000 a year if impacted areas aid were eliminated entirely.

Similar situations exist in the hundreds of school districts now receiving sizable impacted areas aid. The Congressmen representing those districts can surely be forgiven if they balk at cutting their own throats.

Praise for President's Message to Congress on Ethics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I applaud the President for his special message to the Congress of the United States on conflicts of interest. I have long taken the position that people must have confidence in their Government and a review of conflict of interest statutes convinces me that an up-to-date law covering ethics of all persons in public service is long overdue.

My only comment at this time, Mr. Speaker, is that regulations covering a standard of ethics and moral conduct should not be limited to those in the executive branch of Government. Congress should examine into the need for reform in our legislative branch of Government.

I was particularly gratified that the President should recognize the fact that you cannot legislate in every detail regarding the behavior of Federal officials and employees. I favor his establishing by Executive order a set of standards for those in Government service. The conclusion of the President that these standards can be maintained best by personal example of those in leadership appeals to me. Many Members of Congress, including myself, have introduced bills to improve the conduct of those in the legislative and executive branches. Now I trust we will get some action.

CWA President Beirne Backs the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most dynamic, progressive leaders in the labor movement is Joseph Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America. Indicative of his wide range of interests is his recent article expressing enthusiasm and support for the Peace Corps. His intellectual insight into the corps, its purpose and goal, is to be commended.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Beirne's enlightening and inspirational article entitled "Peace Corps Exciting Opportunity for Dedicated, Committed Service," in the May 1961 CWA News be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the CWA News, May 1961]

OFF MY MIND—PEACE CORPS EXCITING OPPORTUNITY FOR DEDICATED, COMMITTED SERVICE

(By J. A. Beirne, CWA president)

The most exciting idea yet launched by the Kennedy administration is the Peace Corps. It has caught the imagination of the American people, and has won the admiration and respect of peoples throughout the free world.

What is it? Only the outlines are firm at this moment; there is much planning and thinking to be done. Yet the general scheme of things can be put into words.

America's Peace Corps calls for creation of a voluntary group of dedicated and committed young men and women who will serve the cause of freedom overseas under the most trying conditions. The goal is simply to help underdeveloped countries attain a better and fuller life. It will be, in the hopes of all of us, a real contribution to the cause of peace and human progress.

As we start this exciting and dynamic new program, we must recognize certain restrictions. There are to be no "ugly Americans" among the men and women of the Peace Corps, and (as the New York Times declared) they must not proceed "like Communist agents by stealth and subterfuge * * * they are not to become instruments of propaganda or ideological conflict, except of course, insofar as their aid and bearing give testimony to our ideals and purposes."

This tremendous new idea for making the world a better and safer place in which to live has aroused enthusiasm not only among the people of America—it has created a hustle and bustle even in the world of official bureaucracy.

On the fifth floor of an old building in downtown Washington there is a sense of purpose and mission, an air of dynamism, that hasn't been seen in the typical Government office for many years. It's the head-

quarters of the Peace Corps, and this inspiring project can truly be called an example of that other "idea," the New Frontier.

There are those among us who are afraid that the American fiber is weakening; that we are a nation without ideals or an ideology * * * and that if we don't do whatever it is they want us to do * * * the Communists will get us, or some other dreadful thing will happen.

Anyone who could witness the demonstration of spirit and bounce and moral strength in that old building where the Peace Corps is setting up shop, would feel, as I do, that the United States is as full of the spirit of serving others, as ever before.

It goes back to the spirit of those times when men gambled everything that was sacred to them, in order to bring justice into America. Out of that time in history came the American Revolution—and it is exciting to me, as I know it must be to you, to realize that President Kennedy has ignited the idea for all the world to see. It burns brightly today in Asia, in Africa, in Latin America * * * in all those places where injustice, and hunger, and wornout traditions are causing misery, not progress * * * war, rather than peace.

As you who have followed this Peace Corps idea in your newspapers know, this is a project that came up during the course of the last presidential campaign. And it got, I am told by people who should know, a tremendous response from all segments of the population. It was established early in his administration by President Kennedy, by means of an Executive order, pending congressional action to put it on a permanent basis.

The prime objective is to send to those areas that need them, some of our fellow citizens who have special skills and knowledge: craftsmen, teachers, farmers, builders, or whatever. They will live and work with the people of the country, and I mean the ordinary people, not the wealthy, not the landlords, not the highborn. They will be paid enough to sustain them, no more. Their service with the Peace Corps will not necessarily exempt them from service in the Armed Forces. They will receive no special privileges, no PX's or commissaries or motor pools or household servants.

They will go as the people of our country to the people of another country, openly, with no propaganda ax to grind, no religious doctrine, except that one basic doctrine, common to all faiths, love one another.

Certainly for those who serve in the Peace Corps it will not be an easy life. So many things which we take for granted, will be missing. The corner drugstore with its many comforts, the paved street, running water, electric lights, a telephone: somehow we assume everyone has these, that life without them would simply come to a halt. These will go out of the lives of the Peace Corps members.

Yet, in spite of the obvious hardships of such a life, in spite of the pitfalls and the very real personal risks, the young men and women of America are applying by the thousands because they respond to the American idea of commitment and dedication built into this noble enterprise.

People will be helped to read, to grow two bushels of wheat where only one grew before, to pipe water in from springs instead of bringing it in a pail, to dig their furrows across the hills instead of down them. We can tell others these things.

And it seems scarcely necessary to add that we will also learn things just as fundamental: how the rest of the world really lives, how it speaks, how it thinks, what lies on its mind and on its heart. We will learn how it is possible for life to go on without the things we call essential; yes, and how far wrong we are when we think we know all the answers to the ever-present questions of where did we come from, why are we here, where are we going.

Back in the last century one of the Russian czars fought for a window on the world for his country, a window through which his country could look out and through which the rest of the world could look in. In recent years we have seen that window closely shuttered with only an occasional window giving us and them a peep at each other.

In this country, it seems to me, the Peace Corps is our window on the world, another chance for us to look out, another chance for the rest of the world to look in. I hope it will never be shuttered. And I envy the young men and women who will make this exciting idea a reality.

Results of Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, during the 7 years I have served the 23d District of Ohio in the U.S. Congress, I have attempted to keep the closest possible contact with the individual thinking of the residents of this suburban Cleveland area. One of the highest income, high-intelligence districts in the Nation, its constituents are quick to respond to my regular newsletters, opinion polls, and annual traveling office meetings.

The opinion poll is mailed yearly to the home of every registered voter in the district—this year to 135,000 homes in all. The response is excellent, underscoring the interest these voters take in national affairs. This year nearly 25,000 returned the questionnaire, some 1,500 of them amplifying their views in additional letters on key issues. I know of no other district which shows such a high response to similar polls.

This year shows a few marked changes in opinion from past polls. There is an upsurge in favor of Federal aid to school construction, for example: only 35 percent favored it last year; 62.8 percent, this. The division on foreign aid remains nip and tuck, as in the past. One interesting point I have noted in the 1961 returns—citizen confusion on important legislation runs heavier than in the past, with a greater percentage of questions marked, "No opinion." This I feel is the result of increasingly complicated legislation, often obscured by fuzzy and contradictory statements from political leadership, the press and other news media.

I would like to emphasize, as I have in the past, that results of the poll are not used as political weather vanes for any votes I make in the House of Representatives. I am grateful for the outstanding response, and for the many letters accompanying the questionnaires. All are helpful to me in reaching my final decision on the issues.

Results of the poll follow:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor—			
1. Federal aid to education to provide for—			
(a) School construction?	62.8	31.7	5.5
(b) Teachers' salaries?	32.6	59.5	7.9
(c) Aid to private and parochial schools?	18.9	74.9	6.2
2. Revising the electoral college system?	77.6	14.0	8.4
3. Federal Government assistance in relocating industries?	24.0	58.5	17.5
4. Minimum wage legislation—			
(a) Increasing present hourly rate of $1	57.6	32.9	9.5
(b) Extending coverage?	49.7	31.2	19.1
5. A mandatory program of medical care for the aged?	48.9	42.3	8.8
6. More liberal social security benefits?	55.1	35.8	9.1
7. Resuming nuclear testing if we cannot reach an agreement with Russia for adequate inspection?	75.7	14.4	9.9
8. Increasing postal rates to help reduce this year's estimated postal deficit of $900,000,000?	63.4	30.4	6.2
9. Easing trade restrictions with Iron Curtain countries?	29.7	56.9	13.4
10. Continuing the 1-cent "temporary" Federal gasoline tax to aid our highway construction program?	66.5	28.3	5.2
11. The administration's proposal for Federal aid to "depressed areas"?	55.2	31.7	13.1
12. Continuation of our foreign aid program?	44.4	42.7	12.9
13. Do you think the Peace Corps a good idea?	49.9	33.5	16.6
14. Abolishing the Un-American Activities Committee?	20.9	60.4	18.7

Freedom Flights to West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to draw attention to the vast and increasing number of East Germans who are seeking refuge in the West German Republic. Such flights, especially when under conditions of extreme danger, bear testimony to the oppressions of life behind the Iron Curtain and the desire of those oppressed to live in freedom and to enjoy the opportunities of free peoples.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statistical summary of such flights as reported in the Press and Information Office Bulletin of the West German Federal Government.

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

ESCAPE FROM THE ZONE

(Memorandum in Bulletin No. 28 of the Press and Information Office of the Federal Government)

According to a report of the Federal Ministry for Expellees, Refugees and War Damages, 16,697 persons fled from the Soviet Zone to the Federal Republic in the course

of January 1961; i.e., 2,298 more than during December 1960. Two thousand three hundred and ninety-nine of these, that is 14.4 percent were juveniles of less than 24 years, 18 of them were members of the volkspolizei (people's police forces) and 45 members of military units of the SBZ.

In the course of 1960 the number of refugees from the Soviet Zone reached a total of 199,188 persons, among these were 31,424 juveniles of less than 24 years, 152 members of the volkspolizei and 555 members of the military units of the SBZ.

Employment of Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, having served in World War II as a Marine and being a member of the Disabled American Veterans and the American Legion organizations in this country and knowing of the many problems that confront our disabled veterans and having a vital interest in their welfare and livelihood, I have read with considerable interest the fine address by Mr. Frank G. Wood, national director of employment relations for the Disabled American Veterans. Mr. Wood has had a long and distinguished career in serving our veterans. After serving in the Army of the United States, he became the national service officer for Disabled American Veterans in 1945. He served in that capacity until 1959 when he was appointed director of rehabilitation for the Department of California Disabled American Veterans. In 1960, National Commander William O. Cooper, of the Disabled American Veterans, appointed him national director of employment relations. Mr. Wood is a member of the Federal Advisory Council for the Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor. He is a member of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped and is a member of the executive committee and the Disabled Veterans Committee of that body. Mr. Wood gave the following address to the Ohio Governor's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. His remarks in this field are so significant that I feel that they are worthy of the attention of my colleagues and therefore deem it a privilege to insert his address in the RECORD:

AN ADDRESS BEFORE THE OHIO GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

(By Frank G. Wood)

As the national director of employment relations for the Disabled American Veterans and as a member of the Executive Committee of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, I am very pleased to be with you today in giving recognition to the many young people of this State who have entered the essay contest. I am, of course, also highly honored to have been invited here to witness the presentation of awards to the five winners of the State essay contest.

The need for young people to understand the handicapped person as a fellow American with the same desires as the able-bodied is most important. The ideal of generating through education the cause of the handicapped will assure better understanding which will result in advances or solutions of these problems in generations to come.

The need of the handicapped to achieve the same dignity of man is as great as is this desire in the able-bodied person. Certainly, a program of this type which will alert our young people to this problem will assure us of continued study and the application of new ideas. To you ladies and gentlemen here today, the problem of the physically handicapped is real. You are certainly aware of the present-day situation by reason of your close association with the Governor's committee.

As we look upon the trends that are being shaped for the future of America, we cannot help but recognize that this program is going to assume more importance as time goes on.

The campaign for the Presidency in 1960 was unique in that the basic principle of the need for all of our people to assume leadership and to work together was the same as expressed by both candidates. It is, therefore, most important that we consider the physically handicapped person and his place in the economic philosophy of today. This philosophy demands a supreme effort that must be made to achieve the goals contained in the staggering challenges of today in science, in space, in medicine, and in the problems manifested by automation and its effects upon employment.

The American way of life, free enterprise, is pitted against the collectivism or socialism and the whole future of the free enterprise philosophy is on trial. That system which arrives first in reaching these goals may well win the greatest competitive struggle for man's mind, body, and soul that has been had since the beginning of time. To win this struggle, Americans must learn and practice the adhesive quality of togetherness which is the mobilization of all our people into a gigantic army. This army will be composed of management and labor of white-collar and blue-collar, of egghead and squarehead, of intellect and brawn and all of our people of all colors and religions, ablebodied and disabled.

It is absolutely necessary that this mobilization take place before we can meet the challenge of today and the future. This togetherness I speak of is not just an ideal but a proven fact. We need look no further back than the days of World War II. Surely, if we can mobilize our brains and our brawn into the task of creating the most devastating force known to mankind and to create the most destructive military machine in all human history, we can mobilize in peaceful pursuits with the same high degree of efficiency.

The talents of the handicapped person has an important role in this great struggle to be the first in arriving at the New Frontier or new horizon that is now within our view.

There is a growing recognition in government and labor that it is good business to hire the handicapped. His productive ability is higher than in nondisabled workers. He has a lower absentee record by which is meant that because of his disabilities, he is more caution minded. The fiction of the idea that the handicapped worker requires more absenteeism has been dispelled. We here today know the truth of these statements but we also know that more education is needed to spread the work of these truisms.

It is suggested that this can best be done through groups of persons acting as coordinators for the employment of the physically handicapped both in industry and in government. I would like to call your attention to the great effort made by the AFL–CIO plan which is in effect a coordinator plan to introduce handicapped persons into all phases of labor.

First, there is the plant policy which is established through collective bargaining. Here the plant and the union committee members work together in conducting a survey of the physical requirements necessary in all the operations of a plant. A training program is worked in coordination with placement so that when the handicapped person assumes his job, he has had an indoctrination course which will acquaint him with the job and with the specially adapted measures he must observe in connection with his disablement.

One of the biggest advancements in recognizing the problems of the handicapped has been made in modifying his job to meet the problems of the handicapped worker. Here ways and means are studied to make some slight alterations in machine control or duty assignment to enable the handicapped worker to perform the job.

These methods are the result of long study into these problems and both management and labor is to be commended in the great strides made in utilizing the abilities of the handicapped.

It has been said before but it is worth saying again, the remaining functions of the disabled are many times more acute than those of the nondisabled. For instance, the blinded person has a highly developed sense of touch that makes him specially suitable to certain operations requiring intricate hand movements.

While it is true that management and labor in private industry is doing much to place the handicapped person in employment suitable to his disability, it is equally true that government has likewise concerned itself with this problem. In the Federal Government, we have the coordinator for the physically handicapped program. Many State governments have the same type of program. Here we find that agencies select coordinators whose responsibilities are to place the handicapped person into civil service employment, which is commensurate with the disability.

Although it is true that great strides have been made in the overall program, we have not reached the stage where we can afford to be complacent. Much needs to be done, particularly in the education of the shop foreman or in the case of government, the supervisory level or leadman level. There are still many who harbor an antipathy toward physically handicapped people. The problem of employment of the physically handicapped is not only in the employment but equally in the underemployment of the handicapped person. Too often we find that industry and Government is being deprived of the full potential of the handicapped person because he is placed in a position where his full abilities cannot be used. Today Americans are facing up to the ideal that all persons regardless of race, creed, or color are entitled to equal opportunity.

We recognize that discrimination, in any form, defeats and is repugnant to the great purposes of Americanism. As the tide against discrimination mounts, it will sweep out that discrimination which exists against the handicapped. If we are to prove our case to the world, it must be so.

I, therefore, again emphasize how pleased I am to have been invited to this luncheon to join with you in celebrating another milestone in the education of the youth of this land toward the principle that disability does not mean inability. For every round peg there is a round hole. For every square peg, there is a square hole and for every disability there is compensatory ability.

Michigan Loses by Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Telegram of April 24, 1961:

MICHIGAN LOSES BY FEDERAL AID

Michigan residents who favor President Kennedy's school aid proposal—and there are some—should think again. And this second-thinking should be applied to all Federal grants-in-aid. For Michigan is the loser in them.

Last year Michigan paid 4.66 percent of the internal revenue collections, being one of the higher paying States. But when Federal grants were allocated only 3.03 percent of the total handouts came to this State—34 States and the District of Columbia received relatively more than they paid in taxes; 16, including Michigan, received less.

These percentage figures were compiled by Tax Foundation, a nonpartisan and privately operated agency. Using the foundation's figures, Congressional Quarterly in an article presented on this page recently, came up with the fact that for every dollar Michigan contributes in Federal taxes toward grant-in-aid funds it gets back 65 cents. Or to put it another way for every dollar of Federal aid to Michigan we pay about $1.55.

The Kennedy school aid proposal allocates school money by a somewhat different formula than other Federal grants, but so far as Michigan is concerned the results are about the same. Michigan would be the loser. Under the Kennedy program, Michigan would receive $27,070,252, but the cost to Michigan of the $666 million Federal program would be $29,770,000. Michigan would be out of pocket $2,699,747. Some other States would be losers also, New York would pay in $91,110,000 and get back $37,650,000.

Michigan is said by those supporting Federal school aid to need 10,762 more classrooms, and is rated as being the State with the second largest classroom shortage. New York is placed first with a deficit of 14,000 classrooms. Yet these States, declared to be at the top of the list in classroom needs, would be big losers under the aid program designed to help the States provide classrooms.

By and large, Michigan is doing as much as any State to enlarge its school plant. Every Michigan election finds school financing proposals on the ballots in some school district. On top of that the schools get the largest cut from State tax revenues.

Left on their own, Michigan residents will meet their school needs. They have been doing it and they will continue to do it. These extra classrooms will be constructed under the watchful eyes of residents of the school districts who feel it imperative that they get the greatest possible dollar for their money.

But under Federal aid they would be putting in far more dollars than they were getting back. This extra money would be going to States less diligent in meeting their school needs. Michigan would still be carrying the burden of providing its own school facilities. On top of that, tax money from Michigan would be going to schools in other States. There is no aid to Michigan under Federal school aid. The aid would go elsewhere and in part from Michigan tax dollars.

Report to Congress on Effect of Cabaret Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely gratified when the 86th Congress passed legislation in May 1960 reducing the Federal cabaret tax from 20 to 10 percent. It was also a source of great personal satisfaction, inasmuch as I was privileged to offer the first legislation to eliminate this discriminatory tax when I introduced H.R. 858 in the 85th Congress in January 1957.

My original bill called for complete elimination of this tax. However, compromise being a way of life in Washington, we were forced to settle for the 10-percent reduction previously mentioned.

In testifying on several occasions for this legislation, I repeatedly emphasized, as did other interested witnesses, that removal of this obnoxious tax would not result in any appreciable loss of tax revenue. Rather, there were reliable estimates to the effect that total repeal of the tax might well result in a substantial increase in the Treasury's revenue and at the same time materially benefit the unemployment problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in support of this statement, under leave to extend my remarks I include a letter which I received recently from Mr. Herman Kenin, president of the American Federation of Musicians, which in my judgment effectively substantiates our most optimistic forecasts. Furthermore, I believe it presents a compelling argument for total elimination of a tax which obviously defeats its own purpose:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
New York, N.Y., April 5, 1961.

REPORT TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE 87TH CONGRESS ON EFFECT OF CABARET TAX REDUCTION ON EMPLOYMENT AND REVENUES

When the American Federation of Musicians urged upon previous Congresses a reduction of the so-called cabaret tax, our key premises were that the tax was discriminatory, that it destroy jobs, that net tax revenue loss by reduction would at most be negligible. We promised members of the 86th Congress that we would survey the effects of the tax reduction and report upon it. These are our findings:

Some 650 AFM locals scattered throughout the United States were requested to forward statistical reports to my office comparing cabaret-type engagements for the November, December, January 1960–61, quarter with the comparable similar months of a year earlier. Reports have been received from 426—approximately two-thirds—of our locals, including all the major population centers.

During the quarter, this partial return shows an increase of 8,715 engagement nights for professional musicians, a payroll of approximately $2,265,900. Projected over a year, this totals $9,063,600 in additional earnings for musicians—this, in the face of economic distress in many parts of the Nation. A projection of employment of associated employees (waiters, barmen, busboys)—on a basis of a conservative estimate by an independent research organization—that five and one-half to six others are employed for each musician, shows additional annual payroll of approximately $36 million.

This $45 million total—again estimated conservatively—should yield $4,500,000 a year or $1,125,000 per quarter in income tax increase. Offset against this is the difference in excise tax yield now against prior quarters. Previously the excise yield ran about $10 million per quarter. For the last available quarter reported, that ending December 31, 1960, the excise yield was $8,473,000, a difference since the halving of only $1,527,000. Deducting from this the $1,125,000 increase in income tax yield leaves only a $402,000 difference. This is exclusive of increased income taxes that can be expected to be paid by cabaret operators doing better business.

It is our considered opinion there has been no loss in tax revenues. It also is our considered finding, based upon the results accruing from the one-half reduction of this excise tax, that total repeal would benefit substantially the Treasury's revenues and the current widespread unemployment problem.

Knowing you to be busy as legislators, this report was confined to bare essentials. More complete details may be obtained from the enclosed reprint from the New York Times.

Very truly yours,

HERMAN KENIN,
President.

Proclamation by the Governor of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of the Members a proclamation by the Governor of Florida designating April 30 of this year as Past Presidents' Day.

This day will be observed by all Floridians as a tribute to the past Presidents of our great Nation who shouldered the responsibilities of leading our country with honor and integrity.

In addition to the Governor's proclamation, city officials within our State plan to issue similar statements. The Governor's proclamation follows:

Whereas the Presidents of the United States have been men of great integrity, bringing to the post of Chief Executive the quality of leadership that has made our country admired and respected throughout the world; and

Whereas the achievements of our past Presidents have advanced the progress and development of our Nation, contributed to the general welfare and have led us to a position of world prominence; and

Whereas it is fitting that 1 day of each year be designated to honor those who have so ably led our Nation in peace and war; now therefore

I, Farris Bryant, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida, do hereby proclaim April 30, 1961,

as Past President's Day in Florida, and urge all the citizens of Florida to consider the heavy responsibilities borne by our past Presidents and the sacrifices they have made in guiding the Nation.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Florida to be affixed at Tallahassee, the capital, this 20th day of April, A.D. 1961.

FARRIS BRYANT,
Governor.

Attest:

JAMES ADAMS,
Secretary of State.

Pennsylvania's 12th District of American Legion Opposes Admission of Red China to United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of transmittal from Mr. Nello S. Carozzoni, 12th district commander, the American Legion of Pennsylvania, dated April 5, 1961, with which he forwarded a copy of a resolution adopted by his organization on March 26, 1961, which opposes the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

The indicated letter and resolution follow.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Wilkes-Barre, Pa., April 5, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: On behalf of my organization—the 12th District American Legion, Luzerne County, Department of Pennsylvania—I am forwarding a resolution which is self-explanatory.

It is the hope and desire of the delegates, who approved this resolution unanimously, to petition our President to give the resolution utmost consideration in the best interest of our Nation.

Respectfully yours,

NELLO S. CAROZZONI,
12th District Commander, the American Legion.

Whereas the 12th district, the American Legion, county of Luzerne, Pa., comprising a membership of some 12,000 veterans, understand a concerted effort is underway to have the United States recognize Red Communist China, and consent to have the so-called Chinese People's Republic admitted to the United Nations; and

Whereas the aforementioned members after a study of the compilation of facts such as: 33,000 U.S. fighting men killed in action in the Korean war, along with numerous others tortured, plus still others wounded, plus some 450 still presumed held prisoners in Chinese jails—with Chinese Reds as the guilty parties in the most of such cases, and finally the fact that we are still officially at war with Red China, thought President Eisenhower obtained an uneasy truce in 1953; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the members of the 12th district of the American Legion, Luzerne County, Pa., that for the United States to recognize Red China or consent to its admission into the United Nations would cause the United States to "lose face" all over the Far East and put a stamp of approval on all the wrongs committed by Red Communist China; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Ambassador to the United States, Senators CLARK and SCOTT of Pennsylvania, and Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD.

The above resolution was approved and adopted at the regular monthly meeting of the 12th district, the American Legion, Luzerne County, Department of Pennsylvania, Sunday, March 26, 1961.

Respectfully submitted.

NELLO S. CAROZZONI,
12th District Commander, The American Legion.

National Employ the Physically Handicapped Committee of the Great 23d Congressional District, California, Awards U.S. Government Bonds to Five Winners in High School Essay Competition—City Officials, Newspaper Editor, Veterans' Leaders and Business Representatives Act as Judges at Compton, Calif.—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, heretofore having received unanimous consent so to do, I am pleased and consider it an honor to present to the attention of your own distinguished self and also that of other readers the text of a letter to me from Lillian M. Karnes, chairman, southeast district, National Employ the Physically Handicapped Committee, in the great 23d district, together with five winning essays by high school students, the subject of all of said essays being "Jobs for the Handicapped."

Mr. Speaker, my well-known and long-time interest in jobs for the handicapped makes it a special pleasure for me to produce the text of these five essays so as to make same available to all who read and, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this matter of jobs for the handicapped extends over into the matter of two bills which have been filed in this Congress, to wit: the one by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, being S. 1365; and a corresponding bill filed in the House by me, to wit: H.R. 347. Both these bills are identical in text and ask this Congress to favorably consider issuing a charter to said Indoor Sports, this organization being made up entirely of American citizens, both youth and adult, who are considered permanently physically handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, one of the always anticipated occasions which Mrs. Doyle and I have when we are home in the great 23d district is to be annually invited guests of the Indoor Sports group at Los Amigos Hospital, Downey, Calif. At this great hospital the several dozen physically handicapped Indoor Sports have the advantage of a very worthy, unique, valuable rehabilitation shop and center where they place and invest their sincere desire and ambition to become rehabilitated so that they move forward in an independent, economic condition on their own.

It has been my experience, Mr. Speaker, on several occasions to be also present at an annual awards banquet and dinner at Compton, Calif., when awards similar to those herein mentioned are made and in visiting on such occasions, and other occasions, with the representatives of management who are present and who make it a part of their established policy to employ physically handicapped, I am advised by management itself that it finds the physically handicapped persons as almost always equally productive in their respective assignments in their respective shops and factories.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and all the other Members of this great legislative body join with me in congratulating the winners of these awards of U.S. Government bonds. Also, that you join with me in congratulating the branch of the National Employ the Physically Handicapped Committee on again conducting this worthy essay contest.

Following is the essay winning first place and one of those winning $25 bonds. Part II of my remarks containing the remaining essays appear also in the RECORD for today.

LAKEWOOD, CALIF., *January 27, 1961.*

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: We recently held our National Employ the Physically Handicapped Annual Essay Contest in the southeast district. Five high schools participated this year. The first prize—a $50 bond—went to a pupil at the Centennial Senior High School in Compton. A $25 bond will go to each of the other contestants of the schools that also won in turn. Arrangements are being made for me to shortly present them to the winners at these respective schools during their assembly. Mayor Del Clawson, of Compton; Jack Cleland, editor of the Herald American newspapers; Guy Warner, manager; and Daniel Quigg, VER of the Compton Department of Employment; Wayne Bowen, chairman of the local veterans' employment committee; and myself as chairman of the southeast district (Compton) Employ the Physically Handicapped Committee, helped to judge the essays. Cash for the prize bonds were provided by Veterans of Foreign Wars Post, No. 2089; American Legion Post, No. 152; Disabled American Veterans; May A. Carson Chapter, No. 32; all of Compton, World War I Barracks, Lynwood; and three members of our local employee the handicapped committee.

Miss Newman's essay has been sent to the Governor's committee to be judged on the State level for a $100 bond and a trip to the Capital. The winning essay on that level will go on to Washington, D.C., where its author will receive a $1,000 bond furnished by the National Disabled American Veterans with possible presentation being made by President Kennedy.

May our committee again ask your indulgence in placing these essays in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this year as you did in past years? It would be very much appreciated if you would do so.

Again our thanks for your help to our local National Employ the Handicapped Committee.

Sincerely yours,

LILLIAN M. KARNES,
Chairman, Southeast District—(Compton)—National Employ the Physically Handicapped Committee.

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

(By Constance Newman, Centennial Senior High School, Compton, Calif.)

Rocks crunching fragile bones, blood streaming from pierced arteries—this was the way medieval Europe treated its handicapped people.

Sparks flying, the crackling of blazing flames, a charred human mass among them—this was sometimes colonial America's treatment of handicapped persons who were looked upon as witches or devils because of appearance or actions deviating from the normal.

The sting of a whip, the crack of a gun shot—these marked our country's growth and expansion westward. This was life on the frontier. Excessive heat in the parching deserts and freezing winters in the Sierras were but a part of the hardships. The man who succeeded was the strongest. Here the handicapped could not survive. Since the beginning of time, society and the elements had seen to it that there was no extensive social problem insofar as handicapped people were concerned, for they could not survive the cruelty of man and nature.

As civilization came, the frontier life became less strenuous. Many handicapped people began to live longer lives. The frontier passed and with it its challenge. Other challenges took the place of the primitive ones. Foremost among these challenges is that of providing jobs for the handicapped.

Communities meet this challenge in different ways. The following is an example of a community and an individual who met this challenge and conquered it.

During World War II, many of our men were called to fight for our country. One of these was Tim who was 22 when he enlisted in the U.S. Army. Hating to leave his wife Helen and baby, but realizing his patriotic duty to his country, Tim enlisted. Like many of our men, Tim was injured in the war. Due to this back injury, he was told that he would never walk again. How could he support his family? This was a question that crossed his mind repeatedly. Now, he was like those whom he had once pitied. He was an excellent engineer, but would his handicap be accepted by his family and the community?

The success of his entire future depended on this acceptance.

He must try to prove himself capable. He was determined to do so.

When he returned home to his wife, he could see that he was being engulfed in a sea of pity. He needed encouragement and confidence. Why couldn't she understand and realize that he needed confidence and encouragement. Despite his handicap, Tim began to do things for himself. Helen realized that instead of pity, Tim wanted her admiration and support.

Having Helen's support, he knew that he would have the courage to apply for a job. Tim called for an interview at the California Employment Service. After the interview, he was sent to the Hanson Electronics Co. Would Mr. Hanson hire him or would he think that all jobs require strength rather than ability? Knowing that skill, however, is more important in many jobs, Mr. Hanson placed Tim on a 2-months' trial.

When Tim reported for work, he was placed in the mechanical engineering division. Mr. Hanson introduced him to the 20 workers in his division.

As Mr. Hanson introduced Tim, each of the workers stopped what they were doing and began to stare at Tim. They whispered among themselves. Tim actually heard one man say to another, "Does he actually think that he can hold a job with such a handicap?" Although it wasn't meant for Tim to hear, he had heard it. He felt terribly hurt, but still determined.

When he came to work the following day, he worked very earnestly and diligently. The others were astonished to see him doing so well.

Not only was his work done amazingly well that day, but for every day during his 2-months' trial. The workers of the entire mechanical division of the company wrote letters to the company's president, Mr. Hanson. One man described Tim as "an earnest and very intelligent worker who knows just what he wants from life and intends to get it."

Mr. Hanson called Tim into his office and congratulated him on his fine work. He said, "Tim, not only did the other workers praise your work to me, but your rate of absenteeism has been lower than that of the other workers. You have a permanent job here."

Tim was bursting with excitement. With his job, however, came the depressing thought that there were many other capable handicapped people in the community who had been denied jobs because they possessed a physical defect. How could he help them? He decided to talk to Mr. Hanson.

In his conversation with his employer, Tim pointed out that although 2,600,000 physically handicapped men and women had jobs, it has been estimated that each year in California alone 2,650 handicapped young men and women will need jobs. In 1959 there were 66,000 handicapped who had been rehabilitated and placed on jobs in California. The President's Committee for Employment of the Handicapped with the cooperation of the Governor's committee has done much to publicize the need for employing the handicapped.

"Let us form a local committee of which there are 42 already in the State of California to assist in this worthy work here. Let us help all the handicapped to know the valuable aid that can be given them through the State Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. Let us also arouse the attention of the good people of the community to the fact that our town has its share of the estimated 150,000 handicapped workers who need medical or psychiatric assistance as well as placement in a more fitting job. The hearts of our business men must be touched. Then they must weigh the facts and figures. The voice of the newspaper must be used.

"The national Government is doing its part to promote the employment of the handicapped. Many communities are following the lead of the National Government. Our community must also accept the challenge of finding jobs for the handicapped.

"Employers must make the employing of the physically handicapped people one of their major goals."

Working together, Tim and Mr. Hanson brought the attention of all the community to the needs of the handicapped. The town cooperated in holding an annual NEPH Week dinner which was attended by 125 people.

Thus did this community meet the challenge of finding jobs for the handicapped—through the efforts of dedicated people like Tim and Mr. Hanson.

Let there be no verbal stones thrown in our town at the handicapped; let no handicapped person be burned at the stake of public opinion; let the climate of our town be such that here all handicapped people will be non-handicapped workers.

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

(By Pat Brenden, Dominguez High School)

Man's basic needs have always included those of security, success, and happiness. The answer to this need has become the acception of some type of work. Since the handicapped are human beings this automatically becomes a necessity on that basis alone. These ungratified human needs can develop into a psychological problem which can be solved only by their admission to some field of work; for the handicapped person requires more than anyone to feel useful to his fellow man.

Through his deformity or injury, the rendered handicapped person suffers greatly. In his suffering he has come to know the real values of life, as few others can understand them. Realizing these values, he will strive to do anything which he feels will help him pay what he believes is his debt to mankind. Because he is working, for this reason he will try to do his very best; a trait which is lacking in many workers today.

The employer has almost positive insurance that he is obtaining a reliable and valuable worker. The small risk that is involved in hiring any worker, which is greatly reduced in this case, is well worth the employer's effort because he is giving one human life the chance to obtain his basic needs of security, success, and happiness as well as dignity and some measure of independence. The employer must also remember that in actuality no man is handicapped except in the eyes of the onlooker.

As proof of the success of the handicapped here in America, let us look first to Franklin D. Roosevelt who was crippled by polio in 1921. Instead of letting this depress him he rose to even greater heights; showing not only the ability of the handicapped to do great things, but, also, doing a great service to the American people by his strong leadership. Recognition should also be given to world-famous people such as Ludwig von Beethoven, whose wonderful music was given people all over the globe, even though at the time of his writing of the "Ninth Symphony" he was totally deaf; Lord Byron, whose poetry has contributed to the literary world, though he was lame in one foot; John Milton, blind writer of classic English poetry; and the more recent Connie Boswell, whose voice thrilled millions even after she was crippled; Alex Templeton, who contributed music to the world on his piano though blinded; and George Shearing, another blind pianist who brings us jazz today. Perhaps a handicapped person who has become a success and who is even closer to home is Mrs. Longbean, an English teacher at Dominguez High School.

What is more is the fact that the handicapped are a part of our society and, as such, a useful place must be found for them. We must accept them into our organization, for if we deny them the privilege and basic right they become a useless organ not only to this country but to themselves as well. Not only must society welcome the handicapped, but it becomes our duty to find a place for them. The employers, as leaders of this body, should feel that it is their responsibility to do what they can to help make our society a smoothly and humanely conducted group.

In welcoming these handicapped, we become unique among the nations of the world. In lesser nations than ours, those who are handicapped are sometimes tolerated, but are certainly not respected, nor are they considered productive human beings. Little does man realize that in these small ways we do our part to uphold the American way of life; these relatively small differences are what make America great and outstanding.

As American citizens who believe in the American ideal, we are obliged to do our part to uphold one of the founding principles which our Nation was established upon; that all men are created equal. This has

been interpreted as meaning that all men regardless of race, creed, religion, or color are equal with uniform rights. It is mandatory that we amend this definition to include every man, no matter what shape, form, or condition, having equal rights and opportunity. Let us not forget this great American ideal which also leads us to believe that since all men are created equal they must each be created for a purpose; and that God wants us to love and help our neighbor. Let our Nation and our society be a perfect model to all nations by showing that we believe that the handicapped are a functional and integral part of our American community.

Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, earlier this session I introduced S. 1187, on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] to amend the air pollution control law. That bill dealt directly with interstate air pollution. It did not deal with the particular problem of air polluted over a relatively small area by automobile exhausts.

On April 22, the Washington Post and Times Herald ran an editorial entitled "Bye, Bye, Blowby." It dealt with the attitude of Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Ribicoff, and his predecessor, Secretary Flemming, currently the president of the University of Oregon, toward the practicability of a simple device for destroying automotive crankcase fumes, and thereby reducing automotive air pollution.

The Post editorial indicates that both Secretaries have been enthusiastic about a factory-installed device that would cost about $5 and would control raw gasoline hydrocarbons. I share this enthusiasm.

The automobile industry now has the opportunity to clean its own tailpipe. It can take the initiative in cutting down what I have referred to as "garbage in the sky." Should the automobile industry fail to introduce this depolluting device on its 1962 models as standard equipment, Congress may feel impelled to require it on every car shipped in interstate commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred appear at the conclusion of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

BYE, BYE, BLOWBY

Secretary Ribicoff of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, like his predecessor, Secretary Flemming, has taken a clear, strong stand on the practicability of a simple device for destroying crankcase fumes of the type called "blowby." Such a device is now available as factory installed optional equipment to buyers of new automobiles throughout the country. "It seems to me," said Secretary Ribicoff the other day, "that this method of reducing air pollution should be put into use as rapidly as practicable." And he added an unmistakable warning: "If the automobile industry does not make the device standard equipment, then legislation to require it should be considered."

We cannot escape a conclusion that the identical view expressed by two HEW Secretaries makes the attitude of the automobile industry seem unreasonably recalcitrant. The industry asserts that no clear need for the device has been demonstrated anywhere save in California and that it is willing therefore to do no more than make the device optional to any individual buyer—with installation to be done by dealers at approximately twice the cost of doing it on an assembly line.

The cost of the device, factory installed, is no more than about $5. It is effective in controlling a secondary source of automotive air pollution, the raw gasoline hydrocarbons that blow by the piston rings. To make this standard equipment would not raise the cost of a car appreciably; and it would indicate a consideration for the public's health and the public's comfort which the automobile makers can hardly afford to forgo.

Cuban Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, all loyal citizens of the United States were proud of the strong stand taken by our President last week in his speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in regard to Cuba and communism in the Western Hemisphere. We feel our true friends in Latin American will respond to vigorous leadership in Washington against communism.

Today the National Security Council is meeting to make a full reappraisal of our position toward Cuba and Communist activities in general, and it is my hope that a very strong and firm policy to be backed up by actions will be decided upon.

A complete economic boycott of Cuba should be instituted by the United States, then a meeting of the Organization of American States should be called to invoke first complete economic sanctions against Castro's government; second, diplomatic isolation of Castro's government; and, third, initiate action to form an inter-American force sufficient to prevent a continuation of communistic activity in this hemisphere.

One thing that should be done by the United States immediately, which has been under consideration for more than 1 year by our State Department although action along this line has been urged by many of us Members of Congress, is to stop Cuban imports into the United States. Does it make sense to buy Cuban products and supply Castro with American dollars to continue his domination of the Cuban people, when we have already cut off exports to Cuba, broken diplomatic relations, and stated in an official Government publication that there is no further doubt about Castro and his Communist police state in Cuba?

Just using one port in Florida as an example, in January of this year over 10 million pounds of agricultural products were received from Cuba. During February over 14 million pounds were imported. During March and April up to date, some 23 million pounds of produce have been imported from Cuba.

Aside from the fact that these products, which include pineapples, oranges, tomatoes, tobacco, cucumbers, and native vegetables, compete with the same produce grown in this country to the detriment of our domestic agricultural industry in many States in the Union, the Castro government is paid U.S. dollars for these products.

The time to act to stop these imports was over a year ago. But action was not taken. There can be no further excuses for delay and inaction. The President has spoken out publicly and the world is waiting to see what we will actually do now. Stopping these imports would be a logical first step, and one which should be taken immediately. Almost 50 million pounds of produce has been shipped into one port during the first 3½ months of this year alone.

I have introduced a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States ban all imports from Cuba. This resolution should make it clear beyond doubt to the State Department that it is the wish of the American people that these imports be stopped. We stopped exports to Cuba long ago, we should complete the economic boycott by banning all imports also.

The resolution is House Concurrent Resolution 215, and is pending before the Ways and Means Committee. I urge every interested Member of the House to join with me in asking for an early hearing on this measure, and to again ask the State Department to act.

West Virginia University Team Wins National Intercollegiate Rifle Championship and Two Team Members Place First and Second in Individual Scoring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the legend of the feud of the Hatfields and the McCoys in the hills of West Virginia no longer rates top billing in the recording of the prowess of the mountaineers with the rifle.

We proudly acclaim our new champions who achieved fame through pursuit of a peaceful and a thoroughly law-abiding utilization of their firearms.

In this instance I am proud to be privileged to call to the attention of my

colleagues the fact that the West Virginia University rifle team has won the 1961 national intercollegiate team rifle championship conducted under the auspices of the National Rifle Association of America.

Not only did the Mountaineer quartet of sharpshooters win the national team title, but its captain, Bruce A. Meredith, made it a sweep for West Virginia University by winning the national individual title with a score of 299 out of a possible 300. In second place was his teammate, Robert I. Davies with a score of 295.

I am sure West Virginians generally join in paying tribute to Bruce Meredith and Robert Davies, and to their teammates, Charles L. Rowan, who scored 289, and Robert I. Gosnell, who shot a 286 score. Their combined team score was 1,164 out of a possible 1,200 points.

Captain Bob Means, coach, and M. Sgt. Charles Haley, assistant coach, of the Army ROTC staff at West Virginia, were appropriately praised for their work with the rifle team by Col. W. E. Roberts, head of the Army ROTC program at the university.

Colonel Roberts pointed out that three of the four varsity rifle team members also fire on the university ROTC team.

I join him in his comment that "those concerned at the university are extremely happy and proud of this achievement," and I concur in his remark that this team championship "will go a long way toward encouraging even more success in the sport or rifle shooting."

Along with complimenting our West Virginia team for its success, I wish also to extend tribute to the women's team of the University of Alaska, winner of the coed rifle team national title with a score of 1,085 points.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the newspaper account of the national intercollegiate rifle competition as published in the April 25, 1961, editions of the Dominion-News, Morgantown, W. Va.

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

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY NAMED NATIONAL RIFLE CHAMPION—MEREDITH IS RANKED TOP STAR

WASHINGTON.—West Virginia University won the 1961 national intercollegiate team rifle championship, the National Rifle Association of America announced Monday.

Bruce A. Meredith of the West Virginia team made it a sweep for the Mountaineer club by winning the national individual title.

The team score was 1,164 out of a possible 1,200 points, and Meredith scored 299 out of a possible 300.

The West Virginia victory broke a 6-year domination of the title by Western squads. It was the first win for West Virginia in the 33-year history of the contest, and Meredith's win was the first individual crown won by the school.

Meredith tied a record set by Robert E. Hickey, of Illinois College, in 1959. His victory came in the biggest field ever to shoot in the event—1,376 contestants. There were 295 college and university teams entered.

Other members of the West Virginia team and the scores are: Robert I. Davies, 294; Charles L. Rowan, 289; and Robert I. Gosnell, 286.

Following West Virginia in the top 10 teams were: Arizona State University, 1,154; Kansas State, 1,154; St. John's University, 1,152; University of California, 1,147; St. John's University No. 2 team, 1,145; City College of New York, 1,145; U.S. Naval Academy, 1,145; U.S. Coast Guard Academy, 1,144; and Oregon State College, 1960 defending champion, 1,141.

Second to 10th places in individual standing were: Davies, West Virginia, 295; Bill G. Davis, Kansas State, 293; Kenneth T. Wessels, St. John's, 292; David W. Kimes, University of California, 292; Robert T. Mellen, Jr., Ohio State, 292; John S. Watkins, University of Alaska, 291; Rowan, West Virginia, 291; Ronald J. Pellar, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 291; and Walter S. Draper, Northeastern, 291.

The women's team of the University of Alaska took the national coed rifle team with a score of 1,085, and Jean Linton, of Akron (Ohio) University was individual titlist with 285.

High ROTC team in the competition was Cornell University with 1,142, and high ROTC individual was Nicholas C. Steen, Michigan State, 292.

CHAMPS LAUDED BY COLONEL ROBERTS

Col. W. E. Roberts, head of the Army ROTC program at the university, last night hailed news of the varsity rifle team's national championship as a great step in advancement of the sport here.

"I confine my interest mainly to the ROTC team," he explained, "but I can't help but feel closely associated with those who participate on the varsity rifle team."

All but one member of the varsity team also fires on the ROTC team.

"Capt. Bob Means and Sgt. Charles Haley have done a fine job with the varsity," Colonel Roberts noted. "I think their men deserve the victory. It's a great tribute to them."

"Those concerned at the university will be extremely happy and proud of this achievement," he added. "It will go a long way toward encouraging even more success in rifle shooting here."

Secrecy in Government Wastes Time and Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News of April 24, 1961:

SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT WASTES TIME AND MONEY

"You can't find out what's going on in Washington," is one of the oldest complaints against the Federal Government. Several events since the inauguration provide a basis for the secrecy charges being made against the Kennedy administration. It is difficult to know which individuals are most to blame, but there can be no doubt that the charges have some justification.

This is a matter of prime concern to newsmen, of course, but it affects all citizens. Most taxpayers feel certain that money is wasted to some extent by the Government, but few seem to realize that economy would be easier to enforce if government had to operate more in the open.

Secrecy charges are coming from a variety of sources. Representative GEORGE MEADER has commented several times recently on the growing tendency toward needless secrecy in Washington. He is a member of the House foreign operations and monetary affairs subcommittee, which recently persuaded the President to overrule a secrecy order issued by Secretary of State Rusk. Before Rusk's order was withdrawn, however, the Soviet propaganda machine made use of it by ending direct censorship of news sent from the U.S.S.R.

Another example: The American Society of Newspaper Editors, which met last week in Washington, is studying a report which says neither Kennedy nor his administration has lived up to a promise of a freer flow of news. Prepared by Eugene S. Pulliam, managing editor of the Indianapolis News, the report says access to individual White House officials is freer than in the Eisenhower administrations, but tells of increased restrictions on news from the State and Defense Departments—which spend a major share of the Federal budget.

Also: Herbert G. Klein, formerly Richard M. Nixon's press secretary and now editor of the San Diego Union, has said flatly that the Kennedy administration curbs the free flow of news more than any other administration in this century. It may be said that this is only sour grapes from a man who wishes he were working in the White House, but there is no denying that Klein is in a position to know what he is talking about.

Rusk's order is only the best publicized of several events which have stymied the work of Washington newsmen in recent weeks. It grew out of a controversy that started in the last weeks of the Eisenhower administration. The subcommittee of which MEADER is a member asked Secretary of State Herter to furnish certain information regarding aid to Peru. Herter said the subcommittee lacked jurisdiction and Eisenhower supported him. Rusk similarly ordered State Department employees not to give the subcommittee information. MEADER and other subcommittee members complained to the press, and the resulting publicity led to withdrawal of the order.

It also led Senator JOHN A. CARROLL, of Colorado, to introduce a "freedom of information" bill (S. 1567), which would require Federal agencies to publish their rules and procedures, and would expand the definition of public documents. Its purpose is to restrict the tendency of bureaucrats in Federal agencies to stamp "secret" on material which has no bearing on national security. Senator CARROLL'S bill deserves wide support.

No one denies that there is a great deal of material which must be classified for security reasons. But there is also a natural tendency among employees at all levels of government, from townships up, to keep their activities from the public eye until they can present completed, dramatic programs. No one but the public, acting through legislators and the press, can discourage this tendency.

Missile Force for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in the April 2 edition of Jessen's Weekly,

a newspaper published in Fairbanks, Alaska, an editorial appeared which I believe succinctly expresses the sentiments of many Alaskans who are concerned with the military vitality of this country. The editorial reminds us of the strategic role Alaska should play in the offensive capability of the U.S. military force. I wholeheartedly endorse the idea that Alaska's role in the defense of this country should not be restricted to "a bastion of mere defensive capability" but should be enlarged through the establishment of missile-launching facilities. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

FREEDOM FIGHT NEEDS STRONG ALASKA

Electrifying events recently shattered the familiar patterns of alliance in the deliberations of the United Nations. Just as with the admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union, the United States struck another hard blow against colonialism, proving once again, the youthful vigor and idealism of our Republic.

Breaking with our traditional European friends, United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson spoke up forthrightly for the ideals of freedom and independence for all peoples.

The question before the Security Council was a resolution to investigate Portuguese suppression in colonial Angola. The traditional Western bloc had all taken the position that the U.N. had "no jurisdiction."

It was then that Stevenson spoke, charting the course of the New Frontier along a route that had the familiar ring of early American history.

"I regret to find myself in disagreement," Stevenson said. "Angola is but a part of the overall picture of evolution on the African Continent. The views of the United States have not changed since Jefferson wrote: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'

"These words reflect, we believe, the basic principles which all governments would do well to observe and to implement with all of the energy at their command.

"The United States would be remiss in its duties as a friend of Portugal if it failed to express honestly its conviction that step-by-step planning within Portuguese territories and the acceleration thereof is now imperative for the successful advancement of all inhabitants under Portuguese administration—advancement, in brief, toward full self-determination."

Stevenson's performance on this, and the many other issues coming before the United Nations, are doing much to restore America's position of world leadership in the cause of freedom.

Here in Alaska, his words serve as an inspiration to those of us who read our history books in the veritable shadow of the Soviet Union.

An America dedicated to freedom for the enslaved peoples of the world must be a strong America. We are inclined to agree with the remarks made recently by Eielson AFB Commander Stephen Henry, that we are militarily "tending toward a fortress America."

And we must agree with the remarks made long ago by Gen. Billy Mitchell in regard to the strategic position of Alaska in world affairs.

Certainly if America is to speak with authority in the cause of a world free from enslavement, then it is axiomatic that Alaska must become more than a bastion of mere defensive capability.

General Armstrong spoke up forthrightly from Anchorage some time ago. He was speaking with deep conviction. Far away in Washington, his plea for retaliatory missile forces in Alaska fell on deaf ears.

Just as Adlai Stevenson spoke honestly and logically in the battle of words at the United Nations, so must the United States be able to speak with the military strength to give those words real meaning.

The time has come for the construction of a retaliatory missile force in Alaska. A warning system is not enough. Defensive missiles are not enough. The strategic location of this vast State makes it imperative that our military forces here be supplied with the tools to keep America strong.

Alaska is an integral part of the United States. It seems foolish to rely on the instability of leased bases in foreign lands, when Alaskan military leaders make pointed stress of the lack of offensive capability in this, the most strategically located of all the 50 States.

In casting aside an archaic portion of recent American foreign policy, the New Frontier has embarked upon a bold rededication to the ideas upon which this great Nation was built. Let us hope that, at the same time, the New Frontier can cast aside, along with archaic diplomacy, the archaic philosophy that has seen military expenditures too often in the past, spent in unlikely areas that happen to have significant representation in the Congress.

It is time too, for the Congress to take an overall look at the defense picture as it pertains to Alaska. Certainly, as far as Alaskans are concerned, we would be far safer to remain as a warning device for the rest of America. It would be far safer to watch missiles sailing over our heads toward the more heavily populated areas of America. With the limited offensive capabilities of the Alaskan military establishment in the Aerospace Age, it would be pointless for a potential aggressor to waste its offensive weapons on us.

But if the words of Thomas Jefferson, so eloquently restated by Adlai Stevenson, are to have full meaning in the world of today and tomorrow, then Alaskans must express their willingness to enter the target area of the timeworn adage that states, "The best defense is a good offense."

Certainly, a good offense dictates the utilization of Alaska to its full military potentialities. This utilization should be of primary concern to the citizens of all the States of the Union, of more concern than the involvement of payroll dollars, of more concern than the other benefits of military expenditures. For after all, the security of the individual citizen and the security of the free world speak more loudly than the materialism of the dollar if only we will stop and listen.

The Record of Ambassador Adlai Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Roscoe Drummond has published in the New York Herald Tribune an interesting comment on the record being written in the United Nations by Ambassador Adlai Stevenson. I concur in his conclusions that Adlai Stevenson's great gift of articulate speech is well suited to this forum, and that he is proving a powerful advocate of U.S. policy within the United Nations. I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred may be printed with these remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

EARLY GAFFES FORGOTTEN—STEVENSON CUTTING LARGE FIGURE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Viewed from both Washington and the United Nations, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson is emerging as a powerful figure in the Kennedy administration.

This does not mean that the President is not making the final decisions on policy. This does not mean that Secretary of State Dean Rusk is being detoured as Mr. Kennedy's principal adviser on foreign affairs.

It does mean that, on the basis of his experience, initiative and political prestige at home and abroad, Stevenson is exerting unusually wide influence in the State Department and the White House.

Whatever coolness there may have been in the past, Stevenson and Mr. Kennedy are now establishing a good working relationship. As a consequence, the President's U.N. ambassador is today at the center of policy formulation.

Every delegate here is under instructions from his government. Stevenson is, too. But to a notable extent, his recommendations shape his instructions. And beyond that, his views on the widest range of foreign policy carry great weight in the top councils of the administration.

It was at Ambassador Stevenson's initiative that the United States for the first time voted with the Afro-Asian nations in their colonial resolution on Angola. It was Stevenson, in part because of his long personal acquaintance with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, who was called upon to conduct the delicate and important negotiations for resuming the disarmament talks with the Russians.

When British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan was in Washington this past week to meet with President Kennedy, Stevenson took part as well as Secretary Rusk.

Mr. Kennedy needs Stevenson in his administration. The President, aware of his close election, wants to keep the support of Adlai's followers. In addition, Stevenson, through his wide travels, has gotten to know personally more world leaders than anyone else in the administration, including the President. This is invaluable for his job as Ambassador at the U.N. He also brings his gift of articulate speech to the U.N., perhaps the best forum for Stevenson's talents.

All of these things give Stevenson a voice in Cabinet deliberations and a degree of access and influence with the President which is exceptional. Yet everything hasn't always gone well.

Mr. Kennedy was annoyed no little when Stevenson guessed publicly that the President would be glad to see Premier Khrushchev if he decided to come to the U.N.—this when the President did not want to give Khrushchev any encouragement to come. I am also told that Stevenson delivered two speeches, not before the U.N., which had not been cleared by the State Department.

But these things were in the early period of the administration's takeover—and have not recurred. Rusk and Stevenson have worked together smoothly thus far.

In his job at the U.N., Stevenson is at many points doing things differently than did Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. He is initiating breakfast, luncheon and dinner sessions with the heads of all the 99 delegations, sometimes including wives. For the first time, Stevenson as U.S. representative let it be known that he would be available to meet with the caucus of the Afro-Asian nations on a common matter. They invited him at once.

There is one intriguing thread of sameness-plus-difference between the governor and his predecessor. As U.N. Ambassador, Lodge was, to a degree, seeking to make his political reputation while Stevenson is seeking to conserve his political reputation.

It is premature to guess what Stevenson's record will look like when it takes fuller shape. But at this point he is proving a powerful advocate of U.S. policy within the U.N. and an influential spokesman for his own views within the Kennedy administration.

Lockheed Repudiates Erroneous Press Report Regarding Its Showing of the Film "Operation Abolition"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 13, 1961, there was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Los Angeles Mirror of March 3, 1961 "relating why Lockheed missiles and space division has stopped showing the film 'Operation Abolition.'"

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD two letters: the first dated March 27, 1961, which I addressed to Mr. Robert E. Gross, chief executive officer of the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., asking confirmation of the above mentioned press release; the second letter, dated April 15, 1961, received in reply from Mr. John E. Canaday, vice president of the company, in which he repudiates the "erroneous press report" regarding Lockheed's halting its showing of the film:

MARCH 27, 1961.

Mr. ROBERT E. GROSS,
Chief Executive Officer, Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.

DEAR MR. GROSS: I was somewhat surprised to read in the press that the raging controversy over "Operation Abolition" had caused Lockheed Missiles and Space Division to halt its showing of the film. I am somewhat at a loss to understand this, and am quite sure the release was, perhaps, unauthorized or at least garbled.

I am sure you are aware of the report made to our committee by Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, on the subject of the riots in San Francisco and the fact that our committee made a report to the House concerning the legislative purpose for the production of the film. Both of these publications are enclosed for your information.

I would very much appreciate hearing from you as to whether or not the present comments are indeed accurate.

With very best regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

LOCKHEED AIRCRAFT CORP.,
Burbank, Calif., April 5, 1961.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALTER: Mr. Robert E. Gross has asked that I investigate and reply to your March 27 letter. Evidently there has been a misunderstanding about Lockheed's position in regard to the film "Operation Abolition." We have no overall policy against its showing.

Lockheed acquired one print of the film for internal purposes. We have shown it to some of our security coordinators and others. It has been shown to the management clubs at two of our divisions. On a few occasions our print has been shown to outside groups. And we shall continue to lend our single print to such groups when the dates can be worked into the rather tight internal schedule.

I have recently seen the film and feel that it is an excellent documentary-type record of tactics used by the Communists and their supporters. We believe everyone should see it, especially parents who may not be aware of the dangerous influences their sons and daughters may encounter on college campus.

Occasions for showing the film either among our employees or to outside groups with our assistance are limited, however, both by propriety and the regulations and practices characteristic of large industrial firms and Government defense contractors. It would be inappropriate and contrary to longstanding practices, for example, to show the film to employees on the job. And it would be inappropriate for industrial firms like Lockheed to serve as a film distributing agency. Outside groups will have no difficulty in obtaining a print from the commercial film company that produced it and is distributing it.

It was a misimpression that grew out of one or two such occasions that led to the erroneous press report that we would no longer allow the film to be shown.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. CANADAY,
Vice President.

National Employ the Physically Handicapped Committee of the Great 23d Congressional District, Calif., Awards U.S. Government Bonds to Five Winners in High Schoool Essay Competition—City Officials, Newspaper Editor, Veterans' Leaders and Business Representatives Act as Judges at Compton, Calif.—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the following are the three remaining essays as hereinbefore described by me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for this date and I call these essays to your attention and also to the attention of all readers thereof:

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

(By Sue Carter, Hollydale, Calif., Paramount High School)

Any bodily defect that is a disadvantage in normal activities is considered a physical handicap. Public attention has caused programs for the welfare of the handicapped to be concentrated on the more noticeable handicaps like loss of hearing, vision, or parts of the body, and crippling of the bones, joints and muscles. Other disabilities which seriously affect individuals are damage to the heart, veins, or kidneys; difficulties with the nervous system such as cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis and epilepsy; respiratory ailments, including arrested tuberculosis, silicosis and asthma; diabetes; and speech defects.

Physical handicaps are usually due to accidents, diseases, birth injuries and defects in the development of the child before birth, but the causes of some handicaps are unknown. Rheumatic fever, which damages the heart, tuberculosis of the bones, which causes bone deformities, and infantile paralysis, which results in inability to use muscles, are common causes of crippling in children. Perhaps with the full use of modern medical knowledge 75 percent of all handicaps have been decreasing in recent years because of improved nutrition, prevention of disease and accidents, and better medical and obstetrical care. Many existing physical handicaps can be improved through physical therapy, surgery and other medical treatment, but there are many areas in the United States where such treatment is not available to everyone. In the case of handicaps due to illnesses that tend to reoccur, such as rheumatic fever and tuberculosis, proper health care can help to prevent additional damage. Research is being done by public and private agencies and by individuals in the prevention and treatment of physical handicaps.

Certain handicapped people for example the blind, the deaf and those with severe orthopedic crippling need specially trained instructors in order to have as good an education as other people. The present trend is to enable these people to have a normal home life and contacts with unhandicapped people while having special training. Most States provide boarding schools for blind and deaf children. People realize now that the training of blind and deaf children should be started in early infancy if they are to take advantage of schooling and in some localities there are classes for parents and public or private nursery schools for these children. Some schools provide job training for handicapped children and counseling to advise them concerning suitable occupations.

An ideal program for the physically handicapped, toward which both community and private agencies are working, consists in making available to all handicapped persons means of restoring as much use of their bodies as possible, helping them to develop their natural abilities, and enabling them to lead happy, normal lives as self-supporting, self-respecting members of the community. Such a program must include medical diagnosis and treatment, providing appliances such as hearing aids and artificial limbs, special public education for handicapped people, training for work and placement in a job suited to the abilities of the individual, recreation and counseling to help the individual with his personal problems.

Many corporations in many communities have developed programs for hiring disabled workers as a practical solution to their labor

shortages. Certain aircraft, automobile and farm equipment manufacturers have been most successful. The Federal Government, however, is probably the biggest single employer of the physically handicapped in the United States.

Educational programs based on numerous studies of experience in business and industry have helped to prove to industrial leaders, the general public and fellow employees the fact that the disabled worker is a satisfactory worker when he is properly placed. By job analysis a disabled person can be selected so that his handicap does not interfere with his job performance.

Contrary to popular opinion, experience in employing the handicapped during the war has shown that with careful placement in a suitable job, the handicapped person can be just as efficient as other workers and often has fewer absences and changes jobs less frequently. Education of the community in understanding the needs and abilities of the handicapped is a vital necessity in securing support for such programs.

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

(By Ken Perkins, Compton Senior High School, Compton, Calif.)

Ability. This is the keyword to success in our modern, industrial age. It is that substance which employers are constantly trying to find. It is the nucleus around which all successful enterprises revolve. In spite of all this, however, some of the greatest ability in the possession of mankind today is forced to remain idle because of a physical handicap.

The American people boast that in our country any person with ability can advance in his selected field of endeavor. In the great majority of cases, this is true, but in the case of a physically handicapped person, whose handicap in no way affects his capability in his job, this great boast semingly does not apply.

The rejection of physically handicapped people by American industry is not brought about by malintent, but rather by ignorance of the facts. If the employers of America knew the truth about physical handicaps, and were to consign to old wives' tales that have grown up about these handicaps to their proper sphere, this hire-the-handicapped campaign would not be necessary.

The industries of America owe it to themselves and to the public in general to take another look at this matter of job for the handicapped and to find out just what the truth is.

The facts now make it impossible for anyone to make the blanket statement that a handicap of any nature makes a person unfit for a job. A blind man in Peterborough, N.H., tests ball bearings (which are so small that nine would fit in an aspirin tablet) by the sense of touch. With this superdeveloped sense of touch, he is more capable of doing this work than a man with normal eyesight. August Renoir produced some of his finest paintings from a wheelchair. John Milton wrote some of his most beautiful poetry while blind. Even more astounding, Beethoven created some of his finest works after deafness had overtaken him.

No longer can anyone say that a handicapped person is a liability to his firm. There is a company in Long Island, N.Y., called Abilities, Inc., which is run by a man born without legs and is manned entirely by 200 disabled men. After the first year, its insurance rate went down 21 percent. A survey by the U.S. Labor Department has shown that handicapped workers are safer on the job, have better production records, and have no greater rate of absence than normal workers.

The Federal Government has realized the need for employment of handicapped people. Congress has set aside 1 week of the year as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. The Department of Labor has made surveys regarding this problem and is constantly encouraging the hiring of handicapped people.

Employing the handicapped is not just something to be done out of decency or charity. As the preceding has shown, it is also good business. But there is something more involved in it than just good business—something that makes it the concern of every American citizen who is conscious of his duties as an American. Perhaps the best way to convey this would be to quote President Eisenhower as he once spoke on the subject—

"In these demanding times, the labor force of our Nation is our most precious asset. Working shoulder to shoulder, the handicapped can add spirit and power to America as we seek to promote the strength of the whole free world."

It is not what the employer can do for the handicapped that is important, but rather what the handicapped can do for the employer and the whole Nation. The hiring of able, handicapped workers is a challenge to America which, in order to survive in this modern world, it cannot neglect.

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

(By Michelle Ruth Reynolds, Lynwood, Calif.)

There are in the United States today some 2 million handicapped people who, despite the loss of a limb or one of the senses, still possess skills, talents, knowledge, and the desire to work. But few of these people will be hired; most of them will continue to live in tax-supported hospitals or homes or off tax-paid pensions or benefits.

Yet, it is good sense to rehabilitate and hire these handicapped people. A survey conducted by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation showed that in 1 year the earnings of some 44,000 rehabilitated workers increased from $6,500,000 to $78 million, quite an increase in tax and spending money coming into the community.[1] Nor was that the only financial benefit. It costs $500 a year to support a handicapped person; only $300 to $500 to rehabilitate him.[2] The cost of supporting the people used in the survey for just 1 year meant the difference between their costing the community and their helping the community.

To a handicapped person, a job is the gateway to self-respect, the means of once again becoming an active worker. It is the difference between idleness and productiveness. It means that he is once again a useful member of society.

But all too often society rejects the rehabilitated. All to often doors are closed to the handicapped. Businessmen say, "I run a competetive organization. I'm afraid a handicapped person would not be able to do the work that would be expected of him."

Is this statement true? Are the handicapped a liability? No, as several highly successful firms who prefer the handicapped person have proven. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. and the Brown-Brockmeyer Co., of Ohio, hire deaf-mutes because they are not bothered by the noise of machinery or conversation. Marshall Field and Eastman Kodak employ heart patients. North American Aviation, Boeing Airplane, Bates Manufacturing, Otis Elevator, and the Radio Corp. of America all use blind persons in their factories and offices. The Caterpillar Tractor Co. hires amputees, as well as those who are deaf, blind, or mute.[3]

Most of these companies did not hire the handicapped out of pity, but because they know that the handicapped worker is actually a better worker, as was proven by the Western Electric Co. Western Electric ran a test using two groups of workers, one composed of disabled persons, the other of regular employees. At the end of a year, the handicapped proved superior in all four areas of study.[4] They had seven times less absentees, five times less labor turnover and accidents, and were outproducing the other group. One reason for this performance is that a disabled person is generally more conscientious, more careful, and more stable than the average man.

A handicap is not necessarily a hindrance to work. The Ford Motor Co. estimated that in their organization there were 2,637 jobs that could be done by a one-legged person, 670 a double amputee could handle, 715 a one-armed individual could perform, and 10 that the blind could do.[5] An analysis by the U.S. Civil Service Commission of 6,000 jobs disclosed that 3,500 of them could be performed by the handicapped as efficiently as by the able-bodied.[6]

These are the facts. The handicapped are able and willing to work. Must industry refuse them the opportunity? After fighting to overcome their handicap, must they also fight to overcome the prejudice of a society that is supposedly dedicated to the belief that all men are equals? This is the challenge given by the handicapped to the communities and the people of America: Give us jobs. Let us show that we can work as well and as hard as any other employee. Will the American community accept this challenge?

---

[1] Ray, Marie Beynon, "How To Conquer Your Handicaps," p. 120.
[2] Ibid., p. 121.
[3] Ibid., p. 283.
[4] Ibid., p. 285.
[5] Ibid., p. 286.
[6] Ibid., p. 287.

The Nation's Stake in Atomic Power—Address by Representative Holifield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week, it was my privilege to hear, at San Antonio, Tex., an informed and stimulating address before the 18th annual convention of the American Public Power Association, by the able, diligent, dedicated CHET HOLIFIELD, Congressman from California, and chairman of the U.S. Congress Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Believing that the facts, information, and thoughts of Congressman HOLIFIELD worthy of wide dissemination over the country, and before the Congress and the Government, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD today, his address of April 25, 1961, before the 1961 annual convention of the

American Public Power Association, under the titled "The Nation's Stake in Atomic Power."

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

THE NATION'S STAKE IN ATOMIC POWER

(Remarks by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, of California)

I am sure that you gentlemen are aware that the subject on which I speak to you today is not as fashionable as it used to be. Atomic power has lost some of its glamour, and there may have been a corresponding decrease in general public interest.

My principal purpose in speaking to you today is to emphasize that the development of atomic power is no less important now than it was a few years ago, when the Sunday supplements were predicting an atomic power plant in every home and an atomic-powered automobile in every garage. These were fantasies born of ignorance, and it is well that they now are recognized as such.

However, I do foresee a time when many homes will be heated and mass transportation will be powered indirectly by atomic energy—not by individual atomic reactors, of course, but by electricity generated in huge nuclear power stations of several million kilowatts capacity and transmitted over great high-voltage regional grids for distribution to homes, farms and industrial establishments.

Just when this may occur and just what types of nuclear power plants will have been developed by that time, I would not venture to predict. But I am confident that this day will come.

The theme of my talk with you today is that we should hasten this day to the extent that we can by initiating a positive and effective program to develop atomic power plants that are safe, reliable, and economic. This program must include a strong public development effort because this is the only way, as I see it, that the public interest in this new source of energy can be protected.

Right now the importance of protecting the public interest in atomic power may not be too obvious. We generate most of our power from the fossil fuels—coal, oil, and gas—and the U.S. and the world reserves of these seem to be very large. However, this condition will not last forever.

There will come a day when we will foresee the end of our fossil fuel reserves if we do not start soon to tap additional sources of energy. In a careful study made last year, the Atomic Energy Commission concluded that within 40 years the world would be burning up annually above five times a much coal, oil, and gas as in 1958, and the people of the United States four times as much. The study predicted that if no other sources of energy were tapped, we would exhaust our fossil fuel reserves in about 90 years.[1]

Obviously, we cannot let this happen, nor should we allow this point even to be approached. Our fossil fuels will become increasingly valuable as sources of chemical raw materials, and the time may come when people will wonder why we were so wasteful as to burn them up.

The development of atomic power also can bring into our economy a new source of low-cost energy and help to restrain the steady upward march of the prices of the conventional fuels. We all know how the price of natural gas has been rising, despite reported large reserves. Our supplies of coal are far larger, yet I am told that coal prices have shown an upward trend averaging almost 1.5 percent per year compounded.

Low-cost atomic power, developed without delay, can help restrain this upward drift. If atomic power held back the average cost of fuel for powerplants by as much as one-twentieth of a cent per kilowatt-hour—one-half mill—the savings to the American consumers as of 1980 would amount to between $1½ and $2 billion per year, and the amount would increase each year thereafter.

Atomic energy will not have to supply a large percentage of our total power needs in order to be a restraining influence on fuel and energy. As a matter of fact the threat of atomic energy is already having an effect. As I understand it, the conventional fuel price situation in certain parts of Florida and California have been stabilized or lowered, as a result of proposals to build large-scale atomic powerplants in those areas.

But conventional fuel producers should have no fear that atomic power will supplant coal and oil and gas in the foreseeable future. All of you are familiar with the rapid growth in the consumption of electricity in this country. It doubles every 9 to 10 years. In 1958, power production in the United States was about six times what it was in 1935. If we continue the same rate of growth, total U.S. power production by 1980 will be five or six times what it was in 1958.

Even a small percentage of this large a power industry would be a great number of kilowatts. For example, if only 10 percent of our total generating capacity in 1980 were from atomic power plants, our atomic power capacity would probably equal or exceed the total generating capacity which the United States had in 1950—more than 80 million kilowatts.

This fantastic growth rate in the electric power industry, sustained for more than 50 years, and the fact that our reserves of coal, oil, and gas are not inexhaustible, make it clear that the vigorous development of atomic power will be of great importance to the American consumer.

However, this is a most difficult and complex undertaking. We have made progress in civilian atomic power development, but knotty problems remain to be overcome. There are such technical problems as the development of new metals and ceramics which will not fail under the unusual heat and radiation conditions in a reactor, and designing fuel elements which are both cheap and reliable. There is the problem of how to store large quantities of extremely radioactive waste materials for literally indefinite periods of time.

There are also stringent safety requirements to be met. The nature of the nuclear technology and the magnitude of the hazards require a much greater degree of technical competence and a far higher level of public responsibility by both Government and industry than have earlier industrial technologies. In the past, we have permitted industry to pollute our atmosphere and streams to a considerable extent, but any similar attitude is completely intolerable in the atomic energy industry.

The Atomic Energy Commission has maintained a good safety record, although it was unfortunately marred in January of this year by the fatal reactor accident in Idaho. It will be essential to maintain a good record as the industrial uses of atomic energy spread. This will require substantial research and training, and a sufficiently deliberate approach to widespread industrial utilization, to assure the needed competence and control.

In conjunction with unique technical and safety problems, the development of atomic power presents stubborn economic obstacles. Many utility and industry people said in 1954 that if private enterprise were unleashed by amending the Atomic Energy Act, it would rapidly develop economic atomic power.

However, economic atomic power has not been achieved. The first large private industry plant has been shut down for repairs most of the time since its startup last year. These repairs incidentally arise primarily from causes which are nonnuclear in their origin. Another large plant, the Consolidated Edison plant at Indian Point, N.Y., is estimated to cost more than twice as much as originally estimated. This can result in increased power costs to the consumers of the area of one sort or another.

The costs for the Shippingport pressurized water reactor—the only large Federal power reactor in operation—also are indicative. The capacity of this reactor is to be increased from 60,000 to 150,000 kilowatts equivalent by installation of a new and improved core. This will reduce fuel costs to one-third their present level. Even so, the new fuel cost will still be much too high to be economic.

The lack of achievement of economic atomic power should not discourage us. The problems are not more difficult now than they were in fact in 1954. And we have learned a great deal from our mistakes and successes since then.

Our slow progress, in my opinion, has been primarily due to the adoption by the Atomic Energy Commission in 1954 and 1955 of an ineffective approach to solving these complex technical and economic problems.

As you will recall, the former administration rushed through legislation in 1954 to place primary responsibility on private industry to develop atomic power. At the same time, this same administration proclaimed a grandiose international program of atoms for peace, whereby the peaceful atom was going to replace stockpiles of atomic weapons.

The chosen instrument to achieve economic power in the United States, and to promote atoms for peace abroad, was the so-called partnership approach. This method emphasized U.S. Federal financial participation, without any corresponding U.S. leadership or direction of the programs.

It became evident quite early in the period following the 1954 amendments that we needed greater U.S. leadership if the domestic and international atomic development programs were going to succeed. Together with Senator GORE, I sponsored a bill in 1955 and 1956, to initiate a Federal program of building developmental atomic powerplants.

Following introduction of these bills, and particularly during their consideration by the Joint Committee in public hearings and executive sessions in the spring of 1956, various improvements were made in the bills. Thus, under Chairman ANDERSON'S leadership, the bills authorized both large and small atomic reactors which would be prototype plants for experimental and demonstration purposes. The electric power produced would be absorbed at AEC installations, and thereby hopefully avoid the alleged public power issue.

These bills, as revised, were reported out unanimously by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. However, they still were not palatable to some important interests. Our proposals were denounced by Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Lewis Strauss, the private power companies, and others for advocating a wasteful crash program, aimed at nothing more than building a lot of uneconomic atomic power capacity. We were accused of proposing a useless kilowatt race with Russia and the United Kingdom, and of trying to socialize the power industry.

The fact is, of course, that we had no such purposes in mind. The bill was passed by the Senate and defeated in the House by only 12 votes despite the fact that the entire weight of the executive branch was thrown against us. Obviously, a good many other Members of Congress and people elsewhere thought the bill was well advised.

I review this history not for partisan reasons, but because of the effect on the atomic

[1] It is recognized that estimates this far in the future in themselves involve major problems.

power program of the defeat of the Gore-Holifield bill. We in the Joint Committee sponsored that bill because we knew that the development of economic and safe atomic powerplants was going to be a long, hard, and expensive job. We knew that the costs of development were far beyond the capacity of private industry, particularly since there were no prospects of early profits on investments. The bill therefore aimed at establishing a positive Federal construction program of developmental plants.

With the defeat of the Gore-Holifield bill, the so-called partnership approach became the dominant pattern for the construction of atomic powerplants. In my opinion, the decision to rely almost entirely upon the approach has delayed the development of atomic power and allowed the privately owned utilities to dominate a program largely financed with public funds.

It has taken at least 5 years to complete the first large plant under the "partnership" approach. This is the project sponsored by the Yankee Atomic Electric Co. The Dresden plant, sponsored by the Commonwealth Edison Co. was built outside the "partnership" program.

A number of other projects are underway and several are nearing completion, as you know. Four of these are under construction in partnership with local public power agencies and rural co-ops but not one is yet in operation. Even in these cases, where the Federal Government has financed the reactor, the rate of progress has been halting and uncertain.

The program has been equally slow in respect to the plants proposed by the private utility groups, where Federal funds are provided for research and development and fuel subsidies. A number have been canceled and others are seriously behind schedule.

Back in 1958, I tried to make some sense out of the partnership approach by advocating AEC leadership and technical direction of the program. This more aggressive approach was spelled out in a report prepared by the Joint Committee staff in August 1958, with the advice of a distinguished panel of consultants. The Joint Committee, as you know, sponsored several projects, including the Oak Ridge gas-cooled project and the Puerto Rico superheat project under this more aggressive approach. However, AEC has not followed through aggressively to carry out its other authorizations.

The "partnership" approach seems to have run its course, at least as the main vehicle for developmental plant construction. The last three projects have apparently been duds. AEC received no proposals at all from the private power companies on the 50-megawatt organic reactor. But it apparently won't build the project itself, as authorized in the 1961 law. On two water reactor projects offered to public power and co-op systems, AEC received proposals but was unable to conclude mutually satisfactory arrangements. One of the three projects has been canceled and the other two are in a state of suspense. Congress authorized all three for construction in 1959.

Although some worthwhile plants have been started and there has been technical progress in the past 6 years, the partnership approach has proved to be clumsy and cumbersome. As a supplement to a strong Federal program, it might have some merit.

It seems to me high time that the Atomic Energy Commission move ahead with the development, construction, and operation of a sequence of developmental projects aimed at achieving clearly defined technical objectives according to a reasonable definite schedule. As the first sign of a new and bolder spirit in the executive branch, President Kennedy's recent recommendation to convert the new production reactor at Hanford to a dual-purpose plant is extremely encouraging. A converted NPR would use the heat from the reactor, which otherwise would be wasted, to produce 650,000 to 750,000 kilowatts of electric power. It will be by far the world's largest power-producing reactor. This step makes me hopeful that the new leadership in AEC will move ahead with a positive Federal program.

Once we get the NPR generating facilities authorized, and ascertain which of AEC's currently authorized projects should go forward, I believe that AEC and the Joint Committee should have a little get-together to see where we go from here. The private power people, the co-ops, and yourselves, as well as the industrial equipment companies have a stake in the development of a more aggressive program. So do consumers everywhere.

I certainly would not preclude the construction of additional plants by the privately owned utilities which they believe are financially justified in undertaking, but the U.S. program should not be primarily dependent on such projects.

As for the municipal and rural co-op utilities, there may be opportunities for additional "second round" projects. However, the costs and economic uncertainties involved probably mean that a relatively limited number of your utilities can or should participate directly in these developmental plants.

During this developmental period, I suggest that you prepare for the future use of atomic power by planning now for interconnection of your public and co-op systems. The economics of atomic power favor large plants even more strongly than those of conventional plants, and it appears that nuclear plants usually will need to be outside the city limits. While you should remain interested in the development of small plants, there is no assurance that economic reactors of less than, perhaps, 50,000 kilowatts can be developed in the foreseeable future. The best way, it seems to me, to prepare for the use of atomic powerplants is to interconnect your public systems so that you can use larger generating units located away from population centers.

In my opinion, it is in your interest also to continue your support of a strong Federal atomic power program. Experience has taught that the most effective way to protect the interests of all consumers is to maintain a strong publicly owned segment in the power industry. Your utilities have been the historical "yardsticks," in many cases in conjunction with the Federal power systems. To continue to provide such a yardstick is one of your important public responsibilities.

In the case of atomic power, during this developmental period it seems to me the Federal Government must carry the main burden of assuring strong public agency participation because of the unusual costs and economic risks involved.

I believe that we do need an effective public effort in atomic power development in order to protect the public interest in this new source of energy. If the Federal role were confined mainly to providing subsidies and research funds, effective control over the rate of atomic power development and its price to the public would come to rest largely in the hands of the privately owned utilities and the large equipment manufacturers. Now I bear no hostility toward either. Both industries are essential and are performing most important functions, on the whole with a high degree of competence.

The fact is, however, that the private utilities are State franchised monopolies which are becoming ever larger and more powerful through mergers and combinations. Their past history is spotted with major instances of consumer exploitation, public progaganda, and the abuse of the great political power they wield as well-financed monopolies. State and Federal regulation have been only partially effective at best in restraining them.

A further factor affected by the lag in the atomic development program is the situation of our private atomic equipment companies. We have had a fairly healthy competitive situation with at least seven major equipment companies in the field of atomic power development. Because of the general overoptimism in the early days, and AEC's exhortations, these companies have tended to overcapitalize on private facilities in the atomic field. Now that the pickings are not so good, it is only Government contracts once again, which are primarily responsible for keeping this industry alive.

Moreover, unless a well-planned Federal directed and administrated program is established we can be sure that only the bigger and entrenched companies can remain in the atomic power development business. Various consolidations and dropouts have been taking place.

I would regret to see atomic equipment development end up with only one or two giants in the business.

We have had a vivid example of what happens when two corporate giants dominate the electrical equipment manufacturing and distributing industry. I speak of the shocking facts which were revealed in the recent indictments of 29 electrical equipment companies and the 45 individuals involved.

I was aware of some of these corporate price-fixing and collusive bidding practices as early as July 20, 1959, when I spoke in the House of Representatives on the TVA-Los Angeles Water and Power Department's purchase of large generating equipment from Swiss and English manufacturers. Westinghouse and the General Electric Co. raised such a hue and cry against these foreign companies which outbid them, that I decided to investigate the facts which were involved.

I proved that their failure to obtain the TVA and Los Angeles Water and Power business was based on managed prices and collusive bidding practices. As you know, my contention was proven by the Department of Justice in their antitrust suits. These suits were decided in the Federal courts and resulted in some very prominent corporation officials taking an enforced vacation in what is sometimes referred to as the "pokey."

Federal Judge Ganey fined the 45 individuals involved in the price-fixing conspiracy a total of $1,924,000. The judge labeled the case as "a shocking indictment of a vast section of our economy." The Justice Department called this case of massive conspiracy the biggest in antitrust history. Judge Ganey also vigorously denounced the conspirators by stating that their actions "flagrantly mocked the image of the economic system of free enterprise which we profess to the country, and destroyed the model which we offer today as a free world alternative to state control and eventual dictatorship."

I mention this case to emphasize the need for continuous objective evaluation of our so-called free enterprise system. It is only one example of our retreat from the principle of competition. Other great segments of business have, for all practical purposes, deserted the principle of real competition. We can point to similar situations in steel, rubber, chemicals, petroleum products, finance, and labor.

We have been told throughout the complete development of our economy that our progress has been based on the incentives of reward under competitive effort in a free enterprise system. But throughout the length and breadth of our land, we can see a pattern of monopoly, managed prices, regional distribution agreements, collusive agreements between great labor unions and their employers, and rigged collusive bid-

ding, gradually taking the place of competitive practices and procedures.

Profits no longer are based primarily on efficiency of production and distribution between real competitors. Profits depend too often upon the elimination of competition through various devices which I have described.

I am deeply concerned with this erosion of the competitive principles. If our system of competitive free enterprise is a valid one, and if it is to succeed in the world struggle against the Communist system of production, it must be allowed to function without crippling distortion. We will not be able to compete successfully with the Soviet system through operating a system that denies the transmission of its benefits to the consumer.

I say we cannot deny to our people the advantages and improvements in the productive and distributive processes of a free society which operates under the competitive principle and which is inevitably stifled when monopoly takes over.

We are in a desperate cold war struggle with the Soviets, not only for the minds, but for the markets and technologies of free and neutral nations. If we are to be crippled with the deadweight of monopoly, managed prices, limited production, and unjustified profits, we cannot win. We are doomed to failure.

In the field of atomic development, the problem therefore is not merely one of maintaining a competitive domestic atomic equipment industry, or of someday achieving economic atomic power on a business-as-usual basis. In many ways the world technological leadership of the United States is at stake. We cannot depend upon the controlled pace of monopolistic groups, dictated by their own limited interests, to maintain this technological leadership. We must provide for the leadership of the Federal Government in the current state of the development of this new energy resource, and insure the full participation of private, co-op, and public organizations in the atomic program for which the Federal taxpayer has contributed billions of dollars.

Omnibus Farm Bill Is in Keeping With American Experience and Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman gave an excellent summary of the principles and programs of the proposed Agricultural Act of 1961 when he appeared before the House Agriculture Committee on April 24. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include excerpts from Secretary Freeman's testimony in the RECORD:

SIGNIFICANCE OF PRINCIPLES AND PROGRAMS OF THE NEW FARM BILL

The Agricultural Act of 1961 seeks to accomplish essential goals by means that are, on the one hand, in line with American experience and tradition, and, on the other, adapted to meet the conditions and demands of today.

The principle of adjusting abundance to current domestic and foreign needs is itself in the American tradition

This Nation, historically, has sought higher standards of living. It has sought to achieve plenty. In agriculture we have succeeded to a greater extent than in any other field. But we have never sought the waste—of both natural and human resources—that occurs when we produce what cannot be used. And so we seek, at one and the same time, in this legislation, to increase our utilization of farm products both at home and abroad and to adjust our productive abundance to those increased quantities. We are realistic enough to recognize that, even with an expansion of programs for increased consumption to the greatest possible extent that is consistent with sound and humane ideas and policies, we will not be able, in the years immediately ahead, to expand consumption enough to absorb all of our potential agricultural productivity. Thus, we must adjust our abundance.

The principle of equality of economic opportunity is basic to our philosophy, and this is all we are asking for the American farmer

The farmer is the only basic producer in our economy who now has available to him no means by which he can adjust his production to demand—and who, therefore, has no effective means by which he can influence the economic rewards of his enterprise.

It is absurd, in any consideration of a farm program, to compare the farmer with the small corner merchant.

Perhaps there should be Government action for small business, but of a different nature for a different reason. But the farmer, as a basic producer and not a retailer, can be more accurately compared with other basic producers—such as, for example, the producers of steel. Government has given to such producers the instrument of incorporation, by which they can become large enough to effectively adjust their production to quantities that can be sold profitably.

Government has likewise given to labor the instrument of collective bargaining whereby millions of individual workers—who, as individuals, would be even more helpless than the farmers—can work together to achieve a fair return for their productive activity.

To achieve economic equality, therefore, we propose programs to provide farmers with the insitutional machinery for coming together and developing supply adjustment programs, and with democratic methods for approving or rejecting such programs. We would specifically provide safeguards for consumers' interest in this process.

By enacting the proposed legislation, the Congress would establish the ground rules and guidelines under which supply adjustment programs would be developed and placed into operation. Then, whenever action is needed with regard to any commodity or group of related commodities, a committee of producers—including one consumer representative—would be selected to consult with the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and recommend a program of supply adjustment for that commodity. The Secretary would recommend a program based on these consultations. Only after such a program had been approved by the President, sanctioned by the Congress, and approved by a two-thirds vote of the producers themselves, would it become binding upon all farmers who choose to produce that commodity. The farmers who serve on these commodity advisory committees would be chosen from nominees designated by farmer-elected county committees and by farm organizations.

It is a part of the strength of this Nation to emphasize self-help and voluntary action

This principle is emphasized in the legislation here presented. I believe that the farmer advisory committees provided for in the bill will have an opportunity to exercise genuine leadership and develop economic statesmanship. They will be chosen because, taken together, they represent every group, segment, and interest that should be heard in the discussion and formulation of commodity programs, and they will therefore consider the broader implications of the policies they recommend. Charged with the responsibility of considering the interests of the farmers they represent, and facing public scrutiny and examination and approval by the Congress, they will, I am confident, once again demonstrate—as Americans have so often demonstrated—that the people themselves have the ability to consider the interest of the people as a whole. I have had experience with citizen committees and voluntary action. I know that members of these committees will recognize that they can "write their own ticket" only where the ticket is in the public interest and acceptable to all concerned.

The proposed legislation further recognizes the principle of self-help in its authorization of the expansion of marketing orders and agreements, as one important means available to farmers for developing and adjusting their industry. They give farm producers the opportunity to jointly plan their production in a manner designed to make abundant supplies of food available at reasonable prices, and yet to avoid the waste which results from excessive production.

Marketing quotas, product diversion, promotion, research, and quality control will provide many agricultural industries with the means of self-regulation. Marketing orders are truly a self-help program in that they are producer initiated, producer administered, and producer financed. And, since consumer interests are adequately protected, as required under the act, this self-help approach should be highly successful with respect to many commodities.

It is in the American tradition to seek to raise the economic level of all segments in our society

It is in this tradition that provisions for agricultural credit are incorporated in this bill.

A number of improvements in our supervised credit program are proposed, directed toward enabling all of our family farmers to benefit from the improvements contemplated in the farm program, toward strengthening the position of the family farmers, and toward enabling them to make their maximum contribution to the Nation's economic growth.

Under the proposed program the Farmers Home Administration could serve the full range of family farmers, including young farmers with farm background and training who are just starting out. It could do a far better job of helping farmers reorganize their farming operations and otherwise meet farm credit needs that are currently neglected. The administration of supervised farm credit would be simplified and improved. Farm management assistance would continue to be provided along with the loans, so that borrowers could get the maximum assistance out of every dollar borrowed. The Farmers Home Administration would continue to serve only those farmers who are unable to obtain sufficient credit from cooperative and private sources, and the legislation would in fact encourage an even greater use of credit from those sources.

Broadly speaking, the legislation would provide credit for financing farm adjustments, for enlarging and improving family farms, for acquiring farms, for making better use of water resources, for minimizing the risks in farming, for improving living conditions, and for financing modern production practices.

It is likewise in the American tradition to use our abundance to meet human needs at home and abroad, and to utilize our abundance as an instrument for peace and freedom in the world

The provisions in the proposed legislation relating to agricultural trade development will enable us to step up our programs for expanding the export of food and fiber, both for dollars and for foreign currency. They will enable us to make more effective use of our food for peace.

The request for a 5-year extension is the key recommendation to make Public Law 480 a more forceful instrument in U.S. foreign relations. A long-term extension will give notice that the United States is prepared to give greater assurance of a continuing supply of agricultural commodities needed by emerging nations. Many of these countries are striving to promote economic growth through ambitious, long-term plans. A 5-year extension of Public Law 480 will permit the coordination of U.S. agricultural export programs with these development plans. It will also be an integral part of our Nation's plans to establish a national food policy and develop a world food budget—thus assuring our contribution to the world problem of more adequately feeding hungry people. As we increase our efforts for expanded utilization, and as we develop means—in cooperation with other countries—for the more effective use of greater quantities of agricultural exports, these new and increasing demands on American agriculture will have to be taken into account in the formulation of our agricultural programs at home. This is why an extension and strengthening of our food-for-peace program is an integral part of the Agricultural Act of 1961.

I believe that affirmative action by the Congress on the programs we present in the Agricultural Act of 1961 would set the stage and provide the tools by which (1) the farmers of this Nation, in cooperation with Government, can achieve incomes comparable, in terms of labor and capital and management skills invested, to those received by other Americans; (2) a healthy and increasingly efficient and productive agriculture will continue to provide an abundance of food and fiber at fair prices to the consumers; (3) better farm incomes and a sound farm economy will contribute to economic growth and national prosperity; (4) costs of the Federal Government can be expected to decline as programs get underway and become effective; and (5) we can achieve maximum utilization of our abundance to meet needs and promote freedom at home and abroad.

When the Poor Support the Rich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Salt Lake Deseret News of April 21, 1961, entitled "When the Poor Support the Rich."

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

WHEN THE POOR SUPPORT THE RICH

As the new emergency unemployment benefits go into effect this week, they offer another example of what so often goes wrong when Federal programs extend into such areas.

Theoretically, Federal aid of all kinds is intended to equalize burdens—that is, to help poorer States take care of problems they couldn't handle by themselves. Otherwise, it would be more economical and efficient for States to spend money directly on their needs rather than having their money make a round-trip to Washington with a slice taken out in the process to pay for Federal bureaucracy.

Well, let's see how that theory is working out in the emergency unemployment compensation program.

The program extends the period of unemployment payments to a maximum of 39 weeks instead of the 26 weeks covered previously. If a State is already offering coverage beyond 26 weeks (Utah had already covered 36 weeks of unemployment), the Federal Government reimburses the State under the new program.

The cost is to be paid by an additional payroll tax of 0.4 percent, to be imposed on all employers of four or more persons. The program—and the tax—is supposed to be temporary, extending only through 1963. Any assumption that it will disappear on schedule, however, would have to be based on an optimism not justified by past experience.

Anyway, here's the joker: In 41 States, including Utah, the tax payments will exceed the benefits received. The nine States where benefits will exceed payments are New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Alaska, Oregon, Kentucky, and West Virginia.

Of those 9, the Utah Foundation points out, 3 are among the top 10 States in per capita income, and 4 more are among the second 10 States in per capita income.

And so we have the curious phenomenon of poorer States subsidizing richer States through the agency of the Federal Government—an absurdity which is, unfortunately, not confined to this particular program.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

BROOKLINE, MASS., *April 7, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I have read about your bill concerning the captive nations and am very happy that someone is taking a deep interest in the nations subjugated by Russia. I think it is high time that someone did.

I think that the committee for captive nations that you plan to establish will do a fine job for the cause of freedom and liberty throughout the world today. It will also enhance the prestige of the United States.

I do hope that this administration will see the value of your work and will work to see that the bill is passed.

Very truly yours,
MARCELLA A. KOZUCH.

UKRAINIAN-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION INC.,
Omaha, Nebr.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Ukrainian-American Association Inc., of Omaha, Nebr., wishes to congratulate you on your bold and far-sighted move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

This committee will not only serve as a reservoir of information and data on various enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R., but will also inform the American people and the world on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain. This no doubt will be of great help in assisting the U.S. Government in formulating its policies with respect to these enslaved nations.

Again we wish to emphasize our great pleasure in seeing this resolution introduced, and we also wish to commend you on your outstanding work in regard to this committee.

We are also writing our Congressmen from Nebraska and asking them for their support of this resolution.

Sincerely yours,
MRS. H. CZECHUT,
President.

ELMSFORD, N.Y.,
April 7, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: Please accept my congratulations on your introducing House Resolution 211 establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. This is a step toward a most worthy goal, that of ending the manmade inequalities that rob men of the chance to develop to the full what possibilities they have.

By making known to the world conditions existing in the captive nations, and by other valuable work to be done by your committee, you are challenging every one of us to work

to make every country a fairer place for all. We each have a part to play in making the brotherhood of man a reality and ending the scourge of war. We are all members of a human family with certain rights. Your committee will help build a foundation on which to build freedom, justice, and peace in the world. I am confident you will be successful. It is a worthwhile endeavor and you are to be congratulated on your work.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM T. SNYDER.

BRIARWOOD, LONG ISLAND,
April 3, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL FLOOD,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Your idea for setting up a permanent Committee on Captive Nations is comparable to a medicine for curing cancer. A great weakness in our foreign policy is lack of knowledge and information about the people the Russian Communists are whipping into line as they keep spreading their military power.

The free world keeps forgetting more and more that most of the people in the Soviet Union live under the Russian conquerors' heel and they are very unhappy. With proper and intelligent encouragement, this unhappiness can swell into a wave that will either destroy or, at least, neutralize communism's successes.

Your committee would provide the necessary information for intelligent action concerning the people who are captive but who long for freedom. May God help you in your gallant effort.

Most respectfully yours,

JOSEPH LESAWYER.

MARCH 29, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Ukrainian Congress Committee of Willimantic, Conn., wish to congratulate you on introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a Permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. We agree that such a committee is long overdue. The Soviet Union is one of our greatest problems, master of many peoples of various nations. These nations are very eager to be free from such slavery. It would be a great advantage to us to know all the weaknesses of such an existance.

If such a committee were formed, and it must be, it would be a great source of information. Such a committee could help to prove to the U.S. Government and its people and to the people of the world, the great necessity and importance of their work for freedom.

A letter has been written to Connecticut's own Congressman KOWALSKI, informing him of our intentions and asking him to give this matter his greatest interest. Once again congratulations on your good work.

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL PLESZ,
President, Ukrainian Congress Committee of Willimantic, Conn.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y., *April 5, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our heartiest congratulations to you in introducing the resolution for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. It is our duty, and certainly to our advantage to know all that is possible about the nations held captive by Moscow. These nations, eager to throw off the hated Communist yoke, constitute the weaknesses of the Soviet Union.

A committee such as you proposed would enlighten America and the world as to the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain. It would also serve as a source of information on the enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R., to assist the Government in formulating its policies with respect to these nations. We will certainly make every effort in urging our Congressman to support your resolution.

Sincerely,

STEPHAN BERNYK.

FAIRFIELD, CONN., *April 9, 1961.*

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I would like to congratulate you on the excellent work you have done in initiating the drive for the establishment of the Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

I certainly don't have to inform you of the seriousness in which we find ourselves—the almost daily reports of further setbacks by the free powers in the psychopolitical cold war. That is why I wholeheartedly support this attempt by you and many others to try to take the offensive in the cold war.

I give my complete support for the Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Very truly yours,

JOHN J. RELIHAN, Jr.

COURTS OF OYER AND TERMINER
AND QUARTER SESSIONS OF THE PEACE,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 19, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Congratulations on House Resolution 211 establishing a Special Committee on Captive Nations. This most worthy movement will encourage the hopes of those unfortunate enslaved people who are suffering under a brutal atheistic rule of Communism.

I also want to congratulate you on the excellent work you are doing for the people not only in your congressional district but also for the country at large. By this you are giving inspiration and hope to the unfortunate people who have lost their freedom.

With kindest regards and best wishes for your continued success, I am

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN H. SHENKEL,
Consultant, Americanism Committee, Department of Pennsylvania, The American Legion.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
April 5, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: As representatives of the named organizations, we wish to express our wholehearted support for the resolution you introduced in the House of Representatives, and we will urge our Congressmen from the State of Minnesota to vote for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in Congress.

We feel your proposal is very important to our Government, because it would constitute not only a source of complete and reliable information about the many nations enslaved by Moscow, but also would make the American people and the free people of the world realize that life in the U.S.S.R. is not as the Communist Party and the Soviet dictatorship would like the world to believe. The Committee on Captive Nations could, we think, present the truth about the peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

Your dedication, effort, and concern for the truth about the nature of Soviet tyranny and the lack of freedom of the people who must live under communism, deserves not only the support of our Congressmen, but of all the people of the United States.

Our sincere greetings,

WASYL FILONOWICH,
Chairman, Association of Ukrainian Veterans and Ukrainian Financial Committee.

VSEVOLOD RADCHENKO,
Secretary, Association of Ukrainian Veterans.

WOLODYMYR ROMANOWSKYJ,
Secretary, Ukrainian Financial Committee.

ANTON ROMANENKO,
Chairman, Ukrainian National Democratic Association.

PHILLIP PRODANCHUK,
Secretary, Ukrainian National Democratic Association.

GILMORE & CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., April 14, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have read House Resolution 211 and would like to congratulate you on your fine proposal. I have observed the various reactions to Captive Nations Week throughout the world and give my wholehearted approval for your most recent resolution.

I sincerely hope that you can muster the strength to insure its success in Congress.

Very truly yours,

LOUIS A. GILMORE.

Fordham Professor Comments on Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a distinguished constituent of mine, Prof. James J. Flynn, chairman of the department of social studies of the Fordham University School of Business, recently commented on the issues underlying the present public controversy over the role of the electoral college. His speech is a thoughtful and reasoned analysis of this subject. It contains much which is worthy of our close attention.

While I personally am of the opinion that the electoral college has outlived its usefulness and should be abolished, I am happy today to invite attention to Professor Flynn's comments. Although he takes a somewhat different position, his statement is indeed an important contribution to the literature on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

IS THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE DOOMED?

(By James J. Flynn, Ph. D.)

The major TV networks had scarcely switched off their electronic computers on the morning after election when from all

parts of the country came complaints against the electoral college. Every 4 years, the months after the presidential election, becomes open season on the machinery for choosing the Chief Executive.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD is the spearhead of the current attack on the electoral college. He argues that the college is antiquated and that only the popular vote should decide our choice for President and Vice President. This position, so soon after one of the closest elections in our history, only helps to confuse the issue for the average citizen.

The members of the Constitutional Convention in 1787 found the decision on the mode of choosing a President one of their most difficult. James Wilson, a delegate, stated it this way:

"The subject has greatly divided this House. It is in truth the most difficult of all on which we have to decide."

The final decision to permit the State legislatures to choose the method of picking their electors for the President and Vice President was based on the thesis that the right of appointment was not to be exclusively vested in the people.

What was the intention of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention in deciding on this method of electing a President? One suggestion is that they wanted to keep the people from all participation in choosing the Chief Executive. Another suggestion is that they wanted the electors to be completely free agents without any control by the people. The Founding Fathers would have denied both of these suggestions. James Madison constantly stated "the President is to be elected by the people." Edmund Randolph said "the electors must be elected by the people at large." Such statements clearly refute the view of those who argue that the Founding Fathers feared the people and distrusted their judgment.

It has never been quite understood that under the Constitution State legislatures have the uncontrolled and unrestricted power to fix the manner of appointing the presidential electors. With this great power at their disposal State legislatures have nevertheless, under a kind of moral persuasion, given up their prerogative of changing the present system. By the adoption of similar laws in each State there has developed a uniform method of appointment.

The method of choosing electors in present use is called the general ticket-plurality system. In the election just completed there were 537 electors to be voted on. The breakdown of the number is arrived at by assigning 100 electors to the States on the principle of equality, each State being entitled to 2. The remaining 437 electors (to be reduced to 435 as the result of the census of 1960) are distributed according to the principle of population, each State being assigned as many electors as it has Congressmen. To be elected a presidential candidate must capture a majority of the total electoral vote. In the election just completed an electoral vote of 269 was needed for a nominee's victory.

The Constitution says that electors may be chosen, "in such manner as the [State] legislature may direct." Under the present general ticket-plurality system a citizen enters his voting booth to choose a nominee for President. In fact he is voting for every elector to which his own State is entitled. For example, if you voted in New York State on November 8, you would have faced a voting machine listing the names of Kennedy-Johnson and Nixon-Lodge yet as you pulled the lever for either team you would have been voting, not for your candidates, but for a list of 45 electors previously approved by his political party.

As a result of this system the candidate who wins the largest popular vote in the State receives all of the electoral vote of that State. This makes possible the situation in which the candidate with the total popular vote of the country could lose the electoral vote and the election. An extreme example might be as follows:

State	Candidate A		Candidate B	
	Popular vote	Electoral vote	Popular vote	Electoral vote
	Thousands		*Thousands*	
Alabama	25	0	200	11
California	2,100	32	2,000	0
Massachusetts	1,100	16	1,000	0
Montana	90	0	100	4
New York	3,100	45	3,000	0
Ohio	1,000	0	2,000	25
Pennsylvania	1,000	0	2,000	32
North Carolina	80	0	700	14
Texas	600	32	400	0
Wisconsin	401	12	400	0
Total	9,496	137	11,800	86

The Constitution makes electors free agents who may vote for any qualified man or woman that they feel should be President and Vice President. Our Founding Fathers did not fully recognize the possibility of political parties and thought of the electors as free agents. This myth persists. For example, as late as 1952 in *Ray* v. *Blair* (343 U.S. 214.) the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that a California law requiring an elector to sign an affidavit to support the candidates nominated at the national conventions was unconstitutional. Custom and party pressure almost invariably make electoral delegations vote as a unit. The last exception to this occurred in Alabama in 1956 when 1 of the 11 Democratic electors did not cast his ballot for Stevenson.

Some of those who have agreed that the above system has outlived its usefulness refuse to support the thesis that some system not using the electoral college should be devised. A method called the single-member district system has been suggested as a more democratic way of choosing electors. In this method the candidate receiving the largest popular vote in each congressional district would get the electoral vote for that district. The candidate receiving the greatest popular vote in any given State would garner the two additional electoral votes for the State. For example:

NEW YORK

Candidate A:

Won 23 congressional districts—23 electoral votes.

Popular vote—3,240,600—2 electoral votes.

Total electoral votes: 25.

Candidate B:

Won 20 congressional districts—20 electoral votes.

Popular vote—2,301,306—No electoral votes.

Total electoral votes: 20.

While the single-member district system has gained some momentum, the most effective argument against it is that it would inevitably degenerate into a gerrymandering system. A gerrymander is an artificial arrangement of districts designed to give the political party making it (that is the party in power) a guarantee of electing its candidate to a representative or electoral body. With all the undemocratic overtones to "gerrymandering" it would seem that the single-member district system would be a weak solution to the electoral problem. However, it is generally agreed that this system is superior to the present general ticket-plurality system.

Following the election of 1948, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge and Congressman Edward Gossett introduced a resolution for a constitutional amendment. It was approved by the Senate, but later failed in the House. This resolution would have translated popular votes into electoral votes, and alloted a State's electoral quota among the candidates in proportion to the statewide popular votes polled. All that would be necessary to win would be a 40-percent plurality which would practically obviate the chance of an election being thrown into the House. This proposed amendment would have operated as follows:

NEW YORK

Present System:

Candidate A, 3,260,362—45 electoral votes.

Candidate B, 2,167,367—No electoral votes.

Lodge-Gossett resolution:

Candidate A, 3,260,987—22.6 electoral votes.

Candidate B, 1,999,999—22.4 electoral votes.

The strong argument against a change by means of the Lodge-Gossett resolution is that both State and National Legislatures presently overrepresent rural interests. The present electoral college system, conversely, is the only way to assure that presidential candidates will listen to the demands of urban majorities and minorities in America. The chief interest of southern sponsors of electoral reform is to diminish the alleged power of urban minorities, particularly the northern Negro, in national politics.

It is to be noted that all suggestions for change mentioned in this article are alike in that they modify the electoral college. If the change is to come it must be by amendment, for State reform is unlikely especially in the big industrial States. The same considerations of interest and pride, chiefly the increased weight accruing from an undecided block of electoral votes, which originally induced one after another of them to give up the earlier district system plan can be counted upon to frustrate any attempt, within their own boundaries, to revive it or anything resembling it.

One thing is certain. The elimination of the electoral college system is practically an impossibility. The use of the popular vote as the sole determinant is not practical. Our representative system is based on a compromise between population and regional needs.

From a practical point of view, since the polls closed on November 8 some Republican leaders thought that there should be a recount in 11 States. Some of these recounts were started. A recount in all 11 would have provoked considerable uncertainty and political passion.

But, if the Presidency depended on a majority of the popular vote in the entire Nation, we would then have a recount of the votes in all 50 States. This would open the door to extensive opportunities for fraud in every area where one party had decisive control of the election machinery.

The electoral college system, if it does nothing else, restricts the area of argument to a limited number of States. It does not put the whole country at the mercy of political machines determined to grab everything in sight.

No one really questions that the electoral college system is cumbersome and anachronostic. But it is still very much a question as to whether the change should be made now. The real issue has been posed by President John F. Kennedy: "If we are considering a radical shift in the balance of power in the United States, it should not be undertaken lightly." The cure is often worse than the disease.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, under leave to extend my remarks, I included in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence with the ad hoc committee, composed of Milwaukee, Wis., residents, who were critical of our Federal Government for its alleged failure to take any steps to seek peace in Laos.

The other day, I received another open letter from the ad hoc committee. In this letter, the committee has in effect urged the Government to give the Communists a free hand in Cuba.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD the text of the ad hoc committee's letter, as well as my reply to them. The two letters follow.

AN OPEN LETTER

To President John F. Kennedy, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, Senators Alexander Wiley, William Proxmire, Congressmen Henry Reuss, Clement Zablocki, Robert Kastenmeier, editors of the Milwaukee Journal, and the Milwaukee Sentinel:

We strongly support the declaration of President John Kennedy at his news conference on April 12, 1961:

"There will not under any conditions be an intervention in Cuba by U.S. Armed Forces. This Government will do everything it possibly can, and I think it can meet its responsibilities, to make sure that there are no Americans involved in any action inside Cuba. I wish to make clear also, that we would be opposed to the use of our territory for mounting an offensive against any foreign government."

We affirm this stand because:

1. We see in armed invention the risk of world war III.

2. We do not wish to adopt the methods of the Soviet action in Hungary or the British-French action in Suez.

3. We have faith that there can be negotiated solutions to international disputes.

4. We believe that intervention would forfeit the confidence and friendship of the Central and South American Nations.

While many of us may look upon the Castro regime with disfavor, puzzlement, and disappointment, we are no less concerned with the folly of our Cuban policy which now causes the American people so much anguish. Now is the time for open discussion. It is our conviction that an informed public opinion will make its influence felt upon those who are in positions of leadership.

There are questions deserving serious and immediate attention. For example: (1) What are the minimum conditions for reestablishment of diplomatic relations with Cuba? (2) What should be our attitude toward social and economic upheavals in Central and South America? (3) In what specific ways does the social revolution in Cuba threaten the fundamental interests of the American people as a whole? (4) Is there anything in American policy toward Cuba which has contributed to her dependence on the Soviet bloc? (5) What are our obligations under the Charter of the Organization of American States?

We think that James Reston, political analyst of the New York Times, has clearly stated the principle involved:

"Everywhere in the world the United States is trying to defend or establish a simple overriding principle: That force shall not be used, directly or indirectly, to achieve political ends, and that all international disputes shall be settled by negotiation. This is the principle we are trying to sustain in Laos, where we are arguing against the shipment of Soviet arms for use against a government we support. This is the principle we supported even against the British and French in the Suez war. This is the principle we are trying to defend in the Congo in Indonesia, in the Middle East, in Algeria, and in Berlin.

Surely that same principle applies in our relations with Cuba and the other Central and South American nations.

People striving for economic betterment, political freedom, and national independence, sometimes use methods we abhor or go to extremes we deem unwise. Even in such cases we must uphold the principle of nonintervention. Our claim to moral leadership demands it. Intervention points to disaster.

Sincerely yours,

The ad hoc committee: Rev. Roy Agte, W. Robert Brazelton, Louis Becker, Dr. Neal Billings, William Brown, Dr. Gladys Calbick, Dr. Martin Cohnstaedt, Wilma Ehrlich, Jack Eisendrath, Rev. Roger Eldridge, Dr. Hugo Engleman, Donald Esker, Mrs. Maxine Franz, Richard Franz, Wayne Gourley, Dr. Alan Grossberg, Mrs. Ruth Grossberg, Mrs. Leon M. Hamlet, Dr. Dorothea Harvey, Rev. Herbert J. Huebschmann, Edward Jamosky, Harvey Kitzman, Dr. David Luce, Dr. Willie Mae Gillis, Mrs. Virginia Parkman, Mrs. Louise W. Peck, Dr. Sidney M. Peck, Mrs. Annette Roberts, Mort Ryweck, Dr. Gordon Shipman, Dr. James W. Skelton, Rev. Kenneth L. Smith, Max Taglin, Mrs. Thelma Taglin, Corneff Taylor, Arthur Thrall, Nick Topping, Frieda Voigt, Rev. Lucius Walker, Theodore Warshafsky, Jack Weiner, John Werner, Rev. Herbert Zebarth, Leonard Zubrensky.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1961.

Dr. S. M. PECK,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR DR. PECK: This will acknowledge your open letter of April 25, outlining your ad hoc committee's views on the situation in Cuba.

I have noted your views and I wish to reassure you that, as in the past, I will continue to support efforts made by our Government to resolve international problems through peaceful negotiation. However, we can only expect constructive results from such negotiations if we negotiate from a position of strength, not of weakness.

I must add that I am amazed at your committee's apparently unshakable faith in the peaceful intentions of the commies and their willingness to reach negotiated settlements. It would seem to me that your belief in the sincerity of Communist statements and pledges should be wearing thin. What do you find in the record of the past 15 years—and in the record of recent developments in Cuba, Laos, Vietnam, and other areas—to sustain your faith? I would be interested in receiving your reply.

There is one last comment that I would like to make: Apparently history has failed to persuade you about the true nature and the real objectives of communism. You are, of course, puzzled and disappointed with Castro; according to your letter, many members of your committee even look upon him with disfavor. But the last paragraph of your letter indicates to me that you still consider Mr. Castor, and others in his category as basically well-meaning agrarian reformers, social reformers, or political reformers who—on occasion—may go to extremes which you consider unwise. Your advice in those instances is that we should sit tight and do nothing.

I do not believe that we should try to run the affairs of any nation other than our own, or attempt to rule the world. At the same time, we should not sit back and watch the Communists swallow up the free world bit by bit until they accomplish their objective—world domination. As a free nation, as a responsible world power, and as leader in the free world, the United States has a responsibility to its neighbors which goes beyond sitting back and engaging in intellectually stimulating discussions, or in passing resolutions, or in composing open letters. I am confident that the vast majority of the American people are conscious of that responsibility and are determined to live up to it.

Yours sincerely,

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Congressman, Fourth District.

Lessons and Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there are many dangers and lessons in the article here presented—Human Events, April 21, 1961:

GERMANY IGNORED ECONOMIST HELLER, AND PROSPERED

Imposing evidence has only recently come to light to show that leading New Deal economists, including Prof. Walter W. Heller, are capable of giving some mighty bad advice. This is important because Mr. Heller is now Chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers.

The State Department has declassified a 1951 report in which Mr. Heller, Prof. Alvin Hansen, and several others solemnly warned that the German economy could not possibly improve without a thorough immersion in Keynesian-New Deal philosophy (reported in Human Events, Mar. 17, 1961). Events have proved that the forecast was silly.

The professors were members of a Marshall plan team whose mission was to tell the new German Government how to manage its economy. Their 400-page report, said to be largely the work of Mr. Heller, expressed the opinion that the German economy was bogged down on a sort of plateau and that proper measures must be taken if the possibilities [of further progress] are to be realized.

Fortunately for Germany, the Bonn government disregarded the report. In every important matter it kept on doing precisely what Mr. Heller and his colleagues said it should stop doing, and Germany has wound up better off than the report considered possible even if its recommendations had been followed.

The report said Germany would never achieve the necessary rate of industrial expansion if it continued to worry about inflation; that it should not confuse wartime inflation with the normal operations of peacetime credit; that it had an excessive concern for price stability; and that it was

overly timid in allowing the creation of new credit.

Germany has continued to guard against inflation (as successfully, in fact, as any industrial country) and has kept a tight rein on the expansion of credit.

The report called for easy money and said that a rate of interest high enough to stimulate any large volume of personal savings would seriously curtail investment.

Germany has kept a high rate of interest.

The report said that tax concessions granted to industry, such as depreciation allowances, were being abused and that in any case they represented only an expenditure of tax funds which would otherwise have been collected by the Government. Accordingly, the report said, a compulsory investment program would be more effective. Under the recommended program, all industries were to be assessed for the fund and the government was to distribute the money to industries where there was a crying need for expansion.

The Government did nothing of the kind.

The key bottleneck in German industrial expansion, the report said, was an inadequate supply of coal. It recommended vast Government programs for stimulating the production of coal.

Little was done along this line. Coal has become a drug on the market and the problem has been how to dispose of the surplus.

The report proclaimed that "the nostalgic hopes * * * looking toward a revival of the 19th century role of the capital market are doomed to disappointment. The capital market plays no such role in any modern country and there is no prospect that it will."

The capital market is still functioning much as it always did, here as in Germany, in spite of persistent attempts to dislodge it.

Finally, the report drew a distinction between Germany, squeezed between too great a demand for imports and not enough exports, and the United States, "where there has never been any fear of a squeeze or an external drain."

Today, having disregarded all of Mr. Heller's recommendations, Germany has turned the tables on us. It has built up an enormous trade surplus, accumulated nearly $8 billion in reserves, and the squeeze is on the United States—to such an extent, indeed, that we are begging Germany to help us out.

What actually happened just couldn't happen, according to Mr. Heller and others. They go on pretending that the United States must take the same medicine they prescribed for Germany even though Germany recovered precisely because it poured the nasty stuff down the drain.

Now, what are the dangers and lessons?

First. Danger: Security classification by the State Department which withholds information from our people.

Lesson: Public knowledge and discussion will show up the fallacies of regimented bureaucratic thinking, foreign to a free enterprise constitutional Government society.

Second. Danger: The gentleman whose views are so thoroughly discredited, Mr. Heller, is now the top economic adviser to the President.

Lesson: A President can surround himself with fuzzy thinkers.

Third. Danger: While Germany disregarded these fallacious economic theories, of no need to worry over inflation, easy money, Government aid to industry, misunderstanding the capital market, the United States is obviously following them, witness recent Presidential messages and legislation—the tax recommendations, area redevelopment bill, the housing message, and the like.

Lesson: Government regimentation, Federal bureaucratic planning, taxing, and control is no match for free private enterprise and people left alone by Government.

When will our people wake up to the dangers which our Nation faces and remember the lessons learned by our leaving the Old World, our revolution and formulation of our form of limited constitutional Government?

Confidence in Uncle Sam: Unlimited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday and Tuesday, April 24 and 25, 1961, Quimby Melton, Sr., publisher of the Griffin Daily News, Griffin, Ga., initiated a campaign entitled "Confidence in Uncle Sam: Unlimited." I personally endorse the thoughts of this patriotic American, and it is with personal pleasure that I include an editorial written by Mr. Melton, which appeared in the Griffin Daily News issue of Tuesday, April 15, 1961:

CONFIDENCE IN UNCLE SAM: UNLIMITED

The suggestion made Monday, in this column, that every family in Griffin and Spalding County show their confidence in Uncle Sam, by buying a U.S. savings bond, is beginning to "snowball." There are indications that this suggestion may catch on as a nationwide campaign.

Today, the city commission has issued a proclamation calling May a month for showing "Confidence in Uncle Sam: Unlimited." In this proclamation the city fathers urge everyone to buy a bond during the month of May. If every family in Spalding does this it will mean $150,000 they are investing in a fund to help preserve democracy and freedom in this Nation.

Numerous persons have called, not only locally, but several from out of the county, approving the plan. Today we are featuring the proclamation of the city commission in another story. Tomorrow we will comment on what folks are saying in support of this campaign.

It all started when we were impressed by the statement of President Kennedy, that he was determined that our freedoms should not be curtailed by communistic aggression.

We asked ourselves, "What can I do to help?" Then came up with this idea of buying a bond—taking stock, as it were, in the "Confidence in Uncle Sam Unlimited" organization.

To fill out the column today, we'll just recount a conversation with two men.

One, a businessman, said, "I'm going to buy a bond for each of my three grandchildren. I want to do my part to help guarantee that they never live under the rule of a totalitarian dictator."

The second man, a large property owner and a man who owns many gilt-edge stocks and bonds, said:

"I have never bought a Savings Bond. For I can earn more interest with my money by other investments. But this can be called a national emergency. I'm going to buy at least $1,000 worth of bonds, not as an investment, but as a contribution to my Government. I realize, looking at this from a hard-boiled business viewpoint, that if the Communists take over, all the property I own and all the stocks and bonds in my safety deposit box will not be worth a dime."

There you have two viewpoints.

The businessman, who wants to help guarantee that his grandchildren will enjoy the same freedoms as he enjoys; and the hard-boiled investor, who wants to guard the value of his property, stocks and bonds.

Few of us can buy $1,000 bonds—but each family can well afford to put $18.75 into one bond and have a part in saving this Nation of ours from Communist domination.

Come on Griffin and Spalding County—let's all buy bonds.

Another Try at Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the leaders of the Democratic and Republican Parties for supporting President Kennedy's foreign policy at this crucial time. There can be only one foreign policy of the United States, and the President is solely responsible for its execution. Certainly history has shown that once a decision is made the people of this great democracy have never flinched from the consequences of that decision.

Past events, however, have also demonstrated that the American people do not have closed minds. They seek information and even welcome debate. They are eager to explore alternatives. They have faced up to war, but overwhelmingly they desire peace.

Because we are an intelligent people, I believe, Mr. Speaker, there is room and indeed a need for an objective appraisal of the Cuban situation.

The invasion of Cuba was a horrible fiasco. The American people join with those who grieve for the young Cubans, so uselessly sacrificed on the beaches of their beloved land. Furthermore, it is no secret that many Americans have lost confidence in those who conceived and led this unfortunate invasion. Most significantly, the American people are deeply disturbed by the terrible blow which the invasion debacle has dealt the prestige of the United States.

It matters little whether the United States did or did not finance, organize, and arm the invasion forces. The cold fact is that the world believes we did. And so, Mr. Speaker, we cannot escape the indictment that the failure of the anti-Castro counterrevolution was an American failure.

But why did the invasion fail?

As a military action, it was doomed to failure from the beginning because the invasion force was militarily inade-

quate. It was no match for the defending forces available to Castro.

The invasion failed also because it was ill conceived, poorly planned, and lacked necessary military capability. It is difficult to believe that the Pentagon was very pleased with the operations. I am inclined to think that our military leaders were skeptical onlookers, thoroughly amazed at the ineptness of amateurs playing at war. It would appear that on the American side, the invasion was encouraged essentially by a group of enthusiasts who really believed that Cubans by the thousands would leap to arms in support of the counterrevolution. They were wrong and our position must be reoriented.

But most important, the counterrevolution failed because it had no roots in the people of Cuba. It failed because it had no appeal for the farmer and the worker. It failed because it appealed mainly to the dispossessed—those who had and lost. Unfortunately, there were many, many more of those who had nothing and were promised much.

There is strong evidence today that the recent invasion of Cuba was only a probing action, that there will be other invasions of Cuba, supported and encouraged presumably by the United States.

Before we support other invasions of Cuba, let me caution the sponsors of future invasions to read carefully the lessons on revolution written by Che Guevara in his manual on guerilla fighting in the Castro uprising. Whatever Americans may think of Castro, he is nonetheless a living example of a success revolutionist. He understood and still thoroughly understands the Cuban farmer and worker. He won in Cuba, because he fanned the burning desire of the peons for land and reform. He has maintained himself in Cuba, because he fans the great pride of Cubans in Cuba and in themselves. Unless the architects of future invasions ignite a similar spark in the hearts of the Cuban farmers and workers or crush them outright with overwhelming military power, it is doubtful that these recent guerilla fighters will desert the Castro revolution.

So much for the invasion which failed.

We have also failed to starve Castro into submission. The sugar embargo has failed and so have our efforts to isolate Cuba. As a matter of fact, these efforts have aroused sympathies for the Cubans throughout South America and in many parts of the world. The great Yankee democracy is pictured as a heartless colossus crushing the little people of Cuba.

But why are we so overwrought about Cuba?

Historically, the United States has always feared the presence of an alien force on Cuba. In the Castro regime we have a hostile government which has accepted foreign military and economic assistance of great potential danger to the United States. Cuba is being built up not only as a hostile military base, but a stepping stone for international communism—a friendly door inviting Soviet penetration into this hemisphere. This we cannot permit. What frustrates us in Cuba is that we are unable to come to grips with the real culprit, the Soviet Union.

The United States has every right, under international law and under the inter-American treaty arrangements, to defend itself and the hemisphere from external attack, direct or indirect, whenever such an attack has occurred or is being prepared. It has no right, however, under international or domestic law, and no moral justification for taking action but pretending that it is not doing so.

Moreover, as long as the pretense exists, any such action must be covert, ineffective, and doomed to failure. We thereby compound cynicism with defeat.

Before we took action in Cuba or supported others, in so doing we should have ascertained whether we had full legal and moral justification for what we did. Our experts in international law know that frequently there is a legitimate conflict of legal principles which creates doubt as to our legal rights. However, we have the right and duty to apply those principles which sanction actions essential to protect ourselves and to oppose aggression if such a threat in fact exists. If the facts did not justify such action, we had no course but to withhold action.

We have always stood before the world as the defenders of international law. We therefore cannot afford to be vulnerable to a charge of violating it.

Nevertheless, the conclusion seems to be that we must destroy Castro and his regime. We could crush him with our military power like an elephant might crush a mouse, but we dare not. And so we have decided to sympathize with, support, and encourage a counterrevolution in Cuba.

In the light of this decision, other invasions of Cuba are coming. Who will be the invaders? Reliable sources have suggested that they will be Social Democrats. Each one of us will have his own views of what is a Social Democrat, but it is reasonable to assume that the United States will support Cuban patriots with liberal views. The invaders can be expected to support progressive social and land reform programs. The fundamental political objective of the invaders will be to reestablish freedom and democracy in Cuba.

The last invasion failed to communicate its objectives to the people of Cuba; and future invasions, I regret to observe, will have the same difficulties. For in a popularity contest in Cuba, Castro is the hero. It was Castro who seized the sugar lands. It was Castro who seized the banks and factories from foreigners and wealthy Cubans. It has been Castro who has seized the imagination of the Cuban people.

As Americans, we hope patriots will find a way to ignite the spark of desire for freedom which could destroy Castro, but I doubt that the peons and the bearded ones can really understand the noble intricacies of a social democratic counterrevolution. I must reluctantly conclude that in any future invasion as in the past one, they will remain loyal to Castro.

It has been reported that during the last invasion, great masses of people were armed and ready to fight off the invaders. Accordingly, if an invasion of Cuba by "Social Democrats" or any other group is to succeed, it seems quite certain that U. S. military forces will have to play a determining role. The invaders must be strong enough militarily to destroy sizable Castro forces on the beaches and in the interior. This will require the recruitment, training, and equipping of major rebel invasion units. It will require naval and air support. Bluntly, it will require at least limited military intervention by the United States. This course will lead us to horrible bloodshed and slaughter.

We might get some other South or Central American country or countries to do the recruiting, training, and equipping for us, but this is a doubtful expedient. It would certainly entail the possibility of the inherent danger that the countries of South America might choose up sides.

Is there then an alternative, or must we take the calculated risk of supporting with military power a counterrevolution against Cuba? There must be an alternative.

If negotiations, cease fire, and a neutralist government are preferable to war in Laos; if endless meetings and discussions on control of nuclear weapons are more acceptable than unilateral nuclear testing; if insults and abuse can be endured better in the United Nations than a clash in the Congo, then surely reason dictates, even though emotions cry otherwise, that the United States is big enough to talk to Cuba.

"It's too late for that now," the cry echoes every time negotiations are suggested.

Yet, if this is a sincere statement, then one ventures hopefully that there might have been a time in the past when the United States might have negotiated with Castro. And, if we could have negotiated in the past, then why not now? How will we know whether some acceptable rapprochement is not possible unless we try?

I am inclined to think that this country might well exercise a little restraint and patience with Cuba. Governments and regimes have come and gone in Central and South America. We have weathered storms before. Castro may be an unpleasant irritant, a thorn in our side, but I certainly hope no one believes Cuba is a serious challenge to the United States.

I suggest that:

First. The American people can accept the land reform program and the social and economic changes inaugurated in Cuba, providing the Government of Cuba will undertake to reimburse the original owners for the properties taken from them.

Second. The American people are ready to consider the reestablishment of normal trade and commercial relations between our two countries, and even to

offer economic aid to Cuba providing the Government of Cuba will cease its build-up of Soviet armaments in this hemisphere, and

Third. The American people are eager to extend the helping hand of a good neighbor and accept the Cuban people as full partners in the inter-American society of nations, providing the Government of Cuba will stop to serve as a base for Soviet penetration into this hemisphere.

I am suggesting that there is room for exploration of alternative accommodations. I am not suggesting, however, that this Nation can stand quietly by while Cuba builds up a base hostile to our way of life and dedicated to support Soviet Union penetration into this hemisphere. What I am saying is that we should give Castro one more opportunity to demonstrate to the world and to the United States that he is not a tool of Soviet subversion. If he is willing to do this, he has nothing to fear from the United States.

President Kennedy, in his inspirational inaugural address, addressed himself most eloquently to the problem which faces us today. He said:

Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

The question then is, Should we make one more try to find an acceptable rapprochement with Cuba? If we succeed in this try, we will have demonstrated to the world our own greatness and a leadership truly worthy of the New Frontier. If we fail, then we will have shown the world that Castro is, in fact, a madman condemned to his own destruction.

Mr. Speaker, before we support another invasion of Cuba, an invasion which ultimately can be expected to involve our own military forces, let us pause to ponder the words of our great President:

So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.

Liberalism Is American Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to insert the following editorial by Mr. C. L. Dancey of the Peoria Journal Star in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LIBERALISM IS AMERICAN TRADITION

(By C. L. Dancey)

Dear anti-Communist friends, Sunday, we urged you not to hunt subversives, since that is a very difficult task even for professionals and is no place for us amateurs.

Today we'd like to talk about liberals, the people that we believe some of you confuse with the real enemy.

Liberals should not be confused with Communists. (The Reds aren't liberal at all.)

A genuine liberal has a liberal or generous and open-minded approach to all problems. He is opposed to prejudice or discrimination on the basis of race, religion, color, economic status, or social status.

He believes that every person involved in a crime is entitled to the benefit of the doubt until proven guilty by processes assuring him every right and safeguard under our great liberal Constitution. And he further believes that the convicted criminal should be treated with no thought of punishment but in a manner best calculated to salvage and rehabilitate that human being.

These are all noble sentiments.

You have no quarrel with liberals.

However, there are also some mixed up folks who call themselves liberals, usually loudly. And this is where the confusion comes in.

You might say they usually exhibit a violent underdog complex and a "McCarthy syndrome."

These are the folks not satisfied and not emotionally cut out to be liberals, so instead of no prejudice they specialize in reversing the historic prejudices.

They are usually violently prejudiced up the social or economic scale, instead of down. Sometimes, instead of maintaining an absence of prejudice and a liberal view even on matters of race and religion, they develop a passionate prejudice on behalf of minority groups against majorities.

(NOTE.—This is understandable, and in some circumstances commendable, but it certainly is not liberal.)

Finally some of them are so thin-skinned and jittery about their supposed liberal beliefs that they are scared to death they will be linked with Communist philosophies, so they strike out with passion and prejudice at the very idea of people being curious about Communist activities.

They are afraid of where it will lead, and history has given them some cause for this.

That's why they aren't the least bit liberal toward anti-Communists. The word knocks them off balance.

So remember that the liberal tradition is part of America from the days of the Founding Fathers, and is part of the true character of our Nation.

Be liberal yourselves. Study with objectivity, not emotion. Study with an open mind, not prejudice.

If you still have outspoken enemies, ignore those who are mixed up liberals. Don't confuse any special personal enemies with the great enemy of us all. Don't be distracted by jittery people.

The more you learn to know your enemy and his real nature, the less time you'll have to waste on these other folks.

C. L. Dancey.

A Realistic Approach to Our Educational Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, a joint resolution adopted by the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois might be of keen interest to the Members of the House deliberating on the proposed Federal aid-to-education legislation. It is interesting to note that the resolution was originally offered by 29 members of the Illinois Legislature who are closest to the problems in education in my State.

I submit that this resolution, as placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 17 by Congressman ROLAND LIBONATI, is a realistic approach to the real problem which faces the parents and taxpayers, not only in Illinois, but across the other 49 States.

Editorials Appearing in the VFW American Security Reporter for March 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, two articles appearing in the March 1961, issues of the VFW American Security Reporter, published monthly by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is my own personal experience over a long term of years that the Veterans of Foreign Wars is one of several national organizations of distinguished veterans of wars in which the United States has been involved which is doing a vigorous and valiant and necessary patriotic service to the cause of our national security. The editorials follow:

COMMUNISTS ANNOUNCE OPEN WARFARE

The Communist Party, U.S.A., has now disclosed openly that destruction of the U.S. defense establishment is a major objective of its "peace policy."

General Secretary Gus Hall rolled out the broad outlines of the campaign at a meeting of the party's 60-member National Committee in New York January 20.

He said that Communists' biggest job in the immediate future is to agitate both inside and outside of established peace organizations to destroy public confidence in the U.S. defense establishment. He declared:

"It is our task to reveal to every American that big business and big brass are today the chief force for war. We must make clear that their talk of defending freedom is a fraud."

Moreover, he said, Communists must step-up their work inside peace organizations and work to "widen the struggle for peace, to raise its level, to involve far greater numbers, to make it an issue in every community, every people's organization, every labor union, every church, every house, every street, every point of gathering of our people. It is imperative to bring everyone—men, women, youth and, yes, even children—into the struggle. The fight for peace is basic to the cause of progress and socialism."

He indicated that this would mean many more "mass marches, demonstrations, peace walks, picket lines, postcard campaigns, letters to Congressmen and Senators, delegations, meetings, and many others."

Further, he said, Communists should look toward the formation of a super peace organization "possibly of the type of the British Peace Council" which "is linked with peace movements in all other countries through its association with the World Council of Peace." (WPC has been cited as a Communist world front organization.)

An analysis of Gus Hall's lengthy policy statement shows that we can expect these main features of the attack:

They will charge that the system of U.S. oversea bases is "needless and useless for the defense of the United States and a waste of the taxpayers money."

They will praise the policy of peaceful coexistence, and propose plans "for the use of the billions being squandered on arms for houses, hospitals, schools, roads, and other social service and social welfare needs."

They will demand universal disarmament as a panacea to end the threat of war. And they will continue a day-to-day harassment of the "big brass" for stepping up the armaments race and for "provocative warlike moves" in regard to Cuba and other countries.

Above all they will carry on a running attack, charging that the "monopolies, the Pentagon, and their political henchmen are sacrificing the national interest, hurting our national prestige, degrading our democratic heritage, undermining the security and liberty of every American, and jeopardizing the very existence of the American people."

While this is going on inside the United States, similar campaigns will be launched in other countries of the free world. For this drive is worldwide. It is based upon an agreement made by 81 of the world's 87 Communist Parties in Moscow last fall, an agreement which Gus Hall quoted as his guide in launching such activities here.

Communists obviously are aiming to whip up public mob hysteria against the U.S. defense establishment both here and abroad, thus gain their real goals of weakening U.S. ability to defend herself and her allies against the rising tide of Communist "peaceful" aggression.

What can be done? Counteraction must take into account the fact that the vast majority of people in peace groups think of themselves as non-Communists and even as being opposed to Communist tyranny.

For this reason, counteraction must avoid attacks against individuals, and must avoid any blanket statements about a particular peace group or about the peace movement in general.

What veterans can do, however, is to inform fellow citizens in peace groups, in unions, in fraternal, women's and youth groups correctly and repeatedly on issues of vital importance to our national security.

All of the people in peace groups which Communist hope to exploit for their own ends must be made aware how Communists are working to use their idealistic views to speed the destruction of free institutions and the means to defend them.

Only by a constant flow of information on the role of the defense establishment in defending free institutions and in furthering man's hope to live in a world at peace can Communist agitation be counteracted and defeated.

What Communists are trying to do, in effect, is to use a chain forged in Moscow to harness American peace groups to haul the Communist chariot ahead. You have it in your power to break that chain.

How Reds Are Moving in Latin America

In an unimpressive building in Mexico City on March 5, Red Chinese Delegate Chou Erh-fu wound up a ringing speech that had been punctuated by shouted slogans of, "Long Live China" and "Long Live Mao Tse-tung."

The audience was made up mostly of Latin Americans, including a large delegation from Fidel Castro's Cuba, attending the Latin American Conference for National Sovereignty, Economic Emancipation and Peace.

The conference was called by former Mexican President Lazaro Cardenas, a 1959 visitor to Peiping and a top member of the Executive Bureau of the World Peace Council which is run by the Chinest and Soviet Communists.

As was expected, the meeting ended with a string of resolutions condemning alleged U.S. aggression in Cuba, seeking repeal of hemisphere treaties for mutual defense and cooperation, opposing U.S. military missions to Latin America, opposing all U.S. aid, and supporting efforts to "liberate" territories held by Western countries in Latin America.

The real importance of the meeting is the fact that it was held in the first place. It was at an Afro-Asian Solidarity Congress in Cairo in December 1957 that campaigns were launched which have brought us the Congo and the turbulence in Africa.

We can expect that the meeting in Mexico City means the launching of an intensified effort by Communists to create chaos in Latin America, to break up the unity of the Western Hemisphere, and to further isolate and weaken the United States.

Action to counter such a Communist campaign can be taken by trade unions, by other private organizations which have regular relationships with friends in Latin America. The most effective action, however, can only be taken throught the offices of the U.S. Government.

In the case of Africa there was a time lag of about 2 years between the Afro-Asian Solidarity Congress and the outbreak of chaos. There are some signs in Latin America that we might not have that much time left there in which to act.

The Dilemma of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the April 3, 1961, issue of the New Republic. Mr. T. K. Quinn here concludes his enlightening discussion of the price-fixing case involving the electrical manufacturing companies. On March 23, 1961, and April 26, 1961, I inserted articles by Mr. Quinn on this same subject. The importance of the matter commends it to our attention:

The Dilemma of Business

The decision, the jail sentences, the fines, and the disillusionment following the electrical machinery price collusion case in Philadelphia could mark the beginning of a new understanding of the economic and political issues involved if the actual conditions are frankly faced. This is much more vital than the passing, publicized settlements and new Federal lawsuits against the price fixers promised by the Attorney General.

We are obliged to begin, as Judge Ganey said in Philadelphia, with the conclusion that the chief officers of 21 corporations had guilty knowledge of "the vast conspiracy." After all, price control is a common practice in many industries. General Electric, the principal offender, has a long record of antitrust violations dating back 50 years. On an average of once every 2 years for half a century the company has had some governmental action brought against it. The policy of violation is well established. Similar indictments, although not so regular or quite so often, have been brought against such other giants as General Motors, Du Pont, A.T. & T., Westinghouse. There have been a number of convictions despite almost insurmountable obstacles the prosecution must overcome.

The plain fact is that the big corporations are caught in an impossible dilemma. On the one hand, they know from experience that unrestricted price competition is destructive and that if it actually prevailed markets could be disrupted, profits reduced or eliminated, and industrial instability result. They could, of course, crush smaller concerns because of their capital advantages but would in time be themselves broken up. When giants fight there is bloodshed.

Adam Smith is outdated in this modern age largely because fixed overhead has become a principal factor in total cost, and because corporations have swollen so big as to make our whole society dependent upon them. They simply refuse to take price chances wherever they can be avoided, often regardless of the law.

On the other hand, anything less than seemingly enthusiastic support of competition as a constructive force would be inevitably interpreted as an attack against free enterprise, so faithfully advocated and guarded by its honest believers and practitioners as well as by those who, being in positions of capital and market advantage, insist upon the license to charge and do as they please, free from all governmental interference or public controls of any kind, and regardless of inflation or any other harmful effects. What they really want are easy profits, assured, continuing and increasing.

So big business, preaching one thing and practicing its opposite, is obliged to pretend that it favors competition and the antitrust laws while it secretly opposes them, establishes uniform and administered prices, sets up barriers against the entry of new companies into its fields, stalls costly technological innovation and curtails production. Thus, otherwise respectable businessmen—the conforming bureaucrats in big corporations—become the carriers of misrepresentation and falsehoods and degrade themselves. They are victims of a dilemma most of them don't understand.

In about one-third of the national economy—an area that includes automobiles, steel, cigarettes, cement, oil products, chemicals, roofing materials, electric light bulbs and machinery—price competition has been eliminated by mutual understanding, legally or illegally, among the corporations represented. They have taken the position, in practice, that prices should be substantially uniform and profits so made secure.

Now, if the American public is ready to accept this condition then the only remaining question is who should fix the prices and what standards should be adopted. Shall we permit these and other private collusive interests themselves to decide what their "take" is to be? If so, then the laboring man should also be permitted to set his own wages.

Before pursuing this absurdity further, let us quickly say that obviously the public interest must come first, and it becomes the duty and responsibility of the people, acting through government, to set the prices which would otherwise be under private collusive control. The situation is not changed in the least by resorting to name calling—i.e. "socialism." We would simply be recogniz-

ing the conditions brought about by big business overreaching itself.

The Government need not interfere in that two-thirds of the economy where honest price competition prevails. Every business concern could have a choice between the acceptance of maximum prices set by the Government or prices set by competition without Government regulation. Antitrust laws would be more strictly enforced. Uniform prices would require standard wage patterns, and a Federal Price and Wage Board would have to be established to supervise the regulation, as was done during the last war.

The public would, in effect, be saying to the monopolists and oligopolists: "As long as you insist upon uniform or controlled prices, we insist upon refusing you the right to set them. We would rather not have Government intervene but you leave no alternative."

Members of a Price and Wage Board would be selected with the same care as Justices of the Supreme Court. They would have to be high principled men more interested in service and honor than in accumulating material wealth. The Board would be a most important public body.

It becomes more apparent every day that powerful, giant, private corporations cannot safely continue to be treated as wholly private institutions. They have power over investment, output, employment, sales, and wage policies that substantially affect the markets in which they deal, and therefore all of us whose lives are conditioned by those markets. Moreover, they aspire to an ever-increasing role in our educational and political lives, as so much of the subsidized literature demonstrates. They have made a captive of competition in many industries and are more controlling than they are controlled.

Their preeminent positions might be tolerable as long as the public could believe the corporation officials were more or less unselfish, public spirited, unusual men of the highest integrity. But this illusion has been shattered by excessive salaries paid to quite ordinary executives, by the stock option racket, high prices and by illegal and unethical conduct.

The country will be a long time recovering from the shock of the Philadelphia price collusion verdict. It served to dramatize to the general public what only a relatively few have long known concerning the unsavory practices of big business. They are by no means limited to the companies or the disclosures in that one case. All of us have in some measure been morally hurt. But it will not have been in vain if we can now get on with the business of bringing the freebooters under public control and striking at the sources of the evil. Let us give more support to the Department of Justice and to the Senate and House Antitrust Committees under the able chairmanships of Representative CELLER, of New York, and Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee. These men have nobly struggled against handicaps that would have discouraged lesser men.

In addition to the establishment of a Price and Wage Board, we should now reconsider such proposals as public representation on the boards of directors of the biggest corporations, which by the very nature and size of their operations and ownership are quasi-public organizations. A tax on corporation profits graduated upward, instead of the present flat 52-percent tax, would discourage the trend toward even bigger private institutions, which is proceeding by leaps and bounds—and not for reasons of increased efficiency, as is so commonly misrepresented, but to secure more financial and marketing power. This undemocratic authority is bankrupting small business and has become so great that it threatens the continuance of our freedoms, especially when it becomes further concentrated as it is now in a handful of bankers acting as trustees for equity funds with controlling interests in all the giant corporations.

T. K. QUINN.

Speech of Mayor John J. Buckley, of Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include the well prepared speech which was delivered at the annual installation banquet of the Julian Stopyra Post, Polish-American Veterans, on April 16, 1961, by the Honorable John J. Buckley, mayor of the city of Lawrence, Mass., and also member of the Governor's council, representing Essex County and part of Middlesex County, Mass. The speech received enthusiastic approbation to a degree which I consider justifies recording it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, since I know that Mayor Buckley is a fine after-dinner speaker and a very interesting and able orator:

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE JOHN J. BUCKLEY, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF LAWRENCE, MASS., DELIVERED AT THE ANNUAL INSTALLATION BANQUET OF THE JULIAN STOPYRA POST, POLISH-AMERICAN VETERANS, LAWRENCE, MASS., APRIL 16, 1961

It is indeed an honor and a pleasure for me to join with you in this occasion of the joint installation of the officers of Julian Stopyra Post, Polish-American Veterans and its auxiliary.

It is both vital and commendable that a patriotic organization such as yours exists and takes such a deep interest in maintaining our hard won heritages.

We need active groups like the Polish-American Veterans in order to insure at no time can a certain nationalistic minority, even though unorganized, be dismissed as of no significance or consequence.

Basically, the true purposes of nationalistic organizations such as the Stopyra Post Veterans lie in their recognition of the human values of democratic freedom, dignity of the individual, and the guarantee and assurance of equal opportunity.

Although the waves of immigration from European shores have decreased in volume as compared to the years gone by, I think it is most praiseworthy that their sons and daughters, aware of their own particular role in American society, have continued to maintain a consistency of effort and unity in order to perpetuate the noble heritage of their nationalistic origin.

Thus, in the same sense, I, although of Irish extraction, share the same motivation, ideals, and purposes which have energized your activities since the founding of this post some years ago.

I would say that it is because of our mutual backgrounds and environment that we, like our immigrant forebears, embrace with loving devotion the ideals and the principles of the Constitution of the United States.

Recent political events have borne out the validity of my remarks. Only a few short weeks ago, we in this country witnessed the culmination of all the hopes, the dreams, and the aspirations of every immigrant, who upon descending the gangplank and setting foot upon the soil of the United States, felt within his or her heart that someday, despite the peasant origin, a descendant of theirs might gain the highest honor to be achieved by a natural-born citizen of these United States.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States is only three generations removed from the same classification which identifies so many of us here today.

It was his great grandfather who sought the opportunity to better his lot by leaving his native Ireland much for the same desirable reasons which brought so many natives of Poland to this land of democratic freedom and opportunity.

The election of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as President of the United States is the fitting culmination of an Irishman's dream, and I am equally certain that his victory is a direct reaction of attitudes transformed into action by not only the Irish and the Poles but also by other nationalistic groups who by their collective efforts succeeded in making their influence felt in the selection of this "son of an Irish immigrant" as President.

I expect John F. Kennedy to be one of our greatest Presidents.

I believe that he will reflect in his official actions the compassion bred into him for the trials, tribulations, and difficulties experienced by all immigrants and their offspring who have made up the working class since the beginning of the industrial revolution in America.

Social progress in the true democratic sense as opposed to statism and communistic collectivism made its greatest advance in the early years of President Roosevelt's administration. The war intervened. I expect to see a resumption toward the goal of human betterment despite the financial obligations and national difficulties we face and have faced since the end of World War II.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy assumed the task of President of these United States under a similar set of circumstances which 100 years ago saw a nation divided. Today, it is not a nation but a world that is divided. The road which lies ahead for our new President will be long, hard, and arduous. It may well be that in the immediate years which lie ahead in the unending struggle for mankind to achieve its ultimate destiny, the geographical frontiers we know today will not move an inch beyond the Iron Curtain.

But I am certain that the frontiers of religious misunderstanding, the fears and bitterness of political and sectional animosities, the very ramparts of economic selfishness have already been breached by the turn of events which resulted in this victory for the common man.

So it is, that in a lesser geographical area, namely, the fifth councilor district, the contribution of the Polish spirit was a factor in placing me as an elected State official in the vanguard of the assault forces upon the new, conquerable frontiers of (1) housing for the elderly, (2) general urban renewal and obliteration of blighted areas, and (3) medical legislation and higher minimum wage laws.

Your continued assistance as a patriotic veterans organization is needed to achieve our national goals.

Five times in the last century, the Polish people have been ground under the heels of oppressors. Never in this long period of tragic history has the fighting Polish spirit faltered. Even today, that fighting spirit has caused the present communistic and atheistic masters to recognize and permit a lessening of the hardness so prevalent and existent in the countries under Red domination.

Why is this so?

Because the Polish spirit lives on, undaunted, in Poland and throughout the world. It is because for the period since the Julian Stopyra Post of Polish-American Veterans and its auxiliary has been founded, this spirit has been nourished by the courageous purpose of providing not only civic interest in the community at large but also by providing both spiritual and charitable assistance to kindred both at home and abroad.

In conclusion, just one more thought to leave with you.

We in the United States, a country founded in strength have always surged forward in times of stress and uncertainty. We shall reach these new frontiers which lie ahead. We shall overcome the stresses which beset our generations with the same high degree of courage displayed by our predecessors.

Many gains have been made. We shall hold this high ground. In such a spirit, I wish the Julian Stopyra Post, Polish-American Veterans and its auxiliary Godspeed.

Needed: A Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in our foreign relations, I am ready and anxious to support our President, completely and vigorously. I ask only that the President advise our Nation as to what his foreign policy is. I recall that Senator Kennedy was extremely critical of President Eisenhower's foreign policy, but in the days since he himself has been President no clear-cut policy has come forth, and I am deeply troubled by the news on all sides. I bring to your attention two editorials that appeared in the Wall Street Journal on April 27 and an article by Carroll Kilpatrick that appeared, the same day, in the Washington Post:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 27, 1961]

THE COLD WORLD

The verbal beating the United States is taking around the world in the wake of the Cuban defeat ought to occasion some sober thinking, in Washington and in the country, about America's foreign relations.

There is no little irony in the situation in which we find ourselves. Fifteen years ago the United States proclaimed, with some fanfare, that it was forswearing isolationism forever. Yet today it is visibly being isolated to a considerable degree by the rest of the world.

Our enormous outpouring of aid, nearly $100 billion since the end of World War II, goes ignored or is greeted with cynicism. Our obvious concern for man's freedom is disbelieved. In Laos we try to help a people that apparently have little understanding of, or interest in, freedom. In Cuba we try to help a people dislodge a monstrous Communist tyranny, and get castigated for our pains. In Britain and elsewhere the tides of Communist-serving neutralism and pacifism run high.

At the same time the Communists get away with murder at the bar of world opinion. They hold hundreds of millions in slavery, they smash Hungary and Tibet; yet the Russians are fawned upon and the agitation increases to get the unspeakable Chinese Communists into the United Nations.

What is the matter with such a world?

One thing, plainly enough, is that clear political thinking is a rare commodity. That has always been true, but it is aggravated today by the emergence of scores of little nations that would merit no attention were it not for the Communist conspiracy and the forum the United Nations provides for the pompous.

An even more basic difficulty is that the concept of freedom itself is a difficult one for most of the world's peoples to grasp, let alone practice. The life of liberty in world history has been but a fitful and frail one. Most people have never experienced it; for political leaders it is infinitely easier to run a police state than a free society, and far more gratifying to their egos.

These fundamental circumstances—gullibility, ignorance of freedom, dictatorial ambitions—are made to order for the Communists. In a sense they are offering the world what most of the world knows best. They can portray the United States as just the opposite of what it is, and gain credence.

That kind of deceit is extremely difficult to combat, as President Kennedy is beginning to notice. The Communists can subvert peoples and governments against freedom, but it's a contradiction in terms to talk about subverting people to freedom.

Still, the United States has not been blameless in the distorted picture it has acquired in many places. We flipped too far and too fast from isolationism to internationalism. We assumed our new "role in the world" with an excess of zeal and an excess of sentimentality. We know that we have the world's true interests at heart and we supposed, naturally enough, the world would recognize it and be able to see the most obvious fact of our times—the Communist conspiracy to capture all nations.

Well, it didn't work that way. In trying to be kind to everyone, we too often seemed soft. We worried too much about what the world would think of this or that. We seemed to adopt the notion that war is the worst of evils when in fact it is not; a world in Communist chains is the worst.

In these observations perhaps lies a clue to a somewhat different direction of our national attitudes toward the world. We must realize, first, that we are being isolated not because our way of life is wrong but because most people just don't get it. We must do the things that are necessary in dealing with our vicious enemy without fretting unduly over the reaction in Africa or India.

That is not to advocate isolationism but simply an American foreign policy. It is to say that it is time we stopped running after the world; we had better start looking at its realistically from our own point of view. We should be willing to help, but only to the extent the world understands we are trying to stave off a dark age.

If we act with dignity and aloofness we may expect respect. Indeed, a certain amount of coldness in a cold world and a cold war might be the approach most likely to awaken other nations to an awareness of the true situation and the real perils.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 27, 1961]

OVEREAGER WOOING

As an example of how not to deal with those who make the world a cold place for opponents of communism, take the administration's red carpet treatment of Indonesia's visiting President Sukarno.

Following a 21-gun salute, President Kennedy hailed his guest as "a distinguished national leader, father of his country, and a leader in the world." That description was so extravagant that even Mr. Sukarno protested: "I am just a small mouthpiece of the Indonesian Nation."

He is indeed a spokesman. At home, Mr. Sukarno speaks for a guided democracy which amounts to a thorough-going socialist totalitarianism. Abroad, he speaks for the curious kind of noncommitment which is willfully blind to Communist aggression and hostile to every free world response. Naturally, he is sharply critical of the United States' support of Cubans trying to free their homeland from communism.

Of course, the United States cannot pretend that Mr. Sukarno doesn't exist. But it is surely permissible to wonder if we must be all this ardent in our wooing.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 27, 1961]

AIM IS TO ASSURE SUCCESS: KENNEDY ASKS BROTHER, SORENSEN TO HELP HIM OUT ON FOREIGN POLICY

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

In the wake of the Cuban fiasco, President Kennedy has turned to two of his oldest and most trusted advisers and told them that in the future they must help him on foreign policy problems.

They are the President's brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, and Theodore C. Sorensen, special counsel to the President and chief ghostwriter.

Far more than telling these two men that they must help on foreign policy, which is the President's primary preoccupation these days, he seems to be saying that they must help him consider every foreign policy problem in terms of its effect on the President's own authority and prestige—as well as the Nation's.

Neither Robert Kennedy nor Sorensen has any special competence in the field of foreign policy. Indeed, they are amateurs in a field usually reserved for the experts.

But they have one qualification which the experts lack: they rose to their present positions of power with the President by looking at every issue in terms of his interest and advancement.

WORLD POSITION WEAKENED

Neither the President nor any of his advisers seems to have looked at the Cuban problem in those terms, and the failure in Cuba seriously damaged the Presidency itself. The President's own personal position before the world was weakened.

It is hard to explain why John F. Kennedy should make such a mistake. More than most Presidents he was thought to understand the essentials of Presidential power, the importance of success, and the necessity always to think in terms of the effect of actions on the high office he holds.

In a book published last year called "Presidential Power," Richard E. Neustadt, now a special assistant to Mr. Kennedy, wrote of two cases in which President Truman and President Eisenhower neglected to consider actions in terms of the effect on their power and prestige.

"The lesson of these cases is that when it comes to power, nobody is expert but the President; if he, too, acts as layman, it goes hard with him * * *.

"What occurred in these cases is what always tends to happen. While experts in all spheres except his own advised the President from where they sat, their judgments hid from him the need for personal prospective.

"NO BAD INTENT

"They did not take his own look for him (how could they?) but neither did their presentations prompt him to start looking. Presumably, there was in this no 'sabotage,' no bad intent. In neither instance is there much indication that advisers acted irresponsibly. Each seems to have performed his duty as he saw it; none sat where the President did * * *.

"Both [Presidents Truman and Eisenhower) were the victims of reliance upon issues and advisers to do more than any President can count on them to do—to clarify his stakes of personal power."

It would almost seem that Neustadt was writing about the Cuban failure—or the U–2 case—both of which occurred after his book was written.

And the President is said to believe that there was no "sabotage" or "irresponsibility" among his experts. He has taken the full responsibility on his own shoulders.

By all that he has said since last week, Mr. Kennedy seems to have taken this lesson to heart. He is obviously trying to recapture the position he held in the eyes of the world before the abortive landing on the Cuban coast.

NO CRITICISM SEEN

White House aides insist that in asking Robert Kennedy and Sorensen to concern themselves with foreign problems in addition to their other responsibilities no criticism is intended of any of the President's other advisers.

They will continue to assist him as in the past and to carry the same burdens.

When the President was forming his Cabinet it was apparent that he strongly felt the need to have his brother close at hand. He did not think he should be in the White House or have a Sherman Adams role. He made him Attorney General, and now he has made him much more.

Sorensen and the Attorney General were the chief assistants in the Kennedy presidential campaign. They proved that they were shrewd and tough men who could say "no." They demonstrated their ability to see issues and men in terms of the Kennedy needs and aspirations and success.

President of U.S. Chamber of Commerce Publicly Declares President Kennedy "Doesn't Have a Socialistic Bone in His Body" and Also Says "President Kennedy's Program Designed To Energize Weakening Economy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in the Los Angeles Times, February 3, 1961, I read a release which was in text as follows:

KENNEDY'S NO SOCIALIST, SAYS U.S. CHAMBER HEAD; PRESIDENT'S "PUMP PRIMING" MEASURES SEEN AS SPUR TO NATION'S LAGGING ECONOMY

Arthur (Red) Motley, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and an outspoken apostle of free enterprise, said here Thursday that, while he may disapprove of some of President Kennedy's antirecession measures, he would hardly go so far as to call them socialistic.

"He [Kennedy] doesn't have a socialistic bone in his body," said Motley.

The red-haired chamber president, by turn critic and defender of the President, told a news conference in the Biltmore that he's convinced the administration's "pump priming" is designed to "energize" the country's sagging economy, not destroy it.

And, because, in my humble judgment, the direct quote in said newspaper by the President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce should be specifically observed by as many Americans who really think as possible, I am pleased to present the text thereof. President Motley surely knows whereof he speaks about President Kennedy.

And, Mr. Speaker, please note what he says about President Kennedy's administration, its purposes and design.

The Feelings of an American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1961

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House, as well as others, the reading of a letter which has come to me and I have asked that it be printed in the RECORD. For the past several months, I have received letters of a similar nature but this letter is so expressive of all the others I deemed it wise to give it as much reading opportunity as possible:

Hon. FRANK J. BECKER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BECKER: I have often been tempted lately, with the trend of things as we face our New Frontier, to write to you and let you know how I feel and what I think of some of the silliness that is proposed. But after waiting a bit and cooling off, I realize how close you are to your people and, knowing that you represent a large majority of reasonable and generally conservative people, you indicate by the record that you are truly representing the wishes of most of us.

So, why pester you with letters? You have enough to answer without mine. Still, once in a while you should know that what you have been doing has the notice and the approval of your people. Of course I can speak only for myself and my family, but I hear only approval of your record in Congress amongst my friends.

But there comes a time when one gets just so fed up with what the New Frontier proposes, that one just has to let you know how they feel and what they think. Like most of your constitutents, I am just an average person, working for my living, earning about $7,800 before taxes. I have two children, one in high school and the other in college. I own my own home (no mortgage, thank goodness, I saved and paid it off) and pay some $650 yearly in local taxes—not to mention the Federal and State income tax bites. All of that, with college tuition (nondeductible), shaves it pretty closely, as you can well imagine. Through the years I've managed to save a bit above and beyond the reserve one needs in a savings bank and thus I have become a moderate investor in both A.T. & T. and LIL Co. stock.

Now we are getting close to the meat of this whole thing. No doubt you read of it, but I'd like to call it clearly to your attention. At Chicago, the opening game between the White Sox and the Senators drew 16,637 people. On the same day in Chicago, the A.T. & T. annual meeting drew 20,000. Total A.T. & T. shareholders exceed 1,910,000. As one newspaper put it, "When a stockholders meeting can outdraw a major league opening game, it seems to prove that people's capitalism is a genuine American phenomenon and not just a slogan."

Someone will have to get over to the President and the egghead breakfast club that only a minority of the stockholders belong to the champagne set—and I guess it will have to be you fellows in Congress. Stockholders, by and large, are investors without which the whole American economy will bog down. To keep on, through restrictive legislation and tax legislation to make such investment unattractive will only backfire on the Government in the long run. I have always honestly declared stock dividends and savings bank interest and I think that most people do. I believe that the present setup of having such dividend and interest payments reported to the Internal Revenue Service by the paying corporations is quite sufficient for them to check on the taxpayer's honesty and I believe that it is up to them to do so. I am opposed to any further "withholding at the source," believing what we already have is an infringement of our rights. I am opposed also to discontinuing the $50 exclusion and 4 percent credit on dividend income over that amount.

Now, I'd like to prove to you that I am small-time, that I have invested for additional income which is needed these days just to keep one's head above water and not for speculation: I own 74 shares of A.T. & T. and 19 of LIL Co., all purchased at much less than the presently inflated prices, and with no intention of selling for capital gain unless something happened to me or my family and there was no other alternative. And, the good Lord forbid, if I had to do this, isn't it enough that the Government would collect 25 percent of my profit as tax on capital gain? They would collect this amount on my foresight, my saving to invest, my attempt to provide for the future of myself and my family.

Please, Mr. BECKER, stay on our side.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

I Believe in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, in this trying period in the history of our beloved Republic, expressions of faith in America are not as commonly voiced as are reports of her failures.

I was impressed by the following letter to the editor of the Utica Observer-Dispatch written by a resident of Utica, N.Y., who is a native of the Republic of Lebanon.

His love of country is self-evident from his eloquent statement of beliefs which I commend to the attention of the House:

To the EDITOR:

In spite of the Russian success in orbiting Yuri Gagarin around the world and in spite of words such as "complacent" and "lagging" in reference to our space program, my belief in our beloved United States remains firm because:

I believe in this bighearted country of ours and I believe in its destiny, as I have always believed in its glowing liberty and justice for which it stands.

I believe in our American Government, in its Constitution and in its flag as firmly as I have always believed in the versatility

and generosity of our people, whose limitless gifts and contributions to the human race of 3 billion people have surpassed the combined efforts of the Grecian, Roman and Phoenician Empires.

I believe in our family and in our youth who are fearless, daring, curious and intelligent, as firmly as I believe in their honesty, sincerity, fairplay and in their upbringing.

I believe that every time I see our American children, they seem to be saying to me: "Here we are, and in our veins runs the blood of our fathers who have dazzled all continents with so many achievements that people have long stopped talking about the 'Seven Wonders of the World.' "

I believe in our schools and in our teachers, collectively, who have profusely given us and the world great men and women in every field and branch of human endeavor.

I believe in our American ingenuity and creativity as I believe in our bridges, buildings, tunnels and other titanic feats, which became realities because the world, like Yuri Gagarin, had challenged us in saying, "They couldn't be done."

I believe we have been orbiting around the world with the innumerables, the immeasurables and the impossibles—zooming, darting and thunderously blazing with honor and glory on land, in the sea and in the air—and we shall continue to do so.

I firmly believe that our country's stockpiles of secret weapons are ready to earthquake every inch of the world with mass death and pulverization, if we are forced to fight.

I believe that Uncle Sam is a giant standing between heaven and earth, who could rule the world if it weren't for the heaven in his heart.

Oh, U.S.A., I know you. I believe you are as eternal as the Cedars of God in Lebanon, believe me.

PETER KHOURY.

J.F.K.: What a Difference 90 Days Make

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

J.F.K.: WHAT A DIFFERENCE 90 DAYS MAKE

There was a striking picture on page 1 of Sunday's paper—two men strolling down a wooded path, talking in comradely, confidential fashion of the crisis in Cuba.

From the rear, it was a little hard to tell just who they were. We have the photographer's word for it, though, that they were President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower.

The mind's gears growl a little here as one attempts to put this in perspective. Would this be the same man who, as Candidate Kennedy, was so critical of the Eisenhower administration's handling of Cuba?

Well, apparently it is. For that matter, it's the same President Kennedy who, shortly before meeting with Mr. Eisenhower, met also with Richard Nixon and Senator Barry Goldwater to discuss the Cuban situation.

What a difference a few weeks in office—and a crisis—make. Who would have thought that Candidate Kennedy, so critical of Republican efforts where Cuba was concerned, would, as President Kennedy, confer with those same Republicans on the very subject where he cast doubts upon their capabilities.

Last week, sidestepping questions about the Cuban trouble, President Kennedy cryptically said: "Victory has a hundred fathers—defeat is an orphan."

He meant, evidently, that had rebel efforts against Fidel Castro succeeded last week, plenty of people—including both past and present administrations—would have been willing to share in the credit for its success.

But, instead, an orphaned infant named Defeat has been laid on the White House doorstep.

It must be acknowledged that President Kennedy is not ducking responsibility. He admits that as head of the U.S. Government he is responsible for the U.S. backing—to whatever degree it existed—of the rebel effort against Castro.

He is also finding out that the White House diplomatic nursery is a lonely place in the bleak hours. And he is willing—overlooking what he said as a candidate—to call upon some who have been there before, pacing the floor with earlier orphans named Defeat.

So what we are seeing is not a legal proceeding to establish paternity. Instead it is a family conference to discuss just what to do with the colicky babe.

Real Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress in 1949, I have read with interest and profit the columns of Mr. Constantine Brown which appear almost daily in the Washington Evening Star.

It is with regret that I note Mr. Brown is being assigned to Rome, Italy, for the next 2 years for his has been an effective voice on the Washington scene. I am pleased, however, that his columns will continue to appear in the Star and from his vantage point in Europe I am sure there will come much needed appraisals—fairly, clearly, and courageously written—of the involvements of the U.S. Government and thus the citizens of this country in the Middle East and Europe.

Constantine Brown, the veteran reporter and columnist, knows that the people and byways of America, not Washington, provide the true heart and soul of this Republic.

With his many friends and admirers, I wish Mr. Brown well during his sojourn in foreign lands, and I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his column from the Star of the date of April 25, 1961, which follows:

In a few weeks this reporter will sail across the Atlantic and up the Mediterranean to Naples, and thence by train to Rome. For the next 2 years, the assignment will be to cover at first hand the extraordinary developments in Western Europe's almost miraculous recovery, political as well as economic, from the disaster of World War II.

And, of course, from the vantage point of the Italian capital, we will be close at hand to cover the next manifestations of militant communism's penetration of the Middle East and Africa.

Except for occasional trips to Europe, the Middle East, and Asia, this reporter has covered the Washington scene for more than 31 years. There comes a time when long concentration on the undoubtedly world significant but relatively small area between 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and Capitol Hill induces, we think inevitably, too much concern with the impact of the U.S. political drama on international affairs. One loses, to some extent, the perspective needed for the balanced view.

Particularly these days, with events crowding each other for the attention of the world and so very much happening in parts of the political spectrum that only yesterday, in a sense, were colonial backwaters or decadent former empires, a closer affinity both physical and psychological is essential. This we are going to try to achieve.

On leaving our old "beat" for a while, however, it seems a few reflections might be in order. We would like to leave a few observations on the nature of things American today as they appear to a reporter on the point of leaving for a new environment and new perspectives. Here they are.

First of all, every American ought to know that the true voice of America is not in Washington, not in that fascinating stretch of American Government between the White House and the Hill. It is in the hearts and minds and throats of all Americans. It is in America's homes, its schools and universities and colleges, its Main Streets and city halls, its prairies and mountains, its churches and lodges, its baseball diamonds and picnic grounds. It is in America and in Americans all.

Our true ideologies are not necessarily truly expressed in Washington. Only a few of their trappings are visible here. They can be found on the family hearthside, on the kitchen range.

Freedom, as the Founding Fathers meant it to be, will never be preserved in the Nation's Capital. It will never be realized in its true nature through political parties, movements or programs that in their very nature are the antithesis of American freedom and integrity and self-reliance, the kind that made us the Nation we have become.

Young America seems to be sensing these facts, even after 30 years of indoctrination and familiarity with New Deals, with one-world diplomacy, with internationally minded compromiser diplomats and so-called statesmen who have been leading the Nation down the glory trail, in the wrong direction, for more than a generation.

Take a look at the map of the world as it is today. Indeed, in the light of most recent developments, take a look, if you can, at a map of the universe itself. Try to realize, as you look, that the reactionary concept of political, social, and economic life reflected in the growth of imperialist communism, erroneously labeled "revolutionary" but in truth a reversion to tyranny, albeit of a new type, has come to dominate much of the world and to threaten all of it.

America is manifested in its fundamental truths in people like the man who donated 16,000 copies of J. Edgar Hoover's "Masters of Deceit" to as many high school libraries. It is to be seen in the Freedom Library, with subscribers donating unselfishly that America may know the truth. If the wife of a bus driver contributes her little mite, so can you.

And the truth shall, in truth, make you free.

The Agricultural Situation Is a Many-Sided Thing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the urgent need for enactment of long-range and forward-looking farm legislation was emphasized by Agricultural Secretary Orville Freeman when he testified before the House Agriculture Committee April 24 on the proposed Agricultural Act of 1961. He cited the current technological explosion in agriculture and the magnitude of the storage problem as two of the reasons why this bill should be enacted into law as soon as possible. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include this portion of his testimony in the RECORD:

TECHNOLOGICAL EXPLOSION HAS INTENSIFIED THE FARM PROBLEM

THE URGENCY OF THIS LEGISLATION IS FURTHER EMPHASIZED BY THE CURRENT TECHNOLOGICAL EXPLOSION IN AGRICULTURE

The magnitude of the technological revolution in agriculture is too little recognized, and its consequences—in the present and for the future—are not sufficiently realized or understood.

Agricultural efficiency and productivity have advanced so rapidly during the past decade that agriculture has tripled its output per hour of labor while industry's output has only doubled. Output in agriculture increased much more rapidly than the commercial market increased. During the 1950's farm output increased by 28 percent while population increased only 19 percent. Since the domestic demand for food is tied closely to population changes this means that supplies have outrun demand. Supplies have pressed against population needs in the United States and given rise to a constant downward pressure on farm prices.

This increase in output has been accomplished with the use of only 2 percent more resources than were used 10 years ago. The composition of these resources has changed sharply, with about one-third less labor and 6 percent less cropland. But the use of machinery, fertilizers, pesticides, and other purchased inputs has risen sharply. Overall efficiency, in terms of output per unit of input has gone up by 25 percent. These changes in resource needs have had a sharp impact on declining farm employment, increased capital requirements, and the decreasing opportunity for young people to enter farming.

This technological revolution in agriculture has only just begun. Only a few of our farmers are using all of the new technology to the best advantage. Economists in the Department of Agriculture recently estimated that a population of 230 million people in 1975 could be provided better diets, and our export markets readily satisfied, from a crop acreage no larger than that in use just prior to the start of the Conservation Reserve program, simply by using presently-known methods of production on most farms. If all farm production in 1975 were to be carried on with only the best techniques in use in the late 1950's, not all of the cropland acreage now in use would be needed for food and fiber production.

* * * * *

It breaks down to this: If American farmers are given some assurance of relatively favorable prices and incomes in the 1960's, and if we provide a sound program for adjusting our production to that which can be used, we will have a highly productive and flexible agricultural plant—one capable of responding to any foreseeable food production emergency. This is the kind of an agriculture we want.

But, in the absence of such a program, results could be disastrous. What are the potential consequences?

Farmers could, in the absence of such a program, use their productive capacity indiscriminately. In that event, if support programs were continued, the burden on the Federal budget would become intolerable, and the stockpiles of surplus completely unmanageable. Or—and more likely—the public would refuse to continue such supports, and prices and incomes would be driven down so low that results could be catastrophic. Millions of farmers, their incomes depressed below subsistence level, would swell the ranks of the unemployed, would crowd already crowded areas of our cities, seeking jobs. And many of them would be neither trained for jobs or adjusted to city life. The economic problem would be complicated by the social problem.

This is not all. I should like to point out here how such a development would in the end be likely to add higher consumer food prices to its unfortunate results. Further decline in income for the family farm could lead to a corporate type agriculture controlled by outside capital. Hired labor would increasingly replace work done by the farm operator, and the costs of management, supervision and labor would go up. For one of the major reasons why the American family farm has become the most efficient agricultural producer in history is that the owner-operator is on hand, to do the work and to supervise the work. Neither collective farms nor large corporate landowners are able to mtach the efficiency that results.

If low incomes squeeze out all but a few corporate-type farms, there would doubtless result the kind of supply control that would result in high prices, without regard for the public interest, or the consumer interest, or interest in our programs to expand the use of food abroad in the interest of peace and economic progress.

We deplore the collectivization of farms in a part of the world, and we would encourage land reform in those other areas where huge landholdings have—like the Communist collective farms—proved so inferior to our family farm economy. How ironic it would be if we allowed that family farm economy, that has proved its superiority socially as well as economically, to be destroyed for want of the tools it needs to meet conditions of today.

The family farm in this Nation has reached a pinnacle of success in its primary function, the production of an abundance of food and fiber to meet human needs. It has made this abundance available to the consumers of this nation at a lower real cost than ever before in history. The consumer now spends about 20 percent of his disposable personal income for food, as compared with more than a fourth in 1947. The consumer in America works fewer hours to feed himself and his family than in any other country. The American public should pay tribute to the farmer for his contribution to our standard of living. Even Khrushchev pays that tribute. A little over a week ago he was quoted as saying that the Soviet triumph in space "must not detract the attention of the Soviet people from other targets, and these include catching up with the United States in the standard of living."

To insure our continued superiority in this field in which we have unquestioned leadership, we propose a program that will end the current paradox in which productive success has led to economic distress. This happens, in a large measure, because of the inelasticity of the human stomach, hence the inelasticity of the demand for food. A little too much in the way of food supplies leads to dramatic farm price declines—hence to a farm income problem. And a little too little in the way of food supplies leads to skyrocketing food prices and a real income squeeze on consumers—this is the food problem so often encountered in wartime.

* * * * *

In fact, paradoxical as it may seem, these gyrations and this instability can hurt both producer and consumer at the same time. The instability adds to the risk of farming, and risk always increases costs. And the uncertainties of economic ups and downs make for an inefficient use of the productive plant the farmer has, and which he must maintain whether prices are good or bad. This, too, increases costs.

This leads to my final point with regard to the technological explosion and its effect on both farmer and consumer. Only if we put into effect a program that succeeds in adjusting production to that which we can use and that at the same time provides a fair income for the farmer, only if we thus promote economic and price stability in agriculture, only then can continued technological improvements in production be expected to result in an eventual lowering of prices to consumers while maintaining farm incomes. Without such a program the farmer must pay the cost of risk, and of inefficient use of his productive plant, as I have described. Without it he must maintain greater financial liquidity than would otherwise be the case; he must pay more for credit; he is forced to use older and less efficient methods than he would otherwise use.

Supply adjustment programs that serve to reduce and minimize the extreme and uncertain price fluctuations in agriculture would reduce the costs borne by the farmer. They would mean a gain in production efficiency, and this in time would mean a reduction of the per unit cost of production. This would really set the stage for both the maintenance of farm incomes and an eventual orderly lowering of prices to consumers, consistent with the march of technological advance.

The urgency of this legislation is demanded by the magnitude of the storage problem.

The cost of the storage is so great that we cannot expect it to be long continued. This is an immediate and pressing burden. Eight years ago, agriculture's house was in order. Commodity carryovers were at reasonable levels. Producers had no burdensome surpluses hanging over their heads.

These were the quantities, held in public and private hands, of principal crops carried over into the marketing year of 1952–53:

Feed grains: 20.1 million tons which was 18 percent of the amount used in that year.

Wheat: 256 million bushels, or 26 percent of the amount used in that year.

Cotton: 2.8 million bales, or 22 percent of the amount used in that year.

The coming marketing year confronts us with a different picture:

Feed grain stocks will be around 84 million tons, or half of a year's needs. Over 85 percent will be Government owned or under CCC loans.

Wheat stocks next July 1 will amount to about 1½ billion bushels, or more than a year's expected domestic and export needs. About 90 percent will be under CCC loan or in CCC inventory. Cotton stocks, at 7½ million bales, largely in private hands, will be down

sharply from recent highs, but almost 3 times as large as in 1952.

The growth of feed grain and wheat stocks did not occur overnight.

Feed grain stocks have increased in every year since 1952, as a result of excessive production. Wheat stocks have increased in 6 years out of 9.

How can we convey the magnitude of the storage problem?

Taxpayers should know that Government costs of carrying and handling commodity stocks have risen from $238 million in fiscal 1953 to $1 billion in the current fiscal year. These costs include storage, transportation, and interest. The CCC investment in price support at the end of this fiscal year will be about $8.5 billion. Wheat and feed grains will account for 87 percent of this.

We must face the problem of working down these large stocks. As long as they exist, they pose a threat to markets and to price stability that extends beyond these commodities to the livestock industry.

We cannot reduce stocks as long as the supplies that come out of inventories are more than replaced from excess current production. Each recent year has added an average of 7 million tons of feed grains to stocks. Annual additions of wheat have been about 130 million bushels. We cannot expect to reduce CCC inventories until we have the legislation and programs that will effectively adjust production below total annual needs. This is a major goal of legislation here proposed.

More About the CIA From the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Post for Tuesday, April 25, 1961, by the able Washington columnist, Mr. William V. Shannon. I am bringing this item to the attention of my colleagues in another effort to point out that we are getting our information on this super secret organization only from the press. From the press we learn of the ineptness of the CIA in the Cuban invasion. We were given no advance notice that our Government was involved in the plan. Mr. Shannon's article again points up the need for this body to exercise some direct control over what has become something of an autonomy—an overseer of our foreign policy—inside the executive branch:

CIA KEPT ITS SECRET—EVEN FROM THE REBELS

(By William V. Shannon)

WASHINGTON, April 25.—The strange story of how the Central Intelligence Agency mismanaged last week's misadventure in Cuba can now be pieced.

According to information from exile Cuban sources which has been reluctantly confirmed by Administration officials, the leaders of the Cuban Revolutionary Council had no part in directing the actual military operation and no opportunity to coordinate with the Cuban underground.

The CIA held the six leading members of the Council incommunicado near an abandoned airfield somewhere in Florida while the "invasion" was underway. They were not permitted to join the rebel forces or speak in their own name. Statements were issued in their behalf of which they had no knowledge.

Only after it was clear the invasion was going to fail were they consulted by top-ranking U.S. officials.

HELD 3 DAYS

The story began on Sunday, April 15, when members of the revolutionary council in New York received word that they should go to Philadelphia. They were then flown from Philadelphia to an abandoned airbase somewhere in Florida. They were quartered in an old, rambling house in a deserted area. Armed guards were posted outside.

Provisional president Jose Miro Cardona, defense minister Antonio de Varona, and Manuel Ray were among the six civilian exile leaders kept incommunicado in this house for the next 3 days.

The reason for holding them in this fashion was apparently a desire on the part of U.S. intelligence officials to maintain tight security.

OFF GUARD

The Cuban exile leaders first heard of the invasion from radio news bulletins on Monday. The timing of the operation caught at least some of them off guard. It provided no opportunity to work out plans with the underground inside Cuba to set off sabotage and diversionary incidents. The coordinator of the Cuban underground had a few days earlier journeyed from the island to Miami in order to make such plans. The invasion caught him flatfooted and as a result, there was no sabotage or uprising. Some of the Cuban exiles blame the CIA for this failure. The CIA explanation is that it did not wholly trust the underground and chose not to rely upon it.

On Tuesday, the exile leaders were briefed on the military situation in Cuba by a U.S. Army colonel. They grew restive, clamored for more information, and demanded to be allowed to confer with their supporters.

At 1 a.m. Wednesday morning, Adolph A. Berle, coordinator of the State Department task force on Latin America, was routed from his bed in Washington by an urgent call from the White House and directed to fly to Florida. He was told the invasion seemed definitely to have failed. He arrived at the guarded house in Florida shortly after daybreak and spent the morning canvassing the situation with the Cuban exiles.

COMPLETE DISASTER

That afternoon, he flew with them back to Washington where the group met twice, once in the late afternoon and again early in the evening, with President Kennedy. The President meanwhile was working between conference on an entirely new draft of the speech he made the next day to the American Society of Newspaper editors. After conferring briefly with him a third time the next morning, the Cuban exiles were released from the CIA's protective custody and allowed to go their own ways.

The only member of the revolutionary council to participate in the invasion was Capt. Manuel Artime, the youthful ex-Castro follower whom the CIA had developed as a protege. He broadcast appeals to the Cubans to overthrow Castro, speaking from a ship off shore. This ship was subsequently sunk by Castro's planes and Artime's whereabouts are now unknown.

The landing itself was apparently a disaster from first to last. There was only one landing, not several. It took place on a mile-long strip of the coast of Cochinas Bay. Three roads lead inland but Castro's forces succeeded in blocking them all. The United States provided air cover against the attacks by propeller planes, not jets, used by Castro's air force. The rebels captured an airstrip near the coast, but the plan to use it to bring in supplies went wrong because Castro's men had rendered the strip useless by heaping mounds of gravel on the runway.

About 1,200 or 1,300 men were landed. More than one-third were captured by Castro's troops and most of the rest were killed. Castro's forces apparently did not fight with any great distinction but they had so many natural advantages of position and terrain they were able to crush the landings in less than 3 days. Very few, if any rebels made their escape to the Escambray Mountains.

FOUR BIG MISTAKES

The CIA is known sarcastically in Miami as the Cuban Invasion Authority. The more liberal wing of the Cuban exile movement is convinced the disaster took place because the CIA overestimated Castro's weakness, refused to cooperate wholeheartedly with the underground, put too much reliance on sheer military force—and then did not provide enough of that.

The Cuban exiles believe that the CIA's treatment of them during the invasion as so many puppets was the natural outcome of this basically contemptuous, paternalistic approach. U.S. officials deny that all of the Cuban complaints are justified but they concede that the CIA's attitude contributed heavily to the making of the fiasco.

Controversial Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on Wednesday, March 1, 1961, entitled "Controversial Committee":

CONTROVERSIAL COMMITTEE

The life of the House Un-American Activities Committee continues to be a stormy one. Riots have attended some of its hearings and new efforts have been launched in Congress to curb it. Yet a great many Americans feel its work is necessary to keep the Nation alert as to Communist infiltration. And the Supreme Court, in a narrowly split decision, has just upheld jail terms for two witnesses who refused to answer the committee's questions.

The chief significance of these cases is in their confirmation of the Barenblatt decision in 1959. That ruling signaled a halt in the Court's trend following the McCarthy era. In the Watkins case and some others it had castigated the abuse of investigating committees' power and set up stern limits. But then in the Barenblatt case and now in the Wilkinson and Barden cases, the Court has supported wide authority for such inquiries.

The majority, speaking through Mr. Justice Stewart, specifically declares it is making no judgment as to the wisdom of "the creation or continuance of this committee."

It sought rather to decide whether the committee was operating within the authority conferred by Congress. It said it found nothing to indicate that Congress intended to "immunize from interrogation all those (and there are many) who are opposed to the existence" of the committee.

These latest cases differed from several earlier ones mainly on this question of harassment or intimidation of critics. Mr. Justice Black in his dissent said that if the present trend continues:

"Government by consent will disappear, to be replaced by government by intimidation, because some people are afraid the country cannot survive unless Congress has the power to set aside the freedoms of the first amendment at will."

The defendants in these cases had not resorted to the fifth amendment but had relied on the first amendment in denying the committee's right to question them as to their political beliefs. The Court seems to be saying that the amendment affords no protection on that score as against the authority of Congress to investigate subversive activities.

From the start serious questions have dogged the committee. It has become far more circumspect in many of its operations since the Martin Dies and Parnell Thomas days. Yet courts have refused to uphold many of its contempt charges. And there have been cases of great injustice where its hearings have been used for unsupported accusations that harmed innocent persons. A film the committee has made is bitterly criticized as one-sided. College students have also raised the question of intimidation, protesting that even peaceful distribution of critical statements where the film was being shown brought arrest.

Committee supporters declare it is essential to turn a publicity spotlight on Reds and their sympathizers. They say that the FBI and the courts do only part of the necessary job when they spot and halt punishable acts, that the public must be alerted to resist subversion of opinion. If this function is to be added to the recognized one of investigation for legislative purposes, it must be safeguarded against political abuses. This watch should be maintained first by Congress. But it is well that many other patriotic Americans (including at least four High Court Justices) are also concerned to protect individual rights.

The U.S. Navy in the Antarctic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1961

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Navy has distinguished itself in the Antarctic in recent years, and has added to its laurels during the past year. Under the able direction of Rear Adm. David M. Tyree, our scientific project there has contributed substantially to the storehouse of scientific knowledge.

Admiral Tyree returned to Washington last week following a period of 6 months at his command post at the Naval Air Facility at McMurdo Sound. There on that almost inaccessible continent that has been icelocked for ages at the very bottom of the world, the admiral made the most of the Antarctic summer. At the McMurdo base, at the Byrd Station, and at the South Pole Station, all under his command, a record of vital construction and scientific research was achieved.

As the Antarctic winter got underway, the Navy was called upon to evacuate a sick Russian scientific observer from the Byrd Station, an inland and inaccessible scientific post. But to the U.S. Navy it proved not to be inaccessible. And a historic rescue was carried out.

As a recognition of Admiral Tyree's accomplishment in the Antarctic I include a message to the admiral from the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm Arleigh Burke. I share the sentiments contained in that message, which follows:

"As your ships and aircraft withdraw from Antarctica, all hands can have more than normal feeling of pride and accomplishment. Operations this year have been marked by great forward strides in Antarctic communications, preparation of the nuclear reactor site; completion of three major construction projects; a deep peneteration into the Bellinghausen Sea and increased utilization of C–130 aircraft. The long, hard Antarctic months endured by all in your party have made it possible for the United States to maintain its dominancy in scientific achievement and other peaceful pursuits in this area of increasing international importance; well done and welcome home to all hands."—Arleigh Burke.

U.S. NAVY PLANE MAKES HISTORIC FLIGHT TO ANTARCTICA TO EVACUATE SICK RUSSIAN

(From the New Haven Register, Apr. 14, 1961)

CHRISTCHURCH, NEW ZEALAND.—The Russians may hold a lead in space travel, but the Americans again have proved the validity of their claim as the world's greatest humanitarians.

For the first time in history, a U.S. Navy ski-equipped Hercules cargo plane risked a landing this week in near darkness on Antarctica's McMurdo Sound ice. Its mission: to evacuate a Soviet scientist requiring medical treatment from Byrd Station.

With the arrival of the Hercules at international airport here on Tuesday, the U.S. Navy successfully completed one of the longest mercy flights ever—6,300-mile round trip to isolated Byrd Station, deep in the heart of the white and frozen wastelands of Antarctica.

BALKED BY WEATHER

The long winter night and sudden, fierce storms always in the past have prevented ships and aircraft from landing at Antarctica at this time of the year.

As a result, scientists and Navy personnel now serving at the three chief U.S. bases in Antarctica, bade farewell to their supply ships in February and settled down to endure the cold and darkness which will last until September.

That, at least, was the plan until the Russian scientist, Leonid Kuperov, became ill. Kuperov, a physicist, was stationed at the Byrd base under an exchange agreement with the Soviet Union.

Facilities at the Byrd station were not considered adequate to treat him properly for 7 months until the relief planes arrived on their normal schedule in October. He is suffering from a duodenal ulcer.

DELAYED 5 DAYS

The record flight, which was the first an aircraft has ever made into Antarctica after March, was delayed for 5 days in Christchurch because of adverse flying weather at McMurdo Sound Naval Air Facility, major U.S. supply base on the icy continent.

The *Hercules* departed last Sunday morning, piloted by Comdr. L. E. Newcomer of Air Development Squadron 6 (VS–6). It arrived safely at McMurdo 8 hours later. After making final preparations and waiting favorable weather for a fast turnaround flight to Byrd station, the plane took off at 5:42 a.m. Monday.

On the flight were the Deep Freeze 1961 flight surgeon, Lt. Jack Potter, and Lt. Comdr. James Corley, a Russian linguist (Kuperov speaks only Russian).

The C–13 OBL *Hercules* covered the 917 miles to Byrd station in just under 3 hours, picked up Kuperov and returned to McMurdo, jumping-off place from Antarctica for New Zealand. With just a short stopover for refueling, the plane was again airborne on the last leg of its mission.

Upon arrival at Christchurch, Newcomer, and his crew were congratulated by Rear Adm. David M. Tyree, Operation Deep Freeze commander, who had delayed a scheduled departure for Washington, D.C., to oversee the rescue effort.

Kuperov was taken to the Christchurch Hospital for further observation, diagnosis, and treatment.

Preparation for the mercy flight meant a lot of extra work for the personnel stationed at McMurdo. To safeguard the aircraft, McMurdo's commanding officer, Navy Comdr. J. J. Brosnahan directed reinstallation of air navigational aids, ground control approach equipment, and preparation of a skiway on the ice over the Ross Sea.

The unscheduled rebuilding of a landing strip was necessary because the past summer's heat had broken up the ice over the water. Now, however, the seas are again solidly frozen, and a new field was quickly laid out.

Meteorologists carefully plotted weather reports received from the Antarctic stations of France, New Zealand, Argentina, Norway, Chile, Australia, Belgium, England, Russia, Japan, and the United States to give the most accurate forecasts possible for the history-making flight.

Meanwhile the U.S.S. *Staten Island*, already on weather duty between New Zealand and Antarctica, remained on her mid-ocean station to serve as a beacon for the Navy Hercules and to supply a steady flow of up-to-the-minute weather information.

The mission was accomplished at almost the last moment before total darkness overtakes McMurdo Sound Naval Air Facility on April 25 (6 months of night arrived at the South Pole Station on March 23).

This flight, however, was regarded by many of the airmen as the first step in ending the traditional winter isolation of the ice-age continent.

T. G. Masaryk and the Voice of Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following two articles. The first is from the December 20, 1960, issue of Chess Life and the second from the March 30, 1961, issue of the Calais (Maine) Advertiser:

[From Chess Life]

THE HEIGHT OF SOMETHING OR OTHER

(By Fred M. Wren)

Walter Muir, chess champion of Roanoke, Va., recently sent a move in a correspondence game to an opponent in Czechoslo-

vakia. The postcard happened to bear a U.S. postage stamp through which this country honored the 110th anniversary of the birth of the founder and first President of the Czechoslovak Republic, Thomas G. Masaryk. The card was returned to Muir, bearing notations in several languages that it was not admissible to Czechoslovakia. When Muir sent a second card, with another kind of stamp with less dangerous political connotations, it went through without difficulty. And the Communists call us stupid. Messrs. Pachman or Opocensky are offered equal space in Chess Life, if they care to explain or comment on this incident.

(If, after reading the preceding paragraph, you feel that you may have seen it somewhere before, you are probably right. It appeared on this page in the issue of September 20, 1960, and is reprinted now to set the scene and tempo for the following letter from Karel Opocensky, international master, international arbiter, and editor of the FIDE Quarterly, who wrote from Prague on Nov. 3, 1960:)

"In No. 2, volume 15 of Chess Life of September 20, 1960, I read the article 'The Height of Something or Other.'

"In this article, you ask Grand Master Pachman or myself to comment on the case outlined in the article. Since Grand Master Pachman is at present in Leipzig at the Chess Olympics, where he is defending the colours of his country, there remains just myself to reply:

"First, permit me to recall an era of the recent past. At that time the Czechoslovak people stood alongside the American people in the fight against Nazism. At that time, my wife and all my relatives died under the Gestapo ax. I consider that they laid down their lives in the fight for freedom, not only for the Czechoslovak people but for the Americans as well. And this circumstance justifies my answering you frankly.

"We will not argue on the significance of T. G. Masaryk. We probably hold different opinions. But this question is not the main issue of your article and has not, and cannot have, anything in common with my opinion on the whole affair. It is natural that at the time when the U.S. Government is conducting a cold war against all the Socialist countries in Europe, every method of dealings of American citizens with those of all the Socialist countries is of special import. And stamping the letter of Mr. Muir to the Czechoslovak chess player with a stamp bearing the picture of T. G. Masaryk must be considered as a rude political provocation and an attempt at political infiltration. And every such attempt, be it a stamp or transmissions of 'Voice of America' or any other act will find only one answer today and in the future, not admissible.

"But all the Czechoslovak chess players want to live in friendship with American chess players. Please take special notice of this. They want to play correspondence matches with them and exchange experiences and wish, from the bottom of their hearts, great success to American chess players, but only on the basis of mutual respect and mutual understanding. Permit me to present one example: This year your students achieved outstanding success when they won the world university teams championship. An ironical note is that they won this world championship in Leningrad, the city of Lenin, and won it in a contest sponsored by the Democratic Union of Students, which you consider Communist. But we rejoiced at your victory because in it we perceived the sound results of mutual competition even on a politically difficult basis, and we would like in the future to meet with American chess players again.

"I, personally, have been attentively following the development of your young, talented players, the work of Fischer and Lombardy, and your organizational work "Operation M," where you are trying to develop chess playing in the United States.

"I wish you much success as becomes the land of the chess tradition of Morphy, Pilsburry, Marshall, and others and also the land with the traditions of Abraham Lincoln and Benjamin Franklin."

In the last editorial which I shall have the pleasure of writing for Chess Life I should like to comment on the fourth paragraph of the letter quoted above. In the first three sentences the writer indicates that the name of T. G. Masaryk may be dismissed as being without significance, to the matter under discussion. The hell it can! Masaryk was to the Czechoslovak Republic what George Washington was to the United States—its founder and its first president. His name, therefore, belongs to history, and to the world. If the United States Government sees fit to issue a memorial stamp honoring the 110th anniversary of his birth, communications bearing the stamp should pass freely through the mails of any country in the International Postal Union. Reverting to the comparison with George Washington, I remind Master Opocensky and our other European readers that Washington led a successful revolutionary movement nearly 200 years ago, which resulted in thirteen colonies breaking away from the mother country, England, and in the formation of the United States of America. The Revolution was a bloody affair of 7 years duration, and England has never ceased to moan the loss of her American colonies. England has little reason to revere the name of Washington, who was—let's face it—a traitor to the British Crown. Or the names of Lafayette, or Pulaski or Von Steuben, to name only a few who contributed in such large measure to his success. Yet memorial stamps bearing the names and faces of these men have for years carried mail from the United States to and through every part of the British Commonwealth, without the slightest idea on the part of the American correspondents or of the British postal authorities of rude political provocation or attempt at political infiltration.

I well remember your beautiful city of Prague, Master Opocensky, and the friendly people who lived there in the early 1930's. As I remember it, several of the public squares contained statues of T. G. Masaryk, and I know there was a large one of Woodrow Wilson, through whose vision and efforts the ancient dream of a Czechoslovak Republic became reality. I remember that several of my Czech friends spoke with pride of the constant fight for freedom which their ancestors had made, of the unsuccessful Czech revolt which culminated in the famous battle of the White Mountain in 1620, and of the subsequent religious and political persecutions to which they had been subjected under Austro-Hungarian rule—now all happily ended with the establishment of responsible government, free elections, and religious and political freedom. Where are they now—the friends whom I cherished, and the institutions which they loved? Some of them undoubtedly perished along with your family in the hands of the Gestapo. But, since I have gone so far in my attempt at "political infiltration" I may as well go a bit further and remind you that Gestapo axes cut no deeper, nor more impersonally, nor more finally, than those of any other totalitarian police state. Some of the Czech friends mentioned have discovered the truth of that statement in the last seconds of their lives. I am happy to say that others have fled—over, or under, or through the Curtain—and are now living in various decadent capitalistic centers, where they may listen to "Voice of America" or "Voice of Moscow" with impunity, and after listening, decide for themselves—again with impunity—which one is the "Voice of Truth."

This brings to mind Big Brothers's Ministry of Truth in Orwell's "1984"—you should read it, Master Opocensky—the government bureau in which the book's hero labors daily. His work? Writing and rewriting history in terms of the whims and policies of Big Brother's administration; elimination of names and dates and photographs and all other references to events which Big Brother thinks best forgotten. It would appear that such a "Ministry of Truth" is now operating in Czechoslovakia, and that Masaryk's name and deeds have been expunged from the history of the country.

I share your wish, Master Opocensky, that the chess players of your country live in friendship with the chess players of my country. On behalf of the chess players of the United States I accept your congratulations on the achievements of our world champion student team, and thank you for your interest in the development of our young grandmasters, Fischer and Lombardy. We have the same admiration for the achievements of the great Czech players—no list of whom would be complete without your own name at or near the top. Your appreciation of the chess tradition of Morphy, Pillsbury, and Marshall is gratifying to all Americans. Your references to Abraham Lincoln and Benjamin Franklin—two controversial political figures in the light of historical research—prompt me to toss in your direction a quotation from each.

"As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy." (A. Lincoln.)

"They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." (B. Franklin).

It is possible that these reactionary sentiments may result in the ejection of Lincoln and Franklin from the current Czechoslovak version of history. If such should be the case, I take comfort in the thought that they will nevertheless undoubtedly retain their proper places in world history, along with Masaryk, and Benes, and the many others whose names and whose ideas have proved distasteful to the Big Brother of today, but whose names and ideas may even survive those of Gottwald and Navotny.

[From the Calais Advertiser, Mar. 30, 1961]

It is probably no secret that Fred M. (Monte) Wren's columns "I See by the Papers" have attracted attention outside the confines of Washington County, and that what was written with the original intention of getting our readers in this area interested in and discussing current events has become required reading for some of the legislative solons in the 100th legislature in Augusta. That his literary work has received international recognition may interest friends in this area.

In December 1960, while editor of the U.S. Chess Federation's bimonthly newspaper Chess Life, he entered into an editorial controversy with one of Europe's best known chess masters and chess writers, Karel Opocensky of Czechoslovakia. The bone of contention was the action of Czechoslovak postal authorities in refusing to accept into their country mail posted in the United States bearing U.S. postage stamps honoring T. G. Masaryk, Czechoslovakia's first president. Mr. Wren commented on this incident of bureaucratic stupidity, and invited an explanation from any of the known Czech chess masters.

Karel Opocensky took up the challenge, and justified the Czech postal authorities by saying that sending mail to that country

with stamps bearing the picture of T. G. Masaryk must be regarded as a rude attempt at political infiltration comparable to our attempts to corrupt their people through "Voice of America" radio broadcasts.

Mr. Wren's reply to Mr. Opocensky has been referred to as a classic being a full page editorial in the December 20, 1960, issue of Chess Life. Last week he was informed that his editorial had been translated into several foreign languages, had been published in a New York Czech-language newspaper, and that the well-known "Radio Free Europe" wants to use the editorial verbatim in Czech, Polish, Russian translations for radio broadcasts beamed to the people behind the Iron Curtain.

National Brotherhood Award of the National Conferences of Christians and Jews to Barry Bingham, of Louisville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BURKE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, during the recent observance of National Brotherhood Week, the National Conference of Christians and Jews conferred upon a distinguished Kentuckian, Mr. Barry Bingham, president and editor-in-chief of the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times, its National Brotherhood Award as a tribute to his outstanding public and community service and the unparalleled contribution which he and Mrs. Bingham have made to a better understanding among people of all races and religions. I have had the privilege of knowing Barry Bingham for many years during which I have seen how well he exemplifies those admirable traits which the National Conference of Christians and Jews seeks to bring out in all men of whatever ethnic and religious backgrounds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the inspired message of the President set forth in his letter to the President of the National Conference of Christians and Jews endorsing the observance of National Brotherhood Week and the President's remarks in a film shown at the national brotherhood dinner this year. In addition I urge my colleagues to read the following letter written by the President to Mr. Bingham and the addresses given at the National Brotherhood Award dinner in Louisville, Ky., on February 23, 1961, by the Honorable Charles W. Morris and Senator Thruston B. Morton:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1961.

Dr. LEWIS WEBSTER JONES,
President, National Conference of Christians and Jews, New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. JONES: I heartily endorse the suggestion of the National Conference of Christians and Jews that a period of time again be set aside for the observance of Brotherhood Week. In celebrating National Brotherhood Week we honor the human values upon which our country was established. As long as men fear or distrust one another because of race, religion, or ethnic origins, as long as any of the gates of opportunity are closed to the deserving, as long as there is unreasoning biogtry, instead of understanding and tolerance, our Nation will fall short of its full power and greatness.

Across the world new nations are struggling for survival and progress. These nations, composed of men of all colors and faiths, are looking for leadership and guidance in their effort to construct new societies. Only if we demonstrate that the freedom which we advocate is available to all our citizens will these new nations look to us for this guidance. Yet on the choices of these new nations hinge our own ultimate survival.

Thus brotherhood is not just a goal. It is a condition on which our way of life depends. The question for our time is not whether all men are brothers. That question has been answered by the God who placed us on this earth together. The question is whether we have the strength and the will to make brotherhood of man the guiding principle of our daily lives.

I therefore urge all Americans to join a nationwide observance of Brotherhood Week from February 19 to February 26, 1961.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President.

TEXT OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S FILMED MESSAGE

I have on many occasions taken part actively in dinners such as the one in which you are participating this evening and it is therefore a great pleasure to speak to you from the White House and to express my strong support for the work in which you are engaged.

These dinners are held and have been held for many years in order to place before us a goal to which this Nation has been dedicated since its earliest beginnings—the goal of men and women of different creeds, different races, different origins living together harmoniously and in brotherhood.

I know that there is a constant feeling that we fail to achieve our goals and in spite of the work of this organization and on the part of dedicated men and women across our country, that we still stand a good distance from the standard which was raised in the earliest days by our Founding Fathers and which has been the national goal ever since. I hope that no one in this room feels that disappointment. National progress has been made on a whole variety of fronts.

I want to congratulate, therefore, all of you on the work that has been done in other years. But I also want to suggest that we still have a good deal of distance to go, that the work in which we are engaged is more important than it ever was, not merely to us as individuals and as fellow Americans but as leaders of the free world and as strong believers in the future of our country and the things for which it stands.

We seek to lead the free world against an alien system but we cannot do so unless we ourselves match our actions to our words. We look for support and brotherhood to millions, hundreds of millions of Americans of different creeds, of different colors, who share our aspirations but sometimes are not convinced that we believe strongly in the doctrines that we preach. I believe we do. I believe as a nation we must be committed to these goals. I believe as a nation increasingly we will be, and I believe that when we eventually reach these goals it will have been due to the work of organizations such as yours.

I want to thank you on behalf of our country for the effort in which you are engaged. It is an effort to which all of us give, I hope, not only lipservice but also commitment. The brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God is a basic principle which has directed this Nation through many years and I am confident will direct it with increasing vigor in the years to come.

FEBRUARY 21, 1961.

Hon. BARRY BINGHAM,
The Louisville Courier-Journal,
Louisville, Ky.

DEAR BARRY: I am delighted to learn that on Thursday you will receive the National Brotherhood Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Your public and community service as well as your distinguished editorial career surely merit this recognition. I hope you will extend to all your friends and to your family my warmest wishes on this occasion.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely,

JOHN KENNEDY.

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES W. MORRIS

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is my proud and pleasant privilege tonight to represent the National Conference of Christians and Jews in bestowing an honor long postponed and richly deserved.

As we all know, the American vocabulary is growing like Topsy. Words that Shakespeare never imagined—that Einstein never dreamed of—constantly crop up in the language—words like framework, finalize, in terms of, project, expertize, and now it has become increasingly popular, especially among psychiatrists, advertising men, educators and columnists to employ the word, "image." We read about the "father image," the "son image," et cetera, et cetera. Indeed, Senator MORTON, I seem to recall having read recently in the papers that a distinguished Kentuckian spoke about the Republican image. Now I'm not sure just what these learned people have in mind, but I am convinced that if there is one "image" around these parts that prevail over all others—if there is one name which—like that of Browning's Abou Ben Adhem—leads all the rest, then that image and that name is Barry Bingham.

It has been his prerogative and, at the same time, his burden to exercise a greater influence upon the minds and hearts of his fellow citizens, in Louisville and in Kentucky, than any other man I know. There are occasions, of course, when almost every one who reads the Courier-Journal or the Times, or who listens to, or watches WHAS, may find himself in disagreement with some official position, some editorial, some headline or comic strip or some other feature of the compound of communication which yet another Barry (Mike, by name, the erudite editor of the Kentucky Irish-American) likes to call "the monopoly press" (I confess to a compulsive aversion to Dick Tracy and David Lawrence). But this much we know—our man is forthright: he is not afraid to take a stand—often an originally unpopular stand—and stick by it (as Marse Henry Watterson was wont to say) in spite of hell and high water.

Behind this attitude there is simplicity, courage, and a profound and often prophetic understanding of human rights—a devotion to the kind of community, local, State and National, which symbolizes the dreams of our Founding Fathers—a community where every citizen, Christian or Jew, white or black, rich or poor, shall have a chance to make use, without let or hindrance, of the opportunities with which he has been endowed by his creator, for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—and to use these endowments, if you please, with dignity and self-respect.

Embellishing these qualities are modesty, humility and that rarest of gifts—a real sense of humor.

It is significant that this meeting should be held the day after the birthday of George Washington—who declared that our Government gives to bigotry no sanction (and) to persecution no assistance.

Barry Bingham typifies the highest and truest ideals of the organization which honors him this evening; and it is fitting and felicitous that he should receive this tribute.

Will Rogers used to say that all he knew was what he read in the papers. I think that applies to most of us here tonight—and most of us are impressed by the consistent dedication of the Bingham press to those rights which are guaranteed to all citizens by the first amendment: freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the right of peaceful assembly and petition. If the news is occasionally a little oblique, thank God it is directed toward the attainment of these constitutional guarantees. Now add to this dedication a generous and sympathetic devotion to all good causes and a mature, even-tempered day-by-day crusade for a decent and progressive community—and you will understand why we pay this tribute to our guest of honor.

I would be both ungrateful and ungracious were I to fail to pay another tribute—a tribute to the lovely and brilliant lady who sits at his side. Mary Caperton Bingham became Protestant cochairman of the Louisville Chapter of the Conference of Christians and Jews when the chapter was in its formative stage. She—more than any other single individual—is responsible for its remarkable growth and success. She is a true aristocrat—because she has a profound sense of noblesse oblige—an understanding that social eminence, good fortune, wit and charm involve a grateful recognition of other people's rights.

And may I say to our honored guest that though providence has chosen you as an instrument for brotherhood and for good, and crowned you with rare and precious gifts—influence, a certain power, good looks, good health, a fine family, comfort, yes, affluence—your richest gift and your rarest possession is your gracious and charming wife.

And so, Barry Bingham, we tender to you this citation—you have deserved and received so many, from schools and colleges and foreign nations, from your country and your fellow publishers, your city and your State, that you may find no place to display it upon your walls or on your desk, but each of us here finds an immense gratification in taking part in this ceremony and vicariously your recognition will speed each of us on to greater dedication. The liberty of no nation can rise higher than its source—and that source is and must be the individual dignity and the general liberty of man.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THRUSTON B. MORTON

During the national observance of Brotherhood Week, it is a high honor for me to speak at this dinner honoring one of Kentucky's most famous sons—a man well-deserving of his national award from the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

As editor in chief of our great Louisville newspapers, Barry Bingham long has been a tower in the encouragement of the ideals for which the National Conference works: enlightened tolerance—the application of reason and understanding to human conflicts which arise from the pits of prejudice and misguided emotions.

Barry has not limited his dedicated lifetime of public service to the editorial pages of his newspapers, either. In countless other activities, both here in Kentucky and on the national scene, he has pressed his basic goals with untiring dedication.

In politics, Barry and I sometimes have been on the same side of the fence—sometimes on opposite sides.

But even when we were on opposite sides, I do not believe that any basic conflict was created—it was simply a matter of us choosing a different means for the progress that we both want.

Unfortunately, this is not the situation with all people in America on opposite sides of a fence.

In many instances, both in individual and group situations, being on opposite sides of a fence—a racial fence, say, or a religious fence—has created sharp conflicts that leave deep scars unless they are mediated by the forces of moral and religious leadership.

Barry has been one of the country's leaders in mobilizing public support of these tempering forces, and it is for this work that he is being given the Brotherhood Award tonight.

But while our specific purpose tonight is to honor Barry, we really are saluting a great cause—of which he is one shining exponent.

This great cause is one to which this organization has devoted its creative energies since 1928, and for which Barry has done so much in our area and in the Nation.

The cause will end most of the world's troubles when it is achieved in full. It is understanding and tolerance, applied to bring about community unity.

The National Conference of Christians and Jews has worked long, hard, and successfully to alleviate the tensions that arise from religious and ethnic misundertandings. And these conflicts must be eliminated, for they are dangerous as well as morally wrong.

At home and abroad, Americans in the exciting decade of the 1960's face unprecedented dangers and unprecedented opportunities—both at the same time.

Americans are challenged in the 1960's to avoid the dangers while reaping the opportunities.

To do this we must face the challenges united—united in moral principle and united in moral purpose, no matter what different edifices or ceremonies we individually attend in our personal worship of God.

Nothing can defeat a morally united America—but a morally disunited America can never fulfill our historic promise of greatness. It is to this crucial unity that the work of the national conference is dedicated.

To a U.S. Senator, this is a somewhat unusual organization. It has no legislative goals. It does not lobby. It does not file lawsuits nor does it pressure legislators to enact special-interest laws.

This national conference is more of an educational group—though many concrete advances have been made.

The conference proceeds by mobilizing religious principles and bringing them to bear on problems which divide Americans.

One theme of President Kennedy's inaugural address seems to apply to the national conference's approach. While he was referring to foreign policy, a paraphrase of his thought is appropriate.

Let us concentrate, the President advised, on the things that unite us rather than the differences that divide us.

That's what the national conference does as it proceeds to rally religious principles that will spur civic actions solving community problems.

Our three great religious groups—Protestants, Catholics and Jews— differ in philosophy and procedure, of course. But through all of them run common strands of moral conviction that can, and do in the national conference, combine into a mighty educational force that is greater in power than the sum of the three.

While country-wide in its organizational structure, the national conference to my mind essentially is local in character. While it has general national and international goals, its most dramatic advances and its most penetrating work have been done on the local level—and this is one reason Barry should take much pride in his award tonight.

To share in the work of the national conference, a person is not asked to leave his home and community and strive elsewhere for one specific national goal. He is asked to enlist for the duration in the war against prejudice, intolerance and divisive misunderstanding in his own community.

In a phrase, a participant in this great organiaztion is summoned basically to follow the political advice Theodore Roosevelt gave excited partisans who wanted to help his cause but could not discern what to do.

TR's sound instruction was: "Do what you can, with what you have, where you are."

Here in Kentucky, this wise dictate was being followed when the local chapters rallied public opinion against religious and racial bigotry in elections; when you organized many human relations programs at our high schools and universities, and when you promoted National Brotherhood Week observances among schools and civic groups.

From such advances in Kentucky and in all the other States, the national conference is a dynamic part of America's effort to create a broad, national climate of moral unity from the Atlantic coast to Hawaii and Alaska.

And this we will need as we move into the challenges that lie ahead.

America, and indeed the entire free world, face from atheistic communism a dangerous challenge of monolithic thrust.

Divided in any basic way, we will not be able to muster the national response necessary to overcome this awesome challenge.

Divided in any basic way, we will not be able to develop at home that national consensus under which we can minimize political and economic differences and take bold, constructive action to make America even more solidly prosperous than in the past.

Divided in any basic way, America cannot agree on action to rid itself of those prejudices that sap the potential strength of the Nation.

Toward all of these goals, the national conference strives.

But in this organization the work is definitely not aimed at some compromises of expediency—in which social conflicts are merely swept under the rug with a "let's don't talk about it" policy.

More effectively than I can state, the deeper aim of the national conference was stated 2 years ago by your eminent president, Dr. Lewis Webster Jones.

Dr. Jones said this:

"Adjustment by itself is not an adequate social ideal. It can be barren and self-defeating. The religious view of man, on which the work of the NCCJ is based, assumes that man is responsible, as a free moral agent, for his own acts, and for the ethical climate of his own society. Something is required of him by adjustment. Conformity to corrupt practices, however general they may be or however successful, is simply wrong. Unless we recognize this fact, American civilization will not fulfill its promise. It will not even survive, nor deserve to survive."

If all of us, regardless of whether or not we are members of the national conference, can summon this spirit—when we are faced on a personal level with a situation of social conflict—such conflicts largely will pass out of our lives.

And when this happens, the reality for everyone will be those words in the salute to the flag which appear as a keynote phrase in so much of the national conference's literature:

"One Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

That's what we're working for and the national conference, with such distinguished and energetic leaders as Barry Bingham, is in the forefront of the struggle.

I endorse your program. I praise your progress. I congratulate you for having the mature judgment to see the need for such enlightened work.

Wetlands Acquisition and Water Pollution Control Are on Wildlife Federation's Priority List

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when delegates to the National Wildlife Federation's 25th annual convention met in Washington, D.C., last month, they adopted a series of resolutions that include a priority program on objectives of major conservation importance. That program lists two objectives on which I have already introduced legislation in the 87th Congress, namely, an expanded and strengthened water pollution control program and a crash program for the acquisition of waterfowl wetlands.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of the Wildlife Federation's priority program in the RECORD:

FEDERATION'S PRIORITY PROGRAM

Be it resolved, the National Wildlife Federation, in 25th annual convention assembled, March 5, 1961, in Washington, D.C., hereby declares and affirms its endorsement of the following objectives deemed of major conservation importance:

Acquisition of waterfowl wetlands. In view of mounting competition for land and water areas, drainage, and other factors, it is believed that the next decade will be critical for the future survival of continental migratory waterfowl population. Unless adequate provision is made for the acquisition and preservation of suitable habitat especially vital nesting areas, throughout the North American Continent, flights of migratory waterfowl will dwindle to the point where they are of little or no interest to an important segment of the public. The National Wildlife Federation, therefore, proposed the immediate initiation and implementation of the following crash program: (a) that the U.S. Department of the Interior be authorized a $150 million advance loan, to be repaid with funds resulting from annual sales of migratory bird hunting (duck) stamps, from the U.S. Treasury for the acquisition of suitable waterfowl habitat while still available at reasonable cost; (b) that official State wildlife agencies be authorized advance loans, to be repaid from sources of income available to them, from the U.S. Treasury in the aggregate of $100 million for the acquisition of suitable waterfowl areas to supplement the Federal program; and (c) that the Government of the United States operating through appropriate channels or an international commission, arrange to grant adequate funds to official Canadian wildlife agencies, Federal or Provincial, for cooperative acquisition and preservation of suitable waterfowl nesting areas in that nation. The National Wildlife Federation also supports the principle that appropriate agencies of United States and State Governments should actively pursue every suitable means at their disposal to insure that the unlawful taking of migratory birds be reduced to a minimum throughout the entire North American Continent.

Establishment of public recreational areas: Recognizing that the expanding human population, enjoying more leisure time and improved modes of transportation, is making ever-increasing demands upon outdoor recreational resources, including fish and wildlife, it is believed essential that the establishment of adequate public recreational areas and facilities, particularly in the eastern part of the United States, be included as integral parts of all land-and-water resource planning on National, State and local levels. As the expansion of urban areas and extension of industrial areas, airports and highways, etc., create competition with recreational uses for many land and water areas, it is viewed as particularly urgent that those possessing exceptional qualities for fish and wildlife, boating, swimming, and scenic, historic, or educational appreciation be reserved for present and future public use.

Multiple use of public lands and waters: Now that multiple use is an official policy of the Government of the United States as relating to national forests, it is essential that the same principle be applied to public domain lands administered by the Department of the Interior and to public waters. Public domain lands should be managed equitably for outdoor recreation (including public access), range, timber, watershed protection, and fish and wildlife, as well as the development of mineral resources, without domination by any one or several user interests. Public waters should be managed for fish and wildlife and recreation as well as for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining or industrial purposes. The United States should never surrender any right with regard to water which it presently has and the Federal Government must assert and maintain its right to reasonable use of water on all public properties for recreation and fish and wildlife; furthermore, project plans for impoundments financed by or with the use of Federal funds should include provisions for maintaining conservation or minimum pools or streamflows in the interest of fish and wildlife resources, and for developing other public recreational facilities, including access. It is recognized that all lands and waters are not suitable for all purposes; therefore, application of the multiple-use principle in a broad sense entails determination of optimum, or best, use in the public interest of specific areas.

Water pollution control: Since increasing demands are being made upon limited supplies, the necessary reuse of water makes pollution control a matter of vital concern to all Americans. Because State and local water pollution control agencies, with only limited resources available, have been and are unable to cope adequately with the overall national water pollution problem, it is viewed as urgent that the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956 (Public Law 660) be strengthened to include: (a) increased Federal grants to municipalities for accelerated construction of waste treatment facilities; (b) extension of Federal water pollution law enforcement to navigable intrastate waters when invited by appropriate officials of the State so concerned or when local or State authorities are unable to eliminate pollution; (c) incentives which would stimulate adequate treatment of industrial wastes, including agricultural chemicals, and reduce siltation; and (d) upgrade the Federal water pollution control program within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, probably to the status of an office or administration, in keeping with its importance to the public.

Wilderness preservation: Public lands of the United States under jurisdiction of Federal agencies include areas of true wilderness which possess great educational, scientific and recreational capabilities for the public as well as watershed protection values. It is believed that these areas should be established as soon as possible in a National Wilderness Preservation System which provides for orderly procedures for the protection and addition, modification or deletion of particular areas.

Chemical pesticides: While it is necessary that agricultural and forestry losses caused by insects and pests be controlled, some chemicals now in use for this purpose result in extensive, longtime damage to wildlife population, fish and other aquatic organisms and threaten to contaminate public water supplies. It is believed that the public would benefit in many respects through the adoption of a Chemical Pesticides Coordination Act requiring any Federal agency conducting or contributing to a chemical pest control program consult on plans with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and appropriate State agencies prior to their initiation. Further, research should be expedited upon the development of selective, short-lived chemicals which would perform control functions without damage to other values, including wildlife, aquatic life and public water supplies.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Blakley, Wm. A., *Tex*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Bridges, Styles, *N.H*
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*—The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*—The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*—Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*—4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*—2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Dworshak, Henry, *Idaho*
Eastland, James O., *Miss*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Engle, Clair, *Calif*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*—5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Goldwater, Barry, *Ariz*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hickey, J. J., *Wyo*
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Keating, Kenneth B., *N.Y*—1233 31st St., NW.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*—4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*—7426 Hampden La., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*—5417 Kirkwood Dr. Bethesda, Md.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*—4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*—122 Schotts Court NE.
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Benjamin A., *Mass*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala*—4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*—Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Kerr (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of New Jersey, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Cooper, McCarthy, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. Boggs.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Humphrey, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Bridges, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Blakley, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Hartke, Smith of Massachusetts, Beall, Prouty, and Miller.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Jackson, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Burdick, Metcalf, Hickey, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Fong, and Miller.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Blakley, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Burdick, Smith of Massachusetts, Pell, Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Boggs.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Smith of Massachusetts, Metcalf, Case of South Dakota, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, Fong, and Boggs.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Mansfield (chairman), Hayden, Jordan, Cannon, Hickey, Pell, Curtis, Keating, and Miller.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eight judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker, Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.